

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

**June 9, 2014**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

A regular meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) was called to order by Chair Helber at 7:00 P.M. in the Moraga Library Meeting Room, 1500 St. Mary's Road, Moraga, California.

Present: Boardmembers Glover, Zhu, Chair Helber

Absent: Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Kirkpatrick

Staff: Shawna Brekke-Read, Planning Director  
Ellen Clark, Senior Planner  
Ella Samonsky, Associate Planner  
Brian Horn, Associate Planner

**A. Conflict of Interest**

There was no reported conflict of interest.

**B. Contact with Applicants**

There was no reported contact with applicant(s).

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the public.

**3. ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Adoption of Meeting Agenda**

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

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

#### 4. DESIGN REVIEW

##### A. 533 Moraga Road

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

Consider Design Review (DRB 24-13) to establish a Master Sign Program at 533 Moraga Road (LC, BH).

Associate Planner Brian Horn presented the staff report dated June 9, 2014, and recommended that due to the project's consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan, and with minimal impact to surrounding properties, the DRB adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated June 9, 2014 approving DRB 24-13, subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

Responding to the DRB, Mr. Horn advised that the monument sign, identified as Sign C, would not be changed although he acknowledged that the plans had shown a design element that was not existing and which would need to be corrected by the applicant. The wall signs in area B would have a maximum height of 24 inches but he asked the applicant to provide clarification. As to the differences between a halo and cabinet sign, examples of halo signs that had been approved in the Town had lights within the letter reflecting light back onto the fascia board creating a halo effect. Some types of cabinet signs had punch through lettering, with options to have an opaque front that would create a halo effect.

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky added that a cabinet sign was a back lit sign with Plexiglas or a translucent front, where the entire surface would glow. A halo lit sign would be reflected onto the back of opaque lettering and the light would not extend directly out. The difference between halo and cabinet signs was the orientation of the lighting and the amount and type of surface to be illuminated. Two examples of the halo effect signs with the opaque background, which was not strictly a cabinet or halo lit sign, was presented and it was noted that those types of signs required DRB approval.

Ms. Samonsky further explained that the Draft Sign Ordinance included standards for lighting, with most light emitting diodes (LEDS) having differences in the intensity of illumination. She added that the Town's Design Guidelines regulated the level of brightness as foot candles.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Allen Sayles, Architect, Walnut Creek, commented that while he had submitted applications to the DRB in the past, he had not prepared text for a Master Sign Program before and he understood the only issue was whether the signs would be cabinet or halo lit signs, and he understood pursuant to the staff report and the staff recommendations that if someone wanted either a halo lit or hybrid sign giving the appearance of a halo sign, DRB review and approval would be required. He suggested that the illumination of the signs include hours where it would be beneficial and suggested the signs be allowed to be illuminated from 6:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., a more appropriate time period than 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. as shown in the staff report.

Mr. Sayles emphasized that the number and location of signs had been discussed at length in the past and only one tenant was currently interested in signage. He preferred to have approval of four signs total and noted that the building tenancy was full with little to no interest in signage. For Sign Area B, he commented that although a total of four signs would be preferred, he could accept three signs. For Sign Area C, the monument sign, he clarified that no changes had been proposed to the sign, and he acknowledged there could be a drafting error on the plans.

Planning Director Shawna Brekke-Read reported that the DRB had received correspondence via e-mail and copies of photographs provided by Dr. Julia Hoang, DDS, one of the tenants in the center located at 533 Moraga Road.

Dr. Julia Hoang, DDS, identified herself as one of the tenants at 533 Moraga Road, stated that the DRB had been provided with copies of a sign design she had proposed, asked that the sign area for Area B be further clarified with the hours of operation as recommended by Mr. Sayles, and that push through lettering with LED lighting as she proposed be added as well.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mr. Horn clarified that the sign Dr. Hoang had proposed would fit into a recessed area measured at 20 inches in the area of the garage. He acknowledged that he had met with Dr. Hoang, had measured the area for her proposed sign which had been calculated at 20 inches, with the sign to hang below the score line. A leaf logo in the proposed sign was 18 inches and could fit into the area, although if placed on a 24 inch high sign board would not fit above that line.

