

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING of the ROSS ADVISORY
DESIGN REVIEW GROUP
TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009

1. 7:00 P.M. Commencement.

Jim Kemp called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. The Advisory Design Review group members introduced themselves. Jim Kemp, Mark Fritts, Noreen Slivon and Josefa Buckingham were present. Town Staff present: Gary Broad, Town Manager and Elise Semonian, Senior Planner.

2. Posting of Agenda.

The agenda was posted according to the requirements of the Government Code.

3. Approval of Minutes of March 26, 2009.

The Advisory Design Review Group deferred consideration of the minutes of the March 26, 2009 meeting.

4. Open Time for Public Expression.

No one wished to speak during the public open time.

5. 54 Baywood Avenue, Ross and Ligia Parmenter, A.P. Numbers 72-072-29 and 72-072-30, (R-1:B-20)

Design review and hillside lot/hazard zone 3 use permit to allow the construction of a new 839 square foot residence and car deck on an undeveloped lot. 49 cubic yards of cut and 51 cubic yards of fill are proposed. A variance is requested to locate a car and pedestrian bridge within the front yard setback (25 feet required, 0 feet proposed). The applicant proposes to provide a car lift with the one required covered parking space on the lower level. Two uncovered parking spaces would be available on site on the car bridge and deck. One extra space would be created within the right-of-way and front yard setback. A tree removal permit is requested to allow the removal of two 14" diameter bay trees and a 14" diameter oak tree.

Lot area	20,967 square feet
Present Floor Area Ratio	0%
Proposed Floor Area Ratio	839 sq. ft. 4.0%*
Present Lot Coverage	0%
Proposed Lot Coverage	10.9% (15% permitted)

*(*The slope of the lot is 53%. The Town Hillside Lot Ordinance guidelines recommend a maximum floor area of 839 square feet. The applicant has not included the area of the covered parking space, an unfinished space with a 6.5' ceiling height, in the floor area.)*

Chair Kemp said the project has been before the ADR Group twice last year and the Town Council, but that this was a new plan for the site.

Richard Hannum, AIA, Hannum Associates Architecture, gave a presentation of the project. He believed the design was in concert with the Town's FAR hillside lot ordinance requirements and noted that a variance is required for the drive and walkway connections, but the remainder of the project meets all setbacks, height, and parking requirements. They eliminated the secondary pull-out previously proposed further up Baywood in response to the objection from the property owner directly across the street from the proposed pull out.

He noted that the story poles reflect the original design. The façade has not changed at all. The footprint of the house has been reduced and pulled further uphill and the lowest story poles were removed to reflect the new design. The project is now 839 square feet and most of what it deals with is embracing indoor and outdoor living environment, vertical elements, and some views. They created some interest in the roof by the entrance element. He described the design as improving the turning radius for fire trucks, with the parking area beyond the widened roadway. There is no parking encroachment that would obstruct fire trucks. The texture of the parking area would be different than the roadway. The railings at the street would be cable rails which are open and transparent. Other materials include metal, concrete siding panels, solar shades that allow water to go through, and a living screen wall with landscape vine plantings which are soft and provide privacy for the house.

Mr. Hannum said the house has been reduced in height and size from the last iteration; they worked with the height to achieve a ceiling height that also allows a functioning spiral staircase. He described the living room, kitchen, master bedroom, stair connection, another bedroom and two small bathrooms. He described the sloped roof on top of the stair entry which has an overhang to avoid getting wet from rain. The roof material is hydro-tech living roofs. The house is designed to be certified as a LEED gold project and noted their company representatives are all LEED-certified.

The living roof is a key component to address drainage and fire protection. It takes rain and filters it so that it does not allow for aggressive runoff. It, in concert with the other roofs and decks, results in a net zero impact for stormwater runoff.

The green wall is 27-29 feet in height, or 8 feet above the grade line from the street, and is not solid. He described it as a specific green wall material from Southern California.

Ms. Buckingham referred to the green decks and questioned how they would be utilized as sitting areas, and Mr. Hannum briefly explained how water would be captured and delayed instead of running off the surface and people could easily utilize the decking.

Mr. Kemp asked if ADR Group members could allow Mr. Hannum to proceed with his presentation and then have members ask questions.

