

**TOWN OF MORAGA
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MINUTES**

May 27, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

A special meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) was called to order by Chair Helber at 7:00 P.M. in the Hacienda de las Flores, La Sala Room, 2100 Donald Drive, Moraga, California.

Present: Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Chair Helber

Absent: Boardmember Kirkpatrick

Staff: Shawna Brekke-Read, Planning Director
Ellen Clark, Senior Planner
Ella Samonsky, Associate Planner
Brian Horn, Associate Planner
Doug Donaldson, Contract Planner
Sean Kennings, Contract Planner

Planning Commission Liaison: Steve Woehleke

A. Conflict of Interest

There was no reported conflict of interest.

B. Contact with Applicants

Chair Helber reported that he had contact with the applicants for the Moraga Town Center Homes, Agenda Item 4, Item D via telephone and e-mail; and with the applicants for Agenda Item 4, Item E, Via Moraga, as part of a meeting in the Town offices.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

3. ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

A. April 14, 2014 Minutes

B. Adoption of Meeting Agenda

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover to adopt the Consent Calendar, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Escano-Thomson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Kirkpatrick

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 5 Paseo Linares, DRB 04-14

Applicant: Talon Design Group, 222 Railroad Avenue, Danville, CA 94526

Proposed Application: Design Review for a revised design to construct a new 5,198-square foot, two-story single-family residence.

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for design review of a revised design to construct a new 5,198-square foot, two-story single-family residence, and asked that the DRB adopt the Draft Action Memorandum to approve DRB 04-14, subject to findings and conditions of approval since the project had been found to be consistent with the Town Design Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and General Plan with minimal impact to surrounding properties.

Ms. Samonsky clarified that the story poles had not been relocated as part of the revised design.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Alan Page, Talon Design Group, 222 Railroad Avenue, Danville, reported that after the previous approval, the owner/developer had requested he review the previous design to reduce the retaining walls, address the grading issues, and create a better backyard area. He had come to the conclusion the garage and auto court were too far into the useable portion of the lot and the yard area was not private. As a result, the yard area had been flipped and placed where the auto court had been located in the previous design, the home had been rotated, the orientation changed, and the grading reduced, allowing the home to be better situated on the lot. He found the revised design was more sensitive to the use of the site, reduced the height and quantity of the retaining walls, created a better grading situation that would have less impact, increased the yard area, and retained the square footage of the home with a little less height and similar massing. He suggested the revised design would have little impact on the neighbors.

Jonathan Clark, 2 Paseo Linares, Moraga, asked whether appropriate arrangements had been made for drainage given the history of water coming down the hill, and underground, which could be impacted by the construction of the home.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mr. Page explained that two different civil engineers had evaluated the drainage and grading for the project, there would be drainage behind the retaining walls to catch any drainage off the slope, they would not dig down as deep, and perimeter drainage would

be a benefit. He advised that the applicant had responded satisfactorily to all peer review questions on the project design.

Boardmember Zhu found that the home colors would be neutral, and clarified that corbels would be placed on all corners with the in-between area left blank as part of the Italianate Mediterranean style which he liked, but found the design to be a bit unfinished. He suggested the chimney design pursuant to Sheet A6 appeared too blank and he recommended the addition of a pattern or trim element.

Mr. Page acknowledged that additional design details for the chimney could be considered.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson liked the revisions to the home design as compared to the previous approval, the natural contours of the site, the minimized need for grading and infill, and the fact that retaining walls would be lower than the previous design.

Chair Helber referenced Condition 9(b) of the Draft Action Memorandum and suggested that condition could be clarified requiring the delineation of the scenic easement to be staked on-site; suggested that Condition 21 also be clarified to reflect that the permitted access at the location as shown on the approved plan referred to the driveway access; clarified that the reference to the dedication of a private storm drain easement referred to an easement from the bio-retention area, from the property owner to the Town, as shown in Condition 29; and asked that the condition be revised to reflect that the easement would be from the C.3 facilities to the public facilities. He also clarified with the applicant that he would comply with Condition 36, as written.

Chair Helber commented that the revised plan had shown the driveway being moved directly adjacent to an existing V-ditch, and recommended some type of landscape buffer even if just low ground cover to soften the area, to which Mr. Page commented that a low fence could be placed along the property line and there was room for some vegetation.

Chair Helber also referenced the landscape plans, which had shown trees being planted on top of the drainage line pursuant to Sheet L5; commented that the scenic easement delineated on the plan had shown several Coastal Live Oaks within 15 feet of the scenic easement; and clarified with the applicant that the hillside behind the home went up several feet noting that structures were not to be above a certain elevation. The developer was not opposed to a condition to ensure there were no conflicts.

Chair Helber also spoke to the C.3 design and recommended an additional condition that the Town Engineer sign off on the C.3 Plan; verified the force main by others, as shown on the plans, would have to be clarified by the Civil Engineer; and clarified the second story windows would be casement windows meeting egress for all bedrooms; and that ogee style gutters would be installed with 3-inch downspouts.

Chair Helber further clarified with the applicant the bio-retention area details with a 6-inch rock retaining wall bordering the entire retention area intended to define the planting inside the bio-retention area, which created a transition area. He suggested that bio-retention areas appeared better when blended into the landscape and were not

visible. He found the project to be a good one and liked the changes that had been made which had resulted in a better project with nice curb appeal, minimizing the bio-retention area, and being an asset to the community.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu, to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated May 27, 2014, approving DRB 04-14 for 5 Paseo Linares, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and modified as follows:

- Condition 9(b) to be revised to read: *Fencing plan shall be prepared and installed by and certified by a licensed surveyor to delineate the scenic easement;*
- Condition 21 revised to read: *The applicant shall only be permitted driveway access at the location shown on the approved plan;*
- Condition 29 revised with the second sentence to read: *The applicant shall consider dedicating private storm drain easements from C.3 facilities to public facilities over storm drain lines traversing the site to ensure that the facilities remain unobstructed, undisturbed, and are identified to future homeowners of their existence and maintenance requirements;*
- Add a new condition to read: *Planting plan specifically dealing with Coastal Live Oaks shall comply with scenic easement requirements; and*
- Add a new condition to read: *Landscape buffer shall be added between the existing V-ditch and the driveway*

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the DRB in writing to the Planning Department.

B. 1873 St. Andrews Drive, DRB 1-14

Applicant: J. Allen Sayles, Architect, Inc., 1196 Boulevard Way, Suite 11, Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Proposed Application: Design Review for the construction of two new decks that encroach into side yard setbacks and the construction of 304 square feet of storage space at an existing residence.

