

## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

## RECORD OF ACTIONS

June 25, 2009

A. Call to Order 9:03 a.m.

Board members present: David Brown, Carol Bell, Sandy Diefenbach, Merle Watson, Rob

James and Cathrine Laguna.

Board members absent: Karl Ulle

<u>Staff present</u>: Rozanne Cherry

B. Record of Actions from the June 11, 2009 meeting:

**MOTION:** Moved by C. Bell, seconded by S. Diefenbach, to approve the minutes.

**MOTION CARRIED:** 5-0-1 (Laguna abstain)

C. Oral and Written Communications: Items E.1 and E.4 were withdrawn

D. Consent Calendar: S. Diefenbach pulled item D.1 for discussion

1. <u>2006-12-CUP Police/Fire Facility - Painting Scheme for Emergency Generator Exhaust Ductwork, 1163 N. Centre City Parkway; Zoning OS-P</u>

Applicant: City of Escondido, Joyce Masterson, 201 N. Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025

Planner: Bill Martin

Staff stated that the architect felt that paint worked better than a physical screen which would appear tacked on. The 4 hoods are for the generators that are for emergency use only, and would be tested once a month. Board member Diefenbach felt that the paint would be an easy and inexpensive way out, but that the applicant should look for a better solution. Board member Watson noted that using two colors emphasized the stacks, and suggested that they should be only 1 color. Board member James stated that if the curved portion appeared like a dimensional standing seam roof, it might be okay. He asked the opinion of the architect attending the meeting, who stated that the striped, 2-tone paint drew attention and that a screen could create one mass instead of four.

Vice chair Bell felt that the curved top introduced a new shape into the complex and, therefore, should be redesigned to better coordinate with the design of the building. Chairman Brown agreed that the facility is full of right angles, flat planes and horizontals and verticals. These stacks should have been anticipated. He felt that a wall in front of the ducts would not be a good design either. He suggested that any screening element be set back behind the perimeter wall.

Design Review Board Record of Actions Date: June 25, 2009

Page 1

Board member Watson questioned if the applicant could use a vertical stack instead of a curved one. Chairman Brown suggested an angled top portion. He also stated that the perimeter wall looked unfinished and may need a cap on the wall like the rest of the wall.

MOTION: Moved by R. James, seconded by M. Watson, to redesign and resubmit.

**MOTION CARRIED:** 6-0-0

## E. Individual Case Review:

- 1. Withdrawn
- 2. <u>2004-66 CUP Revised site plan for "Talk of the Town" carwash and restaurant development in the CG zone, 400 Brotherton Road; Zoning CG</u>

Applicant: Ed McArdle, McArdle Associates, 5838 Edison Place, Suite 100, Carlsbad, CA

92008

Planner: Bill Martin

Staff stated that the Planning Commission had denied the previous version of the project due to land use concerns with the car wash. City Council had a split decision over concern with the car wash and referred the project back to Planning Commission. The current proposal included a revised site plan that located the car wash adjacent to Centre City Parkway. No revised landscape plan was submitted at this time. Staff presented issues with the lack of details of the restaurant building facing the street. Staff recommended that additional detailing be provided on the elevations facing the streets and that the applicant submits landscape plans.

Project architect Ed McArdle explained the changes of relocating the trash enclosure to the center of the site and that the mechanical equipment for the restaurant would be on the ground in the landscaping. He felt that they have mitigated the noise of the car wash by relocating it adjacent to Centre City Parkway.

Rex Little, a neighbor of the project, stated that the design was nice, but that he was concerned with the car wash/oil change use affecting the value of homes in the area. He also felt that it would affect development of the land across the street formerly used for Woody's. He felt that any type of auto service was inappropriate.

Kimber Allison, a neighbor of the project, stated that the owner had not maintained the property, which showed how he would maintain it in the future. She agreed that a car wash was inappropriate for the site. She stated that the Design Review Board code outlined how the Board could consider the affect a project could have on the surrounding area. Planning Commission was mostly concerned with infrastructure and traffic.

Board member Diefenbach felt the design was well done but had questions concerning the details of the street-side elevations and noise. Mr. McArdle stated that the applicant would add windows and other elements to the rear and that a new noise study would be done if the Planning Commission approved the revised site plan.

Board member Watson felt that this plan was superior to the previous one and addressed all the issues raised in review of that plan. He supported staff's recommendations.

Board member James clarified that the applicant is proposing an Area Plan revision to allow the car wash as a CUP. He questioned what types of uses were currently allowed or allowed with a CUP. He reminded the group that land use was an issue for the Planning Commission. He felt that the design was well done within the constraints of the project's goals. In the Midwest, car washes have doors on the end.

Ms. Allison stated that traffic was the biggest concern with vehicles going through the residential neighborhood.

Board member Laguna agreed that the revised design was an improvement over the previous one and agreed with staff recommendations.

Chairman Brown suggested that the owner consider a hand car wash without the loud machines, but acknowledged that that was an issue for the Planning Commission. He agreed that the design of the buildings and the site layout were well done within the project parameters.

**MOTION:** Moved by M. Watson, seconded by C. Laguna, to approve staff's recommendations and require the landscape plan to be returned to the Board.