Chair Helber understood that the action under consideration by the DRB at this time was the review and approval of the Master Sign Program for the building at 533 Moraga Road, while Dr. Hoang had requested that the DRB take action on her sign which would fall under the Master Sign Program approval.

Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that staff had brought to the DRB the parameters of a Master Sign Program that could be handled administratively, although the sign proposed by Dr. Hoang would not be handled administratively since it was a cabinet sign which would not comply with the Master Sign Program. If the DRB approved the Master Sign Program standards, as proposed by staff, and the applicant returned with a halo design, such a sign could be approved and addressed administratively pursuant to the Master Sign Program provided it was located within Sign Area B and the sign met all applicable standards. She acknowledged the concerns with how Dr. Hoang's sign had been presented given that when illuminated, the entire sign would be illuminated and not just the letters.

Ms. Brekke-Read reiterated that the sign proposed by Dr. Hoang was a cabinet sign. If the cabinet was removed with just halo lighting with letters, the letters would illuminate the fascia behind with a defined box for a true halo lit sign. If Dr. Hoang proposed a cabinet sign with halo letters protruding out in front, that would be a hybrid requiring DRB review and approval.

Mr. Horn clarified the proposed number and location of the signs including one sign in Area A above the arches and canopy; three signs within the garage area with two facing Moraga Road and one facing south; and the existing monument sign for a total of five signs. The sign for Area A would not be illuminated although the drawing had shown a box with letters. He noted that the cabinet signs would be removed from the plans, with the outline to show the area in which the letters could be mounted pursuant to Exhibit B, Site Plan and Elevations.

Boardmember Zhu pointed out that the drawing that had been submitted included a number of mistakes and he did not see that it could be approvable in that condition.

Mr. Horn suggested that the plans could be conditioned to ensure compliance.

Planning Commission Liaison Woehleke suggested that the Master Sign Program could be approved at this time, with the separate sign application to be considered separately.

Chair Helber suggested that the Master Sign Program could be moved forward; that the hours of illumination could be restricted to the hours of operation of the business, to be included in the Master Sign Program standards; and that Attachment A, Draft Action Memorandum, Exhibit A, Draft Master Sign Program, A. 2 could be revised to read: *The Landlord and tenant are responsible for the correctness of installation and conformance of the work with the approvals by both the Landlord and the Town.*

Ms. Brekke-Read stated that the revisions would be acceptable.

Chair Helber also suggested that with the approval of the Draft Sign Ordinance, as written, there would be a path for Dr. Hoang to have her sign proposal approved administratively, subject to compliance with the Master Sign Program standards, as modified.

The DRB also recommended the following revisions to Attachment A, Site Plan and Elevations, Dated June 2, 2014:

- Revise the site plan and elevations, as recommended by staff, with corrections to Page 1, eliminate references to cabinet style signs;
- Correct Page 2, remove Area B sign options;
- Correct Page 2, the extent of the sign locations; and
- Correct the design of the monument sign to reflect its existing condition.

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated June 9, 2014, approving DRB 24-13 for 533 Moraga Road, subject to the findings and conditions of approval, as modified, and as read into the record by the Chair and staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Glover, Zhu, Helber  
Noes: None

Abstain: None  
Absent: Escano-Thompson, Kirkpatrick

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

**B. Camino Ricardo Subdivision**

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

Consider Design Review of Subdivision Landscaping, Lighting, and Single-Story Home Designs

Senior Planner Ellen Clark presented the staff report dated June 9, 2014, and recommended that the DRB approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated June 9, 2014, approving the design of the subdivision landscaping, streetscape, lighting, and single-story homes pursuant to Condition 26 for the approved Camino Ricardo residential subdivision. She corrected a statement in the staff report which implied that a split rail fence would extend all the way down adjacent to the sidewalk, constructed from the project site to Moraga Road, and clarified the fence would be confined to the project frontage.

In response to the DRB, Ms. Clark explained that unless the combined height of the retaining and fence wall was limited to eight feet, the downhill neighbor would experience a tall fence; however, staff acknowledged the applicants concern that a short fence uphill could be unsafe. Staff understood the applicant's concerns and hoped to find an acceptable design solution. An option to off-set the fence from the retaining wall would allow for a 6-foot fence, although the neighbor would lose some yard space. The minimum requirement off-set from for the retaining wall was recommended at two feet, a reasonable distance, although it could possibly be three feet.

