



STAFF REPORT SAN CLEMENTE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Meeting Date: November 5, 2014

PLANNER: Sean Nicholas, Associate Planner *SN*

SUBJECT: Amendment to Site Plan Permit 97-16/Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series Only), Removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, and Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential, a request to consider architectural amendments to the 7000 Series residential product, removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, and revised residential entry monument signs for the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. All residences will be less than or equal to the heights of the approved architecture.

LOCATION: Residential area of Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan

ZONING/GP: Residential Low Density (Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan)

BACKGROUND:

- The applicant, Marblehead Development Partners, are proposing to remove the Custom Home Lot Program, receive approval of revised architecture for the 7000 Series homes, and receive approval of new entry monuments along Avenida Vista Hermosa for the Residential development.
- On August 6, 2014, the Courtyard, 5000 Series, 5500 Series, and 6000 Series residential products architecture was reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator. The 7000 Series amendment is the last of the series of homes.

Custom Home Lot Program Removal

- The new property owner has decided not to proceed forward with the Custom Home Lot Program. By removing the Custom Home Lot Program from the development, it will allow the developers to build the underlying lot size/Series homes on those 69 lots associated with the Custom program (example: a 5,500 square foot lot previously associated with the Custom Lot Program will have a 5500 Series Home as previously approved). For the 7,000 square foot lots, the architecture is discussed below.
- With the removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, the applicant is proposing to maintain all of the conditions of approval associated with the portion of the development next to Colony Cove. The one exception to the conditions of approval is that story poles will not be required as there is no uncertainty as to the height,

AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, Marblehead Coastal Residential

massing, or architecture since the architectural designs were previously approved. These designs have been seen by the Colony Cove interested parties, and they were supportive of the designs and the conditions continuing forward.

- All other conditions associated with the Custom Lot program will be removed, and the applicant will not be restricted to three building permits a year on the 69 lots previously associated with the Custom program.

7000 Series Homes

- As with the other homes, the applicant is updating all of the designs to meet current market demands. The architect, Chris Barlow, has designed the homes to be both consistent with the other single-family residences previously approved, and the architectural guidelines set forth for the Custom Homes. The result is a high quality home with greater movement in the roof lines as well as the elevations.
- The heights of all the homes are less than or equal to the approved heights of 29 feet.
- All of the exterior designs are of equal or improved architectural quality than what was approved by City Council. Design features include: two piece clay tile roofs, wrought iron and real wood details and balconies, smooth stucco finishes, and varying insets to provide massing breaks and façade relief.
- The applicant also proposes 18 different color palettes to distinguish each home. The color palette uses primarily earth tone colors.
- While staff and the applicant want to use white tones to reflect the City's "Spanish Village by the Sea" character. However, Coastal Commission's previous approval required the project to utilize earth tones, especially at the edges of the project and adjacent to sensitive habitat areas. Staff and the applicant are committed to get white stucco with red tile roof homes throughout the residential development in areas not adjacent to sensitive habitat or edges of the development.
- The architecture was reviewed by the Design Review Subcommittee on October 15th. The DRSC was generally supportive of the design, but wanted to see the side elevations for Plan 2 improved so that the façade provided more articulation. The architect has modified the side to have plane breaks, and has also added additional windows. Staff is supportive of the improvements.

Monument Signs

- SunCal, the previous owner of the residential portion of Marblehead Coastal, had received approval of some unique and varying walls which they proposed to use for monument signs. Unfortunately, even at the time of approval, the walls could not be developed due to utility easements at the various residential intersections.
- To address this, the new property owners are proposing a simplified sign design, somewhat in character with the adjacent commercial development. These signs are reminiscent of the original monument signs approved for the various entry points into the residential community.
- The areas where the signs are proposed are considered gateways pursuant to the Centennial General Plan. While there is no definitive policies in the General Plan about these areas, the proposed smooth white stucco, solid decorative caps, and

AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, Marblehead Coastal Residential

individual pin mounted letters is consistent with the aesthetics of the community and Marblehead Coastal. For that reason, staff's position is that the monument signage is consistent with the intent of the General Plan gateway locations.

- Also as part of the sign package for the residential side was a public art piece in the middle of the roundabout. The applicant is proposing to remove that and add landscaping and a large specimen tree. The applicant has indicated that they will work with staff to determine an appropriate size and tree species. Staff is supportive of the removal of the original feature as it is not in character with Marblehead Coastal.
- Design Review Subcommittee (DRSC) reviewed the designs on October 15th and had mixed comments regarding the design. There were some comments that the scale and design was appropriate to provide mass for the entry ways into a major development such as Marblehead, while there were concerns about the signs being too large and bulky. The applicant took the comments and reduced the scale of the design, while maintaining the character and prominence of the signs. Staff is supportive of the modifications. DRSC was also very supportive of the art feature being removed from the roundabout and adding the additional landscaping.
- Overall, staff is supportive of the removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, the revised architecture to the 7000 Series homes, and the revised monument sign designs. The changes will provide certainty and consistency in the architecture of the development, and provide signage that is both aesthetically compatible and functional. Again, the heights of the homes are all less than or equal to what was approved by City Council.
- The noticing of the project was consistent with both local and state requirements. Staff has received lots of supportive comments on the project, and there has been significant interest in purchasing lots within the development. Staff did receive inquiries concerning the homes adjacent to Colony Cove, as noted above there are no proposed changes to the number of one-story homes or any of the conditions of approval for the homes adjacent to Colony Cove.

