

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

December 8, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER

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.

A. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

Staff: Ellen Clark, Planning Director
Ella Samonsky, Associate Planner
Brian Horn, Associate Planner

B. Conflict of Interest

There was no reported Conflict of Interest.

C. 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. October 27, 2014 Minutes

B. Adoption of Meeting Agenda

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Glover to adopt Item B and to move Item A to Design Review, as Item D. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1460- A Moraga Road, Union Bank

Applicant: Robin Esquivel, Viking Sign Installations, 1164 Bessemer Avenue, Suite #1, Manteca, CA 95337
Consider Design Review (DRB 1-13) to install an externally illuminated monument sign.

Associate Planner Brian Horn presented the staff report dated December 8, 2014, to consider the installation of an externally illuminated monument sign for Union Bank located at 1460-A Moraga Road within the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) area. Due to the project's consistency with the Design Guidelines, MCSP Design Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and General Plan with minimal impact to surrounding properties, he recommended that the DRB approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014, DRB Sign Application DRB 1-13 pursuant to Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) Section 8.88.060-C.1, and subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

In response to the DRB, Mr. Horn identified an existing small olive tree which would have to be removed to allow the placement of the monument sign. He clarified that the monument sign was intended to be perpendicular to Moraga Road. He also advised that the applicant would be responsible for re-landscaping pursuant to Condition 12 of the Draft Action Memorandum, but acknowledged the condition could be revised to more specifically identify that the *applicant* would be the responsible party to re-landscape.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Robin Esquivel, Viking Sign Installations, 1164 Bessemer Avenue, Suite #1, Manteca, explained that the sign application had been in process for the past two years; several changes had been made to the application to ensure that the project met the Town's and the MCSP guidelines; the applicant had agreed to revise the lights that had been proposed to illuminate the monument sign to be consistent with staff's direction; and some concrete would be removed from the site and foliage would be replanted. She affirmed that an existing Russian olive tree would be removed and replaced with a drought tolerant bush, although the plant material chosen had not been included on the list of the Town's preferred plant materials. She suggested the applicant had been very thorough and tenacious bringing the application to the point of completion.

Responding to a recommendation from the DRB to consider upgrading the existing marquee and placing signage for Union Bank on the marquee, she noted that Union Bank was paying for the monument sign. The existing marquee would have to be upgraded by the property owner and any tenants desirous of being placed on that sign. She also commented on the proposed use of succulents around the monument sign and noted that if the lights were placed on a high stake, they may be more visible although if lower to the ground they would be hidden from view. Having driven through the area in the evening, she had found it to be very dark and suggested allowing lights to be operable later at night would be a benefit to the shopping center.

Ms. Esquivel identified Page 2 of the plans which had shown the location of the lights for the monument sign, with one light to be located on either side of the sign. Page 8

had shown the details of the concrete base, electrical and a stub, which would not be much above grade, and was intended for the conduit to run through for the electrical.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Crews supported the application.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson clarified with the applicant that the sign would be wood and the letters of the sign would be smooth and be painted out.

In response to Boardmember Glover, Mr. Horn advised that the sign application had been evaluated pursuant to the Sign Ordinance and had been found to be compliant with that ordinance with the exception of the requirement for a Master Sign Program for the monument sign. As detailed in the staff report, at the time the Town Council had adopted the Sign Ordinance, the Town Council had included a provision that would avoid Union Bank's monument sign from triggering the requirement for a Master Sign Program that would otherwise apply. Based on that direction, a Master Sign Program would not be required for this application.

Boardmember Zhu understood that a Master Sign Program would have to be created by the property owner. He expressed concern that approving the monument sign could set a precedent for future tenants.

Planning Director Ellen Clark reiterated that any future application for a monument sign or marquee sign would trigger the requirement for a Master Sign Program pursuant to Town Council's approval of the Sign Ordinance.

Chair Helber commented that he had also been concerned with the application absent the submittal of a Master Sign Program; however, after reviewing the staff report he understood that the Town Council had provided clear direction to facilitate existing businesses. He recognized that the applicant had spent a lot of time working with staff to ensure that the sign was as staff desired. He clarified with staff that specific light fixtures had been called out in the MCSP but would like more leeway for similar fixtures to allow more tone and color.

Ms. Clark advised that the MCSP was specific about the lighting types preferred in the MCSP Area.