Associate Planner Samonsky presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for design review to construct two new decks that encroach into side yard setbacks and the construction of 304 square feet of storage space at an existing residence located at 1873 St. Andrews Drive. She recommended that the DRB adopt a Draft Action Memorandum approving DRB 1-14, subject to the findings and conditions of approval

given the project's consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, with minimal impact to surrounding properties.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Allen Sayles, Architect, 1196 Boulevard Way, Suite 11, Walnut Creek, explained that the mass of the two decks had been split, with one on the lower floor and the other on the upper floor so that off-site the decks would not appear to be one large mass. The current decks did not include any screening. The proposed project would include a landscape element to address the more visible side of the home which was a common design for homes on hillsides in the Moraga Country Club. The unofficial setback of the home was the footprint of the home.

In response to the DRB, Mr. Sayles affirmed that the project had been approved by the Moraga Country Club Architectural Review Committee and there had been no input from adjacent residents at that time; the spoils from the development would be minor, could be kept under the home, and there was existing landscaping down the hill; there would be easy access to the pilings at the bottom, the piers would be small with support of the two decks; and the depth of the piers was not known at this time.

Ms. Samonsky added that Cal Engineering had conducted peer review and had recommended that the applicant have the original geotechnical engineer review the structural calculations to confirm a match with the calculations, which had since been completed.

Planning Director Shawna Brekke-Read explained that the project was being considered first by the DRB and then by the Planning Commission to offer a more linear, intuitive process that was easier for the applicant. She noted that the DRB had the ability to grant an exception to the Design Guidelines for the Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

Mr. Sayles also clarified the use of the glass railing materials which had been used by many in the Moraga Country Club, and stated that the home located directly above the subject home also used glass rail which allowed views of the golf course.

Maureen Freeman, Moraga, requested clarification of the design that had been proposed; asked whether there had been previous additions to the home; whether the photos represented the built out project; and suggested the use of see through decking was rare in that wrought iron had been more commonly used in the Moraga Country Club.

Ms. Samonsky advised that the drawings reflected the currently unbuilt addition and the proposed decks. The addition would be built into the existing crawl space which had a slope.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Planning Commission Liaison Steve Woehleke commented that the decks that had been proposed were consistent with the decks historically built in the Moraga Country Club, and that landscaping was a critical component for screening.

Boardmember Zhu supported the project as long as there was neighbor support.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson found the decks to be a nice enhancement and suggested the storage space would not affect the massing or increase the footprint of the building.

Chair Helber agreed that the project was well within the established precedent of other projects in the area, that the encroachment into the side yard was small, the use of glass railing added to the view, and the FAR was within the existing envelope and therefore a de minimus change.

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated May 27, 2014, approving DRB 1-14 for 1873 St. Andrews Drive, subject to the findings and conditions as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the DRB in writing to the Planning Department.

C. Camino Ricardo

Applicant: SummerHill Homes, 3000 Executive Parkway, Suite 450, San Ramon, CA 94583

Proposed Application: Consider design review approval of the public park/open space area included as part of the approved Camino Ricardo residential subdivision.

Senior Planner Ellen Clark presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, to consider design review approval of the public park/open space area included as part of the approved Camino Ricardo residential subdivision, and asked that the DRB adopt the Draft Action Memorandum approving the final design of the Camino Ricardo Park/Open Space area, subject to conditions of approval.

Responding to the DRB, Ms. Clark clarified the location of the bridge across from the Skate Park, the north end of Commons Park; and acknowledged that the landscape plan included rye grass, a native grass found in many areas in Contra Costa County, which had been proposed in keeping with the native-oriented landscaping.

Ms. Brekke-Read stated that the final plant material could be chosen by the Landscape Architect from the broader list, and so could take account of concerns such as allergies when selecting the plant materials.

Ms. Clark clarified the terms of the Development Agreement (DA); clarified that the Town would pay for the water connection; suggested the applicant clarify how the water would be brought to the site; explained that the bridge had previously been reviewed by

the DRB as a railcar bridge to be finished with wood decking and rails; She acknowledged there was no existing sidewalk on the left side of Moraga Road and that the Livable Moraga Road Project would consider sidewalk connections along Moraga Road; and clarified that no signage had been proposed along Moraga Road for the park/open space area other than a park rule sign in the park itself.

Ms. Clark reiterated that the bridge had not been included in the item under consideration since it had previously been reviewed. Staff would review the bridge as part of the Improvement Plan submittal for conformance with the previous design. The DRB was being asked to approve Sheets L1 through L2.2, and the plant palette. No lighting had been proposed as part of this project since it would be a passive park.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Denise Cunningham, Director of Development, SummerHill Homes, offered a brief history of the overall park parcel concept, the bridges and trail connections which had previously been reviewed and approved in October 2014, and explained since that time SummerHill had received approval of the Vesting Tentative Map and DA. The Town Council and Planning Commission had provided additional direction on the design of Parcel C to retain the natural topography, incorporate native plants in the design, encourage educational opportunities, and consider the privacy of the existing neighbors. SummerHill had collaborated with staff and the community on the design elements and those before the DRB included the plant palette, trail alignment primarily to the interior, and specifications of fixtures and furniture.

Shari Van Dorn, Van Dorn Abed Landscape Architects, presented the evolution of the park design and explained that Parcel C was bordered by Corliss Tributary and Laguna Creek, and two bridges crossing over to Moraga Road and to the subdivision. She detailed the park design that had been reviewed and approved by the DRB, and explained since that time in working with the Planning Commission and some members of the community, a native open space park had been preferred. As a result, the previously proposed orchard trees had been eliminated from the design and the park would be predominantly native vegetation with a looped trail system; a primary multi-use trail that would travel south away from the neighbors' properties with a Public Works approved eight-foot asphalt trail, with two-foot wide mulch shoulders, and the trail to the north would be a five-foot wide mulch trail to provide a loop. The project would include interpretive signage and all-native plantings. This design plan had been approved by the Planning Commission.

The plan had been further refined in working with staff and the neighbors using the same concept, addition of native plantings, a low growing native meadow, identification of all signage, with interpretive signs to be placed at four locations. An existing sewer easement from the path to the Kline property would be required to be paved on the park side, with a removable split rail fence at this maintenance path entry to discourage public use

In addition, Ms. Van Dorn stated that staff wanted the meadow to be enlarged as much as possible, with both trails moved apart from one another resulting in a smaller looped trail closer to the neighbors' property. The trail would be kept from the Kline's rear yard,

which had been reflected in the plan. In response to the concern of another neighbor that the trail was getting too close, the trail could be moved another 20 feet away from where it had previously been proposed, and would be a minimum of 46 feet from the neighbors' properties. Tall native plants had also been proposed between those properties and the trail to ensure privacy.

Site furnishings would include the use of recycled plastic materials that had the look of wood and were durable and low maintenance; a bike rack; removable bollards; and the interpretative signs with prepared text through the assistance of the Project Biologist, Preserve Lamorinda Open Space (PLOS), and the Town, to be presented to local schools through an art contest or project to be involved in the project and the park. The bridge design was the same as previously approved by the DRB and the Planning Commission.