RECOMMENDATION

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT the Zoning Administrator approve AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series Only), Removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, and Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential, subject to the attached Resolution and conditions of approval.

Attachments:

1. Resolution # ZA14-047
Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval
2. Location Map
3. Design Review Subcommittee Staff Report and Minutes (excerpted)
Plans

RESOLUTION NO. ZA 14-047

A RESOLUTION OF THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN PERMIT 97-16/AMENDMENT TO DISCRETIONARY SIGN PERMIT 07-007, MARBLEHEAD COASTAL RESIDENTIAL, A REQUEST TO REMOVE THE CUSTOM HOME LOT PROGRAM FROM THE DEVELOPMENT, UPDATE THE 7000 SERIES ARCHITECTURE, REVISE THE RESIDENTIAL ENTRY MONUMENT SIGNS ON AVENIDA VISTA HERMOSA, AND REMOVE THE PUBLIC ART PIECE IN THE ROUNDABOUT FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE MARBLEHEAD COASTAL SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2014 an application was submitted and completed on October 23, 2014 by Don McDougall, Marblehead Development Partners, 8105 Irvine Center Drive, #1450, Irvine, CA, 92618, for an amendment to the approved Site Plan Permit and Discretionary Sign Permit to remove the Custom Home Lot Program, update the 7000 Series architecture, modify the entry monuments on Vista Hermosa, and remove the public art piece in the roundabout within the residential portion of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Division completed an initial environmental assessment of the above matter in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and recommends that the Zoning Administrator determine that the project has an approved Environmental Impact Report (FEIR 95-01), and that these changes are just to the architecture and minor footprint modifications, and meets all development standards set forth in the approved Specific Plan evaluated in the EIR, as well as all heights proposed are less than or equal to the approved heights by City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City's Development Management Team reviewed the project for compliance with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable requirements on August 21, 2014 and the proposed project was recommended for approval subject to conditions of approval as noted under Exhibit A, and the original conditions in Resolution CC07-02 that are not modified by this Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2014, the Zoning Administrator held a duly noticed public hearing on the subject application and considered evidence presented by the City staff, the applicant, and other interested parties.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Zoning Administrator of the City of San Clemente hereby resolves as follows:

Section 1: The project has an approved Environmental Impact Report (FEIR 95-01), and that these changes are just to the architecture and minor footprint modifications, and meets all development standards set forth in the approved Specific Plan evaluated in the EIR, as well as all heights proposed are less than or equal to the approved heights by City Council.

Section 2: With regard to AM SPP 97-16, the Zoning Administrator finds as follows:

- A. The proposed development is permitted within the subject zone pursuant to the approval of a Site Plan Permit and complies with all the applicable provisions of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, the goals, and objectives of the San Clemente General Plan, and the purpose and intent of the zone in which the development is being proposed in that the removal of the Custom Home Lot Program will allow greater consistency for the architecture of the development and ensure complete build out in an efficient manner, and update and enhance the architecture of the 7000 Series residential products of Marblehead Coastal. All heights are less than or equal to the approved City Council architecture.
- B. The site is suitable for the type and intensity of development that is proposed in that the number of units or uses are not being amended by this amendment, just removing the Custom Home Lot Program to ensure consistency in the design and architecture of the development and updates to the architectural design of the 7000 Series. All heights are less than or equal to the approved heights by City Council.
- C. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties and improvements in the vicinity in that all applicable development standards, including building code and green code requirements, are or will be met with the project.
- D. The proposed development will not be unsightly or create disharmony with its locale and surroundings in that removal of the Custom Home Lot Program will ensure consistency in the architecture throughout the development and ensure that they are built together, as well as improve the 7000 Series architecture consistent with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan.
- E. The proposed development will minimize or eliminate adverse physical or visual effects which might otherwise result from unplanned or inappropriate development, design or location in that the residential area has been well planned out and staff will continue to review and monitor to ensure the highest level of architectural quality for the community.

Section 3: With regard to AM DSP 07-007, the Zoning Administrator finds as follows:

- A. The design, including lighting, scale, length and materials, of the sign is consistent with the intent of the design elements of the General Plan, Design Guidelines, respective specific plan in which the sign is to be located

in that it is reminiscent of the Commercial side approvals but distinctive and unique to give formality and importance to the residential entrance into the Marblehead Coastal Development. Removal of the art feature will also be consistent with the design of the community.

- B. The design, scale and materials of the sign harmonize with the architectural design and details of the building or site it serves as it is Spanish in design with the solid detail cap, column elements, and white smooth stucco finish. Removal of the art piece and use of drought tolerant landscaping and a specimen tree in the roundabout is also more consistent with the character of the development.
- C. The design and scale of the sign is appropriate to the distance from which the sign is normally viewed as the scale of the signs have been designed to provide intimacy for the entrance of the residential portion of Marblehead Coastal, yet large enough to provide a sense of entry.
- D. The design and materials of the sign provide a contrast between the background and letters in that the use of the pin mounted dark bronze letters providing an excellent contrast from the Smooth White Stucco background.
- E. If a freestanding sign is included in the sign application, the design, scale or location of the building dictates the use of freestanding signs, rather than building-mounted signs as these signs are the entry monuments for a major subdivision in the City of San Clemente and consistent with the character and designs of the homes.
- F. The provisions of the Master Sign Program ensure consistency in design and style of all new signs in that the signs are high quality design and material and match the high quality nature of the homes in the development.
- G. The provisions of the Master Sign Program address compatibility of the design and style of any existing signs on the building or site in that they are all consistent in design and character. Additionally removing the large public art piece further brings the entire package more in line with the character of the development.
- H. All new signs within the Master Sign Program are in compliance with the design standards of this chapter in that the signs meet all applicable development standards and they are the only signs a part of the package and will be built with the opening of West Avenida Vista Hermosa.