Chair Helber commented that while the recommendation for light fixtures to be high pressure sodium or incandescent lamps may have been the preferred technology at the time the MCSP had been adopted, he was not certain it was the best technology at this time. He suggested that a warmer light fixture as opposed to the sodium vapor, which produced more light pollution, would be more appropriate.

Ms. Clark recognized that some cities had changed from using sodium vapor lights for light efficiency. If the goal was to have a tone that was less white light, Light Emitting Diode (LED) or other light fixture could be considered.

Chair Helber recommended the following revision to the first sentence of Condition 11:

The lighting fixture lamps shall be only high pressure sodium or incandescent lamps, or an alternative lighting fixture as approved by the Planning Director.

Chair Helber recommended the same revision to Condition 7, with the condition to now read:

The applicant shall submit plans showing light fixtures that are hooded and utilize either high pressure sodium or incandescent lamps, or an alternative lighting fixture as approved by the Planning Director.

Chair Helber also affirmed with staff that Union Bank had submitted a letter advising that it would maintain the landscaping surrounding the sign in a healthy condition at all times. The remainder of the landscaping in the shopping center would be maintained by the landlord.

Ms. Clark explained that the Town had been unable to require the property owner to maintain the tenant's space if that was the arrangement or agreement in place. She recommended that Condition 12 be amended to read:

The landscaping surrounding the sign to be installed by the applicant shall be maintained in a healthy condition at all times by Union Bank or subsequent tenants.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Zhu to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014, approving DRB 1-13 for Union Bank at 1460-A Moraga Road, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and with modifications to Conditions 7, 11 and 12. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Crews, 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. 5 Newberry Place

Applicant: Sven Lavine, Architecture, 3730 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA

Consider Design Review (DRB 23-13) to construct a 757 square foot addition and 353 square foot basement, outdoor kitchen, spa, and patio.

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report dated December 8, 2014, for construction of a 757 square foot addition and 353 square foot basement, outdoor kitchen, spa, and patio. Due to the project's consistency with the Design Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and General Plan, with minimal impact to surrounding properties, she recommended that the DRB approve the Draft Action memorandum dated December 8, 2014 approving Design Review Permit DRB 23-13, subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

When asked, Ms. Samonsky explained that in response to recommendations from the Public Works Department, the applicant had proposed a small private bio-retention feature to slow down the storm water from the property rather than allowing the water to sheet down the steep slopes. The bio-retention feature was not required by the Town of compliance with the NPDES (Stormwater) permit.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Sven Lavine, Sven Lavine Architecture, 3730 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA, identified the project site on a developed residential lot on the corner of Fernwood Drive and Newberry Place, at 5 Newberry Place. He noted that existing vegetation on the property would make the addition almost invisible off-site. He described the addition as two story building down, not up, with no height being added to the building. The addition would be two stories with one story above and one story below grade, located on the southwest corner of the existing residence, and would expand the ground floor level of the residence by 506 square feet and construct a 251 square foot partially below grade guest suite, and a 353 square foot basement below the addition. The basement area would be adjacent to the lower level bedroom and hall and have an interior ceiling height of 7 feet, 11 inches.

The addition had been designed in a contemporary suburban style and would extend to the southwest at an obtuse angle from the existing residence, and would utilize a vertical tongue and groove and smooth panel siding, wood fascia, and stone veneer on the southwest wall. The roof would have a low pitch and utilize asphalt shingles, with multiple rectangular wood-clad windows to be used throughout the addition and transom windows on the southwest elevation.

The grading would include fill to expand the flat pad of the rear patio and yard area, excavation of the basement of the addition, and contouring of the slope adjacent to the addition. A new retaining wall would extend from the addition to the northwest corner of the stairs in the rear yard and would vary in height from three feet, eight inches to four feet, eight inches.

Mr. Lavine described the existing façade as one of the most successful pieces of the home, with the plans for the dining room area designed in a low impact way to add interest to the façade. He noted that the roof of the dining room would fit in with the seam of the existing windows, be in keeping with the existing framework, and add to the dynamic element of the main home.

Mr. Lavine also identified the large eave as part of the main home with the intent for a smaller eave for the addition but which would be proportionate to the main building and similar in size to the other eave offering a balance and proportion to the eave on the bedroom. The eaves of the main home would extend farther out. He offered views from all elevations of the home.

Mr. Lavine suggested the proposal as a whole would be harmonious to the site, the neighborhood, and the existing home with measures taken to mitigate any concerns. He clarified that the roof material for the addition would match the roof on the main building. He walked through the eave design pursuant to Sheet A301, and identified the south elevation with a Bay window which would be asymmetrical projecting out further. He acknowledged that while the eaves over the Bay window could be projected out, visually he suggested his plan worked.

