

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

August 25, 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 Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu, Chair Helber

Absent: None

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

A. Conflict of Interest

Boardmember Zhu reported that he would recuse himself from the Rancho Laguna II item on the meeting agenda due to a potential conflict of interest.

B. Contact with Applicants

There was no reported contact with applicants.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

3. ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR

A. July 14, 2014 Minutes

B. Adoption of Meeting Agenda

On motion by Boardmember Escano-Thompson, 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: None

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1725 St. Andrews Road

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

Consider Design Review (DRB 8-14) for the construction of a 503 square-foot addition at an existing residence

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report dated August 25, 2014 for the construction of a 503 square-foot addition to an existing residence located at 1725 St. Andrews Road. Due to the project's consistency with the Design Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and General Plan, and the minimal impact to surrounding properties, she recommended that the Design Review Board (DRB) approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated August 25, 2014, approving Design Review Permit DRB 8-14, subject to findings and conditions of approval. She affirmed, when asked, that the project had been approved by the Moraga Country Club Architectural Review Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Allen Sayles, Architect, identified the unique features of the lot located at 1725 St. Andrews Road including the fact that the lot was 25 percent larger than most of the other lots in the neighborhood with the same design, and was an end lot with more deeded space. As a result, the lot was in conformance with most of the Town's guidelines. He suggested that most lots and homes in the Moraga Country Club did not meet zoning standards, with most having detached garages. The addition would remove the laundry from the garage and provide a secure connection in the winter months with a defined entry courtyard allowing for a better floor plan. The design also involved the least amount of impact to neighbors with the ridge of the addition running through the center lot on the long dimension, therefore the roof slopes downward to the side property lines, and the addition meets current setbacks. He concurred with the conclusions contained in the staff report and stated that the windows on the north elevation would match the existing windows.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Zhu supported the project and found it to be consistent with the existing neighborhood.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson also supported the project and suggested that the project made sense, was located on an infill lot with little impact to the overall architecture of the buildings, and matched the exterior lines.

Chair Helber recommended a revision to Condition 7 of the Draft Action Memorandum, to read:

The applicant shall submit details for exterior light fixtures that are shielded or cut-off and direct light downward and inward onto the property site for approval by the Planning Director or designee.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated August 25, 2014, approving DRB 08-14 for J. Allen Sayles Architect, Inc. located at 1725 St. Andrews Road, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and with the modification to Condition 7, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

B. 581 Moraga Road

Applicant: Alan Jiang, OD Signs, 965 W. Winton Avenue, Hayward, CA 94545

Consider Design Review (DRB 7-14) to install two halo-illuminated wall signs on the west and south elevations of an existing restaurant building

Ms. Samonsky presented the staff report dated August 25, 2014 for the installation of two halo-illuminated wall signs on the west and south elevations of an existing restaurant building located at 581 Moraga Road. Due to the project's consistency with the Design Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and General Plan, and minimal impact to surrounding properties, she recommended that the DRB approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated August 25, 2014, approving DRB Sign Application 7-14, pursuant to Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) Section 8.88.060-C, and subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

Ms. Samonsky clarified that there were two illuminated windows signs, with one informational window sign allowed without a permit per the sign ordinance. She also clarified that a blue rope light around the property had been part of an original submittal, but after feedback from staff the applicant had removed the blue rope lights from the application.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

The operators of the Golden Palace Restaurant explained that the business was new to the area and signage was needed to identify the business. The signs complied with the Town's Design and Scenic Corridor Guidelines. The operators affirmed that banners had been located on the front of the building at the time of the World Cup Soccer event, and acknowledged that those banners must be removed prior to the issuance of a permit.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Glover requested the inclusion of a new Condition 9 to the Draft Action Memorandum, to read:

Prior to issuance of permit approval to proceed with the work applicant shall permanently remove the three banner signs existing on the west side of the building.

Boardmember Glover suggested that existing Conditions 9 through 13 be renumbered accordingly.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson stated that she would have liked to have seen the sign letters placed directly on the wall of the building, which she understood the applicant had initially proposed, and which appeared better aesthetically. She questioned why a structural background was required.

