

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

April 27, 2015

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.

A. Roll Call

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

Absent: Boardmember Zhu

Staff: Ellen Clark, Planning Director
Brian Horn, Associate Planner
Coleman Frick, Assistant Planner

B. Conflict of Interest

There was no reported Conflict of Interest.

C. Contact with Applicants

There was no reported contact with applicant(s).

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

3. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. February 23, 2015 Minutes

B. 15 Avila Lane – Design Review (DRB 8-15) to approve a 9 foot-5 inch (9' 5") tall fireplace and arbor in the side yard setback

C. 489 Moraga Road – Consider Design Review of Street Lighting Plan for the Approved Via Moraga project (Subdivision 9317), a 17-Unit Single-Family Residential Subdivision

D. Adoption of Meeting Agenda

Associate Planner Brian Horn reported that staff had received an e-mail with respect to Consent Agenda Item C, 489 Moraga Road, confirming that the Town's Lighting Consultant had reviewed the applicant's lighting plan, and had found it to be in conformance with the Town's guidelines and ordinances.

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

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

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1066 Larch Avenue

Applicant: Ben Chen, 4125 Maybelle Avenue, Oakland, CA 94619

Consider Design Review for the construction of a new 2,581-square foot two-story single-family residence (DRB 09-13) with 627 square-foot attached two-car garage, street and sidewalk improvements, tree removal permit, and demolition of the existing residence, garage, and tennis court.

Associate Planner Brian Horn presented the staff report dated April 27, 2015, and corrected the staff report which had shown the square footage of the lot at 23,000 square feet instead of the correct 13,900 square feet. Due to the project's consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, with minimal impact on surrounding properties, he recommended that the DRB adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated April 27, 2015, approving DRB 09-13, subject to findings and conditions of approval.

Responding to Boardmember Crews, Mr. Horn clarified that the oak tree to be removed was located on the right hand side, at the front of the property, and partially located in the Larch Avenue public right-of-way (ROW). He affirmed plans to install curb, gutter, and sidewalk within the ROW.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Leal Charonnat, Charonnat Architect + Engineering, 1-5th Avenue, #1-9, Oakland, explained that the oak tree located on the right side at the front of the property and within the public ROW, had been identified on the plans as had the sidewalk required to be installed by the Public Works Department. The tree was located within the sidewalk, posed a conflict, and had been proposed by the Public Works Department to be removed. The home would be articulated and set back from the street.

Mr. Charonnat commented that he had been involved with the project since 2011, had worked to retain the existing home and to reuse it and build a home of comparable size, had received complete approval and had gone through the process to working drawings, although once reaching the Building Department stage, his client had decided to build a new home. The home would be pulled back with as many of the existing oak trees that had been planted in the 1930's to remain in the front.

The home would be contemporary, articulated with wainscoting underneath, plaster, the roof would have sensible overhangs, and there would be a bay, which Mr. Charonnat acknowledged would project. He identified the existing driveway and commented that there had been no easement associated with the original subdivision of the flag lot. As a result, the home must be accessed from the front.

Mr. Charonnat identified the impervious surface just before the sidewalk to allow for ingress and egress; suggested that permeable paving would be difficult for older persons to navigate since it would be uneven, although a pervious surface could be used as recommended by staff. He described the home as fairly small with a larger setback on the side at 12 feet, with a 10-foot dimension for the bay window.

Katherine Burcham, Moraga, spoke to the front of the residence and asked if there would be concrete towards the street to allow for parking or if parking would only be located in front of the driveway.

Mr. Charonnat explained the desire to allow for parking in the driving pad away from the street. No parking was anticipated in front of the lot.

Greg Watkins, 2 Windeler Court, Moraga, identified his residence as within 500 feet of the proposal. He presented photographs of views from his residence over his neighbor's home and of the story poles that had been installed for the proposed residence. He supported the construction of a new home in the location, although he opposed the construction of a two-story home since it would not reflect the character and charm of the mostly single-story ranch style neighborhood. After reviewing the plans, he suggested there was almost 100 feet behind the proposed structure and suggested there was plenty of room to build a single-story structure. He suggested a two-story structure would have an adverse impact on the value of his residence, impact views of trees and hills, and result in a loss of privacy. He compared his lot and home size to the proposal and suggested again that a single-story home could be built on the property and still comply with the Town's design criteria. He also expressed concern with the driveway articulation given the existence of several redwood and pine trees, and the potential impacts to sight distances on Larch Avenue given the location of the trees in front of the property.