Boardmember Zhu recommended that the applicant consider continuing the roof slope all the way across the bottom rather than have a flat roof, although he recognized that the drainage may not be that good. He suggested the slope roof be extended all the way across the front.

Mr. Lavine stated that if sloping the roof from the edge back it would be around three feet, four inches per foot, three quarters of an inch, and in reality could slope a bit up when going back and would not be visible since it would be hidden from view. He added that he did not anticipate any problems with moisture in the basement or any problems with the existing water table in Moraga.

Mr. Lavine also identified the existing fence line pursuant to the landscape plan. He reiterated that the façade would not be clearly visible from the street, and offered a few examples of expected views from Fernwood Drive.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Harry Sousa, Moraga, identified his property as the closest neighbor who would be most affected by the project. While he liked the building design and was not interested in preventing his neighbor from improving his property, he expressed concern that the two-story addition could impact his privacy. He also expressed concern whether the plans for a retaining wall would negatively impact existing large trees and shrubs that currently provided his and the applicant's properties with privacy. He asked for clarification as to whether the projection from the addition would affect his property, whether the retaining walls would harm existing redwood trees, and the expected volume of dirt to be removed as part of the grading of the site.

Mrs. Sousa asked for clarification of the drainage plans and the location of the retaining wall and patio in relation to her property. She stated that the applicant's sprinklers currently created runoff then crossed the rear of her property.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Lavine reiterated that the second story would be down, not up, with little impact to the neighbors. He acknowledged there was a substantial 20-inch diameter tree located in front of the addition, as shown on Sheet C.2.

Any plants to be removed because of the retaining wall would be replaced with drought-tolerant plants consistent with the Town's plant palette. The slope would not change and the five-foot retaining wall would be buffered and buried in plants. The drainage from the patio area would be directed to the bio-retention area.

Mr. Lavine affirmed that while some dirt would be removed, there would be little excavation required for the addition given the proximity of the existing swimming pool. Some fill along the edge for the retaining wall would be required. The height of the addition would be below the existing tree height. Drainage from the property would be reduced since it would be captured in the patio area and be directed to the bio-retention basin. The retaining wall would have a Grade Beam pier system to minimize any disturbance to the root systems of existing trees.

Boardmember Zhu recommended that the applicant consider extending the eave in front of the existing Bay window, adding a vertical element in front of the dining room and the stair.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Lavine affirmed that the bio-retention basin would be planted with plant material yet to be determined. The bio-retention area had been intended to be a garden feature with the edges to be softened as much as possible pursuant to recommendations from the project Civil Engineer.

Chair Helber recommend that the design of the bio-retention area be brought back for staff review given the visibility of the area from the corner of the street. He sought a bio-retention area that would blend in given the location of the home on the corner.

Boardmember Glover was disappointed that the DRB had not been provided with more civil engineering details for the project given the concerns that had been raised. He suggested the information provided by the applicant was insufficient.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Glover clarified with staff that the conditions shown in the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014 under the heading During Construction and currently shown as Conditions 10 through 13, would be renumbered as Conditions 12, 13 and 14. He also understood that every condition after Condition 6 would be renumbered pursuant to a revised sheet to be inserted into the Draft Action Memorandum and provided to the DRB this date.

Boardmember Crews understood the applicant's intent with the architecture for the dining room addition and the flat roof. He had no concerns with the form since it would not be visible, offered an interface of a new volume into the existing volume of the building, and respected the existing roof line and buildings above.

Boardmember Crews found the design to be strong, appreciated that the roofline was lower than the existing roof, liked the courtyard design, and supported the benefits to the family. He did not like the Bay window projection that created a flush eave at the one overhang but suggested it would not harm the neighborhood. While there was more of an overhang on the two sides of the Bay window projection, he did not find it necessary to require the applicant to change anything.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson suggested that the flat roof of the dining room was not a concern although the eaves on the southern elevation should be extended to be consistent throughout the entire home.

Boardmember Glover recommended that the revised Conditions 9 and 10, as presented to the DRB at this time, should be included in the Draft Action Memorandum.

Boardmember Zhu found the volume of the project to be acceptable, agreed the flat roof was not a concern although it would be nice to see the sloped roof consistent with the neighbors, and suggested the project would be visible from two very busy streets.

