

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

RECORD OF ACTIONS

April 23, 2009

A. Call to Order 9:02 a.m.

Board members present: David Brown, Sandy Diefenbach (arrived at 9:15 a.m.), Merle Watson, Rob James and Cathrine Laguna.

Board members absent: Carol Bell, Karl Ulle

Staff present: Rozanne Cherry

B. Record of Actions from the March 26, 2009 meeting:

MOTION: Moved by R. James, seconded by M. Watson, to approve the minutes.

MOTION CARRIED: 3-0-1 (C. Laguna abstained)

C. Oral and Written Communications: Item E.2 was withdrawn; Zoning Code update #63 was distributed.

D. Consent Calendar:

1. 90-11-PD ref, ARCO AM/PM Service Station Building and Canopy Façade Remodel & New Signs, 538 Nordahl Road, PD-C Zone

Applicant: Eddie Vidales, Donco & Sons, Inc., 1410 N. Daly Street, Anaheim, CA 92806
Planner: Jasmin Perunovich

MOTION: Moved by R. James, seconded by M. Watson, to approve the consent item.

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-0

E. Individual Case Review:

1. PHG 09-0007, New Preschool Facility, 2245 East Valley Parkway, CG Zone

Applicant: Betsy Jones, ECCDC, 819 W. 9th Avenue, Escondido, CA 92025
Planner: Kristina Owens

Staff described the project location as the vacant pad area in front of the East Valley Community Center. The applicant would lease 33,000 square feet of the pad from the City for a preschool. The project would require a minimum of 30 parking spaces which would mean adding some parking at the rear of the commercial center. The project would consist of 4 modular buildings and a stick-built kitchen building. Solar panels would be installed on the roof of one of the classroom buildings and the administration building. The kitchen building would be stucco with a raised hip roof and parapet to screen the roof equipment. The

administration building would have stone veneer, a hip roof and parapet features added to the modular building to create a comprehensive look across the front of the site along the west elevation. Security was proposed as: 6' chain link fencing on the east property line; a wall on the north and a portion of the west sides; and a 6' wrought iron fence on the south and the remaining portion of the west side. The perimeter wall would need to be adjusted to maintain sight distances at the driveway on an adjacent parcel to the east. Covered play areas with shade structures similar to those at the preschool on Lincoln Avenue would be provided. Accessible path of travel would be required from the street and around to the trash enclosure, which may require the street wall to be moved back.

Staff recommended approval of the project with the following recommendations: paint the air conditioning units to match the structures; add pilasters at 40' on center to the block walls; construct the wall of the trash enclosure with slump block to match the perimeter walls; use vinyl coated chain link along the east side of the project; maintain sight distances to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department; confirm the location of existing street improvements and their relationship to the proposed landscaping, paths and walls; reconfigure the direction of the parking spaces and circulation at the facility entry area.

Board member Watson clarified: the project background, grant funding and partnerships; the 12-year lease with the city; that the proposal would be reviewed by the Planning Commission and the East Valley Parkway Association. He felt that a daycare would not be the highest and best use of this property, but it might be OK as a temporary use.

Board member James stated that a median should divide the entry driveway to preclude cars turning the wrong way into the drop-off area. He suggested taking a second look at the parking for the drop-offs, which should be located so as not to have to cross driveways. He felt it was a mistake to not have overhangs on the buildings or covered walkways, and that it was not desirable to have a block wall along East Valley Parkway.

Board member Laguna felt that modular buildings seemed cheap and temporary but she understood that the state mandated the use of modular units. Chairman Brown stated that the wall along East Valley Parkway should be setback from the sidewalk with traditional parkway landscaping and vines along the wall. The wall, as presented, would be 7' tall and extensive so it would need to be enhanced as best as possible. He suggested the applicant consider realigning the existing parking in the front for access from a northbound aisle. He clarified that there would be emergency exits for the children at the front entry and the south side gate. He stated that he would prefer the project were not using modular buildings.