Ms. Van Dorn explained that SummerHill had worked closely with PLOS and local nurseries on the plant palette already with selected plants being those growing on the site as a native plant to Moraga or to California. She added that water would be brought to the site from the Camino Ricardo site with a meter installed on the cul-de-sac, to travel under the bridge and to the park. No lighting had been proposed for the park which would not be open at night and which would be passive. Signs would be posted to identify the park hours.

Responding to the DRB, Ms. Van Dorn clarified the location of the bio-retention area as part of the subdivision, outside of the park, with an outfall from the bio-retention area to the creek; identified the location of an overlook with benches which was part of the subdivision; and clarified that the manholes would be inset flush into the path.

Ms. Cunningham explained at this time they were only reviewing the park and the bridges. In the next month, SummerHill Homes would return to review the streetscape.

Ms. Van Dorn identified a hash mark shown on the plans around the park parcel to reflect the additional planting and a buffer between the trail and the neighbors; explained that the interpretative area was intended to be a small, informal area with logs and boulders for sitting; and acknowledged a request to reorient or add more benches in the park which could be considered with a further review of the site.

Brita Harris, 178 Corliss Drive, Moraga, thanked SummerHill Homes for the thoughtful and careful consideration of native plant materials although she questioned the proposal for asphalt as opposed to a soft surface trail which had been originally proposed as part of the park space, and that asphalt was at odds with the existing eco-system. She stated that maintenance of an asphalt surface would be costly, could be a safety hazard in the future, and would increase the speed of bicyclists. She suggested that a soft surface trail would be more appealing, and involve less grading and material to construct, minimizing activity in a sensitive terrain. She also encouraged minimal construction and maintenance practices given the potential impacts to the proposed native plant materials and existing habitat and wildlife. She asked that a soft surface trail be considered in all areas of the park.

John Reed, 846 Crossbrook Court, Moraga, stated that he had complained about the closeness of the soft path, noted the earlier schematic had only involved one path and bridge and two paths were not needed, and recommended the retention of the south path only with the elimination of the path to the north which was too close to the neighbors' homes and was not needed. He asked that the DRB recommend to the Planning Commission the elimination of the north path from the plan. He agreed that no lighting should be included in the plan although he was concerned the park could become a security issue, and having written to the Chief of Police about that issue he noted that the Chief did not share his concern.

Suzanne Jones, 1285 Bollinger Canyon Road, Moraga, representing PLOS, described the background and purpose of PLOS; expressed her support and enthusiasm for the concept of a natural and passive open space area, which would also be an educational and recreational asset to the community; thanked SummerHill Homes for being an incredible community partner through the process; thanked the DRB, Planning Commission, and staff for all their effort; and noted the native plant palette, as reflected on the plans, would offer the Town of Moraga a window into its natural history unlike anything available in the community, illustrate what the Town looked like in the past, and would harmonize visually and economically with the existing wildlife and habitat, and creeks. She referenced correspondence from Malcom Sproul who had explained an effective way to implement the project and how to favor the native plant materials over weeds. She encouraged the Town to work with the applicant to implement the project as Mr. Sproul had recommended. She stated that PLOS also supported adjusting the northern path further south, a wider buffer between the trails and the neighbors, and the original concept of soft surface trails through the property which would be a better fit for the project than asphalt.

Ms. Jones added that lighting had never been discussed as part of the project and suggested that lighting would introduce an entirely new set of environmental issues that had not been analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

In response to Mr. Reed's recommendation to eliminate the northern path entirely, Ms. Jones stated that this was the first time she had learned of the recommendation, was not opposed to entertaining the idea, but did not have adequate time to consider that recommendation. She pointed out that the looped trail concept had come about when there had been discussion to eliminate the second bridge, and it was worth some discussion.

Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that the Planning Commission had approved the project, the Town Council had approved the DA, and both paths had been included in the approved project. An earlier plan had shown a path through the site at the time it had been considered as an active park, and later when the park had evolved into a passive park the opportunity to have a trail had been recognized.

Ms. Clark added that a looped trail offered a better and nicer experience for park users, which was another reason a looped trail had been proposed. She also clarified that a soft surface was anything that was not asphalt or concrete.

Parks and Recreation Director Jay Ingram identified the different types of soft surfaces that could be considered including small wood chips and decomposed granite (DG) which was compacted and which had been used under the picnic areas in Rancho Laguna and Commons Parks. DG was also Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, while mulch was not. Mulch and wood chips were spread once a year in some of the Town parks by maintenance staff. While an asphalt path was not the most durable, it required less maintenance and produced a longer life span than a soft surface.

Teresa Onoda, 24 Merrill Circle, Moraga, identified herself as a Moraga Planning Commissioner. Speaking for herself, she commented on the natural state and topography of Parcel C that she described as a native garden. She suggested the integrity of the land with the least possible environmental impacts should be considered along with the history of the parcel. She noted that pear trees had been on the parcel for decades, were in good shape, and had actual pears on some of the trees. She suggested that everyone view the site. She also suggested respecting the native grasses that had been established and creating a sense of discovery with soft paths in and around the plants, and commented that while the native garden had created a stir in the community, Los Perales Elementary School was excited about the educational opportunities and other local schools were also excited about the opportunities an interpretative center may provide. She emphasized the education that could be provided to future generations and provided photographs of the potential the park could provide.

Dean Okamura, Moraga, inquired where the parking for the park would be provided.

Ms. Clark explained that parking would be provided within the Skate Park parking lot and in a cul-de-sac on the other side with a couple of parking spaces; there was no dedicated parking for the park/open space. A crosswalk had also been planned as part of the project from the bridge terminus across Moraga Road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

DRB members discussed the need for a gate or some sort of distinct entry to the park and expressed concern with the security of the park during the evening hours, even if closed during the evening, which could be a safety issue given the lack of lighting.

Mr. Ingram advised that both Rancho Laguna and Commons Parks were closed sun down to sun up, with no gates or fencing, and were open and accessible during the evening periods. Commons Park had interior lights around the pathway and in the parking lot. There were no lights at Rancho Laguna Park.

Ms. Brekke-Read acknowledged the recommendation for an entry feature of some sort to the park but did not recommend a gate or fence, citing as an example the Fourth of July celebrations or Concert in the Park, which allowed walking along the trails even during evening periods, similar to the use of the Lafayette-Moraga Regional Trail. She added that the north trail was part of the conceptual park plan and that the plans were before the DRB at this time for the detailed design. She suggested the elimination of

the north trail was out of the scope of the subject discussion since it had been part of the conceptual plan.