Chair Helber referenced new Condition 9 and recognized that Fernwood Drive had recently been repaved and the applicant would have to obtain an Encroachment Permit from the Town for any excavation off of Fernwood Drive.

Ms. Samonsky explained that a Town Encroachment Permit would be required for any work in the public right-of-way (ROW) if there was any excavation or digging within the roadway. Since the road had been recently resurfaced, there was a condition that the area to be excavated be replaced to a greater extent of the newly resurfaced street. She spoke to Sheet C.2 and identified the location of the ROW and the area of landscaping to the curb. She reiterated that an Encroachment Permit would be required for any work in the public ROW, and would be subject to the requirements of Ordinance No. 240 since Fernwood Drive had recently been resurfaced.

Planning Commissioner Marnane commented that he had owned two homes with basements in Moraga. He concerned about potential hazards from the existing water table. He suggested the inclusion of the basement be reconsidered. He also expressed concern with the root structure of the existing redwood trees which were normally two feet or so below ground given that the proposed retaining wall would be placed across the root structure. He was pleased to have learned from staff that the landscaping plan would be peer reviewed.

Ms. Clark advised that an arborist report had been prepared as part of the project and included recommendations for preservation of the trees.

Boardmember Crews suggested the retaining wall beams just touch the grade and not go in. He suggested cutting into the ground two feet could impact the root systems of the trees. He offered a motion to approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014, with the elimination of new Condition 10 as part of the revised sheet with the renumbered conditions, as submitted to the DRB this date.

On the motion, Boardmember Zhu suggested that the newly revised conditions, as proposed by staff, should be retained. He recommended the formation of a DRB subcommittee to review potential changes to the rectangular architectural projection from the dining room which could be approved by the Planning Director over the counter.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson seconded the initial motion, as stated.

On motion by Boardmember Crews, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014, as revised, approving DRB 23-13 for Sven Lavine at 5 Newberry Place, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and subject to the elimination of new Condition 10, with the conditions to be renumbered. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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 8:38 P.M. The DRB meeting reconvened at 8:45 P.M. with all Boardmembers present.

C. 489 Moraga Road, Via Moraga Subdivision

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

Consider Design Review for Design and Landscape Details for the Via Moraga Project (Subdivision 9317), a 17-Unit Single-Family Residential Subdivision

Ms. Clark presented the staff report dated December 8, 2014, for the Via Moraga Subdivision review of design and landscape details. She reported that the environmental determination, and approval of the General Development Plan (GDP) and Tentative Map had been completed. She reported that the DRB had reviewed the design of the Via Moraga subdivision including the site plan, Tentative Map, final architecture and landscaping, and circulation plans and determined that the overall design, as presented in the Project Plan package submitted on November 14, 2014, substantially complied with the design related aspects of the General Plan, Moraga Design Guidelines, Scenic Design Guidelines, and other related policies and regulations.

In response to the Chair, Ms. Clark reiterated that action had already been taken on the creation of the lots, overall concept plan, and architecture. Issues related to the pedestrian-activated crosswalk would be left up to staff since there were Caltrans standards for crosswalks which would have to be met with little room for design creativity. Staff would consider design options including a raised median. The location of the crosswalk would be determined by the Engineering Department.

Chair Helber stated he did not want to hold up the project but would like to see the design of the pedestrian-activated crosswalk return to the DRB since the property was located within the scenic corridor. He asked staff to also clarify the light standards that had been proposed.

Ms. Clark clarified that the Town's streetlights had been approved by the Public Works Department. Since the project involved a private street, there was more flexibility in the type of light fixtures to be considered.

Sidewalk lighting would be consistent with Public Works standards. The Public Works Department was considering a Lighting District that would maintain the Town's streetlights.

Ms. Clark explained that staff preferred the ability to approve more attractive light fixtures as opposed to what had routinely been used in the Town. It was intended that the pedestrian-activated crosswalk signal would be similar to the pedestrian-activated crosswalk signal at Corliss Drive.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Tom Quaglia, Project Manager, Signature Homes, 4670 Willow Road, Pleasanton, introduced the Project Team present in the audience. He stated the conditions of approval that had been proposed by staff would be acceptable. He clarified that the landscape stamping material that had been proposed would comply with the staff recommended condition of approval, and Planning Commission and Town Council actions. He described the background of the project and noted that after the project had been presented to the DRB in May, it had become clear that a single driveway concept was desirable and that the buildings would be pushed back a bit to be consistent with the adjacent office building.

