

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

**Tuesday, January 27, 2009
Pavilion Meeting Room**

1021 Harvard Way

8:00 a.m.

MINUTES

NOTE: Applicants and/or their representatives attending the meeting are served in the order of their arrival. A sign-up sheet is available at 7:30 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER: 8:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Haberman, Davidson, Sgamba, Stockdale, McCray, Rain, Rumsey

Kerrie Diebels, Chairman
Jeff Haberman, Vice-Chairman
Jack Davidson, Committee Member
Don Sgamba, Committee Member
Myrllys Stockdale, Committee Member
Cindy McCray, Alternate Committee Member
Lou Rain, Alternate Committee Member
Ellison Rumsey, Alternate Committee Member

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Adoption of Agenda, Approval of January 20th Minutes

END CONSENT CALENDAR

OLD BUSINESS

OB1. VILLAGE: Fairchild, Lot 286, APN: 067-790-021
NAME: Gary Earl and Teresa Quintana
SITE: 3060 Brackenwood Place
RE: Room Addition (reopen/1/2/09)
MOTION: Denied (Rumsey/Stockdale) 5-0

The room addition project was denied because the revised plans had not been provided by the applicant. Once the revised plans are provided, then the file can be reopened.

OB2. VILLAGE: Governors, Unit 6, Lot 260, APN: 125-241-011
NAME: Michael Dupalo
SITE: 2794 Stanford Lane
RE: Landscaping/Fencing/Retaining Wall (1/2/09)
MOTION: Denied (McCray/Rumsey) 5-0

The landscaping, fencing, and retaining wall plan that was submitted was denied by the Committee. The Committee provided copies of the meeting minutes to the applicant indicating that additional information was required, but received no response. The following is required to complete the review process:

1. The railroad ties being used as a retaining wall need to either be installed properly or removed and another type of retaining wall installed (which must be approved by the Committee). If the railroad ties are retained, then landscaping needs to be placed so that it will grow either over the railroad ties or in front of the railroad ties to partially screen them from the street. Also, the 1st row of railroad ties along the curb needs to be removed.
2. A solid six-foot high wood fence and gate needs to be installed behind the drive strips so that a vehicle can be parked behind a six-foot solid wood fence/gate that cannot exceed the height of the fence. Vehicles cannot be parked on the drive strips as it is a violation of the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions.
3. A complete plan of the project which deals with the issues addressed above in Items 1 and 2 and includes a full plant list is required.

OB3. VILLAGE: Ridgeview, Unit 8, Lot 437, APN: 107-422-051
NAME: Kamineni Rao
SITE: 217 Muse Drive
MAILING: 2324 Rudat Circle
RE: New Home (reopen 1/22/09)
MOTION: See below

Mr. Rao's contractor, Mr. Snipes, attended the meeting along with three neighboring lot owners, Mr. Geren, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. Mia. Mr. Geren, who lives next door to Mr. Rao's lot, addressed the Committee. He stated that he had ten points that he wanted to make to the Committee discussing the fact that retaining walls were considered structures and could not be constructed within the setback area. His concern was that the proposed retaining walls on the current plan would be adjacent to his home, in the setback which would create a tunnel affect on the side of his property.

Mr. Peterson and Mr. Mia addressed the Committee with their concerns that the structure would be too high and block their views and was in violation of the CC&R's.

Mr. Snipes, Mr. Geren, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Mia presented a proposal to the Committee as follows:

1. To lower the pad by three feet
2. That the wall along the driveway may be higher—up to 8' high
3. There would be a 5' and 3' retaining wall adjacent to Mr. Geren's property
4. The pitch of the roof would be changed from 5/12 to 4/12.

Mr. Snipes noted that he would have to discuss the proposal with the property owner and that he would have to agree to the changes.

The Committee voted to approve the modifications provided that they were agreed upon by the owner. A Motion was made by Haberman and seconded by Sgamba, Stockdale recused herself and Rumsey voted in favor of the motion in her place.

OB5. VILLAGE: Crescent Hills, Lot 26, APN:120-533-021
NAME: Kim Short
SITE: 376 Arches Avenue
RE: Landscaping (1/8/09)
MOTION: Held Over

The application was held over because the landscaping plans need more details as follows:

1. A detailed plant list with planting areas clearly depicted on the plans
2. An irrigation plan
3. Unclear what Emerald Carpet means on the plan

Suggest that the applicant and/or landscape contractor attend next week's meeting to discuss the plan directly with the Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

NB1. VILLAGE: Crown Valley, Lot 43, APN: 124-020-431
NAME: David and Susie Williams
SITE: 2476 Mormon Island Drive
RE: Storage Shed (1/21/09)
MOTION: Approved (Davidson/Stockdale) 5-0

Mrs. Williams attended the meeting to discuss her project. The storage shed will be located behind the existing wrought iron fence and hot highly visible. The shed will be painted to match the home, but the applicant requested asphalt shingles on the roof rather than tile which is the material on the home.

After reading the CC&R's, which state that no asphalt shingle roofs are allowed, the Committee voted to approve the project with the stipulation that the roofing material on the shed be the same tile roofing material and color that is currently on the residence.

NB2. VILLAGE: Governors, Unit 6, Lot 271, APN: 125-241-121
NAME: Morag Williams
SITE: 2868 Stanford Lane
RE: Exterior Siding/Exterior Paint (1/21/09)
MOTION: Approved (Sgamba/Stockdale) 5-0

Mrs. Williams attended the meeting to discuss her project. The Committee reviewed the request for Mahogany CertainTeed Fiber Cement on the front of the home and a beige colored material on the rear of the home and for the trim. The Committee voted to deny the Mahogany color with a Motion made by Sgamba and seconded by McCray with all in favor.

The Committee then voted to approve Tan CertainTeed Fiber Cement on the front, sides, and rear and Beige for the trim and garage doors.

REVIEW AND COMMENT

1. Hotel Indigo (Valley View Parkway and White Rock Road)
Review and comment to El Dorado County Planning Services
2. Village Shopping Center (Francisco/Green Valley Road)
(Signage Policy adopted by CSD BOD)

Items 1 and 2 above were tabled until next week's meeting.

CLOSED SESSION: (If necessary concerning pending litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9)

Adjournment to _____

NOTE TO PUBLIC: Support material is available for public inspection at the Reception window in the Temporary Modular Building.

APPEALS: Any approval and/or denial of the Design Review Committee may be appealed to the CSD Board of Directors within 10 working days following the meeting. Appeal forms are available at the reception window in the Temporary Modular Building.