Mr. Hannum continued, stating that all materials for the project are low or no ignition materials. They are not creating a front yard scape and the fabric of the tree canopy goes through the area. Part of the landscape plan calls for replanting to bring the canopy through, and one would have to go through the canopy to get to the house. He described all green space, plantings, and said the only hardscape is where the car parks and where there is an outdoor deck space. The rest is all landscaped. The edges, because of the height limits, are open solar screens and open to the

sky to shade glass on the one side. He said their landscape architect in Sausalito created a butterfly garden mix for the green roof planting and only the hardscape area is the open bridge, walkway, two paths, and a bit of the deck.

Mr. Kemp asked Mr. Hannum to draw a line where cars would park. Mr. Hannum explained that there is a sliding barn door and another one on the inside that closes off the pedestrian access to the house. He presented the elevations next, described the circulation of the drive and the lift area that goes into car storage, and there are still four cars but only three are needed. It satisfies everybody's needs and you end up with an extra space. He said if removed, they would not have the requirement for covered parking and would require a variance from the covered parking requirement.

Regarding what is seen from the street, Mr. Hannum drew a picture. Mr. Hannum said the green wall creates an element of privacy and softens the project. Ms. Buckingham said many of the houses have decks with roofs and complete structures right on the road, and the architect agreed. He said this project respects the full 25-foot setback and falls within the 30 foot height limit, and he noted that a bridge would require a variance because it is classified as a structure.

A neighbor asked how the project would look if the wall were two feet shorter, and Mr. Hannum said the extra two feet is to provide a graphic response proportionally for the project. He would like the wall to continue above the pedestrian entry. They lowered the wall at the request of the Council because it used to be taller than shown, but they are still within the height limit and they have reduced the square footage of the house.

Jacqueline Ryan, 50 Baywood, said she is next door and has a buildable lot. If she builds a house on her lot she will be looking right at the Parmenter's cars, as her cars would be right next to the road. Ms. Buckingham explained that when Ms. Ryan builds her house, she should plan to have all the parking and cars together up against each other with the house on the opposite side, and then she would retain her view and not see the cars because they will be behind the wall and screen. Ms. Ryan said her concern is that the house is so far forward, and Ms. Buckingham suggested having more planting on that side, and Ms. Ryan disagreed stating she would lose her view of Mt. Tamalpais and did not want to park her cars on that side of the property.

Mr. Hannum continued his presentation and discussed materials for the project, stating they are all cement material; some smooth and textured. The intent is for a darker colored house so that it blends into the shadow point of the hillside. All materials are two different layers of horizontal panels and painted. They carry a cedar-like texture and the intent is a non-combustible skin. Their goal has been that the structure is non-combustible, and he noted this was the reason they put the skirt back on under the lower deck, which he said was required by wild land urban interface development regulations. He then described a home they recently designed and completed in San Diego where fire went right through the neighborhood and the house was untouched due to the way the venting was constructed. He explained how heat went into the rafters and out the crown.

A resident questioned what would prevent cars from going through the wall and into the house, and questioned the need for a protective railing. Mr. Hannum said they would use 3x3 mounted

steel bollards as a standard, but if a driver accelerated, they could go through anything regardless of the railing. He then described the auto scissor lift as a state-of-the-art design.

Mr. Hannum continued, stating he did not change the style of the architecture; however, the building is reduced in size. They removed many of the upper layers of the design and it is intended to screen itself from the street and from the other side of the hill and blend into the hillside.

Ms. Slivon questioned if the story poles represent the edge of the decks or the edge of the building footprint, and Mr. Hannum said he was not sure, but noted that the building used to be closer to the setback line.

Ms. Buckingham questioned the location of the property line and the project staying within the setback. Mr. Hannum replied there is a bit of a sunscreen considered an eave which cuts over into the setback.

Ms. Slivon questioned the location of Ms. Ryan's property next door, and Mr. Hannum described it on the plans, and Ms. Slivon noted there would be 40 feet between both houses, given Ms. Ryan's setback and the applicant's setback. Ms. Ryan said she still believed her view would be blocked, asked that the garage be placed on the opposite side of the lot, and said she would prefer to see a structure than cars. Mr. Hannum noted that Ms. Ryan's property was actually smaller than the Parmenter's lot and questioned what could be built.

Mr. Fritts questioned if the project gains the pedestrian and vehicular access as one, and Mr. Hannum stated that splitting them would make the bridge narrower and the area would be very slippery when it rains as the bridge is level but the vehicular drive was not.