Mr. Qualia explained that the project had been appealed by both a member of the Town Council and the applicant. While he had attempted different iterations to retain 18 lots on the property, that had proven to be unsuccessful. As a result, a 17-lot proposal with a single driveway had been presented to the Town Council as part of the applicant's appeal. This option had also resulted in the streetscape being pushed back an additional three feet with the single driveway entrance.

Mr. Quaglia noted that the lights along any of the public streets would be dictated by the Town. The lights shown in the concept plan would not be on the roadway, and the light detail in the photometric would be detailed later as part of the construction documents. A detailed sheet had been provided for the fencing.

Mr. Quaglia clarified that a perimeter masonry wall would be located on the north and south elevations, with a cap and rail and stucco finish, as recommended by staff, to match the adjacent 5A Rent-A-Space facility. Privacy fencing between each home would consist of a standard wood fence, with open fencing at the rear with some landscaping. A green screen fence would be installed along the street frontage and would be planted to ultimately obscure the fence from view. He also identified the

location of two feature trellises as well as a trellis to be located in the family recreation area.

Mr. Quaglia advised that the plans had reflected all of the upgrades that had been done prior to the May 12, 2014 DRB meeting and post May 12 meetings. Many of the other details the DRB had requested during those meetings, with the exception of a tower feature the DRB had recommended although the Planning Commission and Town Council had not supported, had also been reflected in the plans. He reported that Lots 7, 8 and 11 would have wrapped enhanced elevations. In addition, the developer would continue to work with the U.S. Postmaster on the mail box design to obtain a more cottage neighborhood design with mailboxes throughout the neighborhood as opposed to utilizing a single kiosk design.

Mr. Quaglia stated that grading, photometric, and the crosswalk would have to be brought back to the DRB for future review. He expressed his hope that the DRB would support the plans allowing the project to proceed to the next stage.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Boardmember Glover did not want to hold up the project although he continued to be concerned with the security of the postal facility. He asked about the type of lighting that would be placed around the mail box area to provide and ensure security.

Mr. Quaglia identified the location of the mail box kiosk for the 17 units which would be adequately illuminated by lighting from the trellis and by street lighting.

Boardmember Glover also clarified with the applicant that the rear fence between the 5A Rent-A-Space facility would be a six-foot open tubular steel fence. He encouraged the applicant to continue to work with the U.S. Postmaster on the mail box design.

Boardmember Zhu verified with the applicant that the street façades for Lots 7, 8 and 11 would have the same detailing. He noted that Sheet 2.02 had shown the window mullion designs, with smaller squares, appearing horizontal and more modern, and that Sheet 2.07 had shown the details of the street facades for Lots 1 and 12.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson asked for a further clarification of the details shown on Sheet 1.03; the views as one entered the subdivision; and the width of the driveway. She recommended that the driveway be widened as one approached Moraga Road.

Mr. Quaglia explained that staff had requested the width of the driveway, as shown, although that would still allow full movement with the single driveway design, and Ms. Clark affirmed that the Moraga-Orinda Fire District (MOFD) would be able to access the single driveway.

Boardmember Glover also verified with the applicant that a Sonoma style garage door was a sectional garage door with an option for windows for some of the lots.

Boardmember Crews liked the quality of work the applicant had presented and the considerations in which the Town had engaged. He characterized the project as strong

and suggested it would improve the street. He clarified that the roof material would consist of concrete tile. He described the aesthetics of the architecture as well done with nice details.

Chair Helber verified with staff and the applicant that the height of the building had been measured from the finished grade; no fabric awnings had been proposed; and the private driveway designs for the homes would be a medium grade concrete finish. In addition, he verified that the public path would consist of a medium gray finish; the reference to Davis Omaha Tan Concrete would be for the stamped stone in the recreation area and not the color of the sidewalks; stamped asphalt rather than stamped concrete or pavers had been proposed; the shutters would consist of foam material to be mounted on the building rather than the use of wood; and that C.3 facilities would be located in the landscape areas at the front at Moraga Road, as identified in the Vesting Tentative Map.

Ms. Clark suggested the second sentence of Condition 3 should be revised, to read:

The final landscape plan shall also include exterior final finish applications for the masonry walls on the north and south boundaries of the property, to include an integral color or painted stucco finish, similar to the homes, and a concrete cap and rail, and green screen as shown on the landscape plans.