Mr. Watkins also questioned how a sidewalk in front of the home would not impact more of the existing trees as opposed to the removal of just one tree. He referenced the number of different tree species on the adjacent property and expressed concern with the loss of wildlife habitat, questioned how the home of the proposed magnitude could be built without damaging trees and wildlife habitat, and urged the DRB to consider the plans and require the applicant to build a single-story home on the lot.

Mr. Charonnat referenced Mr. Watkins' submitted photographs and suggested only the roof of the proposed structure would be visible over the neighbor's roof. He reiterated that the home had been pushed back, was 10 to 20 feet closer to the street than the original proposal, an arborist had evaluated the trees, only hand digging and protection around the trees would occur, the front sidewalk and its location had been mandated by the Public Works Department, and other trees referenced on adjacent properties were

not located on the subject property. He also identified three existing redwood trees that would grow tall over time.

Valerie Watkins, 2 Windeler Court, Moraga, urged the DRB to review the plans and consider a single-story home given the impacts on her views and property values. As a Real Estate Broker, she stated a single-story home had a higher value than a two-story home, and clarified, when asked, that an adjacent residence at 1017 Larch Avenue was a single-story home.

The unidentified property owner of 3 Windeler Court, Moraga, identified his property with a two-story home as being located across the street from the Watkins property. While he sympathized with the Watkins' concerns for a two-story residence, he stated the subject property, which had been vacant for ten years, was an eyesore and needed to be rehabilitated.

Mr. Charonnat advised that the proposed two-story home would have taller ceilings, something over eight feet, and the eave was at 20 feet with a higher peak.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Planning Commission Liaison Malella suggested that while the views of the structure would have an impact, the property had been vacant for some time, had been an eyesore in the neighborhood, and anything constructed on the property would impact the views of those closest to the site.

Boardmember Glover commented that the issue of views had been discussed by the Town Council, and the DRB in the past. He suggested the project would increase property values given the development of vacant property, and noted that views were not guaranteed.

Boardmember Crews commented that the 4:12 sloped roof was not excessive. He suggested there could be flexibility in the finish for the bottom floors. He appreciated the redevelopment of a lot with an abandoned building, whether two or single story was a choice of the property owner, and supported the attempt to save as many trees as possible.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson suggested the neighborhood would benefit from the proposal to replace an abandoned home. She did not find the two-story home to be excessive, suggested the dimensions were acceptable, and could support the project as presented.

Chair Helber referenced the second floor which had shown a recess by the master closet with a lower roof, and questioned how the main roof would be treated.

Mr. Charonnat advised that the plans had shown an indentation to break the upstairs where the wall would be pushed back to match the bedroom in the front, which would provide shadow and structural texture. The lower roof would run parallel with the first floor although the roof would not go all the way down to the first floor. The roof above the second floor would have a small eave to provide articulation at the building's rear.

Chair Helber emphasized the importance of four-sided architecture. In this case, he found a variegated roof line, push pull in the façade, bay windows, chimney, and other elements, and an effort to further articulate that for some of the neighbors present. He sought a way to pull the roof line out so that it would come out on the façade a bit to provide a visual improvement.

Boardmember Crews suggested the second floor roof could continue across with a deeper shadow line.

Mr. Charonnat explained that would result in a four and a half foot recess. Currently, an 18-inch eave had been proposed and the same eave would be on the wall, higher up, creating a shadow. If the roof went all the way up and the gutter all the way across, it would result in a cave-like space on the home, which was not intended. The proposed articulation had been designed prior to any neighborhood input.

Chair Helber spoke to the detail for tile veneer around the front entry door with wood sided wainscoting around the entire home, with no detail of the proposed material.