Mr. Fritts asked for clarification on the square footage regarding the storage space interpretation. Ms. Buckingham commented that there was a lot of public comment on FAR; that the ADR Group is responsible for design review but received a lot of "heat" for not addressing floor area. Therefore, she supported the request for clarification. Senior Planner Semonian said that staff considers the main level storage area and auto storage space to be floor area. The definition of floor area measures spaces from the exterior surfaces of the home and does not exclude areas with minimal ceiling heights or areas that are not used as living space. The definition exempts attic and basement areas, which are indirectly created by the structure. The garage area is 273 square feet and the other storage space is approximately 200 square feet, which she felt should be included in the floor area.

Mr. Hannum noted the site is downhill; he felt that the substructure is below the living area and questioned how it was different than attic space. Senior Planner Semonian said attic space creates a void, and Mr. Hannum disagreed, stating it creates a void between the living area as it is upside down.

Senior Planner Semonian then described the space, which has full exterior walls, and said decks are not included in floor area but may be considered as they impact the project design.

April 28, 2009 Approved Minutes

Ms. Buckingham believed this was new information, and Senior Planner Semonian said she did not know whether it was going to be included when the staff report was prepared because she wanted to review how the Town had historically interpreted the ordinance for areas that are entirely above grade. Mr. Hannum noted it was less than 7 feet.

Senior Planner Semonian said the Council can consider the definition and the areas. But, she said there are options to eliminate the question regarding the floor area. For example, the storage space, if not enclosed, would not be counted. Mr. Hannum said the space cannot be left open under the Fire Code. The Fire Captain Tom Vallee indicated that the design is subject to design review which would allow the Council to review it, and he noted that complete enclosure was safest or it could be fire proofed underneath.

Senior Planner Semonian said her preference is to eliminate the storage area, and Mr. Hannum said they could then ask for a variance not to have a covered parking space and save \$50,000 for the lift which the owners would gladly agree to. Ms. Buckingham said, however, if a roof was placed over it, it would look like a carport from the road. Mr. Hannum said they proposed the living wall which puts two cars off the street; he lives on Baywood and dislikes the collection of vehicles in the neighborhood and this was part of the design intent. He said the lift is a very expensive solution and he could request a variance instead.

Mr. Kemp asked to continue further into the design of the project and questioned a discussion on decks. He believes the intent of the hillside lot ordinance is that it is designed to minimize the footprint, bulk, profile, and exposure from everyone in the canyon that looks out there. However, when taking the minimum floor area requirement and then adding the decks, it just sort of expands the entire footprint. He said the biggest room in the house is a living room which is 10 x 12 feet and the only measure of expanse you have is to move out onto a deck. It just did not feel good to him and said there is not a room in the house that is more than 10 x 12. There is hardly any room in the kitchen and dining room, the applicant is relying on exterior decks, and the decks become an issue of encroachment into the canyon.

Mr. Hannum believed that Mr. Kemp was supportive of the decks at the last meeting. He said 12 foot decks are a common standard; the house has a 400 square foot footprint and a typical parking garage is bigger. It has been minimized down to a small but livable house at 839 square feet. It is common to a San Francisco living room which is nice if given light and some outdoor space.

Mr. Kemp said he does not disagree, but the differential between the interior space and outside space that makes the entire project more livable goes against the grain of the ordinance. Mr. Hannum reiterated that the project is in compliance with setbacks and all other parameters of the ordinance, and Mr. Kemp agreed he could not argue with that point.

Ms. Slivon said it is hard to see on paper, but questioned whether there is more deck space than house space. Mr. Hannum reiterated the house was within standards, is hidden by the trees and it is designed barely high enough to achieve any views.

Ms. Buckingham said there is history in the Town with decks being counted. She noted her deck was counted as floor area, and explained that they changed the regulations when residents were

trying to enclose them to capture the floor area that was already counted. A deck is different than structure as it is half mass. They add to the bulk of the house in an indirect way. And, if decks go way beyond the limits of the house, then they must be questioned. If one lives on a hillside, it is their space, but the fact that it is not counted is another question.

Mr. Hannum said he would agree if the decks were 20 feet, but 12 feet is reasonable for putting together a sitting group. From below the house, the decks cannot be seen through the trees, so he cannot imagine the deck having any impact on anyone at all.

