

French doors opening onto a balcony.

Boardmember Discussion

Generally, the Board was very supportive of the proposed improvements. There was unanimous agreement that the proposed location for the new stairwell was the best solution from a design/aesthetic standpoint.

The Board also noted they liked the proposed treatment for the windows, trim, doors, etc. but Boardmember Johnson noted that the location of some of the windows could be better organized to provide consistency throughout the design.

Several of the Boardmembers inquired about design aspects of the existing duplex such as the exterior stairwell, the porch entry and the screening on the upstairs balcony. Boardmember Reginato suggested that the lattice work under the stairwell be revised or replaced with something else to better screen the trash cans stored underneath the stairs. With respect to the porch entry, the Board asked that the openings be “squared off” to match the rest of the structure when new plaster is applied. For the upstairs deck, the Board suggested that the lattice be replaced with something more substantial. Suggested materials included glass, or louvers with a substantial frame around them.

As far as the proposed colors, the Board was in agreement that they preferred a deeper brown color for the roof shingles and a less fleshy, more tan shade for the new exterior plaster finish.

Boardmembers Johnson and Araluce suggested restudying the remaining ½ cross gable on the portion of the triplex building that would remain one story. They recommended carrying the fascia from the main east-west gable across and tying it into the new stairwell.

Boardmember Johnson also noted that if the new stairwell needed to be revised to be less prominent, that the hip roof could be replaced with a lower, shed roof instead.

ACTION: Motion by Boardmember Nomura, seconded by Boardmember Johnson, to recommend preliminary approval to the Planning Commission with the following comments:

- Restudy the ½ gable on the one story element, extend fascia of main east-west gable across to stairwell instead;
- Provide better screening for the trash enclosure or move trash cans;
- Enclose the upper deck with a material other than the existing lattice;
- Square off the openings around the porch entry;
- Attempt to make placement and sizes of the windows more consistent throughout; and
- Go with a darker brown color for the roof shingles and a less fleshy, more tan color for the exterior plaster finish.

VOTE 5-0

PROJECT REVIEW

2) Applicant: Robert Durtche
Agent: Barry Horwitz
Project Number: 09-1524-DP/VAR/CDP
Project Location: 4791 Seventh Street
Zoning: Planned Residential Development (PRD-20)

Planner: Nick Bobroff

Hearing on the request of Barry Horwitz, agent for Robert Durtche to consider Case No. 09-1524-DP/VAR/CDP for conceptual review of a request to remodel the existing single family residence and construct first and second-floor additions totaling 1,663 square feet. The new total square footage of the residence would increase to 2,699 square feet and the maximum height of the residence would increase to approximately 26 feet six inches. The proposed Variance would allow the new ground floor addition to encroach into the required street-side yard setback one foot six inches.

DISCUSSION:

Barry Horwitz, agent, presented the project to the Board and discussed his rationale for the requested encroachment into the street-side yard setback for the new ground floor addition.

Boardmember Discussion

Boardmember Ellinwood noted that the charm of the existing house is in its simple design and roof form. He noted that the new second floor addition should be restudied and simplified to mimic the original home; a simple hip roof would suffice. He also noted that he liked the south (rear) elevation but felt the west elevation needed to be revised.

Boardmember Johnson agreed that the new second floor ought to be simplified. He liked the detailing of the rear elevation with the new second floor slightly overhanging the garage and being supported by corbels. He noted the second floor could even cantilever a little farther over the ground floor along the rear elevation. He suggested adding a small second porch to the rear elevation of the new dining room. He also noted that the windows needed to be made consistent throughout (i.e., some show break-ups, some do not).

Boardmember Reginato was generally in agreement with all of the comments from Boardmembers Ellinwood and Johnson. He added that he liked the Holly Avenue frontage without a sidewalk.

Boardmember Nomura pointed out the elevation drawings were showing two different chimney heights and asked the applicant to verify which one is correct. He suggested the new second floor could step in from the ground floor rather than out, consistent with the direction given to other projects with a new second floor.

Boardmember Araluce agreed with the recommendations for simplifying the new second floor. He suggested eliminating the dormer for the stairwell and going with one simple hip roof instead. He noted he liked the garage doors as shown. He also asked that the applicant be sure to carefully mimic the detailing (i.e., trim, windows, etc.) of the existing house for the new addition.

All of the Boardmembers agreed that the requested encroachment into the street-side yard setback for the

new addition was minor in scope and several of the Boardmembers expressed their initial support for the proposed encroachment to match the established street-side yard setback. Boardmember Araluce on the other hand, acknowledged that the requested encroachment was small, but felt that breaking up the wall plane where the new addition begins was important to preserve a sense of what is original and what has been added on. He said this would help to maintain the integrity of the existing house and was worthwhile to do even if the house did not turn out to be historic in a “landmark” sense. He suggested that if the addition did step in, it might provide room for a small porch to be added to the Holly Avenue elevation.

After further discussion and at the request for consensus amongst the Board from the agent, the Board came to a majority agreement that breaking up the Holly Avenue frontage with a minimum 18-inch step in as the preferred treatment for the new addition, so as to better maintain the existing look of the home.

ACTION: Conceptual comments were relayed to the applicant and agent. No formal action was taken as is appropriate for a conceptual review.

VOTE N/A

OTHER BUSINESS: NONE

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- Action Minutes of the Architectural Review Board meeting held October 1, 2009.

ACTION: Motion by Boardmember Ellinwood, seconded by Boardmember Araluce to approve Action Minutes of October 1, 2009

VOTE: 4-0 (Reginato abstain)

MATTERS REFERRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL – None

MATTERS PRESENTED BY STAFF/BOARDMEMBERS – Boardmembers Ellinwood and Nomura spoke of the items discussed at the September 10th Caltrans HOV Hardscape & Landscape Sub-Committee meeting. Staff indicated the project would return to the ARB on November 12th.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Araluce adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held at 5:30 pm on Thursday, November 12, 2009 in City Council Chambers.

Secretary, Architectural Review Board

ATTEST:

Chair, Architectural Review Board