Ms. Brekke-Read commented that the distance between retaining walls is twice the height of the walls. This was an issue that had not been addressed as part of the overall subdivision, although decisions had been made to reduce grading by adding more retaining walls, and this was the trade-off.

Denise Cunningham, Director of Development, SummerHill Homes, San Ramon, explained that SummerHill Homes had started the process for the Camino Ricardo Subdivision in 2012; had multiple public meetings and community outreach; had worked to address everyone's input; and continued to make adjustments to the plan throughout the process, resulting in a better plan and more thoughtful design. She stated the Town Council had recently approved the Tentative Map and Development Agreement (DA), and SummerHill Homes was now before the DRB to discuss the streetscape, lighting, and new single-story plans. She expressed her hope that the DRB would approve the changes and plans as presented.

Ms. Cunningham commented that the changes to the plans involved significant changes to the grading, with the grade of the entry road steepened to allow vehicles to get up the

road faster and with less cut. Over the hill to the other side, the road had come down a little steeper allowing the cul-de-sac to be lowered approximately ten feet.

Ms. Cunningham identified the overlook area where people could sit as they walked through the community; the grading plan that had been pulled back with the toe of slope along the riparian area; and Lots 10 and 26 that were now single-story lots as a result of the lowering of the pads from a previous two-story elevation.

Dan Hale, Hunt Hale Jones Architects, described the unique nature of Lots 10 and 26 with the single-story homes designed to fit the lots while working within some constraints. Some of the massing and scale had been taken into consideration with Lot 10, which was approximately five feet lower than Lot 9 leading to consideration of the massing of the home. The lot was also wider with a nice streetscape width allowing the architecture to be pulled forward and the garage set back while also respecting the adjacent two-story homes. A strong gable and simple cross ridge along the back side would offer height against the two-story homes, stucco would be on the main level, shingle on the porch elements, wood trim, columns, and wood detailing on the gable ends and on the sides. He acknowledged that the right elevation was blank but could be embellished with additional windows in the kitchen, long slender windows that would not impact the cabinet work but provide additional daylight, and they could look at the bathroom area as well.

It had been proposed that the garage would be placed back on Lot 26, with the architecture in the front, leading to a very long driveway and not much front yard or green space. A side entry garage had been considered but was not viable. As a result, a front courtyard had been proposed, some green space, with the garage forward. Mr. Hale acknowledged that the garage side elevation could be enhanced by some fenestration.

In response to a condition for recessed windows, Mr. Hale suggested that recessed windows on all sides of the homes were not appropriate and had been proposed, where appropriate, on the front elevations where visible from public view and in certain exterior finishes on stucco homes and stone or masonry homes, although historically they were not used with wood siding or shingle homes. As a result, the front elevation windows for Lot 10 were behind a porch with a large gable element, six to eight feet back with shadow lines, with shingle siding and wood trim wrapped around the windows. Where recessed windows were not appropriate, the garage door would be recessed a foot and if windows were added on the side in-swing French doors leading to the courtyard could provide more natural depth, like a recessed window. Given that the side and rear of the homes were not visible from public view, he preferred not to install recessed windows.

Shary Van Dorn, Van Dorn Abed Landscape Architects, walked through the landscaping plan, identified the fruit and pear trees along the Camino Ricardo elevation and the low natural grasses with perennial color to offer a seamless blanket from Camino Ricardo all the way to the bio-retention area, a ten-foot wide landscape median, an entry wall to the right of the entry which was curved at the end at the request of the DRB, and a split-rail fence with stone pilasters that continued after the wall stopped and ended at the property line, with the same feature on the left side of the entry. Seating had been added at the end of the pedestrian trail along Corliss Creek and terminated until the trail

was extended in conjunction with the property to the south. Each front yard would be designed individually with individual landscaping and entry features. All entry features would be reflective of the architecture for that lot with the colors and materials to reflect the architectural style.

Ms. Van Dorn noted that every landscape plan presented to the Town had included a six-foot high fence at the property line, either at grade or adjacent to the retaining walls, which would be five feet high maximum or less. She suggested the new condition recommended by staff regarding the retaining walls was a new condition, and stated that the plans had already been approved as designed. She suggested that a five-foot high wall and three-foot fence, as recommended by staff, would be a safety hazard with an eight-foot drop and provide no privacy for either home. If fences and retaining walls were off-set, a piece of property would be owned by someone else and on the wrong side of the fence, unless the site was completely re-graded and the walls moved, which was not feasible at this stage in the process. Also, the area was not visible from the street given the orchards, street trees, and landscaping, and she suggested it was a back yard and not a streetscape issue.