Dianne Rudden questioned and confirmed that there are glass windows proposed on the side of the building to capture the view of Mt. Tamalpais. She said the area is all glass, then the use of a deck for transition has been eliminated and it would be a functional part of the house. Mr. Hannum said from a design standpoint this did not make sense; a deck must be large enough to sit on and this was not any different from any other houses in town.

Mr. Kemp said in looking at the building code, the house is designed for rooms that meet the very minimum standard for size of 120 square feet and he thinks the lot lends itself much more to an efficiency unit. However, he clarified he was not asking the owners to change the way they live. Mr. Hannum said they looked at living in one room specifically for those reasons. One of the things they learned in smaller products is that there is no where to get away from each other. For a single individual, it might be okay. One reason for this design is that the kitchen has its own environment, as well as the living room and bedrooms. By doing this, you also get a visual connection that is greater than a 120 square foot room. You also get to see the building coming back rather than having a substantial amount of glass. There is enough of a sense of separation. He said part of it has to do with walking; the experience of coming from above through the spiral staircase. Mr. Kemp appreciated his explanation but said he wanted to bring this up as a response.

Mr. Fritts said while he appreciates the 839 square foot effort, it bothers him that the house has been penalized. He lives in a house this size and believes that what the architect has done is quite elegant. However, he does not see closets, storage areas, and the project has been penalized to the extent that the house functions at a minimum level.

Ms. Slivon said in doing this floor plan, they are not getting the benefit of the mass. The plans represent significantly greater mass than the actual living space or stated FAR

Ms. Buckingham said the client is happy with the design and it is not within the mission of the ADR to comment on architect/client satisfaction. She asked to address the current design and asked to return back to massing, scale, decks and then public comments.

Mr. Kemp opened up the floor for public comment.

Public Comments:

Sheppard Heery, Architect, he lives close to the project at 45 Baywood Avenue. He reviewed the design in detail, supported and welcomed it as a small, exquisite design and wonderful solution. He believes that what he applicant has gone through is a shame, applauded the LEED gold, said

the screen wall is critical and a nice idea, has respect for neighbors' opinions, but felt there has been a dynamic of a mob psychology, which is distressful.

Wendy Kuhn, 5 Madera, said she lives directly below the property and believes the decks will be visible from their home looking up. Mr. Hannum said there is a great deal of tree coverage and the deck area is completely within the profile of the building and will not be sticking out to see. They also did not want it to be seen from underneath, and this is why skirting is proposed.

Ms. Kuhn confirmed with Mr. Hannum that the finish on the house and skirting would be the same; a painted cedar siding. He noted that he could only see one spot when looking at the story poles from her property and the cut off angle is when the deck extends a little bit out. He said Ms. Kuhn will see only the roof above it and the windows are not seen at all because the deck cuts the view of what is above. He noted there would still be 40 feet from the property line, as well.

Ms. Buckingham agreed that she would see the bottom of the building or the underside of decking which blocks the window and thought it would be helpful to draw a sight line so the neighbor can clearly understand what she will be looking at. Mr. Hannum added that the lighting cut-off point does not extend into the deck or grounds either.

Senior Planner Semonian noted there are few low shrubs and under story plants between 5 Madera and the proposed structure and the skirting under the deck was a wall up to 12 feet tall. She voiced concern with the expanse of material. Mr. Hannum said this could be addressed by using landscaping the wall with something like Boston Ivy which is consistent with the overall design.

Jon D'Alessio asked that the minutes reflect that he objects that a member of the ADR Group is making the presentation, which he believes is a conflict of interest. Mr. Hannum confirmed that the telephone pole by the driveway will be moved 5 feet over which he would relocate on the plans. Mr. d'Alessio voiced confusion with the translucent wall and the sliding door. Mr. Hannum said the garage door is solid and is designed to create privacy for the house. The door is suppressed by 4 feet at the high points; that it could be done as a grill, but people would prefer not seeing the car.

Mr. D'Alessio said he believes garages have to be included in the FAR. Mr. Hannum said they are in a 6' 6" space which is not considered floor area. Mr. Hannum explained that the parking requirement says one space should be covered and they may or may not ask for a variance, and that exempting 6'6" spaces is a standard that the Council has approved as non-occupied space.