Ms. Samonsky suggested that a background would help with legibility due to the background of the building. She reported that the applicants had agreed to change the background to a matte background as opposed to a shiny metallic background, and the project had been conditioned as such.

Boardmember Glover understood that the sign would be manufactured off-site and then installed on the building as a single unit, and the restaurant operators expressed their understanding that a background would allow the wires for the sign to be hidden behind the background.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson reiterated her recommendation that the letters be placed directly on the wall rather than with a background.

Boardmember Zhu found that the sign complied with the Town's Design and Scenic Corridor Guidelines.

Chair Helber acknowledged Boardmember Escano-Thompson's preference for individual letters although he suggested that unless wiring was placed for each individual letter, it would be more difficult to achieve through the brick façade. He was ready to proceed with the project, as proposed, and as reflected in the Draft Action Memorandum.

Boardmember Glover offered a motion to approve the Draft Action Memorandum for DRB 07-14, subject to a new Condition 9 with existing Conditions 9 through 13 to be renumbered accordingly.

In response to the Chair's request for a modification to Condition 8, Planning Director Shawna Brekke-Read recommended the following revisions to the Draft Action Memorandum Conditions of Approval, as follows:

- Remove the heading prior to Condition 8, reading *Prior to Issuance of Final Building Permit*;
- Conditions 7 and 8 would be two conditions under *Prior to Issuance of Building Permit*;
- Revise the first sentence of Condition 8, to read: *Prior to the issuance of the final building permit, all but one of the existing illuminated window signs and the three banner signs existing on the west side of the building shall be removed*; and
- There was no need to renumber existing Conditions 9 through 13.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated August 25, 2014, approving DRB 07-14 for Alan Jiang located at 581 Moraga Road, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and subject to the modifications recommended by Ms. Brekke-Read, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

Boardmember Zhu stepped down from the dais due to a potential conflict of interest with respect to the next item, Rancho Laguna II.

5. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

A. **Rancho Laguna II**

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

Study Session to Discuss and Provide Comments to Applicant Regarding Architecture and Residential Design on Rancho Laguna II Subdivision

Ms. Samonsky presented the staff report dated August 25, 2014 for a study session for the DRB to discuss and provide comment on the architecture and residential design for SummerHill Homes 27-lot single-family Rancho Laguna II development. She identified the specific study session objectives including design variety, color and materials, architecture, and front yard landscaping, and encouraged feedback from the DRB.

Boardmember Glover commented that he had not been a member of the DRB at the time the Rancho Laguna II project had been approved. He questioned some of the statements in the staff report, specifically the study session objectives, which raised

concerns with the project's consistency with the Town's Hillside and Ridgeline policies. He also referenced Drawing T1.2, and asked staff whether the Town had received geotechnical reports as to the stability of the land in the area.

Ms. Samonsky advised that geotechnical and grading reports had been evaluated as part of the Conceptual and General Development Plans for the project (CDP and GDP), including Hillside Development Permits (HDP).

As to the fill along Rheem Boulevard, Ms. Brekke-Read explained that initially there was to be a balance of cut and fill on site. Through the approval process, SummerHill Homes had received approval for the use of fill from its Camino Ricardo subdivision. The Design Guidelines addressed structures and land, and while the grading might be a concern for the DRB, its charge was to review building architecture and landscape plans for an approved project.

Ms. Samonsky referenced Grading Plan 4 of 9, which had shown the drainage for the creek ponds to be relocated adjacent to Rheem Boulevard. On the other side would be the actual rear yards of the homes, with a retention basin leading down to the creek at the end of "D" Drive.

Boardmember Glover suggested that Grading Plan 4 of 9 indicated that the drainage channel would remain, and Ms. Samonsky clarified Figure 4, the Mitigation Plan Upper Rheem Creek Planting Detail, which had shown the new plantings and a series of ponds along the drainage. She acknowledged the rendering may not have accurately reflected the proposed landscaping.

Boardmember Glover also referenced a July 9, 2014 letter from the Town of Moraga to SummerHill Homes requesting the installation of story poles. He clarified with staff that story poles had not yet been erected.