Section 4: The Zoning Administrator of the City of San Clemente hereby approves AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series Only), Removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, and Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential, subject to the above Findings, and the Conditions of Approval attached hereto as Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Zoning Administrator of the City of San Clemente on November 5, 2014.

SAN CLEMENTE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

James S. Holloway, Zoning Administrator

EXHIBIT A

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments
(7000 Series Only), Removal of the Custom Home Lot Program, and
Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential**

1. The applicant or the property owner or other holder of the right to the development entitlement(s) or permit(s) approved by the City for the project, if different from the applicant (herein, collectively, the "Indemnitor") shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of San Clemente and its elected city council, its appointed boards, commissions, and committees, and its officials, employees, and agents (herein, collectively, the "Indemnitees") from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses, fines, penalties, and expenses, including without limitation litigation expenses and attorney's fees, arising out of either (i) the City's approval of the project, including without limitation any judicial or administrative proceeding initiated or maintained by any person or entity challenging the validity or enforceability of any City permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnitees in conjunction with such permit or approval, including without limitation any action taken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), or (ii) the acts, omissions, or operations of the Indemnitor and the directors, officers, members, partners, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors of each person or entity comprising the Indemnitor with respect to the ownership, planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the project and the property for which the project is being approved. The City shall notify the Indemnitor of any claim, lawsuit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding (herein, an "Action") within the scope of this indemnity obligation and request that the Indemnitor defend such Action with legal counsel reasonably satisfactory to the City. If the Indemnitor fails to so defend the Action, the City shall have the right but not the obligation to do so and, if it does, the Indemnitor shall promptly pay the City's full cost thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the indemnity obligation under clause (ii) of the first sentence of this condition shall not apply to the extent the claim arises out of the willful misconduct or the sole active negligence of the City. *[Citation – City Attorney Legal Directive/City Council Approval June 1, 2010]* (PIng.)_____

2. All conditions of approval as listed in CC Resolution 07-02 are still in effect, except for those related to the Custom Home Lot Program, unless referenced in these conditions of approval in this Resolution. (PIng.)_____

3. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the final approval for the project. *[Citation – City Quality Assurance Program]* (PIng.) _____
4. All materials, design elements, details, recesses (windows, doors, and other features), and all other features as determined necessary by staff shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to installation in the field. ■■(PIng.)_____
5. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit for Planning Division review and approval the final plotting and locations of all homes, including but not limited to: floor plan, elevation type, details, and color palette. ■■ (PIng.)_____
6. Prior to installation of details in the field, the applicant shall go to Design Review Subcommittee for review of final details including but not limited to wrought iron and Spanish tile features. ■■ (PIng.)_____
7. Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, the project shall be develop in conformance with the site plan, floor plans, elevations, details, and any other applicable submittals approved by the Zoning Administrator on August 6, 2014, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Any deviation from the approved site plan, floor plans, elevations, details, or other approved submittal shall require that the owner or designee submit modified plans and any other applicable materials as required by the City for review and obtain the approval of the City Planner or designee. If the City Planner or designee determines that the deviation is significant, the owner or designee shall be required to apply for review and obtain the approval of the Zoning Administrator. *[Citation - Section 17.12.180 of the SCMC]* (PIng.) _____
8. All heights of all residential structures shall be less than or equal to the heights of the elevations as approved by City Council. Any heights above those approvals shall require the project to be reviewed for approval by the City Council. ■■ (PIng.)_____
9. The residential lots adjacent to Colony Cove shall remain one-story as approved by City Council, and this amendment does not allow any two-story units now, or in the future, on those lots. ■■ (PIng.)_____
10. Prior to issuance of building permits, all building recesses (windows, doors, and other features) shall be indicated on the approved plans. These recesses shall be

a nine (9) inch minimum inset on doors and windows on the front elevation, and a 12 inch inset on prominent architectural features on the front elevation, and a minimum of a six (6) inch inset on all other elevations.

■ ■ (PIng.)_____

- 11. The applicant shall work with the City to determine the appropriate tree species and size to be planted in the middle of the roundabout.

■ ■ (PIng.)_____

- 12. Prior to the issuance of building permits for residential Lots 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 166, 167, 168, 169, and 174, the owner or designee shall submit improvement plans indicating that HVAC equipment, pool pumps and other related equipment shall be located at the property line furthest away from Colony Cove and installed in a manner to mitigate noise to the existing residential community of Colony Cove.

■ ■ (PIng.)_____

- 13. All signs shall be smooth white stucco with a solid accent cap. Final cap design details and all colors shall be approved by the City Planner prior to issuance of Building Permits. The applicant has not shown any lighting for the monument signs, thus none is approved. If in the future the applicant wants the monument signs to be illuminated in some way, the applicant will need to submit a revision and go back to DRSC prior to Zoning Administrator review.