Ms. Van Dorn asked that the DRB waive that staff recommended condition and at a minimum suggested that a fence should be at least five feet high for privacy and safety. She expressed her hope to be able to retain the six-foot fence as approved in the previous submittal. She also outlined the details of the overlook feature to include a curved arbor for shade, curved benches, seating area open to the public, and landscaping.

In response to the Chair, Ms. Van Dorn clarified that the maximum height of the wall would be five feet with a six-foot fence, with 11 feet the maximum height of the two.

Mr. Hale noted that the typical ceiling height for the first floor of a single- and two-story home would be ten feet.

Ms. Cunningham Suggested the stacked wall/fence condition would involve less than 25 percent of the lots.

Greg Miller, CBG, Project Civil Engineer, suggested that issue would affect half a dozen of the side-split lots up the hill and then it would vary; some fences would be six and some four feet in height. He suggested that the DRB also consider the recommendation to offset the six-foot high fence and five-foot retaining wall and the exposed height, and the idea to screen or buffer with landscaping could be considered in the front of the walls that had exposed faces, which would be a better way to screen from the bottom.

Ms. Van Dorn advised that the rear fences were almost always view fences and would be opaque and also six feet in height.

Mr. Miller suggested that five was the maximum retaining wall height until it tapered down at the sidewalk. He suggested the downhill homeowner would likely want the fence to be tall enough to address the privacy issue. In response to the height side yard-to-side yard, and concern with a wall blocking light and air, the wall height had

been pushed more towards the rear yard at five feet and shorter closer to the home, with the minimum front setback at 20 feet and some of the lots greater than that. He suggested that privacy would not be compromised at the front of the homes.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

In response to the staff recommendation for exterior and interior mullions on the windows, Ms. Cunningham stated that had not been a condition of the original plans, could be done, but had not been included in the current design. Referencing Sheet L3.3 for Lot 11, she clarified that everything on the south side of the property line would be maintained by the project Homeowner's Association (HOA), with the front yards also to be maintained by the HOA. Trees inside the front fence would be maintained by the property owner and trees on the side yard outside of the fence would be maintained by the HOA (including the pear trees).

Mr. Miller referenced Sheet L1.0; identified the V-ditch which terminated adjacent to the pedestrian trail, and agreed it could be pulled back approximately five feet where it did not terminate adjacent to the pedestrian trail to the extent there was a landscaping buffer. He also identified the location of the clean-out for the sewer as shown on Sheet L1.5, which could be adjusted where it was not located directly in the walkway.

Ms. Van Dorn also clarified that the 1 x 4 headers on the view fence pursuant to Sheet L2.3 could be changed and had been shown as a 2 x 6 in other details on the plans. Sheet L2.6 was clear that the split-face retaining wall would have a block cap.

The DRB discussed the Camino Ricardo Subdivision landscaping, lighting, and single-story home designs and offered the following comments and/or direction to staff and the applicant:

- The previous single-story plan had included an element of a glass wall with three panels on Sheet A101.1, which had shown a standard two-panel glass slider with a recommendation to revise it to a three-pane glass wall slider;
- Support for the staff recommendation to add articulation to the garage wall;
- For the courtyard side of Lot 26, noted it made sense on the path side once the electrical meter/water meter and fence had been installed there would be little room to accommodate the required setbacks and include a window;
- Clarified with staff that the Public Works Department had not yet reviewed and approved the photometric plan, although minor adjustments could be required to meet their approval; with acknowledgment for an additional condition that the Public Works Department review and approve said plan;
- Discussion but with consensus for recessed windows at the street or public facades only with the other windows to remain flush;

- Staff clarified that the item before the DRB was only for the two single-story homes and the DRB could not modify previously approved conditions of approval for the subdivision; and
- Discussion of the retaining walls and a suggestion that if the lot were larger in size, the retaining walls could be split with the fences pushed back, although over the course of Planning Commission, DRB, and Town Council review, the site plan had been encouraged to maximize public benefits on other portions of the site plan, and in this case there was a suggestion but no consensus to proceed as the applicant had proposed with the fence placed on or directly adjacent to the retaining wall; if the fence was on top of a wall greater than the accumulative height of eight feet, it was to be a lattice style fence.