Boardmember Zhu liked the loop path, recognized the concerns with privacy, although suggested absent the loop people would walk along the north edge anyway and would want to be close to the trees and plants regardless. A looped trail offered maximum opportunity to view the trees and plants and he supported the looped trail.

Boardmember Glover offered a motion to approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated May 27, 2014, as prepared by staff.

On the motion, Chair Helber requested an amendment to the Draft Action Memorandum. Rather than have the final specifications of site furniture be approved by Town staff, he asked that it be approved by the Planning Director and that Conditions 2 and 3 under Part 5: Conditions of Approval, be modified accordingly.

Ms. Brekke-Read recommended that Condition 2 be revised to read:

2. *The final specifications for site furniture including benches, bicycle rack, picnic table, bollards and interpretative signage may differ from the samples shown in the May 1 plan set, and shall be as determined by the Planning Director and the Parks and Recreation Director to ensure durability and minimize maintenance costs.*

And Condition 3 to be revised to read:

3. The final park landscape plan shall incorporate species from the approved plant list, with a final planting selection that may be subset of the larger list, from Sheet LS2.1 and Sheet LS2.2. *The final planting plan shall be approved by the Planning Director and Parks and Recreation Director.*

Planning Commissioner Woehleke asked for consideration of a crushed stone approach rather than the use of asphalt for the path.

Ms. Clark explained that the Planning Commission approval of the project called for soft surface and a hard surface asphalt trail. In terms of the soft surface, decomposed granite had been discussed and was initially the recommended treatment for the soft surface path, although it had presented some maintenance issues and therefore, mulch, which was not ADA compliant, was preferred. If the lower path were mulch, it would not be ADA compliant. Asphalt had therefore been determined to be the preferred surface for the south path.

On the discussion, Chair Helber preferred the way the path had been designed now with two paths offering two different alternatives for two different experiences, with the asphalt path for someone wanting to talk and traverse quickly across the property and away from the neighbors, and it was important to have a path that was easily accessible for those with ADA needs. He did not want to place any more maintenance concerns on the Town than was necessary and acknowledged that asphalt served a design

purpose, and that the developer had listened to the Town and staff to create a nice design.

Chair Helber proposed a further condition of approval related to the bridges, with staff to determine that the final bridge design was compatible with the image shown in the previous approval, or the design would come back to the DRB. He asked whether the maker of the original motion would accept the amendments.

Based on parliamentary procedures, Ms. Brekke-Read suggested the original motion had died for lack of a second.

Boardmember Glover withdrew his original motion.

Ms. Brekke-Read suggested a new Condition 4 could read:

4. *Staff shall review and approve final bridge design for compliance with previous project approvals; substantial changes to the design shall require Design Review Board Approval.*

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated May 27, 2014, approving DRB 06-14 for SummerHill Homes, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, with modification to Conditions 2 and 3, and with the addition of Condition 4 as read into the record by the Planning Director. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	Escano-Thompson
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the DRB in writing to the Planning Department.

Chair Helber declared a recess at 9:20 P.M. The Design Review Board meeting reconvened at 9:30 P.M. with Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, and Chair Helber present.

D. Moraga Town Center Homes

Applicant: City Ventures, 444 Spear Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

Proposed Application: Preliminary design review of the Moraga Town Center Homes Project, a 36-unit residential development in the Moraga Center Specific Plan Area.

Contract Planner Doug Donaldson presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for consideration of preliminary design review of the Moraga Town Center Homes Project, a 36-unit residential development in the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) Area. Since additional information would be required and an environmental determination had not yet been made, he explained that the DRB may not take action to recommend the project to the Planning Commission, and recommended that the DRB provide

comments to the Planning Commission on the discussion points that had been highlighted on Page 15 of the staff report.

Mr. Donaldson reported that after the preparation of the staff report, additional peer review comments had been received on the design and landscape plans. One of the peer review comments was that the street tree pattern was urban looking with a recommendation for a more revised rural orchard type character consistent with the Design Guidelines, and that the number of plants and trees in the landscape palette be narrowed. In addition, that the plans show greater detail as to how the landscape design would handle the transitions between grade, particularly between the larger buildings along Moraga Way, Buildings A, B, C, and D, which had a drop in gradient; the Rock Creek Park design plan may not fully conform to the grading plan; and the parking along Country Club Way, which had been a concern raised by many speakers in prior study sessions and which should be discussed further. Design options and a parking study (Attachment B) had been included in the staff report. He recommended consideration of parking along Moraga Way, which was currently not shown along the frontage of the project.

In response to the DRB, Ms. Brekke-Read affirmed that the project had a three-story element, with three stories allowed by the MCSP. The DRB had considered that design element in a previous iteration. She clarified that the current Design Guideline called for variation in the building setbacks, with no specific standard for a second floor setback.

Mr. Donaldson identified the location between the larger buildings A, B, C, and D; the paseos which would be the front yards of those units; and the auto courts where access to the garages would be provided. He identified the options for parking with or without bicycle facilities; the location of the two mailbox clusters for the development which had been confirmed by the applicant; acknowledged concerns with security issues for the mailboxes; clarified the project had not yet been deemed compete with another letter having gone out in the last week; and that the environmental review had just begun.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that the Engineering Department had also provided a list of incomplete items.

As to the status of the requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Mr. Donaldson advised that work was to start on the Initial Study checklist to review conformance with the MCSP EIR.

Ms. Brekke-Read further added that studies provided by the applicant included biological studies, traffic assessments and analysis, and noise, all under peer review, with a checklist being prepared as part of the review of project conformance to the MCSP EIR. The intent of this discussion was to provide feedback and comments. While some details were being worked out, she suggested that the DRB provide feedback on the conceptual design to the Planning Commission which would consider the various entitlements for the project, after which the Town Council would take further actions.

Once all of those approvals had been completed, the project would return to the DRB for final design review. She described the process as similar to that for the Camino Ricardo subdivision.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Charity Wagner, Director of Development, City Ventures, 444 Spear Street, San Francisco, Project Manager for the Moraga Town Center Homes project, introduced the development team present in the audience. She thanked staff for the thorough presentation of the project, and clarified the purpose of the meeting where the DRB was being asked to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Wagner clarified the location of the mailbox clusters, with the second location between Buildings A and B in response to the U.S. Postal Service, and explained that comments on the landscaping from the peer review were new and the Landscape Architect would respond to those issues. She described the project site which consisted of three acres bound by Country Club Drive, Moraga Way, the Moraga-Orinda Fire District (MOFD), the creek channel/Laguna Creek, and an office building on the opposite side; identified street views from Moraga Way; identified the existing redwood trees between the MOFD and the project site beyond, with the trees on the project site to be preserved. She reported the project was within the MCSP designated for Mixed Office/Residential allowing for 12 to 20 homes per acre; and explained that the MCSP had involved a seven-year process with the intent of the project to be consistent with the MCSP, with careful attention to the existing Design Guidelines through a high-quality design.