Mr. Charonnat advised that the wood material would be painted and could be a smooth fiberboard with deep grooves offering shadow and texture. He assumed the material would be V-grooved and would be lower down with shrubbery around the home, offering a different texture. The wainscoting was intended to discourage the weathering that would result from rainwater hitting the ground and splashing up.

Chair Helber spoke to the chair rail detail, and affirmed with Mr. Charonnat it would be made out of wood, would become a bump as part of a traditional detail of wood siding, would offer shadow, could be painted one color, and would be rich in texture and shadow. He also spoke to Sheet 22 and the detail for a slider on the back elevation although the plans had shown double French doors.

Mr. Charonnat clarified the intention to have sliders that appeared to be French doors, to be hidden in the recess, and would be part of the home leading to a deck which would not be cantilevered. The chimney would be decorative in terms of articulation.

Chair Helber referenced the proposed planting material and asked whether the architect would consider planting a new box coastal live oak in-lieu of the 50-gallon Japanese maple that had been proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Charonnat affirmed that could be done. He asked that Condition 34 a) Landscaping and Trees, as shown on Page 8 of 9 of the Draft Action Memorandum, be revised to read:

- a) Provide temporary fencing around the drip line of the 3 redwood trees and 2 live oak trees.

Mr. Horn commented that the condition should have read as proposed.

Chair Helber appreciated the architect's four-sided architecture and the desire for a visually appealing home.

While he acknowledged the neighbors' concerns for a two-story element, Chair Helber found the two-story home to be allowable under the code, found it to be a good example of a home desired in Moraga, and recognized the property owner had painted the home which had made a difference in its appearance.

Planning Commissioner Mallela found the project to be in conformance with the Town's development standards while recognizing the neighbors' concerns with the visual impacts.

Boardmember Glover agreed with the Chair's evaluation.

Chair Helber asked that an additional condition be imposed; that the landscaping plans include the addition of a coastal live oak along the Larch Avenue frontage, to be set back, to mitigate the removal of the coastal live oak in the front yard.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson to adopt the Draft Action Memorandum dated April 27, 2015, approving DRB 09-13 for Chen at 1066 Larch Avenue, subject to the findings and conditions as shown and subject to an additional condition that a substantial box size coastal live oak rather than Japanese maple be planted along the Larch Avenue frontage, to be set back, to mitigate the removal of the coastal live oak in the front yard, at the discretion of the Planning Department in consideration of the location of the future sidewalk. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal period of a decision of the Design Review Board in writing to the Town Clerk subject to an applicable appeal fee.

B. 533 Moraga Road

Applicant: Arrow Sign Company, c/o Richard Luchini, 0151 46th Avenue, Oakland, CA 94601

Consider Design Review (DRB 01-15) to install one cabinet wall sign with halo-style illumination on the west elevation of an existing building

Mr. Horn presented the staff report dated April 27, 2015, and recommended that the DRB approve the Draft Action Memorandum dated April 27, 2015 denying DRB 01-15 given that the cabinet sign, as proposed, was prohibited by Section E of the Master Sign Program (MSP) in that the design of the sign included several elements that would not comply with the adopted MSP including area, length, and logo size for the sign.

Responding to the Chair, Mr. Horn clarified that the sign had been defined as a cabinet sign with the illumination coming from within the sign itself; the letters would be pushed out approximately half an inch, would be opaque in the front, and the light was coming out from the sides of the letters.

On the discussion, Ms. Clark clarified that the sign that had been approved for the Golden Palace Restaurant on Moraga Road had involved a true halo lit sign, with cut-out letters mounted on a flat sign face, with lighting behind that glowed from behind. She asked the DRB to consider whether the subject sign, as proposed, met the definition of a halo lit sign, which would be allowed as opposed to a cabinet sign. She commented that the sign for the Golden Palace Restaurant also included a raceway and a strip behind on which the letters had been mounted and in which the electrical for the sign had been placed. She described the proposed sign as a hybrid. If the DRB found that the sign met the definition of a halo lit sign and the intent of the Sign Ordinance, the sign could be approved.