Chair Helber offered a motion to approve Camino Ricardo Subdivision, design review of subdivision landscaping, lighting, and single-story home designs, subject to the Draft Action Memorandum dated June 9, 2014, as discussed with modifications to Part 4: Conditions of Approval, as follows:

- Condition 4 to be revised to read: *All windows shall be recessed into exterior walls;*
- Condition 5 to be revised to read: *Where fences would be placed on top of a retaining wall, the total height of the wall and fence shall be no greater than twelve feet when measured from the adjacent grade on either side of the fence. Any fence with a cumulative height over eight feet shall have a lattice feature. Alternatively, such fences may be up to six feet in height if offset from an adjacent retaining wall by a minimum of two feet.*
- Eliminate Condition 6;
- Eliminate Condition 7; and
- Add a new condition to read: *The Town Engineer or Public Works Department to review the photometric plans.*

Boardmember Zhu seconded the motion.

On the motion, Ms. Brekke-Read requested an additional modification to the June 9, 2014 Draft Action Memorandum, as follows:

- Part 3: Design Review Findings: revise the second sentence of the third bullet to read: *Conditions of approval have been specified that would add additional fenestration or other detailing to the sides of the home on Lot 10 and to the west side of the garage on Lot 26;*
- Part 4: Conditions of Approval, Condition 3 revised to read: *Additional architectural detailing shall be provided for the right side or west elevation of*

*projecting portions of the garage on Lot 26, to avoid the appearance of an entirely blank wall on this facade;*

- Delete the first sentence of Condition 4;
- Delete Conditions 6 and 7;
- Condition 5 revised to read: *Where fences would be placed on top of a retaining wall, the total height of the wall and fence shall be no greater than twelve feet when measured from the adjacent grade at the base of the wall. Any good neighbor fence and wall with accumulative height exceeding eight feet shall be consistent with detail G on Sheet L2.3. Alternatively, such fences may be up to six feet in height if offset from an adjacent retaining wall by a minimum of two feet;*
- Add a new condition to read: *Street lighting photometrics shall be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer;* and
- Add a new condition to read: *Sheet L.10 shall be revised to provide a landscape area between termination of the V-ditch and the path to Parcel C.*

Chair Helber and Boardmember Zhu, the maker and second to the original motion, accepted the revisions to the motion, as discussed.

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated June 9, 2014, approving the subdivision landscaping, lighting, and single-story home designs for the Camino Ricardo Subdivision, with the modifications as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Glover, Zhu, Helber
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Escano-Thompson, 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 8:51 P.M. The Design Review Board meeting reconvened at 9:00 P.M. with Boardmembers Glover, Zhu and Chair Helber present.

## **5. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS**

### **A. 14 Hammond Place**

**Applicant:** Chet and Darlene Simpson, 14 Hammond Place

**Study Session for 14 Hammond Place:** Provide input on proposed project to construct a 1,066 square foot addition on an existing residence

Ms. Samonsky presented the staff report dated June 9, 2014, for a study session to provide input on a proposed project to construct a 1,066 square foot addition to an

existing residence located at 14 Hammond Place. She asked the DRB to consider whether the proposed floor area of the project at 3,441 square feet was appropriate and compatible with the neighborhood; should the ridgeline of the roof on the addition align, or is the offset roof height and ridges an acceptable variation; was the gable on the front porch in scale with the entry; and would stepping back the addition on the east elevation by two to three inches impact the quality of the design.

Ms. Samonsky reported that staff had received a letter and e-mail dated June 9, 2014 from Lance Larsen, 12 Hammond Place, copies of which had been provided to the DRB.

Responding to the DRB, Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that when there was a third two-story home adjacent to another, DRB review and approval would be required for an exception. In this case, the project would require DRB review for exceeding the F.A.R. since the home was already a two-story residence. She explained that this was a study session and no action would be taken by the DRB at this time other than to provide input to staff and the applicant.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Daniel DeSousa, Architect, 45 Nottingham Place, Clayton, explained that the home had been built in 1960, the second story had been permitted in 1968, this was the first home in the neighborhood to have a second story, and all proposed windows would be designed to meet current egress standards.