In response to Planning Commissioner Marnane, Ms. Brekke-Read advised that the item would not be considered by the Planning Commission unless a decision of the DRB was appealed to the Planning Commission. The item before the DRB at this time was a study session only allowing the applicant to receive input from the DRB and the public on the architecture and landscaping, to provide feedback to the applicants.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Kevin Ebrahimi, Vice President of Development, SummerHill Homes, explained that SummerHill Homes had gone through several steps to reach this stage, and he emphasized the time and effort to reach this point. He reported that a Tentative Map and GDP had been approved by the Town in April 2014, with SummerHill Homes now presenting the project architecture and landscaping for the site to receive comments and feedback from the DRB and the public in the hopes there could be a future presentation for DRB approval. He introduced the development team present in the audience.

Mr. Ebrahimi described the proposal for 27 single-family homes, to be clustered on 17 acres of a 179-acre site. The remaining 162 acres would be conserved in perpetuity as open space with public trails. An attractive mix of floor plans and elevations had been developed to complement the site and appeal to future homebuyers. He offered views of the homes from Rheem Boulevard through landscaped corridors, identified the proposed use of rear solid wood fencing for privacy purposes, to be screened by appropriate landscaping, with the rear yards of the homes to be livable and pleasant with solid rather than wire fencing, as staff had proposed.

Mr. Ebrahimi referenced Sheet T-1, which showed the homes once constructed with the landscaping in place; Sheet T-1.2, a rendering of the view of the floor plans; and Sheet L1.0, the actual landscape buffer area between the homes and Rheem Boulevard. A birds-eye view perspective of the homes on the upper section of the project was displayed, with the statement that the project had been designed where none of the homes would be visible from Rheem Boulevard, with open views of the adjacent valley and Mt. Diablo in the distance. The homes would be clustered as close to each other as possible to preserve as much open space as possible. Three new trail paths would be provided on the site to benefit the public, to connect to the Palos Colorados trail system and eventually the Lafayette-Moraga Regional Trail system.

Mr. Ebrahimi explained that the developer intended the front yard landscaping to offer the opportunity for future homebuyers to customize their homes. As a result, the developer proposed front yard landscaping as an option, to later be designed and installed at the close of escrow, with the homeowners to then be required to install the landscaping within the first year of move-in. This option provided an opportunity for the high-end homebuyer to customize the front yard landscaping.

Sean Reynolds, Dahlin Group, Architecture and Planning, presented the proposed architecture to consist of six different floor plans for the 27-lot development. Three of the floor plans would be single story and three floor plans two story, ranging in size from 2,650 to a little over 4,700 square feet, not including the garages. The single-story units would be located primarily on Rheem Boulevard, low to the ground, paying attention to the visual sightlines. Plans 1 through 4 would have two elevations each, and Plans 5 and 6 would have three elevations each for a total of 14 completely different and unique elevation styles across the 27 lots.

Mr. Reynolds identified the building height limits in combination with the general context of the development site, with an 18-foot height limit for the single stories, and a 35-foot height limit for the two-story homes, although they were holding to 28 feet. He suggested that proposed low pitched roofs would work well for Moraga given the existing California Ranch and Craftsman style homes throughout the Town. He described a fusion of Craftsman, and California historical style architecture to allow the development to have its own identity through the use of contemporary details, including the use of indoor/outdoor spaces, and metal roofs. Flat roofs had also been used as a tool for the architecture, with the homes to have a flat-roof element working well with the pitched roof, which he suggested worked with the traditional style. Indoor/outdoor connections had been proposed in order to take advantage of the views of the open

space and the natural setting of the subdivision allowing for articulation in the architecture.

Mr. Reynolds took the opportunity to walk through the staff comments as shown on Page 5 of the staff report, where staff had identified inconsistencies with the Design Guidelines. Speaking to Plan 1, California Ranch A/B Front Elevation, he noted the proposed use of a flat roof over the optional covered porch, bedroom, and dining room, would be used in a contemporary way to offer great roof lines, with a large outdoor roof along the Rheem Boulevard elevation, which he described as a an outdoor room with a trellis. In working with the architecture, the intent was to have contemporary window break-ups, playing with the stone on the trellis, and if one of those elements was removed it would dilute the overall design. The roof plan included a large space and if they were to use a shed roof, as staff had proposed, it would be difficult since they were already at the height limit.