Mr. Horn detailed the history of the MSP for the property at 533 Moraga Road, the intent for the proposed sign at the time to be a cabinet sign, and stated the sign had been classified as a cabinet sign during the MSP process and had not changed since that time although it had become larger in size.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Richard Luchini, Arrow Sign Company, 1051 46th Avenue, Oakland, representing Lamorinda Dental Care, explained that he had submitted a Sign Visibility Chart which had been included in the staff report as Attachment D. He described the background and experience of Arrow Sign Company, detailed the sign proposal for a hybrid halo illumination sign, and explained that the letters and copy of the sign would be opaque with illumination off to the sides. The sign would include a raceway and a full background, as opposed to a narrow and deeper type of raceway with channel letters so they would not have to go behind the wall, which had a narrow and tight crawl space where service availability would be difficult. As a result, a sign with enclosed electronics which would duplicate the halo effect had been proposed. The background would be pebbled where light would not reflect off the surface.

Mr. Luchini acknowledged that the sign deviated from the MSP in terms of size, commented that the sign had not changed from a previous discussion, and stated that the applicant had been invited to come back to the DRB at a later date once the MSP had been fully approved. He suggested if the sign was required to comply within the confines of the MSP, those looking for the specific site would have difficulty reading the sign in time to access the driveway to the building. The letters would be six and a half inches in size which would allow it to be adequate for northbound vehicles traveling between 35 and 45 MPH to turn into the driveway, although southbound vehicles had almost no time to recognize the sign given that it would be blocked by the building until reaching the turning lane.

Mr. Luchini distributed a handout to show the subdued colors of the sign and to illustrate that it would not stand out as much. An existing temporary banner, the same size as the letter size of the sign, also illustrated that the sign would not stand out, and if required to be smaller would not be visible.

Dr. Julia Hoang, Lamorinda Dental Care, presented a board to visually illustrate the grand scale of the building, the size of the proposed sign, and the existing temporary banner which was a bit taller.

Dr. Hoang referenced the past discussions for the MSP for the building, the reason she had chosen the name Lamorinda Dental Care to represent her business, attempts to comply within the confines of the MSP, but emphasized that the smaller letters did not look appropriate on the building. She suggested the sign was not a cabinet sign, and asked the DRB to approve the sign to allow the entire name of her business, *Lamorinda Dental Care*, to be on the sign.

Andy Sun, representing the property owners of 533 Moraga Road, reported that the sign, as proposed, had the full support of all tenants of the building as well as the property owners. The letters of the sign only and not the entire cabinet would be illuminated in the evening. She added that the property owners were aware that the sign was larger than stipulated in the MSP, understood the standards were for signs that would be approved administratively, but would not preclude signs that differed from the MSP, and would require DRB review and approval. The existing fascia band could support the proposed length of the sign, the sign would be set back at least 75 feet from the street, and the sign would appear to be small from that distance regardless.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

In response to the Chair, Mr. Horn clarified that Attachment E to the staff report contained previous project plans from December 2012 that had been submitted to the DRB.

Ms. Clark clarified that the applicant had presented nothing formally as part of the DRB's consideration of the MSP, although Dr. Hoang had been present for those discussions and had offered an example of her sign.

Mr. Luchini also clarified the 10-foot dimensions the letters *L* to *E* of the proposed sign copy.

Mr. Horn added that when the MSP had been discussed, it had been discussed that a logo could be part of the lettering. In this case, the logo was separate and did not have to be on the same line but within the framework of the sign. The MSP allowed a 2-foot high area by 10-foot high area, with letters up to 12 inches in height; some could be as high as 18 inches with the logo allowed at 18 inches by 18 inches. He could not recall a discussion allowing the logo to extend beyond the basic envelope of the sign.

Ms. Clark also noted pursuant to the MSP that the maximum letter height could be 12 inches, except that up to 15 percent of the proportional length of the letters could be a maximum of 18 inches in height, and shall include trademark logos that were text only. The proposed logo did not fit that particular description. The MSP also included a definition for a logo allowing up to 18 inches in maximum height.

