Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Vice Chair Ray Welter and Boardmembers Tom Leader and Jonathan Livingston

Staff Present: Roberta Feliciano, Hector Lopez, and Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 22, 2017

Boardmember Fetter asked staff to correct page 7, third paragraph from the bottom starting with “Boardmember Benz”. He asked that the following statement be added prior to Boardmember Benz posing her question for record: “The use of the school grounds and how the community accesses them is an intrinsic aspect of the design and the community.”

March 22, 2017

Chair Whitty suggested continuing both sets of the minutes, given there was not a quorum of Boardmembers present to approve them.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 3-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Welter)

Public Forum – Brown Act – None

City Council Liaison Report – None
MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 14, 2017

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and asked and confirmed members did not wish to place any items on the Consent Calendar.

She announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, May 8, 2017 by 5:00 p.m.

Public Hearing(s)

1. PLN17-032 NASHER RESIDENTIAL ADDITION
   Description (HELD OVER FROM MARCH 22, 2017) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,506 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
   Location 3022 JO ANN DRIVE
   APN 414-084-012
   Zoning RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
   Owner ABDUELLALAH NASHER
   Applicant MOHAMMED SUBHANI
   Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO
   Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO MAY 10, 2017

   This item was held over to May 10, 2017.

2. PLN17-060 RUIZ SECOND STORY ADDITION
   Description (HELD OVER FROM MARCH 22, 2017) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSIDER CONSTRUCTION OF A ±976 SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
   Location 716 MAPLE AVE
   APN 534-312-002
   Zoning RM1, MEDIUM DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
   Applicant GLADYS RUIZ (OWNER)
   Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES
   Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

   Hector Lopez, on behalf of Jonelyn Whales, presented the staff report and described the scope, layout and key elements of the proposal for a design review permit to consider construction of a second story addition to an existing residence.

   Chair Whitty referred to page 2, first paragraph, which states “There is a nice growing along the fence” and she asked and confirmed this was a hedge. She confirmed there were no neighborhood comments received.

   Chair Whitty welcomed former DRB member Robert Avellar who is the designer for this project.

   Boardmember Woldemar stated the application is a perfect example of an addition on a second floor where in most cases is located over a garage. It is backset significantly from the front of the garage which is a classic solution and makes sense. He liked the ground floor eaves which continue alongside the addition so they occur as a wrap around, and supported approval of the project.

   Boardmember Fetter referred to the sequencing of the windows and asked about the rhythm.
Gladys Ruiz, homeowner, explained the reason why she spaced the windows was because she needed some space on certain walls for furniture.

Boardmember Fetter suggested striking a better balance and shifting room volumes so they are more workable on the outside of the house. The particular period of the building and the symmetry of the original building, fenestration and all elements would tend to imply that more symmetry above falls along. He noted there are not many windows and he commented this does something interesting in the way the exterior of the house looks.

Boardmember Benz suggested either narrow windows at the tops or on either sides, and commented that she likes the front of the home and said it fits well with the neighborhood.

Chair Whitty posed the following questions and comments:

- She asked if there was a fence proposed and if so, what does it look like? Mr. Avellar explained there is an existing iron fence about 4 feet tall which a gate. The rear yard has a cyclone fence.

- She asked if the side fence shared with the neighbor is wood or iron. Ms. Ruiz stated it is wood on the west side and on the other side it is chain link and all fences currently exist. The hedge is growing in the chain link fence.

- She referred to the front steps which are tiny and narrow and asked if they could be widened to be more graceful. Mr. Avellar stated these are the original steps and Mr. Lopez noted they meet the Building Code.

- Regarding windows, she suggested on the west elevation the upper narrow window be moved a bit toward the front so it aligns with the one below it. On page A-31, west elevation, she asked that the window be moved toward the front so it aligns right below it. On the east elevation, move the top window #19 back so it aligns with the square window #3 below. On the same page, the proposed north elevation (front) on the top left, there is only one window and asked to move this over a few inches. She also noted there is only one window here and she suggested adding one window next to the closet, but said she would not require this.

Boardmember Woldemar said the problem is that the trim dives into the roofline and he suggested changing that singular window to something like 6 or 8 foot long but only 3 feet high so it stretches across the upper floor.

