

MINUTES
ROSS ADVISORY DESIGN REVIEW GROUP
THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2008

1. **5:00 P.M. Commencement.**

Jim Kemp called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The Advisory Design Review group members introduced themselves. Jim Kemp, Noreen Slivon, Mark Fritts, Joey Buckingham, and Richard Hannum (alternate for Dan Winey) were present. Dan Winey was absent.

2. **Posting of Agenda.**

The agenda was posted according to government code.

3. **Approval of Minutes of April 24, 2008 and May 22, 2008 and June 26, 2008.**

Staff provided copies of draft meeting minutes to the members present. No minutes were approved.

4. **Open Time for Public Expression.**

No one was present to comment on items that were not on the agenda.

5. **8 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard/David and Andrea Millstein, A.P. No. 072-241-23, (R-1:B-A)**

Addition to the existing residence and landscape improvements. Based on the draft plans, the project would require approval of a design review, fence permit, variance and hillside lot application for the following: 1.) addition of 1,712 square feet to the existing residence to create a two-car garage and guest suite at the lower level, kitchen and family room at the main level, and master bedroom at the upper level (4,209 square feet of total floor area is proposed); 2.) new covered porch on the south elevation; 3.) setback variance to permit a portion of the proposed addition, outdoor terrace, and outdoor barbeque to be located within the north side yard setback (25 feet required, 16 feet proposed); 4.) 70 linear feet of new landscape retaining walls up to 4 feet in height; and 5.) 6 foot tall, open design, wood fence with partially solid wood gate and 6.5 foot stone columns at the front property line; and 6.) 6 foot tall wood sound wall approximately 35 feet from the front property line. The materials proposed for the addition would match the existing residence.

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Lot area | 51,401 square feet | |
| Existing Floor Area Ratio | 4.9% | |
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | 8.2% | (15% permitted*) |
| Existing Lot Coverage | 3.3% | |
| Proposed Lot Coverage | 5.3% | (15% permitted) |

The existing residence is nonconforming in setbacks, covered parking and number of stories.

*The slope of this lot is 33%. The hillside lot ordinance would recommend a maximum floor area of 4,034 square feet.

Jim Kemp indicated he had not had an opportunity to view the site.

Michael Heckmann, project architect, reviewed the project plans and project goals. The applicants would like to add a kitchen, family room, master suite and guest room with a design that complements the turn of the century home. They would improve the entry so that it does not come directly off of the parking area and would bring the parking area further from the house. One additional covered parking space would be created. The applicants would like to duplicate the existing siding and would use a similar off white paint color with deep green, almost black, details. He reviewed the changes proposed to each elevation of the residence and the yard. A new solid wood fence would be constructed to cut down on street noise, but the intent is to have the fence disappear into foliage over time. The fireplace would be gas. Square columns are proposed.

Joan Holmes, 18 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, explained that she can see a couple of story poles from her upstairs window and she was concerned that she would see the addition, particularly if it is painted white. The group speculated that Ms. Holmes may see more of the roof, which is dark, than the house. The group suggested that Ms. Holmes have the project architect visit her site to explain what she may see. The project architect clarified that the roof ridge for the addition would be the same level as the ridge of the existing structure. Ms. Holmes confirmed that the new front yard fencing will not eliminate access to the pedestrian trail on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Ms. Holmes was also concerned with reducing impermeable materials, which contribute to runoff and flooding.

Mr. Heckmann had discussed runoff issues with staff and was proposing pavers on gravel for the parking area so that runoff may percolate into the site. The driveway would be a solid surface, but there would be strip drains along the driveway that would collect and direct runoff to French drains to distribute it back on to the site and not directly to the street.

Senior Planner Elise Semonian explained that the Town must consider if the modifications proposed would negatively impact a historic structure. Assuming the structure is historic based on its age, the project would be exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if it complies with the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Structures. Staff asked the group to consider if the modifications proposed to the windows and trim details, particularly on the street-facing elevation, preserve the character-defining features of the existing residence. The applicant explained that he had done research on the character of details on farmhouses constructed in this era. They were seeking to maintain the details of the existing home, including replicating the siding. The majority of the group believed the changes proposed were an improvement and consistent with the style and character of the existing structure.

Richard Hannum was concerned with the plan to pave directly to the building. He thought the proposed plan for the front was a stark three-story elevation with a "panoply of garage doors". He was concerned about the tight turning radius at the top of the driveway. He suggested additional landscaping between the driveway and the residence and that paved areas should be reduced and the landscaped areas should be increased. He thought the mullions and details were more consistent with a craftsman vernacular than a farmhouse vernacular. He was

concerned that the vertical section of trim would be very heavy with a dark trim color. The project architect clarified that only the columns would be dark and the large vertical area of trim would be white. Mr. Hannum suggested using a rectangular gate instead of an arched design.