Mr. Reynolds stated for Plan 1, the California Ranch B Front Elevation, the tower element had been added to provide vertical undulation but could be pulled back to the eave with the tower element tying into the stone façade. For Plan 4, Craftsman Front Elevation (Elevation C), he stated the second story gable would actually be eleven feet back from the other gable at the right hand side of the front façade, and from the street would recede. Speaking to Plan 2, Bay Classic Front Elevation with optional dining, the hierarchy and feel of the home at the entry worked well with the articulation and the contemporary architecture.

Planning Commissioner Marnane clarified with the architect and the applicant the porte cochere design elements proposed for the Craftsman and Bay Classic architectural styles; all grading for the site and Rheem Boulevard improvements would occur at the same time pursuant to the geotechnical recommendations which had been subject to and affirmed by the Town's third party peer reviewer; and that the fencing along Rheem Boulevard had not considered sound channels, with the applicant reiterating a desire for wood rather than wire fencing.

In response to the DRB, Mr. Ebrahimi advised that a Geologic Hazard Abatement District (GHAD) would be part of the project, to be funded by the homeowners' tax bills in the 27-lot development. The GHAD was to ensure slide stabilization and the maintenance of the open space and landscaping.

Ms. Brekke-Read clarified that a GHAD was an agency of the State; the Town Council had recently discussed a GHAD formation and had decided to create a Moraga GHAD to encompass all the different development projects with GHADs; and the Town Council would act as the GHAD Board.

Mr. Ebrahimi affirmed that the development had been pre-plotted; there would be twelve color schemes to also be pre-plotted; optional front yard landscaping had been provided in many SummerHill Homes higher-end communities; and the landscape design provided for the front yards allowed customization by lot, which option benefitted the buyers and reduced resources if landscaping was installed a homebuyer did not want.

In the event a homeowner chose not to have the landscaping installed by the developer, it would be required to be installed within the first year by the homeowner. If a homeowner did not comply with that requirement, the Homeowner's Association (HOA) would install spec landscaping, to be paid by the homeowner. The developer would install the area drainage although the irrigation would be subject to each home plan, with irrigation for stormwater treatment for each lot to be installed by the developer. The developer would install the hardscape. In the event a homeowner desired to do his or her own work, there would be a credit to the homebuyer pursuant to the project CC&Rs.

Mr. Ebrahimi identified SummerHill Homes projects located in the cities of Mountain View, Clayton, and San Jose, where optional front yard landscaping had also been proposed for those higher-end projects. He reiterated that the subject development would include an HOA to maintain all open space areas; landscaping along "E" Street; the entry monumentation to the project; and the GHAD would maintain the open space area for fire. For the SummerHill Homes projects which had optional front yard landscaping, those communities typically had an Architectural Review Committee (ARC) which would review any modifications of the homes or of the landscaping, with all guidelines mandated in the CC&Rs, to be reviewed by the individual city staff and/or attorney. For the City of Clayton, that jurisdiction wanted authority for enforcement, if needed, which had been included in that project's CC&Rs.

Mr. Ebrahimi advised that the HOA would remain in perpetuity, had a great deal of responsibility, and would collect dues and be able to levy additional taxes on each resident pursuant to the recorded CC&Rs on the property.

Jane Russell, a resident of Birchwood Drive, Moraga, identified as the hilltop directly across from the subject site, was pleased with the way the development had come together and liked some of the modern features that had been proposed, although she remained concerned with the impacts to the ridge top. She commented that she had raised her concerns with the Planning Commission in the past, was disappointed a parking lot to the trail head remained part of the project, and hoped that traffic and parking could be minimized as much as possible on the ridge top. She asked for details on the lighting and signage, and clarification of the height of the trees and plantings that had been proposed which could impact the ridge top, appearing out of place and unnatural.

