



CITY of CALABASAS

Architectural Review Panel Action Agenda

Special Meeting

Friday, April 12, 2013, 2:30 P.M.
Conference Room 3, City Hall
100 Civic Center Way, Calabasas
www.cityofcalabasas.com

The starting times listed for each agenda item should be considered a guideline only. The Architectural Review Panel reserves the right to alter the order of discussion in order to run an effective meeting. If you wish to assure yourself of hearing a particular discussion, please attend the entire meeting.

Opening Matters – 2:30 P.M.:

- Call to Order
- General Discussion

Panelists in attendance: Jeff Cooper (Chair), Ken Stockton, Michael Harrison, Mark Handel, Sam Wacht

Panelists Absent: None

Staff in attendance: Glenn Michitsch, Senior Planner

General Comments: NONE

Review Item(s) – 2:45 P.M.

1. **File No. 130000103.** Request for a Conditional Use Permit, Site Plan Review, Oak Tree Permit and Vesting Tentative Tract Map for the demolition of the existing Calabasas Inn and construction of a new 213,227 square-foot mixed use project, which includes 11,700 square-feet of commercial retail space and 80 residential condominium units. The proposed project includes eight (8) affordable housing units located on-site and designated for qualified very low income residents. The applicant is requesting two concessions for providing 10% very low income units; 1) a height increase similar to the previously approved project in 2008, and 2) a reduction in the size of minimum parking stall dimension for spaces located adjacent to columns, walls or other obstructions. The subject site is located at 23500 Park Sorrento, within the Commercial Mixed Use zoning district

Submitted by: D2 Development
Planner(s): Glenn Michitsch, Senior Planner
(818) 224-1707
gmichitsch@cityofcalabasas.com

Michael Klein, Associate Planner
(818) 224-1710
mklein@cityofcalabasas.com

Applicant/Representative attending: Lawrence Dinovitz, Scott Dinovitz, Nancy Johns, Rick Bianchi, Art Alvarado, Brian McClusky, Stephan Jordan, Everett Banke, Tarek Shaer

Members of the public attending: Adrian Brent, Eileen Sonheim, Don Van Atta, Sue Silver, Jerry Becker, Estelle Becker, Charlotte Meyer, Richard Sonheim

Comments: The Panel made the following consensus comments:

- Italianate architecture works well for the site. The next submittal for ARP review should include more specific detailing of architectural features/materials.
- The next submittal should include an elevation drawing of the project as seen over the telecom switching station located to the west.
- A concern was raised that the project should use more landscaping in general, but specifically to the west side of the property.
- Currently, the buildings are designed in a manner that is uniform, and looks like they are all a part of one project and designed by the same architect. Buildings should be designed to look like they are a part of a village that was developed over time. Each building should have its own architectural variation/randomness within the Italianate theme to achieve the goal of a “village” aesthetic.
- Design of each individual building on-site should include architectural variation on the upper floor(s) with the goal of breaking up upper floor building mass and adding more visual interest. Traditional Italian architecture has a design hierarchy, which differentiates the base of the building from the 2nd floor, and the 2nd floor from the upper floor and roof. The Panel felt the submittal looked more like an apartment building, and needed to be reworked. Recommendations to do this include breaking up the roofline through the use of dormers, and varying window type.
- The Panel commented that it would be willing to entertain a higher roofline, provided it was used to create a more interesting façade, with higher ceiling levels on the upper floor, and a variegated roofline with authentic Italian pitched or arched roof forms.
- The Panel commented that the applicant should consider a more pronounced (grander) site entry way (wider, more inviting to the public), and could consider using a wider drive aisle.

- The Panel also commented that the project entry orientation and configuration of the buildings frame a “view” through the development that should create a more visually interesting terminus. To this end, the Panel commented that Building #4 looked “shoehorned” into the site plan. Effort should be made to modify the location of Building #4 so that it creates an interesting visual terminus.
- The Panel suggested a fountain element be included as a feature in the courtyard, to add a sense of arrival and visual interest.
- Entry for “affordable” units should not be through the commercial entrance. All residential occupants should enter the development through the same entry.
- A friendly suggestion was made by some panelists that the pool area might not be private enough. However, this sentiment was not shared by all panelists, and the Panel indicated that this comment is more of a suggestion, and not one specifically related to aesthetics.
- The Panel also raised a non-aesthetic-related concern regarding the parking layout and potential maneuverability issues created by the use of Type V (wood) construction for the on-grade parking podium (of the residential buildings), which creates the need for more structural columns. The Panel suggested exploring the use of Type I (concrete) construction to reduce the number of columns, and to consider wider drive aisles (hence more vehicle back-out space). The Panel further explained that the use of Type I construction will not only aid in the maneuverability issue within the parking podium, but will aid in structural design while allowing more flexibility for overall design of the project and potentially at a lower cost.
- The Panel suggested that other parking schemes be explored
- Members of the public attended and were allowed to express concerns and ask specific questions. The Panel addressed their questions.

ACTION: The Panel recommended that the project come back for further review. Prior to any formal recommendation, the Panel requested to review materials related to the detailing of specific architectural elements. The Panel also requested the submittal of full-size plans for the next formal review.

Adjournment:

Adjournment to the Architectural Review Panel Meeting of April 26, 2013, at 2:30 P.M., City Hall, Conference Room #3, 100 Civic Center Way.

A copy of the Architectural Review Panel agenda packet, staff reports and supporting documents and any materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Architectural Review Panel after distribution of the agenda packet are available for review by the public in the Community Development Department located at Calabasas City Hall, 100 Civic Center Way. City Hall office hours are 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday and 7:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. every Friday. If you have any questions regarding a particular project please contact the project planner.

If, due to disability, you require special accommodations to attend or participate in an Architectural Review Panel meeting, please contact the Community Development Department, (818) 224-1600, at least one business day prior to the scheduled meeting so staff may assist you.