Ms. Wagner identified the details from prior iterations for the site which had evolved into the current design for the 36-unit residential development consisting of 15 cottages along Country Club Drive transitioning to townhomes. Nine of the interior units would be two and a half story with a loft element; there would be a 10,000 square foot plus pocket park along the creek; with vehicular access along Moraga Way and Country Club Drive a key component discussion of the community; and with attached townhome units on Country Club Drive. All 15 homes would have a small front porch entryway that face Country Club Drive, and no garages would front on Country Club Drive. The garages and driveways of the homes would be to the rear towards the MOFD property, and a seven-foot sound wall had been proposed between the project and the MOFD property; there would be 37 feet of landscaping between the closest buildings and the current right-of-way along Moraga Way. The project renderings and images of the townhomes and cottages were displayed.

The project would also provide two points of pedestrian access along Moraga Way and one from Country Club Drive with a meandering sidewalk along Moraga Way, sidewalks along both sides of the vehicular entrance, and an existing sidewalk to remain along Country Club Drive. Decorative pavement to encourage people to walk to access the site was an option, with the site's main entrance along Moraga Way consistent with the MCSP. It was noted that the grades allowed for the preservation of existing trees with the entrance providing full right in/out. The location of a dedicated emergency vehicle access (EVA) was also identified.

Ms. Wagner detailed the parking for the project with the project to have standard two-car garages for every home consistent with the standards in the MCSP and the Town's zoning standards, 18 on-site guest parking spaces located throughout the project site,

with a total of 90 parking spaces provided on-site. Although staff had recommended additional parking along Moraga Way, that option would reduce the landscaping along the scenic corridor. She sought comments from the DRB on that issue.

As to the options for parking enhancements on Country Club Drive, Ms. Wagner stated that staff had asked for alternatives and outlined the options in the staff report including various combinations of parking, bike lanes and changes to median width.

Ms. Wagner commented that based on her research and analysis most homes in Moraga that were for sale ranged around 2,800 square feet in size. The project included two housing types offering variability with cottages along Country Club Drive transitioning to the more traditional townhomes, being respectful to the existing neighborhood. She clarified that the cottages ranged from 1,947 square feet to just under 2,400 square feet, and the townhomes ranged from 1,900 to 2,400 square feet, well below the average sized homes for sale in Moraga.

Dan Hale, Hunt Hale Jones, 444 Spear Street, #200, San Francisco, identified the changes to the plans as compared to the prior iteration with direction to provide more articulation, a variety of setbacks, and massing relief in horizontal planes; with the plans including adjustments to the horizontal wall plane, changes to the rooflines and plate lines, and different expressions between the different buildings, while still keeping the balance with the open space, landscaping along Moraga Way, and maintaining a nice public entrance statement. He offered a rendering to show the changes in the articulation, specifically to Building A which had more of a gabled approach, Craftsman, taller plate line, transom windows, elements off of the building, window shading, featured elements breaking up the massing, with changes in the rooflines, window expressions, materials, and colors. A two-dimensional approach of the four buildings was provided with the intent to provide a unique look to each building to provide the articulation desired.

Mr. Hale commented that in working with the Project Civil Engineer, there was an opportunity for Building A to be shifted down towards the open space at the entry, possibly five to six feet, and possibly shift Buildings B and D towards Moraga Way and Building C down three to four feet. Coupled with the changes to the rooflines, he asked whether that would achieve the staff goal.

In response to the recommendation to provide additional setbacks for the cottages along Country Club Drive with better articulation, Mr. Hale explained that a unique and complementary design would be offered for each cottage with no two cottage elevations the same, to create a unique feel to the streetscape along Country Club Drive. He offered an elevation of one of the interior paseos for the townhomes, with varying wall planes projecting out from one another, a change in materials and colors, with the addition of the third story loft units in the interior of the buildings to offer a nice roofline and massing relief. The same elements would be used and applied to the auto court side in a similar manner to enhance the massing relief. He liked the staff idea for additional recessing of the garage doors, addition of trellises to soften that side.

In response to the recommendation to add balconies, Mr. Hale noted that the main living level of the townhomes was on the ground floor, with the lofts on the bedroom

levels, and they had intentionally not included second floor balconies and vines to preserve privacy. The intent was to keep the activity at the pedestrian and paseo level. In addition, each of the townhome units would have a small patio in the front, with a 36-inch high solid wall offering a semi-private transition space to the outside and creating an opportunity for social activity in the paseo. Some of the patios would step up to the level of the door and to the outdoor patio, and some would step down a step. The cottage units included a private yard space with the kitchen or dining room opening to an outdoor rear yard area, with ample space for a private outdoor area.

Mr. Hale also identified the use of small shrubs and trees along with the additional trellis work that would soften the appearance of the elevations, offered an elevation of the garage side, and suggested the changes provided a better project.

John Pearson, 804 Country Club Drive, Moraga, stated his main concern was parking with only two parking spaces for each home. Since the development would likely have more than two vehicles per household, and if the project was approved, the existing neighborhood would be impacted by overflow parking. He asked that the parking and traffic studies be reviewed and that the developer be asked to review a parking study that involved the existing residents. He emphasized that the competition for parking would be an issue. He also understood the desire to beautify the entrance of Moraga Way and noted that Country Club Drive had originally been designed as the Town's entrance. Due to the parking constraints, he asked that the Town consider permit parking along Moraga Way.

Seth Freeman, Moraga, stated that he had attended many of the meetings held at the Moraga Country Club and he sought clarity from the developer as to the target market for the project given that when the project had first been presented it had been earmarked for empty nesters. He found the parking to be inadequate, the units would not have driveways to accommodate parking overflow, and he suggested it was not unreasonable to expect that the units could have as many as four vehicles per household. He also suggested the units had become three-story homes absent elevators, and each unit had become larger and likely to be in the \$800,000 to \$1 million range, not the target market for empty nesters. In addition, the street was very narrow and the buildings would appear bulky unless set back further. He suggested the design was more urban than what was found in Moraga and was inconsistent with what was desired in Moraga.

Charlie Coane, a resident of Moraga Country Club, agreed with the parking concerns given that garages would likely be filled with stored items, suggested parking along Moraga Way was not a good idea, and asked that the developer take another look at an underground garage which may create quite a few parking spaces and may only need to be one level. He asked whether residents would be allowed to park in the guest parking spaces, whether the MOFD had opined on the project, understood that anyone on Country Club Drive would be able to park on the other side of the street if the development were built, and clarified the setbacks for the buildings along Moraga Way and Country Club Drive. He expressed concern with the limited space available which could impact the views along Moraga Way and asked of the potential impacts to the Moraga School District (MSD).