Bob Miller, Birchwood Drive, Moraga, liked the project design, although he too expressed concern with any planting on the slopes and ridgeline which was currently pristine. He commented that some of the home plans had side access to the garage, which lots he asked be specifically identified given that vehicle headlights could impact the open space. In addition, he expressed concern the road to East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) property could become a direct path to more development on the ridge, resulting in more traffic on the ridge and along Rheem Boulevard.

Ms. Brekke-Read identified the EBMUD right-of-way, with private property located to the west, which may not remain open space in perpetuity although it was subject to the regulations of the Moraga Open Space Ordinance (MOSO) and Non-MOSO Open

Space. Referencing a map of the site that identified the property lines for the property, she stated that Fay Hill Road access to the reservoir could be used for the project since it was on the project site, and the property owner had been given approval to develop on the property using that road.

Mr. Ebrahimi explained that access to the reservoir was from the private road; it was not part of someone's roadway for access. The road was currently paved for EBMUD access, and was a private road which belonged to the subject development. The remainder of the open space would be deeded to the GHAD, which would maintain the open space deeded to remain in perpetuity.

Further responding to residents' concerns, Ms. Brekke-Read explained that development on the opposite hillside past the EBMUD easement, as related to the existing Fay Hill Road access to "E" Street, was not part of the approved project, and if anyone at any time wanted to use that road to access another piece of property would require Town approval and approval of the property owner, which could potentially involve the developer, the HOA, or the GHAD. That issue was not part of the Rancho Laguna II approval.

Chair Helber stated for the record that land use decisions were not under the purview of the DRB. The item before the DRB was a study session for consideration of the Rancho Laguna II architecture and landscaping only.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Escano-Thompson liked the direction and palette the developer had presented which was consistent with some of the newer developments in Moraga. In response to the staff concerns with the flat roofs interfering with the entryway, she did not share those concerns although she had concerns with the two-level California Ranch style for Plan 6.2, with the tall stone column appearing to be out of place and too massive for the home. She generally liked the design and architecture of the three different styles that had been presented. Speaking to Plan 6.3, she agreed with the staff comments related to the use of a metal roof which appeared to be inconsistent with the materials being used on that plan.

Boardmember Glover did not like metal roofs, or gable supported flat roof sections over the doorways, which appeared too industrial. He preferred that the applicant adhere to the staff comments.

Chair Helber offered the following comments and direction to the applicant:

- Plan A1.2: The tower elevation was too short although the proposed height fit the street elevation; liked the carriage style garage doors and preferred high quality garage doors for the home frontages; had no issues with the flat roof; and liked the California room and the idea of blurring the lines of indoor/outdoor spaces which could be enjoyed in Moraga;

- Plan A2.2: Suggested the architect had done a good job terminating the stone veneer which appeared to terminate into the plaster or stucco wall;
- Plan A2.3: The lap siding or wood paneling detail on the two-dimensional elevation did not read right; liked the lap siding detail on the garage and gables but questioned whether the paneling had been detailed right; liked the optional fireplaces for this plan; suggested the vertical articulation could add some benefit since some of the roof lines on Rheem Boulevard were uniformly a standard height; and suggested the kitchen walls on some of the plans could be broken up with windows, specifically Plan A3.1;
- Plan A3.2: The lap siding shown on the garage and above with the other stone and stucco elements appeared to be too much visually and the gable above the garage was too much;
- Plan A3.3: The gable above the garage had the opposite effect and appeared too bland, although he appreciated the extended eaves and shadow lines; the front elevation was missing something;
- Plan A4.2: No comments;
- Plan A4.3: Liked the stone and stucco and bay pop-out window; liked the appearance of the windows on the second floor but not the use of the lap siding which appeared to overwhelm the remainder of the elevation; clarified the roof materials would be a mixture of composition roofs; suggested a variation of tiled roofs would improve the architecture;
- Plan A4.4: No comments;
- Plan A5.2: Uncertain if the issue was with the way the lap siding was reading or with the siding design since the graphic did not read well and recommended adjustments.
- Plan A5.3; Plan A5.4; and Plan A5.5: No comments;
- Liked the use of standing seam metal roofs; and complimented the architect and applicant on the more progressive contemporary design which would differentiate the Town;
- Plan A6.2: The lap siding was too large in size and may not work visually;
- Plan A6.3: Expressed a preference for a standing seam metal roof;
- Plan A6.5: The casita with a door out to the street appeared out of place; liked the appearance of the gables holding up the flat roof over the entry, which was one of his favorite elements in the architectural plan; and hoped the applicant

would be able to persuade the remainder of the DRB to support the use of that design element;