Chair Helber spoke to the use of stamped asphalt, which looked fine when first applied but which would wear over time, and understood that the Homeowner's Association (HOA) would have to maintain that material. Given the proximity to the scenic corridor, he suggested the use of stamped concrete or paver material. He recommended that the DRB approve the December 8, 2014 Draft Action Memorandum, as drafted, with an amendment to Condition 3, and with an additional condition that the stamped asphalt be replaced with stamped concrete or pavers. He recommended an additional sentence to the end of Condition 4, to read:

Landscape plans shall be revised to replace stamped asphalt with stamped concrete or pavers.

Ms. Clark commented on the DRB's observation that there appeared to be some mis-detailing of the windows on the plans, and while not a condition, the applicant was asked to correct the plans to better identify the details for the mullions and labeling.

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Glover to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated December 8, 2014, approving Design Review for design and landscape details for the Via Moraga Subdivision (Subdivision 9317) at 489 Moraga Road, subject to the findings and conditions as shown, and with modifications to Conditions 3 and 4. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Crews, Glover, Escano-Thompson, 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.

D. October 27, 2014 Minutes

Boardmember Glover clarified with staff the accuracy of comments made by the developer for the Rancho Laguna II project regarding the use of solar panels, as reflected in paragraph three on Page 9, with staff affirming that the Town had been unable to restrict the location of solar panels pursuant to State law. He also clarified a statement made by staff in paragraph seven on Page 20 regarding the submittal of cross sections for larger projects, to be added to the applicant form used by the Planning Department, which had yet to be done.

There were no changes to the minutes of the October 27, 2014 meeting.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson to approve the October 27, 2014 Minutes, as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

5. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

A. Planning Commission Liaison Report – Marnane

Planning Commissioner Marnane commended the work of the DRB and staff particularly related to projects that had been considered by both the DRB and the Planning Commission. He reported that the Planning Commission had met on November 3 and had reviewed the Via Moraga Subdivision, and had reviewed and approved a project located at 281 Fernwood Drive, which he clarified with staff would not come to the DRB. At its November 17 meeting, the Planning Commission had approved a Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) for Moraga Town Center Homes, which decision had been appealed and would be considered by the Town Council on January 28, 2015. He added that the meeting on December 1 had included a study session for the Park Street Residences development near the Rheem Theatre, and he offered a brief overview of the discussions related to that project.

Ms. Clark reported that staff would be having a conversation with the applicant for the Park Street Residences since the project would require Town Council consideration of land use rezoning and the Rheem Park Specific Plan (RPSP) area. She noted that the applicant believed he had proposed a very workable and viable project for either townhomes or condominiums. She stated the Planning Commission had provided encouraging feedback.

6. REPORTS

A. Design Review Board

Boardmember Glover reported that he had attended the Hillsides and Ridgelines Steering Subcommittee on November 19, 2014, and he briefed the DRB on the discussions and direction to the consultant at that meeting, to be addressed in 2015.

Chair Helber reported that he had attended the Town Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Livable Moraga Road Project when the alternatives that had been presented during the joint Planning, Park and Recreation Commissions and DRB meeting had been discussed. The TAC had recommended that the Town Council adopt Alternative B, to be considered by the Town Council in early 2015.

B. Staff

Ms. Clark reported that there was little on the DRB docket at this time. She affirmed there had been appeals of decisions from both the DRB and the Planning Commission including an appeal of the DRB approval of the Rancho Laguna II project landscaping and home design plans, and an appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the CDP for the Moraga Town Center Homes. The appeals would be heard by the Town Council in January 2015. The DRB was scheduled to meet again on January 12, 2015.

Ms. Clark also responded to Boardmember Glover's concerns with the proposal for the Park Street Residences and the proposed building height that could impact a communications tower on a building located across from the Town offices. She clarified that facility was not the only wireless communications tower in the Town. She understood there was a tower located at Alta Mesa, a high voltage power pole on Rheem Ridge, and one at Saint Mary's College (SMC). The communication tower on the building across from the Town offices was the only Sprint location.

Ms. Clark advised that the terms of two members of the DRB would expire in March 2015, and those two vacancies would have to be filled. There would be five vacancies on the Planning Commission. She encouraged interested applicants to apply and stated that all vacancies would be advertised.

Boardmember Glover expressed concern that the minutes from DRB meetings held in August and October had not been posted on the Town's website.

Ms. Clark stated that once the minutes had been approved they would be posted. She would look into the matter.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy

Secretary of the Planning Commission