Philip Cecchetti, 58 Wellington Avenue, said he takes exception with the use of the words, "mob psychology", as he believed meetings served as democracy in action and supported neighbors being able to talk. He commented on the design and said it reminded him of the children's toy "transformers", as an 839 square foot house with wings or decks. He also believed that the architect's home also reminds him of a "transformer" because it glows at night, dominates the hillside, and has a billboard effect on the eye. He asked Mr. Hannum to explain how the lighting and glass on the proposed structure would differ from Mr. Hannum's house on

Baywood. He also voiced concern for how much light would be seen from the downhill neighbors and those across the valley looking at the structure.

Mr. Hannum described the lighting in the Council chambers as ambient against the ceiling, creating a shadow on the ceiling. His own house is taller above the canopy than this home is relative to the overall height on the site. The lighting at his house projects up at the white ceiling, unlike the Council chamber lighting. The lighting for this project would not project up to the ceiling, but would be cast down to create a shadow-plane. The proposed house has a sloped ceiling and because the lights are pulled back in, the cut off angle does not spill out beyond the deck line into the trees. He noted that this is a LEED component.

Peter Barry, Wellington Avenue, thanked the ADR Group for doing their job and said the design and presentation were ingenious. However, he said he personally has a problem with the green wall. It may look good on a high-rise but not in the neighborhood and he thinks it is ugly. Neighbors walking will see the wall and its mass, and he felt other homes seemed to survive without installation of a wall. He agreed with Mr. Kemp regarding his concerns with decking and the home's actual footprint, said perhaps a better design would be one where there is room to walk around better such as a studio. He also said neighbors are not mobs, but do get excited when the area is built upon. He said decks were counted in the old days in the FAR and the reason they were counted in the hillside lot ordinance is that things appear bigger as you go up a hill. The effect of the mass and bulk on the building is dramatic, this is what the ordinance was all about, he said in the 1980's, these types of lots were restricted and projects were turned down, and he thanked the Committee for their work.

Carla Small said she was interested in the project but does not live in the area. The whole idea about removing decks from floor area was to try and eliminate boxy type homes and to build porches which create nice fronts. Her concern is that she understands indoor/outdoor living, but the project creates mass and a precedent is being set for other homes in Ross. She suggested that decking be an overall percentage of square footage and asked that the Council take a hard look at the design. She believed the project also affects other issues like hazard 3 issues, but she is looking at it as a resident of Ross, as a precedent and at other homes that were not able to do this and may want to in the future.

Scott Minick, 69 Wellington, said he also objects to the word, "mob". There are 130 people in Town, and the list is growing, that have signed a document objecting to the structure. There are even more residents who have not signed because they fear retribution if they bring their own development project before the Town. The architect has been creative multiple times, but the real issue is a lack of trust about the project. The architect has presented different slope calculations and claims that there is no side setback variance when an eve is in the setback. The enclosed storage area is not habitable space and is not being counted as FAR, but he wonders if years from now he will come back and make it into floor area. He believed there was a track record on the project that has led to the mistrust.

Mr. Hannum noted that the information came from the Town Engineer as not being 53% slope, and then it was changed and he responded both times. He said they have been working on the design as it specifically relates to varying issues. This project has had a lot of scrutiny and they have been responsive to comments.

Mr. Minick said drainage issues do exist and have been identified by an engineer. Mr. Hannum and Mr. Parmenter noted that the opinion is from an unlicensed engineer.

Phillip Paisley, Baywood Avenue, said he sat through proposals for the lot being developed for 25 years, and he believed this was the most creative. He lives at 31 Baywood and said noise is his issue. When people use decks as part of their living area there is more outside activity. He also looked at issues of drainage and hazard zoning which was one of the original concerns that started in 1982, as well as slides.

Mr. Kemp believed the point about noise was a valid one; the more outside living that occurs, the more sound will broadcast through the neighborhood.

Ms. Buckingham said one significant item in all writings is that many people were concerned about drainage, but it has not been brought up, and she asked Mr. Hannum what had been done to address drainage and what happened to the additional pull-out across the road from Mr. Timmons. Mr. Hannum said a neighbor across the street, Sean Timmons, went out and did a test and pointed out that the drainage does not go across the road. Mr. Timmons said he will repair his drain which is filled with gravel, but water does not go across the road. He said the car pullout area across from 55 Baywood was in response to prior issues but there is now no reason to build a drain. The drainage from the house is slowed from the roof; it is spread across the site in above grade perforated pipes, and it becomes natural filtration and does not concentrate as rapid runoff. It is part of the new C3 State standards which is that the proposed run off condition is no greater than the existing condition, and in this case, it is slightly improved.

