



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Meeting Date June 23, 2016

DRB Case No. PDR 1510009

Address 411 La Loma Road

Applicant William Jelliffe

PROPOSAL: To construct a new, 1,820 square-foot, two-story dwelling with an attached, two-car garage on an undeveloped lot of approximately 5,998 square feet.

DESIGN REVIEW

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Charchian					x	
Benlian					x	
Malekian	x		x			
Simonian			x			
Mardian		x	x			
Totals			3	0	2	0
DRB Decision		Return for Redesign with conditions				

Conditions:

1. The yard area to the north of the house shall be landscaped with a limited concrete landing area as shown on the site and landscape plans. The section on Sheet A-4 shall be revised accordingly.
2. A location for trash storage accessible from within the garage shall be indicated on the plans, subject to staff's approval. This location shall not reduce the required garage dimensions.
3. The retaining walls at the driveway shall have a stucco finish to match the house.
4. The proposed walls along La Loma Road shall have a stucco finish to match the house and shall be limited in height to 18 inches. The existing chain link fence shall be removed.
5. Block walls elsewhere on the site shall have the same color and finish as the rest of the walls on the site.
6. The exposed faces of the proposed wall along the north property line shall be decorative on both sides.
7. Outdoor mechanical equipment, if proposed, shall be located on or near the concrete landing on the north side of the house.
8. The guardrails and handrails shall have a twisted vertical bar detail.
9. Gutters and downspouts are not shown on the plans. These shall be designed to complement the style of the building and must be provided on the plans.
10. Windows and doors shall be painted the same brown color as the trims.
11. Windows shall be inset and a cross-section shall be provided on the plans.
12. The floor area of the house shall be reduced to comply with the Zoning Code.

13. Clarify the height of all retaining walls; and specifically at the top left corner of driveway where the walls converge. Use a secondary wall to soften the appearance.
14. Provide a grading and drainage plan with full consideration of existing site conditions and topography.
15. The overall building design is inconsistent. Simplification and more consistency of the roof/building details are needed.
16. For Spanish style influence:
 - a. Solid railings would help this design possibly to create a base.
 - b. Window placement is not proportional. Less height is needed between the head of the windows and the rafters.
 - c. The gable end roof vents as shown are not compatible and should be a more traditional style.
 - d. Reduce the roof pitch - too steep as shown at 5/12.
17. Windows need to be more appropriately proportioned to the intended style and consistent in size and operation - single-hung or casement.
18. At the cantilever above the driveway, disengage the cantilever from the retaining wall so it is free floating or relocate it.
19. The building design is too boxy, and does not follow the Hillside Design Guidelines. Two-story vertical box is not acceptable; and as designed it is too large for its proximity to the street. Eliminate the hipped roof at the front façade as it is too heavy. Possibly use a trellis structure.
20. Remove or relocate the skylight to rear elevation.
21. Clarify the roofing material. One-piece "S" tile is acceptable.
22. Consult with the City Arborist, Water & Power, and Public Works with planning staff involvement to establish site design parameters for existing conditions including but not limited to: protected trees, historical lamppost, required setbacks, new driveway location and power poles.
23. Clarify the overall height of building.
24. Provide drawings with consistency between plans, elevations and renderings.

Considerations:

1. In redesigning the front façade and entry, consider a ground floor entry as it may provide façade articulation that would be more responsive to the hillside design guidelines in terms of massing, and greater flexibility in the location of entry stairs given existing site conditions and grading. (1:25:00)

The Design Review Board approves the design of projects only. Approval of a project by the Design Review Board does not constitute an approval of compliance with the Zoning Code and/or Building Code requirements.

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the Design Review Board decision, plans may be submitted for Building and Safety Division plan check. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, Design Review Board approved plans must be stamped approved by Design Review Board staff. **Any** changes to the approved plans may constitute returning to the Design Review Board for approval. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, **all** changes in substantial conformance with approved plans by the Design Review Board must be on file with the Planning Division.

Please make an appointment with the case planner for DRB stamp/sign-off prior to submitting for Building plan check.

DRB Staff Member

Chris Baghdikian