MOTION: Moved by M. Watson, seconded by R. James, to approve staff recommendations with the following additions for staff review: revise parking and circulation; move the 7' wall on Valley back and add suitable landscaping between the wall and sidewalk; consider an additional emergency access gate; do improvements to the driveway to eliminate immediate left turns into the drop off area; add 2.5' overhangs on all buildings and a canopy over the entrance.

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1 (S. Diefenbach abstained)

2. Withdrawn

3. ADM 09-0035, New Two Car Garage Addition to a Local Registered Property in the Old Escondido Neighborhood, 649 E. 5th Avenue, R-1-6 Zone

Applicant: Carla DeDominicis, 649 E. 5th Avenue, Escondido, CA 92025
Planner: Darren Parker

Staff described request to reduce the setback from 20' to 15' for the new garage. The proposed colors, materials and style matched the existing home. Staff recommended approval as submitted.

Board members agreed that the proposal was a good-looking project that was well integrated with the existing site improvements.

MOTION: Moved by C. Laguna, seconded by S. Diefenbach, to approve the project as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0-0

4. PHG 09-0010, Modification to CUP for Meadowbrook Village, 2124 North Iris Lane, R-1-10 Zone

Applicant: Brent Cooper for Meadowbrook Village, 1508 Mission Avenue, Escondido, CA 92029
Planner: Diana Delgadillo

Staff stated the Building Code requirements for 2 exits and an elevator from the windmill. The project proposed to shift some uses between the community building and the pool building and add a retractable roof at the pool. The new community building would be next to the windmill and would also include 2 more guest apartments, offices, a coffee house and museum space.

Board member Watson clarified that the windmill was being built new in Holland. Board member James questioned why the exiting was required as stated by staff when the only people in the windmill would be people touring the building and maintenance workers. He felt that such a large building next to the windmill seemed inappropriate. If occupancy were restricted, there would be no need for 2 exits. Board member James also stated that, architecturally, the adjacent building doesn't integrate with the rest of the development. Board members Laguna, Diefenbach and Chairman Brown agreed. Board member Laguna clarified the use of the windmill.

Staff stated that the Building Division did not have an occupancy listing for a windmill and that they were looking into the code requirements from a maintenance aspect.

The applicant explained that the owner did not want to add stairs to the exterior of the windmill, that he wanted more than the minimum exiting structure, and that he felt that the space in the larger building, which was designed in a Dutch architectural style, would be useful.

MOTION: Moved by M. Watson, seconded by C. Laguna, to approve the modifications as presented.

MOTION CARRIED: 3-2-0 (D. Brown and R. James voting no)

Board member James encouraged staff to further explore any possible interpretations or waivers with the building official, who would have some discretion in the determination of classifications and occupancy. He cited as examples the Washington Monument and observation platforms in national parks.

- F. **Current Business:** Discussion of the exterior masonry block and architectural dome feature on the Escondido Police and Fire Facility, 1163 N. Centre City Parkway.

Principal Planner Bill Martin informed the board that the 2” split face veneer would be applied to the building for an arch feature on the east side and that architectural mesh panels would be added per the original elevation drawings. The dome, constructed of translucent material, was installed.

- G. **Oral Communications:** Staff informed the board that the next Dessert & Dialogue event was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday May 13, 2009 and that the second community meeting on the General Plan update was scheduled for Wednesday April 29, 2009 from 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

- H. **Board Member Discussion:**

Board member Watson asked about following up on Ben Cueva’s offer at his DRB presentation to have a tour of the historic houses he relocated once they were completed.

The board commented that the new Lexus facility next to the I-15 was a very large building, at this point seeming to overshadow the media screen that had been the cause for concern.

- I. **Adjournment** at 10:30 a.m. to the next regularly scheduled Design Review Board meeting on Thursday, May 14, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. in Training Room #1 at City Hall, 201 North Broadway.

David Brown, Chairman
of the Design Review Board

Rozanne Cherry, Secretary
of the Design Review Board