Chair Helber found the logo and letter height to be in compliance with the MSP although he suggested the question was whether the sign was a true cabinet sign. At the time the DRB had debated and discussed the MSP that issue had not strictly been defined and was more the look the DRB was trying to achieve. He sympathized with the applicant, suggested it made sense to build a raceway/cabinet sign, although the DRB was trying to preclude similar signs used by gas stations, as an example, where the

face of the cabinet sign cast out the illumination. He did not see that was the intent, or end result, in this case.

Chair Helber stated he was willing to find that the sign was not a cabinet sign, although the dimensions of the letters of the proposed sign should fall within the parameters of the MSP, and in this case the logo was in excess of what the MSP permitted.

Dr. Hoang understood that if a sign met the intent of the MSP it would be approved administratively, and if it was outside the parameters of the MSP it would then require DRB review. Since the sign was a cabinet sign, she understood it would require DRB review regardless. She reiterated the intent of her sign, the desire to retain her business name, the reason why the sign had been proposed as shown, and was uncertain how the sign could be made smaller and still be readable.

Chair Helber expressed a preference to see the sign at the original location at the bottom of the façade, not above the cornice line. He referred to Area B, as shown on Sheet 9, Image A, and noted that the cornice brackets, as shown, would prevent a sign on the top portion. When informed by staff that the MSP allowed signs on the top half of the fascia, he expressed support for allowing an exception to the MSP to allow the signs on the bottom of the fascia for the reasons stated. He also supported the sign as a cabinet sign, and a finding that the intent of the sign was for a halo lit sign. He expressed a desire to find a way to fit the letters within the requirements of the MSP but would support an exception to the MSP in that regard since the letters would be less than six inches in excess of what they should be.

Boardmember Escano-Thompson agreed that the sign should be moved to the lower band of the building. She too could support an exception to the MSP to allow the size of the sign as proposed.

Boardmember Glover emphasized the time and effort to develop and approve an MSP for the building, and when those discussions had occurred signage for the applicant had been discussed. He questioned permitting a sign that did not meet those standards and did not support an increase in size for the sign. While he recognized that the building was recessed and the sign may not be clearly visible, he could not support non-compliance with the MSP. He otherwise had no concern with the sign being classified as a halo-lit sign if the sign.

Boardmember Crews found the method of illumination to be within the spirit of halo-lit signs but found the depth of the cabinet sign to be excessive. Not a member of the DRB when the MSP had been discussed, he deferred to the other Boardmembers as to how to rectify the situation. He had no aesthetic issues with the sign, found it to be a nice design, and recognized it was not in a prominent location on the building.

Planning Commissioner Mallela sympathized with the applicant and characterized the design as nice and respectful. He too had not been part of the discussions related to the MSP and agreed with the need to comply with the standards.

Chair Helber opened the floor to public comment to allow the applicant to again address the DRB.

Mr. Luchini asked for clarification as to whether it would be acceptable for the sign to be the exact length of the sign copy.

Chair Helber understood that if the logo and lettering were within 10 feet it would be within the measurement allowed by the MSP and the sign would be compatible with the requirements of the MSP, and Ms. Clark clarified that according to the MSP, the maximum sign length was 12 feet including letters and logo without reference to the size of the background mounting board or the wall sign. If the sign was a halo-lit sign 10 feet in length, it would be compatible with the MSP.

Chair Helber understood if that was acceptable, if the sign was considered to be a halo lit sign and if the application was conditionally approved by the DRB, a plan could be submitted to staff if the leaf of the logo to the *E* of the sign copy did not exceed 10 feet, which could then be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Clark suggested that an interpretation of the wording in the MSP would permit a sign where the lettering and logo alone was 10 feet or less; however, she commented that it was not completely clear in the MSP how that type of sign proposal would be treated. If, as an example, a traditional wall mounted sign with painted letters or mounted letters on a flat board with no illumination was submitted, the entire size of the sign board as opposed to just the size of the letters and logo may be measured.

Mr. Luchini detailed the color and material of the raceway and affirmed it could be the same color as the wall itself although it had been proposed to be white.

Boardmember Glover suggested the next tenant desirous of placing a sign north of the subject sign would likely come in with a similar discussion and suggest their sign would not be visible. He otherwise agreed that the sign should be allowed on the bottom of the fascia.