- Landscaping: Curious about the optional front yard landscaping and sought more information; expressed concern with the ability of the Town to enforce compliance a year after move-in; concerned with impacts to Town staff in the event landscaping plans required review by Town staff for each individual home; sought more information on the common area landscaping and a presentation from the landscape architect on how it would tie the area together; greater detail for the proposed use of split rail fences, columns, and paving features at the entry; and expressed a preference that no stamped asphalt be used.

Mr. Ebrahimi advised that the homes would be pre-wired for the use of solar panels; photovoltaics had been encouraged by the State; and it would likely be included as a condition of approval requiring the applicant to show the potential location and pre-wiring for the use of solar panels.

Chair Helber encouraged the developer that any pre-wiring for solar panels not be visible from the street, which he recognized could prove to be difficult given the number of rooflines that would be visible from the street.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson reiterated that she did not like the metal roofs but had no issue with the metal cables on the flat roof over the entrances.

Ms. Samonsky also responded to some of the comments from the public and explained that there were a number of mitigation measures that would restrict tree height; a full landscape and detail plan would be required for future review by the DRB; and mitigation planting would be provided along Rheem Boulevard.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that the ridgeline would almost create a berm as described in the project plans.

Mr. Ebrahimi stated that all of the landscaping along the roadway south of the ridge was non-linear with the tree and shrub species to be selected to not to grow above the berm, pursuant to one of the mitigation measures in the landscape plan. No irrigation would extend to the ridge to ensure landscaping would not grow over the ridge, which would all be open space and be managed by the GHAD.

Responding to staff and applicants question regarding design of the fence along Rheem Boulevard which is conditioned to be an open wire fence, Boardmember Glover suggested if the vegetation was dense, the design of the fence would provide less of an impact to Rheem Boulevard. Since the details of the landscaping in the GHAD was not yet known, he would like to defer comment on the fence material until those details had been provided.

Chair Helber agreed that if the landscaping was sufficient, an open wire fence would not be necessary. If the intent was to have low lying vegetation and a privacy fence, the

fence would become a visual wall with the creation of a walled-in appearance. If that walled-in effect could be mitigated with dense landscaping, as the Sonsara development had accomplished along Moraga Way as an example, it would create visual depth where the fence would not appear to be so stark. If the proposal was to do something of that quality with dense landscaping, he could support a privacy fence that made sense.

Chair Helber declared a recess at 9:20 P.M. The DRB meeting reconvened at 9:25 P.M. with Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Glover, Zhu and Chair Helber present.

C. Consider Delegating Design Review Board Representative to Town Council, Consider Rules of Conduct for Design Review Boardmembers Attending Town Council and Other Public Meetings, and Discuss Town Council and Design Review Board Roles

Ms. Brekke-Read presented the staff report dated August 25, 2014, and stated that in the past several months three Planning Commission decisions had been appealed to the Town Council. DRB members had inquired about members' attendance at Planning Commission and Town Council meetings to represent the DRB's perspective and decisions on projects. This discussion item would allow the DRB to consider delegating the DRB Chair to formally represent the DRB when communicating with the Planning Commission or the Town Council and/or attending Planning Commission or Town Council meetings. The DRB was also asked to discuss the rules of conduct when DRB members attended Town Council and other public meetings. She advised that the Planning Commission had taken similar action on June 2, 2014.

Ms. Brekke-Read identified the recent projects that had been appealed to the Town Council, summarized the discussions of the Planning Commission on this topic, and offered an example where DRB members should not set a pre-defined position on a particular project if appearing before the Planning Commission or Town Council when the same project would also be submitted to the DRB.

The DRB discussed delegating the DRB Chair to represent the DRB and attend Town Council and Planning Commission meetings, when necessary; the rules and conduct for DRB members when attending Town Council and other Public Meetings; the regulations of the Brown Act related to meeting attendance; and the need to place the election of Vice Chair on a future agenda since former DRB Member Kirkpatrick, who had served as the Vice Chair, had relocated out of state.