Jim Kemp was pleased with aspects of the street elevation but felt the design of the bay could be improved. He suggested a square bay with a flat roofline and a design that relates more proportionately. He was concerned with the street fence and believed that the scale and materials are essential. He would like to see a fully developed rendering with the palate of colors and more detail on the materials.

The group members discussed the fence design. Mark Fritts suggested simplifying the gate and relating the materials and design to the house. Noreen Slivon thought the fence may be far enough away from the house that its design is not tied to the house. Joey Buckingham suggested repeating the column detail on the fence design. Richard Hannum was not as concerned with the fence design since it will be covered with green plants eventually. He suggested that the applicant keep the design simple.

The Advisory Design Review group suggested the applicant return to the next ADR meeting to present plans that address their concerns:

- Design of guest room bay
- Street fence materials and design
- Simple but high-quality details, including window detail, to respect the simple farmhouse design
- Reduce paved areas and increase landscaping
- Reduce runoff
- Increase turning radius at top of driveway, if possible.

Ms. Holmes asked if there would be a fence on the north side of the site.

Mr. Hannum asked staff to require applicants to submit plans that show the site in the context of the neighborhood, such as an aerial shot from Google Earth.

6. **104 Laurel Grove Avenue/Hank and Beth Holland, A.P. No. 72-211-30, (R-1:B-A)**
Addition to the existing residence and construction of a new pool, pool house and sports court. Based on the draft plans, the project would require approval of a demolition permit, design review and variance for the following: 1.) addition of 1,459 square feet on the first and second story of the residence and 438 square feet to the garage; 2.) new covered porch areas at the rear of the residence; 3.) demolition of the existing pool and pool house and construction of a new pool and 2,002 square foot pool house, to be finished with grey board and batten siding, white trim and a grey metal roof; 4.) sports court within the rear yard setback (40 feet required, 24 feet proposed); 5.) new grey shingle siding, grey slate roofing and white trim for the main residence; 6.) retaining walls ranging from 1 to 5.5 feet tall associated with the new sports court.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Gross Lot area | 97,573 square feet | |
| Less driveway easement area | <u><9,491></u> | |
| Effective lot area | 88,082 square feet | |
| Existing Floor Area Ratio | 8.7% | |
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | 12.3% | (15% permitted) |
| Existing Lot Coverage | 9.7% | |
| Proposed Lot Coverage | 12.3% | (15% permitted) |

Adam Gardner, project architect, and Michael Yandle, landscape architect, met with all of the neighbors at two organized neighborhood meetings. They met with other neighbors that could not attend the meetings. They stated that neighbors had no negative comments regarding the project. They reviewed the project plans and the intent of the project to improve the 1980's finishes and pull the design of the house and the landscape together. They have reviewed the site drainage with Larry Doyle and with Matt Smeltzer, the Town Hydrologist, and would maintain the existing drainage pattern.

The group discussed the variances necessary for the proposed sports court. Michael Yandle believed the proposed location would create the least impact for all neighbors. The group was concerned that a tree would be lost to build the court. The group was concerned that it would be hard to make the finding that the sports court was a substantial property right that would justify granting a variance or that there was a hardship that necessitated an exception from the setback requirements. Some members would not necessarily reject the sports court but suggested considering alternative designs or reducing its size. Some suggested rotating the court 45 degrees, which would reduce the height of the retaining walls, bring it further from the setback and allow mitigation of the impacts at the driveway turn with additional room for landscaping. Some members of the group would consider an alternative design.

The group asked if any sustainable methods had been incorporated into the project. The project architect indicated that keeping the existing structure instead of tearing it down was sustainable. The owners had considered solar energy but the site is not ideal for solar.

The group reviewed the design and materials. Jim Kemp and Richard Hannum recommended that the windows be very high quality to go with the other high quality finishes. The project architect indicated that they are planning to use Jeld Wen windows. The group members suggested the architect consider Marvin or Lowen windows.

Richard Hannum did not like the sample of the board and batten presented and suggested the pattern be well through tout on the plans so that it has a rhythm and order that works. He also suggested that the shingles have a semi transparent finish so that the grain and quality of the wood is apparent. Mr. Hannum questioned if the roof structure could support slate material. The group would consider imitation slate for the roof if it is a high quality material.

7. Discussion of group review procedures.

The ADR group agreed to review the minutes of the prior meetings. Staff suggested that in lieu of individual reports for each project, the group recommendations be incorporated into the meeting minutes, which could be provided to the Council.

8. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.