Dean Okamura, Moraga, stated that he had been appointed by the Moraga Country Club Homeowner's Association (HOA) Board of Directors as the point person to speak on this issue, but as a private resident and based on his occupation as a Realtor, he had seen similar construction around city transportation hubs and agreed that parking would be a real issue.

Denise Coane, Moraga, reported that she had attended the neighborhood meetings hosted by City Ventures and had met with Town staff. She expressed concern with the number of stories, and agreed that underground parking should be considered. She recognized the number of changes and iterations that had evolved over time although she expressed concern the project was not a good fit in the subject location.

Jerry Tanner, Moraga, asked whether overnight parking would be permitted along Country Club Drive, noted the north side of Country Club Drive had no parking other than during special events, and recommended that parking on the north side of Country Club Drive be restricted except during special events which could solve many of the parking concerns.

Maureen Freeman, Moraga, asked that staff be directed to place the project materials on-line which she found to be a necessity and obligation to provide to Moraga citizens. She suggested the core problem with the parking was that it either be staged in the development or it would overflow onto the street. She added that the parking solution needed to be in the project interior whether underground or on the surface; a recommendation to jog the façade along Moraga Way would improve the articulation and break up the canyon effect in the development; articulation could also be achieved through the removal of the end units of Buildings A, B, and C; and in discussions with the developer in the past, City Ventures had acknowledged the traffic study had not included bike and school bus traffic. She otherwise asked the dates when the traffic study had been conducted.

Ms. Wagner reiterated that parking needs were met on-site; the total number of parking spaces was adequate and consistent with the Town's codes; the HOA would include requirements for guest parking to be for guests only and not residents; and storage would be prohibited in garages to ensure vehicles parked in the garages. The target market continued to be empty nesters and young family homebuyers; City Ventures continued to discuss the project with the MOFD and had met with the MOFD on several occasions to review the project; overnight parking would continue to be allowed on Country Club Drive; and 36 homes was the minimum number allowed for the project density in the MCSP. She further clarified that no home in the project would be in excess of 3,000 square feet, and most homes would be smaller than that, and the MCSP encouraged work force and alternative housing types. The variability of housing types, providing three- and four-bedroom homes, still provided an entry level home in the Moraga market.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

The DRB discussed the Moraga Town Center Homes project and offered the following comments to be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration:

- Bicycle lane location was important from a safety standpoint;
- Recommended the pursuit of more than two mail drops with the U.S. Postal Service;
- Recommended that parking along Moraga Way should not be permitted;
- Recommended that allowing one additional foot of height of the buildings would allow a ten-foot floor plate on the first floor versus a nine-foot floor plate offering a design addition that would not add much cost;
- Recommended horizontal articulation along Moraga Way by adjusting Building A, pulling it in more towards the site, adjust Building C by pulling it in, and possibly push Buildings B and D out a bit more which would improve the setbacks and the scenic corridor along Moraga Way;
- Recess the garage doors and consider trellis features along the auto courts elevation to interrupt screen sight lines to garage doors on Buildings A and B from Moraga Road to preserve the views of the scenic corridor;
- Pull the trellises on the paseos further out in front of, and behind the building, to offer greater visual articulation;
- Commended the development team effort to listen and improve the project design with each iteration;
- The Country Club Drive streetscape was found to be the most attractive, and as such recommended the same level of detail and attention to the Moraga Way elevation by pushing Buildings A and C out a bit with a recommendation to add dormers to Buildings C and D to break the roofline;
- Recognized that the project, as presented, had improved from the March iteration;
- Recognized that the developer had taken steps to incorporate comments from staff, the public, and the DRB over the many iterations; and
- Expressed concern that a Draft Action Memorandum was not available at this time for review prior to Planning Commission consideration of the application, with staff advising that the peer review of the environmental document was currently underway.

Ms. Brekke-Read commented that if the DRB wanted to see the Draft Action Memorandum prior to consideration by the Planning Commission and upon the completion of the environmental and peer review, it would delay the project from two to four weeks.

- The DRB did not want to delay the project although Boardmembers noted that the DRB's purpose to review and provide feedback as an advisory body to the Planning Commission could not be done through an informal recommendation.

Chair Helber declared a recess at 10:53 P.M. to allow staff to discuss with the developer possible dates for a continuance. The DRB meeting reconvened at 10:58 P.M. with Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, and Chair Helber present.

Ms. Brekke-Read recommended that the item be continued to the July 14, 2014 meeting to allow the checklist and environmental work to be completed and the developer the ability to make any adjustments to the plans, with a formal Draft Action Memorandum to be provided on that date.

The DRB provided further comments, as follows:

- Recognized that the applicant had provided clarification on the size and square footage of the units;
- There was support, although with no consensus, for the staff recommendation for different types of housing to serve different markets which could increase the number of units and affect the parking, and there was no support for one-story units project although there could be a way to have a ground floor bedroom to meet that need;
- The applicant was encouraged to pursue varied building setbacks including second floor setbacks;
- There was no consensus to add additional pedestrian access to the pocket park;
- Suggested an increase in the outdoor space of the units at the end of the buildings which may achieve the staff recommendation to increase the dimensions of the porches and/or add usable outdoor space on the upper levels, with the DRB not recommending the addition of balconies; and
- There was consensus to support Country Club Drive Parking Option 1, which reduced the median and allowed for a bicycle lane and parking on the east side of Country Club Drive.

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to continue Moraga Town Center Homes to a date certain of July 14, 2014, with a Draft Action Memorandum to be provided to the DRB at that time. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

E. Via Moraga

Applicant: Signature Homes, Inc., 4670 Willow Road, Pleasant Hill, CA 94588

Proposed Application: Consider Preliminary Design Review of an 18-Unit Single-Family Residential Subdivision.

Contract Planner Sean Kennings presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for consideration of preliminary design review of an 18-unit Single-Family Residential Subdivision for Via Moraga. Since additional information would be required and the environmental review had not been completed, the DRB could not take formal action to recommend the project to the Planning Commission. He recommended that the DRB provide comments to the Planning Commission on a number of design components as outlined in detail on Pages 23 and 24 of the May 27 staff report, and identify any other outstanding issues.

Mr. Kennings added that after the distribution of the staff report, there had been a complaint received that the story poles that had been installed were too high and too close to Moraga Road, raising concerns with the height of the project.

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Glover to extend the DRB meeting from 11:30 P.M. to 12:30 A.M. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

In response to the DRB, Mr. Kennings identified the Moraga Road frontage setback and stated that the bio-retention area was 18 to 19 feet back from the sidewalk.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that a 25-foot setback was a Design Guideline although there was no established setback requirements established as part of the Limited Commercial District, with the setback to be established through this process. The current setback proposed as part of the project would be 25 feet to the building line not including the covered walkway as shown on Sheet 1.