On motion by Boardmember Zhu, seconded by Boardmember Glover to delegate the Chair or Vice Chair, as needed, as the Design Review Board representative for appeals and other items recommended by the Design Review Board to the Planning Commission or Town Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

D. Update on Recent Town Council Actions

Ms. Samonsky presented the staff report dated August 25, 2014 updating the DRB on recent Council actions, which included adoption of comprehensive revisions to the Sign Ordinance and Nuisance Abatement. The Town Council had continued its discussions on administrative citations to a future Town Council meeting.

Ms. Brekke-Read commended Ms. Samonsky and Senior Planner Ellen Clark for all of their work on the two comprehensive updates.

E. Planning Commission Liaison Report – Marnane

Planning Commissioner Marnane took the opportunity to express his appreciation to Ms. Brekke-Read for all her assistance during his tenure on the Planning Commission and wished her well on all her future endeavors. He also took the opportunity to acknowledge that he had read the DRB meeting minutes and agendas and he appreciated the work of the DRB.

Planning Commissioner Marnane reported on recent Planning Commission actions including the approval of the Via Moraga project, which he understood had been appealed by the applicant and by Councilmember Metcalf, with the Town Council to consider the appeals at its September 10, 2014 meeting; consideration of amendments to the Town's ordinance to ensure consistency with the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP); amendments to the Housing Element to be presented to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for State certification; and consideration of the Town's Climate Action Plan (CAP), with the item having been continued by the Planning Commission to its next regularly scheduled meeting in September.

Ms. Brekke-Read reported that the CAP had been posted on the Town's website; clarified the State mandate for local jurisdictions to identify potential properties for affordable housing units as part of the Housing Element; and clarified the appeal process of a decision of the DRB or the Planning Commission with appeals able to be filed by any interested person including a Town Councilmember pursuant to Zoning Ordinance regulations, and subject to the applicable appeal fee.

6. REPORTS

A. Design Review Board

Chair Helber thanked Ms. Brekke-Read for all of her work for the Town of Moraga; complimented staff on the progress of the Planning Department, quality of work and effort on all projects; and while he was pleased she would be moving on to a great opportunity was sad to see Ms. Brekke-Read move on.

Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Glover, and Zhu also expressed their appreciation to Ms. Brekke-Read and wished her well in her new endeavor with the City of South Lake Tahoe.

B. Staff

Ms. Brekke-Read expressed her pleasure at working with everyone, acknowledged the commitment and caring shown by all Town bodies, and thanked everyone for their hard work. She added that she was proud of the Planning Department and the great talent that had agreed to come to Moraga, which would be in great hands and continue under the leadership of Senior Planner Clark. She also reported that the Town had received a Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan Grant; a joint Planning, Park and Recreation, and DRB meeting would be held in the next month to receive a presentation on the Livable Moraga Road Project to allow a recommendation to the Town Council; the Town had also received \$150,000 in Measure J Grant funds for planning and zoning work for the MCSP Area; and Senior Planner Clark would move into the position of Planning Director.

Boardmember Glover expressed concern with projects that did not have story poles erected until late in the process, and encouraged consideration of a requirement for story poles prior to DRB and Planning Commission consideration of a development application. He clarified with staff that reference to General Plan Policy CD1.3 in the July 14, 2014 DRB meeting minutes would be detailed in a future staff report for the City Ventures Moraga Town Center Homes project. He also requested input from staff as to how to reduce the volume of staff reports. As an example, he asked that the staff report analysis identify only those areas in which a project was non-compliant with the Town's guidelines and regulations.

Chair Helber agreed with the need to consider a reduction in the volume of the staff reports.

Boardmember Zhu suggested it was time to update DRB binders, and in response Ms. Brekke-Read advised that the Design Review regulations and setbacks could be reprinted and included in the next agenda packet. There had also been a recommendation to include regular updates on recent Town Council actions, to be posted regularly on the DRB meeting agenda.

7. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:00 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy

Secretary of the Planning Commission

