

Valley Center Design Review Board

Minutes: February 18, 2015

DRB Members Present: Montgomery, Moore, Robertson , Herr.

Visitors: Bill Miller, Mike Mahan, Dennis Campbell (County of S.D.), , Ashly Mellor, Jerry Gaughan (Hatfield Plaza), Sue Janisch, Will Rogers, Jon Vick and Craig Johnson.

MINUTES: February 2, 2015 were approved 4-0.

OPEN FORUM: There were no speakers for Open Forum.

PROJECTS:

Hatfield Plaza: PDS 2013; TPM-21202; PDS20123; STP-13-011 (Tentative Map and Site Plan)

Hatfield Center, Valley Center Road, South Village, VC 92082

Applicant/Presenter: Jerry Gaughan Architect: Mark Burginger

The DRB held a special meeting to accommodate Jerry Gaughan's request to meet before the South Village Subcommittee meeting to review the changes that had requested at our regular meeting.

Jerry presents the drawings Mike Mahan had reviewed at the last meeting, and where the original comments were noted, along with the revised set of drawings for comparison.

- Bldg. 1: Monterey Style: The changes discussed in the previous meeting have been completed. The DRB asked the applicant, again, to spell Monterey correctly on the drawing.
- Bldg. 2: Rural California Farm Barn Style: The changes discussed in the previous meeting have NOT been completed satisfactorily. The applicant said in the previous meeting that he cannot increase the square footage of the building this late in the design process. However, the DRB agreed with Mike Mahan's suggestion that the façade could, at least, *appear* to be on the same plane by extending the roof of the recessed wings to the same plane as the front entrance, and using the same material and paint color across the front façade. Although these new drawings show the extended roof, they need also to show the entire front façade in the same Hardie board material.
- Bldg. 3: Mission Revival Style: The style of this building has been re-defined as Mission Revival. Some of the changes discussed in the previous meeting have been executed satisfactorily, others not. Execution problems that remain are:
 - the hip roof is higher than the parapet; either increase the height of the parapet or lower the roof.
 - the parapet needs to be "beefed up" so that it is appropriately prominent to the style and scaled to the size of the building. (Also mentioned, a simpler parapet design would be more appropriate to the design of the building and less expensive to build.)
 - DRB member Herr suggested a roof modification to solve a problem with the drawing. Architect Herr also suggested that roof plans generally would be helpful both to the project architect and the DRB.
 - Correct the drawing to show an arch rather than a misplaced circle. Mission Revival architecture features double hung windows with vertical panes. The DRB agreed that this detail is less critical than many others in defining the correct basic form.
- Bldg. 4: Mission Revival Style: The revisions discussed in the previous meeting need to be executed properly. Execution problems that remain are:
 - The stucco columns (18x18) need to be moved away from the building and the roof extended to 5-feet to create a true covered arcade.
 - DRB members explained to the applicant that the column relocation can be accommodated by dropping the hip roof to a shed roof. The shed roof extends to create the arcade roof.

- Eaves on the rest of the building need to be reduced to less than 1-foot in keeping with Mission Revival style, and consistently rendered.
- The Parapet needs to be 'beefed' up, again in keeping with the style and scale of the building
- DRB member Herr suggested that a roof plan would also be helpful for this building, and all the buildings. The rooflines are complicated and not clear on the drawings

After discussion about the elevations was finished, Lael said that the new project description was full of errors and needed to specify the mature trees that would be retained on the site and presumably protected during construction. (The landscape plan shows trees to be retained on site, of crucial importance to the community. The community is also concerned about protecting root systems of the trees along Banbury Road.) This is not new information.

Jerry said he believed he would have been done after these drawings were presented , and that he is frustrated that the DRB continues to ask for more changes. Lael explained that the architectural elevations need to be complete and well executed. She said that today's comments addressed execution issues, as well as some obvious errors in the drawings – they were not additional changes. Jerry responded that PDS staff member Dennis Campbell was attending DRB meetings because the VC DRB had caused so much trouble for him.

Minutes were approved at the March 2, 2015 meeting if the VC DRB. DRB Board Member Herr asked that the following be added to the record of the February 18, 2015 meeting. Minutes of February 18, 2015 were approved with Herr's addition.

I feel that the majority of the issues that we had with the revisions were correcting the discrepancies in the architects work. Roof lines above a parapet. Parapet walls that should have been 15 plus inches in finished width denoted as standard 5" walls, and roof ends that should have died into parapet walls were exposed, with no wings on the parapets.

We had attempted to assist Jerry in correcting these issues. Changes to the design, from what I remember, were one or two items, and nothing major. One item that had been brought up was the window lites. Still on the plans as not in character that we had requested, but agreed upon by Jerry numerous times.

The bottom line is that the architect should be at the review to gather the information and make the needed corrections or explain to us why they do not need to be made. Right now the revisions are going thru Jerry and the translation might be a bit garbled, from looking at some of the issues that were presented to us this week.