■ ■ (PIng.)_____

General

- 14. Architectural Permit 14-226 is subject to these conditions of approval and all applicable Engineering conditions of approval for AM TTM 8817/SPP 97-16 as adopted by the City Council Resolution No. 04-99 on November 1, 2004. In the event of any conflict between these conditions, the applicable conditions for AM TTM 8817/SPP 97-16 shall govern.

■ ■ (Eng.)_____

Fees and Plan Check Deposit

- 15. Prior to the review of plans, soils report and documents for issuance of Precise Grading Permits, the owner or designee shall deposit minimum \$5,000.00 for Engineering Department plan check. *[Citation – Fee Resolution No. 08-81]*

(Eng.)_____

- 16. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the owner shall pay all applicable development fees, which may include, but are not limited to, City Attorney review, park acquisition and development, water and sewer connection, drainage, grading, RCFPP, transportation corridor etc. *[Citation – Fee Resolution No. 08-81& S.C.M.C. Title 15, Building and Construction, Sections 15.52, 15.56, 15.60, 15.64, 15.68, 15.72]*

(Eng.)_____

Reports –Soils and Geologic, Hydrology

17. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the owner or designee shall submit for review, and shall obtain the approval of the City Engineer or designee for, a soils and geologic report prepared by a registered geologist and/or geotechnical engineer which conforms to City standards and all other applicable codes, ordinances and regulations. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SMC]* (Eng.)_____
18. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the owner or designee shall submit for review, and shall obtain the approval of the City Engineer or designee for a hydrology and hydraulic study prepared by a registered civil engineer to determine the sizes and locations of all on-site drainage facilities in accordance with all applicable City regulations and standards. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SMC]* (Eng.)_____

Grading

19. Prior to issuance of any permits, the owner shall submit for review, and obtain the approval of the City Engineer or designee, a precise grading plan as required by the City Grading Manual and Ordinance. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SMC]* (Eng.)_____
20. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall determine that development of the site shall conform to general recommendations presented in the geotechnical studies, including specifications for site preparation, treatment of cut and fill, soils engineering, and surface and subsurface drainage. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SMC]* (Eng.)_____

Improvements

21. Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the owner or designee shall submit for review, and shall obtain the approval of the City Engineer or designee for frontage improvement plans, including but not limited to the following provisions: *[Citation – Section 15.36, 12.08.010, and 12.24.050 of the SMC]*
- (Eng.)_____

- A. An Engineering Department Encroachment Permit will be required for all work in the public right-of-way. The frontage improvement plan shall include detailed topographic construction detail to show that current city standards are to be met including but not limited to, the construction of sidewalk up and around drive approaches, where applicable, with a minimum width of 4 feet at no more than 2% cross fall.

Drainage

- 22. All storm water shall be conveyed directly to an approved storm drain system. No storm water from structures shall sheet flow over the driveways or sidewalks. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SCMC]*
(Eng.)_____

NPDES

- 23. Prior to issuance of any grading permit, the owner shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the project meets all requirements of the Orange County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Drain Program, and Federal, State, County and City guidelines and regulations, in order to control pollutant run-off. The owner shall submit for review, and shall obtain approval of the City Engineer for, plans for regulation and control of pollutant run-off by using Best Management Practices (BMP's). *[Citation – Section 13.40 of the SCMC]*
(Eng.)_____

- 24. Prior to issuance of any grading permit, the owner or designee shall submit for review a project binder containing the following documents:
(Eng.)_____

- A. For all projects that are greater than one (1) acre, a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the General Construction Storm Water Permit must be filed with the State Water Resources Control Board <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/construction.html> and a copy of the NOI, a WDID number and a copy of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be filed with the City.
- B. If the site is determined to be a “Priority Project” (as defined by the Orange County Municipal Storm Water Permit available at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/ocstormwater.html> a final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) must be recorded with the Orange County Recorder’s Office and filed with the City. Design features of the WQMP shall be incorporated into the Grading Plans. Trash enclosures may be required to be covered if required by the City Engineer.

Financial Security

- 25. Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the owner or designee shall provide separate improvement bonds or irrevocable letters of credit, as determined by the City Engineer, if required by the project, for 100% of each estimated improvement cost, as prepared by a registered civil engineer as required and approved by the

City Attorney and the City Engineer or their designees, for each, but not limited to, the following: rough grading; precise grading; frontage improvements; sidewalks; sewer lines; water lines; storm drains; and erosion control. In addition, the owner or designee may be required, if deemed necessary by the City Engineer, to provide separate labor and material bonds or irrevocable letters of credit for 100% of the above estimated improvement costs. *[Citation – Section 15.36 of the SCMC]* (Eng.)_____

Noise

26. Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the owner or designee shall provide evidence acceptable to the City Engineer that all construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, operated within 1,000 feet of a dwelling shall be equipped with operating and maintained mufflers. *[Citation – Sections 8.48 & 10.48 of the SCMC]* (Eng.)_____

CONDITIONS TO BE SATISFIED PRIOR TO CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY

27. Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy for any residence, the owner shall provide City approved sidewalk from that residence to the existing sidewalk on the collector street. *[Citation – Section 15.36, 12.08.010, and 12.24.050 of the SCMC]* (Eng.)_____
28. Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the owner shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and City Maintenance Manager or their designees that all frontage improvements have been completed and accepted and that any damage to new or existing street right-of-way during construction have been repaired/replaced. *[Citation – Title 12 of the SCMC]* (Eng.)_____(Maint.)_____