Boardmember Fetter referred to bedroom #1 and said the bathroom is on the east side of the house. He suggested moving the bathroom and the closet to where it is between bedroom #2 and #1. This way, a window could be located on either side and will result in a better layout.

Ms. Ruiz said she tried doing this but she did not like the spacing it gave her on the family room. She wanted this a bit bigger and more space. Boardmember Fetter noted that this choice would gain one foot of distance on the family room and without the added window, he felt the building would look lopsided from the outside. How it looks on the outside is important.
Chair Whitty said alternatively, instead of the one side window, a longer window could be put in to stretch across bedroom #1 in front so it is more balanced.

Boardmember Woldemar drew a sketch of an 8 foot window and presented this to Ms. Ruiz and asked to maintain the window on the side. Mr. Avellar stated he cannot change them both unless he makes one of the windows bigger for egress.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the window on the side will provide egress so it needs to stay that size. The one window on the front can be stretched. He said because the way the eave continues around the house, if he had to change the material on the upper floor it would be better and thinks the front window could be changed easily.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION:** It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve PLN17-060 with staff’s 4 findings and staff’s 7 conditions, with the change to Condition No. 3 that states “Style, dimension and materials of new windows including trim shall be consistent throughout the addition; change front window as discussed and align with the lower level the two second story east and west side windows per Boardmember Woldemar’s sketch”; approved by voice vote: 3-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Welter)

### 3. PLN16-724 MCMILLER SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH ACCESSORY DWELLING

**Description**  
STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON A VACANT PARCEL

**Location**  
2004 HOFFMAN BOULEVARD

**APN**  
560-640-001

**Zoning**  
RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

**Owner**  
ROSALIND MCMILLER

**Applicant**  
LEANDRE DAVIS (DESIGNER)

**Staff Contact**  
ROBERTA FELICIANO

**Recommendation:** PROVIDE COMMENTS

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report and described the scope, layout and key elements of the request of the Board to provide and receive comments on the proposed design for a new single family residence with an attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on a vacant parcel.

Ms. Feliciano stated staff provided comments to the applicant and there are broader design aspects for the Board’s review and discussion relating to massing, façade, color scheme, the porch, rooflines, and bay window projections. She called out that the lot width is wider than it is deep.

Boardmember Fetter questioned what was incomplete with the application submittal other than the landscaping. Ms. Feliciano stated staff did not receive the color and material board which had been submitted to Jonathan Malagon who was no longer employed by the City and was somehow lost, but the applicant will again provide this.
Boardmember Woldemar stated the front setback is 15 feet and he asked if a 6 foot deep covered porch could be added to the front of the house, noting that currently the drawings indicate a 5 foot covered porch. Ms. Feliciano stated this could be done as long as it is less than 18” above the ground.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed there would be no restrictions to add to the depth of the porch and also there could be projections such as bay windows or covered porches in the rear 20 feet. He referred to Item D; the porch roof, and asked that in future revisions it should be simplified.

Chair Whitty referred to page A-1.3 and asked if this was the design, stating this does not match A-1.2 or A-1.0. She also stated on A-1.3 the entrances are upstairs and on A-1.0 they are almost flat with the ground. The applicant clarified that originally one drawing was changed and A-1.2 was the most current version.

Chair Whitty stated the house next door’s address is 2004 Hoffman and she asked and confirmed that an address is assigned once there is a building. She asked and confirmed with the applicant that 2004 Hoffman was the lot that was divided.

Chair Whitty stated the fence on 3 sides is a 4 foot high picket fence and on one side it is a 6 foot fence. She confirmed that the 6 foot fence will look identical to the 4 foot fences, and the applicant agreed to provide a detail.