Mr. Kennings commented that the environmental work was near completion and the applicant was to sign off on the proposed mitigation measures, which had just been provided to the applicant this evening.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that once the mitigation measures had been signed, the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) could be published and would include a 20-day public comment period. She identified the items that required DRB review and approval; the entitlements that required Planning Commission consideration and approval; and Town Council action as identified on Page 1 of the staff report; along with the process for some of the design items requiring DRB review and comment prior to Planning Commission consideration.

The DRB recommended a correction to the second sentence of the first paragraph of Section C. Circulation and Access, as shown on Page 15 of 24 to read: *“Stop signs would be provided before the sidewalk.”*

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Tom Quaglia, Project Manager, Signature Homes, Inc., 4670 Willow Road, Pleasanton, introduced the development team present in the audience, and explained that the plans included actions and input taken by the DRB on November 12, 2013, and the Planning Commission on December 19, 2013, at which time Signature Homes had been directed to proceed with the plans as presented. In January 2014, Signature Homes had met with Town staff and had been directed to revise all plans, and Signature Homes had held some internal meetings with two DRB members. The land plan reflected the Planning Commission's input with the primary change being the relocation of the recreation area to the rear; additional parking added in the rear at 9 x 19 feet in dimension pursuant to the Town's code; the two end units of a compact size; with the bulk of the parking at the rear meeting the Town's code; and with parallel stalls at 8 x 22 feet in dimension also meeting the Town's requirements. In addition, the entries had additional planting to soften views into the site. The project now also had five vehicle parking spaces per household; one on the street, two on the apron, and two in the garage.

Mr. Quaglia detailed the discussions of the internal meetings with a subcommittee of DRB members comprised of Chair Helber and Boardmember Zhu, and explained that the plans reflected those discussions. The plans showed the revised elevations for all units, all windows had been inset with substantial detail, and all elevations were current and up to date, and detailed. He offered a handout to show the upgrades to the buildings and the streetscape; with elongated features at the bookends of the streetscape to capture some of the rhythm of the taller elevations and respect the lower elevations; and with the two end buildings accentuated, and less so for the middle building. The plan now reflected input from the DRB, the Planning Commission, and the DRB subcommittee members from the internal meetings, and he asked for support from the DRB given that the applicant had been very responsive to the recommendations.

Mr. Quaglia identified Sheet 1 to show the landscape area and the setbacks, with the current setback requirement for the current zoning at 25 feet which allowed for a three-story structure, although only two stories had been proposed. He added that the story poles had been surveyed and staked with the staking representing the façade of the building. He reiterated that the parking ratio was 5:1 and that staff had concurred that front yard landscaping should be maintained as part of the HOA.

Mr. Quaglia responded to a recommendation for a ten-foot as opposed to a nine-foot floor plate and stated he was receptive to that recommendation; explained that the location of a crosswalk must be placed in an area where it would get the most use and would likely have to be placed mid-block; clarified the location of the drainage system through an underground subterranean “Y” with a drop inlet to collect the water, not a manhole, and with the storm drain to collect water from the east; acknowledged concerns with blockage of storm drain inlets; identified the streetscape elevations of the

three homes on Lots 1, 12, and 13; and stated that all units fronting Moraga Road had been substantially enhanced.

Clare Roth, a resident of Fernwood Drive, Moraga, referenced the story poles and in spite of the staff explanation of the setbacks for the district where the project was located suggested the setback, while similar to the nearby veterinary hospital, would not be comparable given the massing of the project. She urged the DRB to seriously consider the opportunity to set a precedent for the scenic corridor area and recommend mitigations to address the massive buildings as opposed to the Country Club project where some effort had been made to stagger the faces of the buildings.

Suzanne Jones, PLOS, expressed concern that the units would be two story, close to the street and would obstruct the ridgeline views of Rheem Ridge, as opposed to what had been stated in the staff report. She suggested that could be addressed by moving the buildings further back or making the units one story to ensure the long range view had been preserved. She emphasized the effort to preserve the ridgeline views within the scenic corridor which should be a priority for the Town.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Ms. Brekke-Read advised that the Design Guidelines called for a minimum greenbelt for single-family residences in scenic corridors with a minimum depth of 20 feet, which could be less if mitigated by shrubbery, trees, and/or acceptable elements of landscaping. In the Commercial District the minimum depth would be 12 feet, with a 35-foot maximum building height.

Planning Commission Liaison Woehleke suggested there had been no expectations in the General Plan or Design Guidelines for a 10-DUA per acre detached project, and he encouraged the DRB to provide input based on its experience as to the acceptability of the project in a semi-rural environment when the project was clearly not semi-rural.

Mr. Quaglia referenced the 2002 General Plan which specifically stated the areas would contain residential land uses at 10-DUA and 16-DUA, and cited Carroll Ranch which had the same density and home sizes.

The DRB discussed the Via Moraga project and offered the following comments and/or direction to the developer:

- Recognized that the developer had made an effort to enhance the streetscape;
- Raised concern with the absence of a buffer zone between the public and private uses;
- Recommended a reconsideration of the setbacks and mandated the setback for the second story;
- Concern with the two-story massing in front of the street and recommended that the building be pushed back further;

- Concern with the building height evidenced by the story poles that had been installed;
- Recognized that the developer had incorporated input from the DRB including recessed windows and architecture on all four sides, but there remained concerns whether the project was appropriate for the subject site since it would be surrounded by Commercial uses within the scenic corridor, and there were questions as to whether 18 residential homes were appropriate for the site recognizing that the Planning Commission made land use decisions;
- Concern that the 5:1 parking ratio made the project over-parked;
- Recommended the removal of the parking perpendicular (east) to Lots 7, 9, and 18, shifting the units onto that perpendicular parking space and having the road loop back with one entrance to offer a superior site design for traffic and interruptions of egress/ingress onto the scenic corridor, which by pushing the homes back would allow a portion of the street frontage to be pushed back and an extension of the buffer zone;
- Recommended replacing the second egress with a bus stop that mirrored the design on the other side of the street and allow for a true bus stop with pull out, which would be appropriate for the corridor and improve the circulation;
- Recommended that Lots 1 and 13 (shown as Lot 15 on the conceptual landscape plan) mirror the setback of the veterinary office building with the recognition it may result in the loss of units;
- Concern staff had not received any input from the existing businesses on the Rheem Boulevard side of the street; and
- Recommended that the project be continued.

Gary Galindo, President of Signature Homes reiterated that the project had been considered by the DRB and the Planning Commission on several occasions and the developer had been faced with turnover on both the DRB and the Planning Commission over that time leading to numerous changes to the plans. He again reiterated the direction from the DRB and the Planning Commission during the November and December 2013 meetings which had led the developer to understand they were heading in the right direction. He sought a recommendation to the Planning Commission at this time, emphasized they could not keep going on in this way since they could be hearing different things a year from now, and suggested staff would agree that many of the comments and direction had been accommodated to the greatest extent possible as part of a process that had been ongoing for three years. He requested that the application be allowed to proceed to the Planning Commission with a recommendation from the DRB. He was confident the units would sell.