**MOTION CARRIED:** 6-0-0

RECESS 9:50 a.m. to 9:55 a.m. Mayor Pfeiler presented Chairman Brown with a certificate and spoke of her gratitude for his service to the Design Review Board and the City.

3. PHG 09-0008 Wireless Communication Facility consisting of three panel antennas mounted onto a faux broadleaf tree, 25005 N. Centre City Parkway; Zoning RE-80.

Applicant: Franklin Orozco for Cricket Communications, c/o meridian Telecom, 4031 Sorrento

Valley Road, San Diego, CA 92121

Planner: Jay Paul

Staff described the previously approved concept and additional details about the panels of the antennas being close to the trunk/pole, the proposal for a 60 branch count in varying lengths and proposed box-size Brisbane box live trees to be planted for context. Staff recommended approval of the project as submitted.

Board member Laguna indicated that Brisbane box trees are not native and that faux tree materials tend to fade overtime. Vice-Chair Bell felt the design of the tree looked fine, but if they wanted the tree to look more like a Magnolia tree then the tree needed to be more rounded in shape. Board member Diefenbach suggested the branches be lower to the ground to help blend with the live trees that have yet to be trimmed. Board member Watson clarified the water system that would be used to water the live tees would be a water tank with a drip irrigation system or a contract with a landscape company for water and maintenance. He also suggested vertical percolation pipes to help direct the water down to the roots of the trees and that the trees should be 36" box size.

Design Review Board Record of Actions Date: June 25, 2009 **MOTION:** Moved by M. Watson, seconded by S. Diefenbach, to approve with 36" box live trees and to increase the number of branches on the faux tree along the lower portion of the trunk.

**MOTION CARRIED:** 6-0-0

## 4. Withdrawn

5. <u>2005-07 GPIP Site Plan and improvements to upgrade the ranch house at Daley Ranch to provide fire protection and accessibility; Zoning OS</u>

Applicant: City of Escondido, Planning Division, 201 N. Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025

Planner: Barbara Redlitz

Staff indicated the existing ranch house in Daley Ranch was on the City's Local Register of Historic structures and that the upgrades to the ranch house were for fire protection and ADA standards. Staff described the remodel which included upgrading the interior bathroom on the first floor to comply with current ADA standards, add a pre-fabricated main restroom at the other side of the access road adjacent to the phone booth and light post, provide an ADA access walkway and ramp at the rear of the house, new exterior siding, skirting, roofing and railings would also be provided. Staff indicated that the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the remodel and indicated that they preferred natural wood vertical siding, simulated shingles under the gable, high dimensional asphalt shingles, and split log railings and skirting. Staff recommended approval of fiber cement vertical siding for better fire resistance, and the other materials noted by the HPC.

Board member Laguna felt the finishes and fixtures in the house bathroom should be period appropriate residential style. She also felt the faux vertical siding looked fake and that it would take away a lot of the integrity of the building. Board member James felt the siding was inappropriate. He suggested camouflaging and relocating the outhouse building to the rear. Board member Laguna suggested turning the restroom door so it would not be so visible from the house. Board member Watson clarified the primary use of the restroom would be for hikers. He also suggested the need for screening around the restroom with landscaping. Vice-Chair Bell had a concern with the fiber cement siding looking fake and suggested shifting the restroom closer to the existing restrooms further north. Chairman Brown had a concern with the manufactured wood siding being used for the ranch house, but said that if it was used, every effort should be made to detail the installation so that it looked like the original individual board installation. He suggested restroom facilities in the garage be used for house users and that another restroom along the road be used for hikers. Board member James clarified that the trim detail pieces could camouflage the panel joints. He suggested using individual faux boards to prevent panel seams, and that additional research and alternatives was needed on wood siding for fire resistance. Board member Watson left the meeting at 10:40 AM.

Danny Sadek, City Staff, indicted the main house bathroom was currently on a septic system and that any upgrades to the bathroom maybe be a problem with upgrading the current septic system. He also noted that the pre-manufactured restrooms are pit toilets and could produce

Design Review Board Record of Actions Date: June 25, 2009 odor problems, which could be an issue for the use of the house for events if the restrooms are too close.

**MOTION:** Moved by C. Bell, seconded by S. Diefenbach to approve the ADA walkway, ramp, interior bathroom, split log rail and skirting, and roof material, and that additional consideration be taken of the use of natural materials for the exterior siding, relocation of the new pre-fab restroom further north, providing bathrooms in the garage, and then return with a revised plan and screening method.

**MOTION CARRIED:** 5-0-0 (Watson absent)

F. Current Business: None

G. Oral Communications: None

- H. Board Member Discussion: Chairman Brown parting comments: The Signature Theater exterior lighting around the parapet has some bulbs lit and some not; Cypress Court with the garages replaced with stone came out well; and the library courtyard was well done. Lastly, "always remember that wood fences are not good." Thank you to all.
- I. Adjournment at 11:00 a.m. to the next regularly scheduled Design Review Board meeting on Thursday, July 9, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. in the **MITCHELL ROOM** at City Hall, 201 North Broadway.

| Carol Bell, Vice-Chair     | Rozanne Cherry, Secretary  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| of the Design Review Board | of the Design Review Board |