Ms. Buckingham asked where the natural terrain was. Mr. Hannum explained the course of the water. He said they studied the entire hillside and where all the water goes and ironically, the building area of the site that is defined by the setbacks is also the best location on the property to build.

Julie McMillan, Crest Road, said the neighbors just received the drainage report and she has not reviewed it, but was told drainage would not be discussed tonight. Senior Planner Semonian stated that they are not asking the ADR Group to comment on the adequacy of the drainage plan, but drainage is still an important issue.

Philip Cecchetti, Wellington Avenue, questioned if runoff retention systems were considered, as there were LEED points for these. Mr. Hannum said they will review it, agreed they must address run-off, but may choose to do storm water retention for irrigation on site. Senior Planner Semonian noted that another drainage plan prepared for the site included on site detention and it was not well received by neighbors because it required periodic maintenance.

Sheppard Heery complimented the ADR Group and said he stood by his "mob" comment because it reflected actions in the past. He agreed the interaction with neighbors was much improved.

Mr. Hannum believed that the whole point of having this kind of forum is to voice comments at the ADR Group level so that they are resolved and not carried onto the Town Council to resolve, and he thanked everyone.

Jon d'Alessio said the fact that Hadden Roth, Town Attorney, asked Richard Hannum to comment on the ADR Group's conflict of interest issue was absurd. Mr. Kemp said the ADR is a new group, he feels grateful to be a part of it, they are learning many things and he felt it was terrific to be part of the community and bring these issues to a forum like this. He encouraged the community to support the ADR Group and said getting issues resolved before they reach the Council was important. He suggested final comments be voiced and for the meeting.

Beth Minick thanked ADR Group members and referred to the car lift, which she thought was something very new for the Town. She personally asked that neighbors be able to see one in use and hear it in use, as noise was amplified. She also cited the fact that use of car lifts would be precedent setting. She said the hydrology report is predicated on the green roof and she questioned how this worked with the surface under the parked cars.

Mr. Hannum said green roofs have been used in Germany and it was 50 year old technology. The lift is different and new, and noted he was proposing to do one for his house. He said there are probably 40 homes with green roofs in southern California in Newport Beach which are in premier neighborhoods, and he has seen the car lift that is proposed used with a green roof surface. They retained renowned acoustical consultant, Charles Salter, to review the noise issue and he concluded the lift sounds would not exceed standards. He said he has provided Town staff with information about where green roofs are located, and he said the lift proposed is the only one that has a national code standard for safety.

Ms. Ryan said she contacted the lift manufacturer, heard it operate over the telephone which she thought was at about 95 decibels, and she thought this would cause a huge problem to all of the neighbors.

Mr. Kemp asked to take the last minutes of the meeting for ADR Group member comments.

Mr. Fritts believed there were a few outstanding issues; the living wall and the lift. 1) He suggested Mr. Hannum or Hadden Roth come up with locations or visuals to demonstrate what the living wall will look like. 2) Regarding the lift, he asked for decibel clarification.

Senior Planner Semonian stated that the Salter report indicates that the mechanical equipment for the lift is approximately 70 decibels inside the structure and the sound would rise up. The mechanical part can be enclosed with soundproof barriers. She said Charles Salter indicated that the 70 decibels drops below what the County standard is for noise when it is carried out to the property lines. She noted the Town of Ross does not have a specific decibel noise standard, so the County standard was used.

Mr. Kemp felt it was probably similar to a garage door opening, and Senior Planner Semonian noted that the lift operates at one inch per second, so it takes some time to lift or lower the vehicle.

Ms. Buckingham asked to consider the wall's mass and location on Ms. Ryan's side and to provide sufficient detail on the car parking area to determine what will be seen from Ms. Ryan's side of the site.

A public speaker questioned the 3 parking space requirement, and Senior Planner Semonian clarified that the zoning code specifies that only 3 spaces are required for lots in zoning districts with a 20,000 square foot minimum lot size.