Chet and Darlene Simpson, Property Owners, 14 Hammond Place, Moraga, explained that the smaller upper windows were not full size windows and were intended to provide light and interest to the side of the house to meet the Town's design review standards. They identified an existing carport which would not fit in the garage but which was intended to protect and park a truck. While they recognized that the carport was out of character architecturally with the rest of the home, they were more than willing to consider a more permanent structure that met the DRB guidelines.

Mike Weinberger and Julianne Lindemann-Weinberger, 16 Hammond Place, Moraga, identified their residence as the one-story house to the side of the project, with the Larsen family residing in the two-story residence to the other side of the project. It was noted that the temporary carport was located between the existing garage and the property line with no setback from the property line, and they expressed concern the drawings that had been submitted had not shown on their side of the property an existing 20-foot long dilapidated storage shed against the fence line between the lower first story section and the fence.

Mr. and Mrs. Simpson explained that the storage area had been put in place years ago by another family member and it did not have a roof. They clarified that nothing had been done to the fence line and they were more than willing to address that issue which had been in place for 40 years. The intent was to address all issues to ensure that the home was attractive to all. The covered temporary carport was in the area of existing concrete, as shown on the plans, to the right of the garage.

Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that setbacks were required to be free, clear, and open to the sky, and the temporary carport was not permitted in the Town since it exceeded the setbacks.

The DRB offered the following comments and/or direction to the applicant on the overall plan for the addition proposed at 14 Hammond Place, as follows:

- Sheet PL4.1 for the front elevation with the second window pushed up above the garage was asymmetrical, stood out, did not do justice to the front of the home, and could be mitigated by switching the walk-in closet and new bath to maintain an equal sized window;
- The stone veneer at the front of the home wrapped to the edge, stopped and did not carry around to the sides, with a recommendation to continue that design element to the fence line which would offer a more finished appearance;
- Sheet PL4.1, the front elevation columns and front gable projected out and terminated between the windows and would appear too bulky if pulled out, with the current size proportion found to be okay, and with a desire for more detail and articulation on the portico design element;
- Concern expressed with the use of oval windows which were not compatible with the ranch style of the home; with the applicant willing to change back to an octagon style; and
- Support for the staff recommendation for the shifting roofline pursuant to Sheet PL3, with staff recommending that the second story roofline be aligned to minimize the appearance of the bulk of the addition and harmonize the design of the roof.
- The walls of the second floor should align with existing.

Ms. Simpson expressed concern with the staff recommendation to align the second story roofline since the rooms could become too small and affect the resale value of the home, and would require raising the floors. The plate height was 20 feet 10 inches, and the existing room above the garage was eight feet. The existing addition would be lower than the new addition. She offered the history of the application since 2013 and explained that the drawings had been revised on more than one occasion after discussions with planning staff. She explained the addition was to provide space to care for an elderly family member who suffered from dementia, while also providing adequate space for the rest of the family. She commented on the difficulty in constantly revising the plans which had become a financial hardship.

Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that the initial submittal had far exceeded the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and that staff had provided feedback on many occasions. Since the issues identified by staff continued not to be addressed in the plans, staff had recently concluded that the best option was for the DRB to provide feedback.

The DRB continued to offer feedback as follows:

- The DRB was not willing to compromise on the required setbacks for accessory structures;
- While the existing carport may have pre-dated the incorporation of the Town, it was out of compliance with the Town's setback requirements and had been placed against the property line with no setbacks;
- Staff clarified that the current project exceeded the allowable FAR by 432 square feet and that the lot at 8,800 square feet permitted a maximum FAR of 3,009 square feet. While the home was out of compliance with the FAR guidelines, it would be in line more with a contemporary sized home in the same zoning district;
- Staff clarified that the property at 10 Hammond Place did not exceed the maximum FAR, was identified as a unique lot, that almost all lots in the neighborhood were undersized with the exception of the properties at 10 Hammond Place and 12 Hammond Place, and that the property at 10 Hammond Place was smaller than the proposed project, but with less storage;
- While there was no consensus, DRB comments did not find that the massing of the home at 14 Hammond Place would be outside of the character of the neighborhood and while recognizing that the property at 14 Hammond Place exceeded the FAR, it was noted that two existing redwood trees obscured some of the views; and
- Recommendation to remove the existing carport, which was not compatible with the existing Town regulations, and consider improvements to the fence line and other improvements that would improve the overall project.