Chair Whitty asked for questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Woldemar posed the following questions:

- He referred to Sheet A.1.1 and suggested the covered porch be 6 feet deep so there can be usable space, and he asked that the applicant provide a detail on the railing when the item returns.
- He proposed this porch would start just to the left of the kitchen and run all the way over to a line with the left edge of the stairway. In doing this, on the right side of the porch there could be a wider stairway so it aligns with the front door and moves to the right a bit.
- He also noted there should be a series of columns to support the roof of the porch which should be a simple shed roof. This breaks up the front façade.
- He provided a sketch of a 4 foot vinyl picket fence for durability and asked to add it out to the front center portion of the house and let the townhouse unit be its own front which could be reflected by its landscape plan. He noted this would also articulate and break up the front façade.
- He asked to adjust the floor plan somehow so the ground floor of the townhouse unit has a back door into the rear yard.
- In the main unit living area is a sliding glass door. He asked that a 2 foot bay window on the second floor above it be added to provide rain cover over the sliding glass door.
- He likes the brick base and he suggested repeating it on the rear of the center of the house to articulate the two pieces. He asked to resolve the different heights as well and also include a man door on the side or the rear out of the garage to the rear yard.
Boardmember Fetter echoed comments of Boardmember Woldemar. He asked to match up the back and front more given there are views from both areas. He referred to finishes on the main residence in so far as the base brick comes over and stops and asked to have slight offsets.

Boardmember Woldemar said when the applicant expands the porch and it is moved as far to the left as the party wall, he believes the brick will come out the face of the porch, it will move all the way back to the kitchen wall and then moves to the right and back to the garage wall.

Boardmember Benz asked to see the actual color and material board return for the project, but said she likes the colors based on what was printed. She asked and confirmed with the applicant that the exit to the rear would be a sliding door and it would have the extended bay window above as a covering, as well as brick along the back lower wall.

Boardmember Fetter asked to beef up the depth of the fascia to bring it out a bit, and Chair Whitty asked the applicant to bring back the landscape plan as well and designate plants, as well as to indicate whether the 6 foot fence will be planted.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the unit is described as an accessory dwelling unit and asked and confirmed with Ms. Feliciano that it cannot be a duplex. He referred to refuse areas and suggested separating these areas with fencing so each unit has their own private open space and so that the north end has refuse space next to the garage.

He then referred to page A-1.1 and said while not a design review item, on the second floor plan, on the main unit upstairs in the middle is bedroom #2. This room does not show an exterior window, does not have rescue and egress and is not legal as a bedroom. Additionally, because of the way the applicant angled the rear wall of the building, the rear elevation will not look like it is presented. If the plate height is kept the same all the way across, they will end up with a warped roof on each of the three components. He suggested making those three components square and to stagger them, which would be a lot easier to build. The applicant said they would love to be able to do this. Given the discussion earlier, Boardmember Woldemar said additional bay windows could be added to the upper floor as the second floor staggers which would be legal and add more square footage.

Chair Whitty confirmed the items that needed to be changed and returned for inclusion includes: color and materials board, landscaping plan, window schedule, brick, bay windows, covered porch, fencing details and picket fencing for the main unit, incorporate separate refuse areas and separate fencing, man door to the rear yard, sliding glass door to the rear, increasing the depth of the fascia, and indicate whether planting will be on the 6 foot rear fence. Ms. Feliciano agreed to copy and to forward the applicant sketches made by Boardmember Woldemar.

4. PLN16-385 MAKING WAVES ACADEMY EXPANSION
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO EXPAND THE MAKING WAVES ACADEMY CAMPUS. THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF RENOVATION OF EXISTING CLASSROOM FACILITIES; EXPANSION INTO ADJACENT PARCELS TO BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE MASTER PLAN; AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW CLASSROOM BUILDINGS, TWO GYMNASIUMS, OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL AREAS, ASSOCIATED PARKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.
Location 4075, 4123, 4131, 4175, AND 4301 LAKESIDE DRIVE, AND 2900, 2925, AND 2975 TECHNOLOGY COURT
Zoning IL, INDUSTRIAL, LIGHT
Applicant MAKING WAVES FOUNDATION, INC. (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO MAY 10, 2017

This item was held over to May 10, 2017.

5. PLN16-743 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±182,000 SQUARE FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON A ±10.55 ACRES VACANT PARCEL.
Location 912 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH
APN 560-260-013
Zoning IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner IPT RICHMOND LOGISTICS CENTER LLC
Applicant JUN LEE
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO MAY 10, 2017

This item was held over to May 10, 2017.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, May 10, 2017.