CONDITIONS TO BE SATISFIED PRIOR TO RELEASE OF FINANCIAL SECURITY

29. Prior to release of financial security, the owner or designee shall have completed the stenciling of all catch basins and/or storm drain inlets with labels 3" high in black letters, on either the top of the curb or the curb face adjacent to the inlet "NO DUMPING - DRAINS TO OCEAN". These markers shall be maintained in good condition by the Property Owners Association. Also, the owner or designee shall insure that all catch basins have filter basket inserts. *[Citation – Section 13.40 of the SCMC]* (Eng.)_____

Building

30. Separate Building Permit(s) are required for monument signage. Construction documents must be reviewed and approved through a separate building plan check / permit process. (Bldg.)_____ *[S.C.M.C – Title 8 – Chapter 8.16- Fire Code, Title 15 Building Construction - Chapters 15.08, 15.12, 15.16, 15.20]*

- 31. Project has not been reviewed for Building Code compliance. Prior to issuance of building permits, code compliance will be reviewed during building plan check. (Bldg.)_____

[S.C.M.C – Title 8 – Chapter 8.16- Fire Code, Title 15 Building Construction - Chapters 15.08, 15.12, 15.16, 15.20]

- 32. Prior to issuance of building permits, applicant shall secure all utility agencies approvals for the proposed project. (Bldg.)_____

[S.C.M.C – Title 15 Building Construction]

- 33. Building permits shall not be issued unless the project complies with all applicable codes, ordinances, and statutes including, but not limited to, the Zoning Ordinance, Grading Code, Security Ordinance, Transportation Demand Ordinance, Water Quality Ordinance, Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations as adopted by the City including, but not limited to the California Administrative, Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Energy, Green, and Fire Codes. (Bldg.)_____

[S.C.M.C – Title 8 – Chapter 8.16 – Fire Code, Title 15 Building and Construction Chapters 15.08, 15.12, 15.16, 15.20, 15.21, Title 16 Subdivisions, Title 17 Zoning]

- 34. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the owner or designee shall pay all applicable development fees in effect at the time, which may include, but are not limited to, Regional Circulation Financing and Phasing Program (RCFPP), park acquisition and development, water and sewer connection, drainage, Public Facility Construction, transportation corridor, Avenida La Pata Supplemental Road Fee and school fees, etc. (Bldg.)_____

[S.C.M.C. – Title 15 Building and Construction, Chapters 15.52, 15.56, 15.60, 15.64, 15.68, 15.72]

- 35. Prior to the Building Division's approval to pour foundations, the owner or designee shall submit evidence to the satisfaction of the City Building Official or designee that a registered civil engineer that is licensed to do surveying or land surveyor has certified that the forms for the foundations conform to the front, side and rear setbacks are in conformance to the approved plans.

[S.C.M.C – Title 15 – Chapter 15.08, Title 17- Chapter 17.24] (Bldg.)_____

All Conditions of Approval are standard, unless indicated as follows:

- Denotes modified standard Condition of Approval
- ■ Denotes a project specific Condition of Approval



LOCATION MAP

AM SPP 97-16/AM DSP 07-007, MHC Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series), Removal of Custom Homes, and Amendment to Monument Signs





Design Review Subcommittee (DRSC)

Meeting Date: October 15, 2014

PLANNER: Sean Nicholas, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: Amendment to Site Plan Permit 97-16/Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series Only) and Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential, a request to consider revised architecture for the 7000 series residential products for Marblehead Coastal, and to revert back to the previously approved monument signage for Avenida Vista Hermosa for entry into the development.

BACKGROUND:

The applicant, Marblehead Development Partners, has acquired the residential side of Marblehead Coastal. They are now proposing an amendment to the architecture to the 7000 series residential homes. No other architectural changes are proposed to the other series of residential homes previously reviewed by DRSC on July 9, 2014.

The applicant is also requesting to go back to previously approved monument signs for Avenida Vista Hermosa. SunCal later received approval for a modified monument sign package, which also included a public art piece at the center of the roundabout. The new owners wish to remove the currently approved sign package and go back to what is proposed.

Design Review Subcommittee review is required per Section 17.12.020, Review Authorities, to provide architectural review of the proposed project and ensure the project is consistent with the Design Guidelines.

The project site's land use designation is Residential Single Family within the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. A separate application is pending to remove the Custom Home Lot program. Once the Custom Home Lot program is removed, this architecture will apply to the 7,000 square foot lots.

ANALYSIS:

When staff started working with Marblehead Development Partners, staff recommended to maintain the same general designs when updating the exteriors and interior floor plans to meet current market demands. The applicant took the recommendations and has developed the attached plans for Design Review Subcommittee review. The 7000 series homes were all associated with the Custom Home Lot program which allowed for up to 29 feet in height and required more articulation. The applicant has designed homes that

AM SPP 97-16, MHC Residential Architectural Amendments and Monument Signs

Page 2

are consistent with the Custom Home Lot program in terms of height and articulation with high quality materials, and varied roof lines. The original approved architecture did not have the same roof line variations as proposed, and the applicant has developed an enhanced building design consistent with the standards of the Custom Home Lot program and consistent with the other home designs already approved in Marblehead Coastal.