Ms. Simpson stated she had gone through her neighborhood and asked for input on the original plans, that the plans had been reduced in size since that time, that there had been significant feedback and support from some of the neighbors including a neighbor behind the home, and this was the first time she was aware that there were neighbor concerns.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberger commented that they had been presented the plans but were not architects and were uncomfortable not supporting plans that other neighbors had supported; however, they were relying on the DRB's expertise as to the acceptability of the plans and would like to have seen more detail. They liked the preservation of the existing redwood trees. They also asked that the DRB not put much weight on whether neighbors had signed-off on the plans.

The DRB offered further comment as follows:

- Clarified with the applicant that the home would be stucco and stone and pointed out the inconsistent use of materials in the neighborhood with the use of stucco, shingle, and wood. The applicants expressed a preference for a stucco and

stone material home to eliminate termite issues and since they liked the smoothness of the stucco and stone material, and they pointed out the property located at 12 Hammond Place had wood siding which was peeling and they did not want to have the same issues;

- Boardmember Zhu offered a quick sketch and recommendations to mitigate the staff concerns with the roofline; staff reiterated the recommendation that the roofline be aligned to reduce the massing; and the applicants explained why the recommendations would be unfeasible;
- The applicant clarified that the existing fireplace would be moved pursuant to the submitted plans;
- Chair Helber suggested it would benefit the project to present it to a subcommittee of the DRB comprised of one to two Boardmembers prior to submittal to the full DRB, allowing for feedback; although Boardmember Glover expressed concern that there could be issues if the full DRB did not agree with the feedback offered to the applicant, particularly if plans were prepared that were not supported by the full DRB. Staff was directed to work further with the applicant; and
- In response to the staff request to consider the issue of stepping back the addition on the east elevation by two to three inches to avoid a variance requirement, by consensus the DRB supported a three-inch recess on the east elevation would not affect the overall design, but encouraged the continuation of the existing line of the building.

#### **B. Planning Commission Liaison Report - Woehleke**

Planning Commissioner Woehleke reported that the Planning Commission Special Meeting on May 19, 2014 had been held prior to the Regular Meeting to provide input to the Town Council on the consistency of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan for the General Plan; the Regular Meeting on that date had been a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and the Park and Recreation Commission; the Planning Commission meeting of June 2, 2014 included review and recommendation to the Town Council on a Historic Preservation Ordinance; study session on the Housing Element Zoning Text Amendments; and a discussion of delegating the Chair and/or delegate to attend Town Council meetings in the event of an appeal of a Planning Commission decision, or when appropriate.

Ms. Brekke-Read advised that a discussion of delegating the DRB Chair and/or delegate in the event of an appeal of a decision of the DRB could also be agendaized for a future DRB meeting.

## **6. REPORTS**

### **A. Design Review Board**

Boardmember Glover reported that the consultant for the Ridgelines and Hillside Steering Committee had presented a recent public workshop, that the process was moving forward, that attendance had decreased, and that the information presented by the consultant would be linked to the Town's website. He otherwise referenced the May 27, 2014 DRB meeting and asked in the future that staff consider splitting lengthy agendas into two meetings as opposed to holding one meeting a month.

Chair Helber was not opposed to meeting more than once a month or holding a lengthy meeting, if warranted. He had supported all of the items on the May 27, 2014 agenda to avoid holding up any of the applications, and since he had been confident the DRB would have gotten through the agenda more quickly.

Ms. Brekke-Read recognized the concerns with the lengthy agenda and explained the intent to help both the DRB and the Planning Commission move more efficiently and effectively through their meetings.

## **B. Staff**

Ms. Brekke-Read reported that she would be on vacation from June 13 to 25, 2014; the Planning Department had received design review applications for the 27-lot Rancho Laguna II project; staff was to conduct a completeness review with SummerHill Homes and would return to the DRB in the next month; staff expected the home designs for the Los Encinos 10-home development to be submitted in the next three months; Via Moraga would be considered by the Planning Commission tentatively the second week of July; and City Ventures would return to the DRB on July 14, 2014.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:44 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy



Secretary of the Planning Commission