Ms. Buckingham referred to the conflict of issue matter and what the ADR Group is tasked to do. She reminded everybody that when polled, people wanted to see a kinder and gentler process with professionals to review plans before they went to the Town Council. This is how the ADR Group came about and she said they are volunteers. Some day she may have a project and she may need to recuse herself. But, if residents want professionals to serve on the ADR Group, they must be able to practice and work in their profession, or no one will volunteer. She said the ADR Group was instructed from the beginning that they were not to address FAR issues. However, it has been a learning experience and we have realized that we cannot separate Design from FAR issues, that the projects must come to us with the appropriate FAR calculations before we can look at the design of said projects. Secondly, she asked to clarify whether the garage is FAR or not. Thirdly, she thought decks could be pulled back and still provide for a successful home. Fourth, everybody is concerned with the wall. The sentence, She felt the model was misleading because it rendered the wall as a solid mass. The idea is to screen cars, as they are ugly to see and it is prettier to look at green. Residents become accustomed to living next to a vacant lot and don't want to see any development there. The Town of Ross needs to ask the more philosophical question if it should be condemning unbuildable lots from development by purchasing them from some sort of an open space fund. If Ross is unwilling to do this, these land owners have a right to build within the guidelines. Finally, she felt the green wall should be detailed, with additional information on materials and a rendering of what that would look like to confirm that views will not be lost with the wall. The idea of a wall hiding the parked cars is a good one, and the pluses of that approach outweigh the negative of a wall. She would rather see a green wall than the cars.

Ms. Slivon agreed with Ms. Buckingham's comments. She could see what the architect is attempting to do with the living wall and thinks that the idea of this wall is okay but is not comfortable with the material and is concerned that it might be taller than necessary to achieve the desired screening. We need to know what the wall will look like without plants on it in the event it does not grow or is not maintained. Senior Planner Semonian commented that she would like to have actual samples of the materials and colors and know what the wall will actually look like.

Mr. Kemp his fundamental response has to do with subdivisions that present the garage as the main edifice. There are 3-4 cars that present themselves on the street. He respects that the architect has at least limited the garage to a single door off the street, made an effort to disguise it as much as possible. His opinion of the wall is that if done correctly, it does not disguise Mt. Tamalpais or beyond, but only the house below it, which is good. Beyond that, he said his objections to the project are now technical in nature. The garage based on the hillside lot ordinance has to be a part of FAR unless there is some decision to grant a variance. The fact that

the architect has adopted an urban solution to making cars disappear on site is creative. Whether he solves the problem of a roof structure, he's not sure that this is resolved or not.

Senior Planner Semonian asked for clarification of Mr. Kemp's comments that the car lift is not a permanent roofed structure. Mr. Kemp said the car is supposed to be covered and permanent. It does not seem that a car lift that goes on top of another car should be considered a permanent roof structure, but possibly the finding can be made. Beyond that, he thinks the decks are excessive and there should be some reasonable percentage calculated. Otherwise he thinks it is a nice project.

Senior Planner Semonian asked about wire railings proposed along the street. Ms. Buckingham said these are a little more natural and she supported them.

Senior Planner Semonian asked the Group's opinion on the proposed temporary fencing along the street during construction, or whether it would be preferable to view the construction site. Ms. Buckingham agreed the road was a tough one and described how contractors were made to all come up in one vehicle during her home's construction. She also noted that no one had commented on the widening of the road, which was a significant improvement to what is a dangerous road. The Group did not voice concerns about the proposed temporary fencing.

Senior Planner Semonian questioned whether or not there would be a benefit of shifting the house over on the lot to increase the setback from Ms. Ryan's adjacent lot. Ms. Slivon believed it was within the setbacks. Mr. Kemp agreed that the matter has been studied and the proposal was fine. Mr. Fritts suggested the one eave which extends into the setback should be moved over, which is only one foot of encroachment.

Ms. Slivon said one of the speakers had questioned lighting.

Ms. Buckingham suggested one idea would be to pull the decks back from the lower level bedrooms and make the main level deck larger around the eating area for a table and chairs. Mr. Kemp believed the ADR Group could consider the decks to be excessive by 50%. Senior Planner Semonian explained that the decks project 9 feet from the bedroom and living area and 7 feet from the east side bedroom and kitchen area.

Ms Slivon thinks all new construction should be conforming in FAR and setbacks, but also realizes that there is a lot of subjectivity in a project like this.

Mr. Kemp thanked everyone for their participation and comments.

10. Adjournment.

Jim Kemp adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.