The applicant is also proposing to utilize the same palette of 18 different earth tone colors previously reviewed and approved by Design Review Subcommittee, to be used to mix and match among the various architectural plans. While staff and the applicant want to use more standard white tones to reflect the City's "Spanish Village by the Sea" character, Coastal Commission has required the project utilize earth tones, especially for structures adjacent to sensitive habitat areas. In areas where Coastal Commission has not placed color restrictions, staff and the applicant are committed to get white stucco with red tile roof homes.

The applicant is also proposing to revert back to the previously approved entry monument signs along Avenida Vista Hermosa. SunCal had gone through a process and had received approval from City Council for very ornate, large, and expansive monument walls at various residential entries off of Avenida Vista Hermosa. The applicants have indicated that those walls are not functional and conflict with utilities already installed on Avenida Vista Hermosa. Additionally, the applicant is proposing the removal of the artistic statue that was proposed for the roundabout on Avenida Costa Azul and replacing the feature with drought tolerant landscaping.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

7000 Series Product

As with the previously reviewed and approved Series homes, the applicant is proposing to exceed the quality and design of the previously approved tract housing. This is being done by having varied roof lines, real wrought iron and wood details, and the use of stone, brick, and Spanish tile details in various ways. Additionally, with the 7000 series homes, the applicants have designed a tract home product consistent with the design guidelines of the custom home lot program. The applicant has also updated the architectural design of the 7000 Series to be similar and in character with the previously approved products so the overall Marblehead Coastal Development is consistent.

The applicant is proposing real wood and solid wrought iron details, and the insets on the various doors and windows vary to provide different looks. All of the homes will utilize two-piece clay tiles. As with the other residential Series, the standard conditions of approval associated with roofs, stucco application, and staff inspection and approval of all details will be included. The same requirement regarding the color palette from Coastal Commission applies. Staff is generally supportive of the designs, but staff has these recommendations:

1. **Door and Window Recess Depths-** It appears from the drawings that the architects are proposing varying recess depths to the doors and windows, but those depths are not well noted. Staff is recommending a condition that requires doors and windows on the front elevation be recessed a minimum of nine inches, with a 12 inch recess used on certain prominent architectural features. Additionally, on the sides and rear of buildings a minimum of a six inch recess shall be used. The reason for the larger recess on these buildings will help add shadow lines, which give a greater sense of depth to the architecture consistent with the design guidelines of the Custom Home Lot program.

2. **Side and Rear Elevation Details-** While the front elevations have been designed to provide distinction and interest between the various floor plans and architectural styles, there are opportunities for more details and variations to help break up the side and rear elevations. Elevations have generally followed the approved designs, but there are some elements that could be added to enhance the look of the buildings, such as: continuing stone elements if used on the front elevation around to the side elevations, utilization of stucco details at windows, utilization of Spanish tile, and utilization of additional wrought iron features.

Monument Signs and Roundabout Art Piece

The applicant is proposing to go back to the originally approved monument signs for the project. In 2007, SunCal received approval from the City Council for decorative and unique walls at the entry points in the residential areas from Avenida Vista Hermosa. Marblehead Development Partners, and even Lehman Brothers before them, had stated that the walls proposed by SunCal were never functional or feasible as utilities that are installed prohibit the facilities.

The monument walls proposed are to be smooth white stucco with a simple solid stone cap. They are located in large landscaped areas and are between seven and eight feet tall depending on the location and are below 10 feet in height which is the maximum allowed for monument signs with the approval of a Discretionary Sign Permit.

The signs are similar to the approved monument signage for the commercial portion of the project, but differentiated by some of the proportionalities to the pillars, and the way the wall portions come out of the pillar area. Additionally, they are not proposing any lighting for the residential signage. Staff is supportive of the signs as proposed because they are similar to the commercial development, so they read as if they are part of the same larger site, but different enough to symbolize the commercial from the residential side. Staff has included the approved monument sign design for Craig Realty as Attachment 4.

AM SPP 97-16, MHC Residential Architectural Amendments and Monument Signs

Page 4

The last component of the sign package is the removal of a public art piece in the middle of the roundabout on Avenida Costa Azul. Instead of the art piece, the applicant is proposing low growing and drought tolerant landscaping. Staff is supportive of the change as the art piece, while unique, did not appear to fully fit into the character of the development. Additionally, removing the tall grass landscaping at the base will be more consistent with State water requirements. Engineering was particularly supportive of the proposed modification as this will greatly improve sight distance at the intersection. Staff is supportive of the redesign, but still feels that a vertical element should be included to provide prominence to the feature. For that reason, staff recommends a large tree be planted in the middle of the roundabout and allowed to grow to provide character to the feature, while not impacting sight distance. A final landscape plan, including a specimen tree, shall be reviewed by Planning Staff and the City's Contract Landscape Architect.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed projects are similar to the previously approved tract housing, but has been upgraded to be consistent with the components of the Custom Home Lot design standards. The designs are consistent with the previously approved series of homes so the whole Marblehead Development is consistent. The changes proposed, both in design and footprint, enhance the look of the development and, staff believes, are greater quality than the original product. With the modifications recommended above, as well as the City's standard conditions and review and approval of all details in the field, staff is supportive of the proposed design modifications, including the design of the monuments signs, and the removal of the public art piece. Staff seeks Design Review Subcommittee concurrence with staff's recommendation and any additional comments and recommendations.

**CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
OCTOBER 15, 2014**

Subcommittee Members Present: Bart Crandall, Julia Darden and Jim Ruehlin

Staff Present: Jim Pechous, Cliff Jones and Sean Nicholas

1. MINUTES

Minutes of the September 24, 2014 meeting.

2. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM

A. Amendment to Site Plan Permit 97-16/Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 07-007, Residential Architectural Amendments (7000 Series Only) and Residential Entry Monument Signs-Marblehead Coastal Residential

A request to consider revised architecture for the 7000 series residential products for Marblehead Coastal, and to revert back to the previously approved monument signage for Avenida Vista Hermosa for entry into the residential development.

Associate Planner Sean Nicholas summarized the staff report and presented a PowerPoint regarding the project. Mr. Nicholas indicated this is the last of the architectural styles to be updated for Marblehead Coastal. The applicant and architect are also present should DRSC have questions.

Subcommittee Member Darden asked if the area where the 7000 series homes are located and if that is part of the Custom Lot Program.

Mr. Nicholas indicated that they are a portion of the 69 homes that are associated with the Custom Lot Program. Staff is currently processing an application to remove the Custom Lot Program from Marblehead Coastal. All of the conditions of approval associated with the adjacent parcels to Colony Cove are being maintained and staff continues to keep an open line of communication with Colony Cove. They did indicate that the single story home designs were nice.

Subcommittee Chair Crandall asked if the applicant has completed the plotting of the lots and where the various floor plans were going to be located.

Mr. Nicholas stated that RBF is actively working on this, and prior to issuance of any building permits, the final locations including plan type, colors, and finishes shall be plotted and provided to staff. Mr. Nicholas stated that he would email the document to DRSC once that document has been received.

Mr. Nicholas stated that comments staff had were very similar to the review DRSC completed on the other single family lots. A key difference is staff is recommending larger insets on these homes on the sides and rears to provide additional shadow lines and relief. The Custom Lot program calls out more articulation for the side and rear, so the extra inset is consistent with these standards. Staff will ensure that all of these features are on the plans and inspected in the field.

Mr. Nicholas then went over the three different floor plans and different architectural designs for each floor plan.

The applicant, Don McDougall, added that there are only 24 homes in the 7000 series.

Chair Crandall then asked for comments from DRSC.

Member Darden stated that she was hoping that some of the elevations would have stronger one-story elements to deter canyonization effects down the street since the homes were so large. She asked the applicant to take that into account when doing the final plotting of the homes to create more space between units.

Chair Crandall agreed with Member Darden's comments. Chair Crandall similarly had concerns about the roof and fascia lines visible from trails and public right-of-ways such as Pacific Coast Highway. He urged the architect to make design modifications to those elements. In particular, his concern was Plan 2 the left elevation. Plan 1 and 3 the elevations, due to the center courtyard, are better with this design component, but the architect needs to look at Plan 2 a bit more.

The architect, Chris Barlow, agreed with the comment, and indicated they would be happy to do a plane break and provide some more detail on the left elevation. Mr. Nicholas asked if the architect could provide a drawing to DRSC of the modification. Mr. Barlow indicated he would.

Chair Crandall stated that he did not know the orientation, but the ridge left to right is very consistent, and doing a gable ends, similar to the Andalusian, would help provide more horizon and light space associated with the roofs. It is not a mandate, but something to think about. Chair Crandall also asked

that the roof lines be included on the plot plan. Mr. McDougall stated he would ensure that happens.

Member Ruehlin stated that he was also worried on the left elevation on Plan 2. He also asked that all the light features include appropriate shielding to avoid light trespass. Mr. Barlow stated they tried to bring more features into the other elevations.

Mr. Nicholas then showed images of the proposed locations and designs of the monument signs. Mr. Ruehlin asked if this is a City gateway and what impact does that have on these sign designs.

Mr. Nicholas did not have the information at the meeting to verify, but said he would address the comment moving forward and ensure consistency. The design of the signs are Spanish utilizing a smooth white stucco finish with individual pin mounted letters. From that respect, if it is a gateway, it should be consistent with the General Plan's aesthetic requirements.

Mr. Nicholas went over the history of the signs, and that the decorative walls that SunCal brought forward for approval were not functional due to existing easements which did not allow for the walls to be constructed. Modifications to the approved signs began when Lehman Brothers still owned the site. Mr. Nicholas also indicated that the signs are all located in landscaped areas.

Member Darden asked about an illumination plan. Mr. Nicholas indicated the plans show no illumination for the signs. Member Ruehlin felt this was a good choice and further distinguished the residential side from the commercial side.

Member Darden asked about the heights. Mr. Nicholas stated that they are about 7-8 feet depending on grade, and all less than 10 feet allowed by code.

Member Darden stated that after seeing the walls of the approved project and how those are much more subtle, she has concerns about the design and feel of these monuments being to "chunky." Chair Crandall disagreed stating that the homes have good mass to the architecture and the signage should carry that mass as well. Chair Crandall did not have concerns regarding the look and massing of the signage. Member Ruehlin understood Chair Crandall's point, but said he agreed more with Member Darden's comments about the feel being a bit to massive.

Mr. Nicholas suggested that perhaps some smoothing out of the massing and style of the signs, while still keeping the prominence, that a balance can be reached. Mr. McDougall suggested scaling back the signs in proportionally may also help address the massing issue. Mr. McDougall stated that they would review this issue and modify the drawings to address this issue.