Boardmember Crews agreed with the placement of the sign on the lower band as an option to what had been proposed.

Ms. Clark commented that the diagrams for Sheet A-2 had clearly shown the total sign area at a maximum of 10 feet, including the sign board and lettering. In the case of a halo-lit sign, the letters would have to be within the 10-foot area, although she recognized this was a hybrid sign which made it more difficult to interpret. She suggested the DRB could make the determination that because of the halo-lit character of the sign it could be measured based on the lettering, although she cautioned something that would have a more prominent backboard that would stand out against the stucco could appear larger than 10 feet.

Chair Helber agreed that if the DRB decided that the sign follow the intent of a halo-lit sign, the background should not extend beyond the halo letters themselves by the dimension required by the MSP. He commented that it would be acceptable if the dimension of the raceway was reduced to extend no more than an inch past the letter *E* of the sign copy, with the raceway itself designed, reviewed, and approved by staff to blend into the wall.

Mr. Luchini commented that it was not typical for raceways to color match the physical background of the building and then measure the actual copy area of the halo letters. If the color was matched to the building the enclosure would disappear.

Chair Helber understood the MSP had shown Areas A and B for signage although only one sign was allowed per area, with Mr. Horn advising that Area A had allowed one sign while there could potentially be three signs for Area B.

Dr. Hoang asked that the minutes of the DRB meeting where the MSP had been discussed be reviewed since she could recall that a flourish would be allowed in addition to the main sign, and since some logos had lettering next to the main sign.

Mr. Horn reiterated that the MSP included a section which allowed logos as part of the lettering, and a separate section allowing an 18 inch by 18 inch logo separate from the actual lettering itself.

Ms. Clark stated the MSP was clear that the sign copy and logo had to be within the 10-foot maximum allowed. While there may have been a discussion of logos, it may not have been incorporated into the MSP. If the DRB were to consider the approval of the application, she asked that staff be directed to return with a new Draft Action Memorandum to encapsulate the findings to allow the interpretation of the sign as a halo-lit sign along with the dimensional standards, with staff to then draft the appropriate language. She reported that the next meeting of the DRB would be held in June.

Boardmember Glover recommended that if a Draft Action Memorandum of approval was drafted, it include a condition that all other signs related to Lamorinda Dental Care; i.e. the temporary banner, shall be removed.

Ms. Clark added that the DRB would also have to consider amending the MSP to account for some of the particularities of the proposed sign, or sign type, to be clarified in the regulations, which could not be done at this time since it had not been agendized.

On the question of whether the DRB supported the electrical fixture as an example of the intent of a halo-lit sign in the MSP, the consensus of the DRB was that the sign met that intent.

Ms. Clark recommended that the DRB provide direction on the interpretation of signage type which would be used for the basis of revised findings for a Draft Action Memorandum to approve the project, and which would not require Planning Commission approval unless a decision of the DRB was appealed.

Chair Helber also understood DRB consensus for the sign be located on the bottom portion of the façade.

On the question of the sign area, height of the individual letters, and height of the logo flourish, Boardmember Glover suggested the raceway should be no more than 20 square feet in size, consistent with the MSP.

Mr. Luchini commented that the square footage of the sign would determine how they would be allowed to measure the sign. There would be an issue if required to measure the entire background of the enclosure.

If allowed to measure the copy area, 20 square feet would be feasible. While the dimension of the raceway could be reduced, the design had been intended to fit within the lower band.

Chair Helber suggested one foot cut off on either side could be considered, or the raceway could be reduced to make it shorter.

Mr. Luchini commented that if the background of the sign was painted to match the finish of the building it would disappear and he hoped to be allowed to ignore the enclosure altogether and just measure the sign copy. He described the box finish as painted dull metal finish designed for signs, with textured coating to match the existing stucco and wall texture.

Chair Helber offered the following motion: The applicant reconsider the plans and resubmit to staff with direction to staff that that type of electrical fixture meets the intent of a halo-lit sign; the raceway itself in dimension should not exceed 10-feet in horizontal dimension; suggested there was a creative way to reach the allowable square footage, and if staff finds the resubmitted plans in compliance, and he hoped that the item could be brought back to the DRB as a Consent Agenda Item, and staff to provide a revised Draft Action Memorandum.