The DRB recommended that the Planning Commission consider the following:

- Reconsider the setbacks for the Moraga Way frontage and the second floors.

On the discussion, the developer expressed concern that they had followed the recommendations of the DRB subcommittee which had led to enhancements of the drawings although now they were being asked to make further changes.

In response to concerns that those meetings had taken place absent the presence of the entire DRB, Chair Helber explained that the developer had requested a meeting with some DRB members to provide feedback on the proposal which had led to the internal meetings between the developer, Town staff, and he and Boardmember Zhu as an ad hoc DRB subcommittee.

Boardmember Zhu outlined the concerns he had raised during the meetings with the developer, particularly what he characterized as a project disconnect, and stated that since that time with the installation of the story poles to be able to visualize the buildings his concerns had not been resolved. He stated he had always supported a higher density development.

Chair Helber concurred he would be more comfortable if the project was high density which would fit in more with the surroundings. He had struggled with the single-family design in the proposed location and its design and context within the scenic corridor. If the units were attached, he suggested there would be more room and more space between the homes to be able to do more.

Mr. Galindo reiterated that the project met or exceeded the Town's existing Design Guidelines for setbacks. He pointed out that a three-story building at a higher density would impact views of the existing ridgelines and would not conform to the existing zoning.

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover to extend the DRB meeting from 12:30 A.M. to 1:00 A.M. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to forward the Via Moraga 18-Unit Single-Family Residential Subdivision on to the Planning Commission, subject to the following recommendations:

- Eliminate the perpendicular on-street parking spaces;
- Move the lots in the center island east over those spaces;
- Terminate the internal street to allow for one entrance and to allow the addition of the bus stop and pull out; and

- Mirror the setback of the adjacent veterinary office building for the two-story wall of Lots 1 and 13 from face of curb to the wall of the façade.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	Glover
Absent:	Kirkpatrick

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the DRB in writing to the Planning Department.

Boardmember Glover left the meeting at 12:31 A.M. explaining that he had provided written comments related to Agenda Item F, Freestanding Electronic Community Message Board Sign, and asked that the DRB take his comments into consideration.

- F. Freestanding Electronic Community Message Board Sign (Moraga Road, West of Moraga Commons Park)**
Applicant: Town of Moraga, 329 Rheem Boulevard, Moraga, CA 94556
Proposed Application: Preliminary Review of Design to Replace Existing Town Marquee with a New Freestanding Electronic Community Message Board Sign West of Moraga Road and Moraga Commons Park

Associate Planner Brian Horn presented the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for preliminary design review to replace the existing Town marquee with a new freestanding electronic community message board sign west of Moraga Road and Moraga Commons Park. He recommended that the DRB provide comments and consider the recommendations found in Attachment A to the staff report, to be forwarded to the Town Council and be incorporated into the final design and operation of the proposed double-sided freestanding electronic community message board sign.

Responding to the DRB, Jay Ingram, Parks and Recreation Director, explained that the sign would be programmable, and copy would be displayed for approximately eight seconds, although that time could be extended, if desired.

Marc Filosa, representing Ad Art Sign Company, advised of the Caltrans standard for images to run as long as eight seconds, and spoke to a recent approval in Santa Clara which had an approved ten-second image cycle.

Mr. Ingram advised that the sign brightness would be adjustable, could be programmed to be brighter and less bright in the evening, and that the messages displayed were intended to be community messages and advertisement of community events, activities, Town meetings, emergency information, and the like.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that the Town's current sign regulations did not allow, the electronic community message board but that the new Sign Ordinance would allow such signage on Town-owned property.

Chair Helber took the opportunity to read into the record a written statement, dated "Received May 27, 2014" from Boardmember Glover; copies of which were provided to the DRB and to staff.

Mr. Ingram explained that the current direction from the Town Council had been to limit the messages to community information and not allow commercial messages. If the DRB were to approve the sign, a sign policy would be considered by the Town Council.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Staff reported that the Town Council would be reviewing the Draft Sign Ordinance on May 28, 2014; that the freestanding electronic community message board sign had been identified as a Town Council goal; and that the DRB was being asked to provide input on the design itself.

The DRB discussed the proposed freestanding electronic community message board sign and offered the following comments:

- Concern whether the sign would conflict with the Livable Moraga Road Project;
- Concern such signage would not be allowed on private property but only on Town-owned property;
- Concern with impacts to the scenic corridor;
- Suggested that the face of the sign appeared to be top heavy, as shown on Sheets 1 and 2 of the sign design; the Town logo conflicted with the font of the copy reading *Town of Moraga*; with a recommendation to make the font slightly smaller, pushed higher than the copy reading *Town of Moraga*, and the base width to be bigger; with clarification the sign would be internally illuminated;
- Some support for the existing Town marquee sign as compared to the new sign since the existing sign had been found to be clean and contemporary;
- Recommended the placement of a small Town seal next to the sign copy reading *Town of Moraga* and to create one continuous line of copy for the Town logo and sign copy reading *Town of Moraga*.

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson to extend the DRB meeting from 1:00 A.M. to 1:10 A.M. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Escano-Thompson, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None

Absent: Glover, Kirkpatrick

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to forward the Draft Recommendations to the Town Council as contained in Attachment A to the staff report dated May 27, 2014, for Freestanding Electronic Community Message Board Sign, subject to the following modifications:

- The sign base was found to be undersized and shall be made wider;
- If kept in the center of the sign for the Town logo to be pushed up a bit and made slightly smaller;
- Item 4 of the Draft Recommendations revised to read: *Moving text, animation or video should be minimized;*
- Combine Recommendations 3 and 4 of the Draft Design Review Board Recommendations;
- Addition of a recommendation that the ultimate location of the sign shall be compatible with the Livable Moraga Road Project; and
- Revise the first sentence of the Draft Design Review Board Recommendations to read: *The DESIGN REVIEW BOARD submits the following comments and recommendations to the Town Council for consideration in the design of the proposed freestanding electronic community message board sign west of Moraga Road and Moraga Commons Park.*

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Escano-Thompson, Zhu, Helber
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Glover, Kirkpatrick

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the DRB in writing to the Planning Department.

Ms. Brekke-Read asked that the remaining agenda items be held over to the next meeting of the Design Review Board.

5. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

- A. Livable Moraga Road**
- B. Planning Commission Liaison Report - Marnane**

ITEMS HELD OVER TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

6. REPORTS

- A. Design Review Board
- B. Staff

ITEMS HELD OVER TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 1:01 A.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy



Secretary of the Planning Commission