Member Ruehlin agreed and indicated that something a little more understated for the development would be appropriate to fit in with the character of the development, and the large signage may not be needed. Chair Crandall stated that he felt these signs are going to set the tone of the homes and the branding and feel it needs to match the quality of the homes.

Mr. Nicholas stated that the signs are all located in landscaped areas. Mr. Nicholas also showed images of the commercial side signage and how the designs are similar, yet different to provide distinction between the two sides of the development.

Member Ruehlin expressed concerns about people trying to find the commercial side might go into the residential side. No lighting will help that issue. Chair Crandall did not think, with the prominence of the shopping center, that it will be possible to mix the two areas up, and having prominent signage for the residential side is important to the design and character of the community.

Member Darden felt that the signs to the residential area should be understated and doesn't need to be massive to support the residential side. She is worried that this is too much signage for the residential portion. Darden felt there should be a better hierarchy between the main signage at the entrance into the area and the smaller monument signs for entry into the residential streets. Darden felt that even the larger gateway signs seemed a bit too large and out of scale.

Mr. Nicholas summarized the comments from the Subcommittee and stated they will work with the applicant to revise the sign designs. Chair Crandall asked if we could avoid other way finding signage to avoid sign clutter. Everyone agreed.

Mr. Nicholas indicated the last component of the project is the artistic piece in the middle of the roundabout. The Subcommittee supported staff's recommendation of using a larger specimen tree consistent with the Coastal Commission Plant Pallet and low level landscaping for the roundabout rather than the art piece.

Chair Crandall suggested talking with Dennis Reed to help in determining the type of tree for the roundabout.

**B. Architectural Permit 14-329/Site Plan Permit 14-356/Minor Conditional Use Permit 14-347, Estrella Shopping Center – Phase II
(Nicholas)**

Phase II of the existing Estrella Shopping Center. This includes a remodel to all portions of the site except the Kmart site.

Associate Planner Sean Nicholas summarized the staff report and showed a PowerPoint of the elevations.

Mr. Nicholas indicated that Phase II is everything of the site other than K-Mart. Staff talked with the architect and he has indicated that they are supportive of all the proposed changes, but wanted to talk about roof top equipment screening on the corner out building. The architect has concerns about screening the rooftop equipment. Also the applicant brought forward a minor change to the Ulta tenant building. DRSC supported the minor changes to the Ulta frontage.

The property owner representative Therese Hotvedt stated that it took them over a year to get through the process for the existing roof screening, but they were willing to work with staff within reason. She also commented that working with staff now has been amazingly better and thanked Mr. Nicholas for all of his efforts and attention to the project.

The architect David Anderson stated that the building is challenging, and will look at ways in which the heights can possibly screen the units. At the very least, the architect stated they will not ignore the issue; they will take a look at it again and address the issue.

Subcommittee Chair Crandall complimented staff on the thorough comments provided in their staff report, and reiterated any comments or changes approved at Planning Commission next week for Phase I need to be incorporated into Phase II as appropriate. The architect agreed.

Chair Crandall stated that he is not in favor of removing the tower between the Ulta and TJ Maxx frontage. While staff recommends removal, he stated he felt it could remain, but incorporate the elements of the towers utilized in Phase I and then it could be an asset to the project. As designed right now it is a distraction. Chair Crandall stated that the roofs need to be expanded and extend back beyond further past the building frontage.

Subcommittee Member Ruehlin commented that he appreciated staff's comments. He got clarification about the awnings with arches and other features and when they should remain or be removed.

Chair Crandall asked about the second story of the corner building above the loading bay and stated that the awnings should be used instead of arches to elongate the element. Everyone agreed.

Member Ruehlin asked about the columns again and indicated to make sure they are more traditional and consistent with the columns of Phase I.

Subcommittee Member Darden stated that landscaping is going to be key to the project as it is with Phase I. Wherever landscaping can be added or included to enhance the design will go a long way to help the project through and help the overall center. Member Darden also commented that having the designated path of travel utilizing the decorative paving will help.

The Subcommittee agreed that the parking needed to be figured out. The applicant was supportive of moving the driveway over away from the trash enclosure, which exits to Mira Costa, which will create more parking, landscaping, and outdoor seating areas. The Subcommittee was also supportive of this, if Engineering agrees with the proximity of the driveway to the intersection.

Staff indicated that despite everyone's efforts, no pedestrian path could be figured out for Phase I, but will be included in Phase II in front of the shops leading to Phase I.

C. Minor Cultural Heritage Permit 14-327, Van Slyke Addition (Jones)

A request to consider the expansion of a non-conforming historic house located at 209 Avenida Granada.

Associate Planner Cliff Jones summarized the staff report. Mr. Jones added that the property was built in 1928.

Cheryl Moe, architect, presented an alternative gabled roof structure over the roof deck that she thought was a better design.

Subcommittee Chair Crandell indicated that he is in support of the revised gabled roof structure as it is beginning to look like a tower element, which is more appropriate with the Spanish Colonial Revival architecture.

Subcommittee Member Ruehlin indicated that the gabled roof structure over the roof deck helps to differentiate the existing historic building from the addition and roof deck. He indicated support for the revised gabled roof structure design because of the differentiation and because it is not too visible from the street.