On motion by Chair Helber, seconded by Boardmember Glover, to direct staff to prepare a Draft Action Memorandum to approve DRB 01-15 for Arrow Sign Company at 533 Moraga Road, with plans to be submitted to staff for an electrical fixture to meet the intent of a halo-lit sign; the raceway not to exceed 10 feet in horizontal dimension; a creative way be sought to reach the allowable square footage, and with plans in compliance, as required, to be resubmitted to DRB as a Consent Item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Helber identified the 10-day appeal period of a decision of the Design Review Board in writing to the Town Clerk subject to an applicable appeal fee.

Chair Helber declared a recess at 9:14 P.M. The Design Review Board meeting reconvened at 9:20 P.M. with Boardmembers Escano-Thompson, Crews, Glover and Chair Helber present.

5. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

A. Consider Nomination and Selection of Design Review Board Chair and Vice-Chair

Boardmember Escano-Thompson nominated **Ben Helber** as the Chair of the Design Review Board. Boardmember Crews seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed. **Ben Helber** was unanimously selected to serve as the Chair of the Design Review Board.

Chair Helber nominated **John Glover** as the Vice-Chair of the Design Review Board. Boardmember Escano-Thompson seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed. **John Glover** was unanimously selected to serve as the Vice Chair of the Design Review Board.

B. Consider Appointment of Two Design Review Board Representatives to Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project Steering Committee

Ms. Clark presented the staff report dated April 27, 2015, and asked that two DRB members be appointed to serve on the Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project Steering Committee. The Committee was expected to meet six times in the course of a year, with meeting dates and times to be determined.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Escano-Thompson to appoint Chair Helber and Boardmember Crews as the Design Review Board representatives to the Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project Steering Committee. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

C. Consider Appointment of One Design Review Representative to the Moraga Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update and Wayfinding Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

Assistant Planner Coleman Frick presented the staff report dated April 27, 2015, and asked that the DRB appoint one representative to the Moraga Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update and Wayfinding Plan Citizens Advisory Committee. The Committee was expected to meet on four to five occasions and the proposed schedule had been included in the staff report.

On motion by Boardmember Glover, seconded by Boardmember Crews to appoint Boardmember Escano-Thompson as the Design Review Board representative to the Moraga Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update and Wayfinding Plan Citizens Advisory Committee. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

D. Planning Commission Liaison Report – Mallela

Planning Commissioner Mallela reported that the Planning Commission had recently adopted the Town's Story Pole Policy.

In response to the Chair, Ms. Clark explained that the policy contained parameters when story poles were required to be erected and removed. A copy of the policy could be provided to the DRB in its final form.

6. REPORTS

A. Design Review Board

Boardmember Glover asked in the future that packets for a Monday DRB meeting be delivered before the prior Friday.

Chair Helber agreed with the placement of some items on the Consent Agenda which did not require much or any discussion. He took this opportunity to note that the Livable Moraga Road Project Committee had not met for some time.

Ms. Clark reported that staff would be asking the Town Council to consider a modification to the contract services and to consider a community survey with different revenue measures to possibly fund that and other community survey efforts. She acknowledged the work must be completed soon. She anticipated that the Livable Moraga Road Project survey would be a mail-in survey to Moraga residents.

B. Staff

Ms. Clark reported that the City Ventures Appeal would be considered by the Town Council at its meeting on May 13; staff was working with the Rancho Laguna II developer on an agreement for the terms of the Rheem Boulevard Reconstruction Project with the road to be closed six to nine months; the developer for the Camino Ricardo subdivision had pulled grading permits; and noted that construction signs would be allowed absent a permit. She also reminded DRB Boardmembers of the April 28 Town Council/Boards/Commissions training at Saint Mary's College (SMC) Soda Center, Lafayette Room starting at 5:30 P.M. as well as the mandated AB1234 ethics training which was available on-line.

7. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Boardmember Crews, seconded by Boardmember Glover and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at approximately 9:45 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy

Secretary of the Planning Commission