

MINUTES  
ROSS ADVISORY DESIGN REVIEW GROUP  
THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 2008

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

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m. Jim Kemp, Mark Fritz, Richard Hannum and Elaine Shultz (alternate for Noreen Slivon) were present.

**2. Posting of Agenda.**

The agenda was posted according to the government code.

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

The group indicated that they had not received draft minutes to review. No minutes were approved.

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

No one wished to speak during public open time.

The applicants for 21 Fernhill were not yet present. The group agreed to hear the subsequent agenda item and return to the application for 21 Fernhill Avenue.

**6. 3 Upper Ames Avenue/Lionel Conacher and Joan Dea, A.P. No. 073-201-02, (R-1:B-A)**

A significant remodel of the existing residence, designed by Bay Area architect Joseph Esherick in 1957-1958. Based on the draft plans, the project would require approval of a demolition permit and design review for the following: 1.) addition of 2,362 square feet of floor area on the first and second story of the residence; 2.) landscape improvements that include construction of a new pool, 860 square foot pool house, and pool patio area at the southwest corner of the site; and 3.) steel, lattice design, driveway gates up to 6 feet in height between new stone columns. Approval of side setback variances would be necessary in order to locate portions of two parking/turnaround areas within the west and south side setback areas. Otherwise, all improvements would comply with required setbacks and no variances would be requested.

Lot area	96,407 square feet	
Existing Floor Area Ratio	6.1%	
Proposed Floor Area Ratio	9.5%	(15% permitted)
Existing Lot Coverage	6.1%	
Proposed Lot Coverage	8.7%	(15% permitted)

The project architect, Jared Polsky, Polsky Perlstein Architects, described the project. He stated that they had met with the Polands at 4 DeWitt since the last Advisory Design Review (ADR) group meeting. They installed lights to demonstrate the impacts of the pool house lighting and some screening landscaping. They had installed redwood trees but the Polands would prefer cedar trees and they are trying to work this issue out with the neighbor.

Mr. Polsky indicated that the visible roofs will be green, which will also help with runoff. He presented material samples showing the color range for the materials, which would be beige tones. They are seeking a monochromatic color scheme with a “dull muddy color.” The windows and doors would be mahogany. They would reuse redwood from the existing structure and finish it with a clear finish that is not shiny, or use a semi-solid stain that will look like clear finish on redwood. They reviewed the gate design and column design. The gate would have a bronze finish. The front yard fencing would be open wire to maintain the natural appearance at the front of the site.

Todd Blake, 1 Ames Avenue, requested additional landscaping to be installed along their shared property lines. The applicant’s design team reviewed the tree removal proposed for the new driveway.

Staff expressed concern with the location of the parking area within the setbacks. The applicant was willing to increase the setback to 15 feet.

Cindy Livermore, 2 Ames Avenue, requested additional information on the driveway and gate location. The applicants indicated that they would install story poles to represent the location of the gates.

Mr. Blake expressed concern with the proposed location of the sports court behind his guest unit and the noise that would be associated with this area. He preferred to see it move further west so that it is adjacent to his tennis court.

The applicant indicated that no lighting was proposed for the court and they could install story poles to reflect the location. They felt the existing and proposed dense landscaping would sufficiently screen the court and, if noise could be heard, it would not be possible to sense where it was coming from because of the screening. The neighbor disagreed and preferred that it be located near his tennis court. The project architect and neighbor agreed to discuss the issue further. Staff pointed out that the sports court complies with the required setbacks and that Mr. Blake could raise his issues with the Town Council if he was still concerned after viewing the story poles and discussing the issue with the applicant.

Jim Kemp was pleased that the applicant took care of issues raised by the ADR group at the last meeting. He would leave the historical issue alone and felt Esherick would not “turn in his grave” over the proposed design. He noted the color scheme and materials were an improvement over the drawings presented at the prior meeting, but thought the materials were still in strong contrast. Generally, he was pleased with the materials. He would prefer a more “organic” gate design.

Mark Fritz was concerned that the materials may be bright, but felt the project was moving in the right direction. He was in favor of the materials proposed.

Richard Hannum felt the quartzite material presented was reflective and bright and could appear white on site. He suggested a deeper iron tone with a less reflective, deeper, shade. He preferred rich, muted, colors so that the structure will not take away from the sylvan quality of the site. He was concerned with the proportion of the entry gate and columns and

preferred something more delicate for the gate design, such as a woven instead of welded design. He suggested a metallic, auto shop, bronze finish for the gate.

The applicant indicated the drive would be pervious pavers and not gravel.

The committee members were pleased with the design and thought it would be a very attractive house.

Assuming no historic resource issues, the ADR group (Fritz, Schultz, Kemp, Hannum) supported the project with a recommended condition that the Council require the actual materials to be review and approved by staff in consultation with two members of the Advisory Design Review group.

5. **21 Fernhill Avenue/ Brian and Rachel Wells, A.P. No. 073-091-37, (R-1:B-20)**  
Review of plans for new pedestrian and driveway gates, up to 6 feet tall, between new stone columns.

The ADR group members introduced themselves.

Staff indicated that they would like the ADR groups opinion on the appropriateness of the gate design for the site and neighborhood. If supported, staff would approve the project at a staff level.

The applicants indicated that they wanted the gate to prevent deer from entering the site and to prevent their children from going out on the busy road. They are growing the English laurels to screen the house. They described the project to the group and presented pictures of the different gates in the neighborhood, as well as pictures that represented the wrought iron work proposed.

No neighbors were present to comment on the project.

The group considered the location of the gate and the gate design. The ADR group found no objection with the plans proposed.

7. **54 Baywood Avenue/Ross and Ligia Parmenter, A.P. Nos. 72-072-29 and 72-072-30, (R-1:B-20)**

Plans for the construction of a 1,198 square foot two-story residence with a 2-car, attached, garage (242 square feet of floor area), a one-car driveway, and expanded road shoulder that provides parking for one additional car. As designed, the project would require Town Council approval of a variance, design review, hillside lot/hazard zone 3 use permit, and tree removal application. A variance is necessary to locate the expanded road shoulder, elevated driveway and pedestrian walkway within the front yard setback (25 feet required, 0 feet proposed). The applicant also proposes to re-grade the roadway so that runoff is directed towards the inside curb, install new concrete curbs along the outside edge of Baywood Avenue along the frontage of the site, and construct one additional parking space within the right-of-way. A tree removal permit would be necessary to allow the removal of a 14" bay tree in the area of the proposed driveway.

Lot area	20,971 square feet
Present Floor Area Ratio	0%
Proposed Floor Area Ratio	6.8% (15% permitted*)
Present Lot Coverage	0%
Proposed Lot Coverage	10.4% (15% permitted)

(\*The slope of this lot is 53%. The hillside lot ordinance would recommend a maximum floor area of 840 square feet.)

The ADR group members and others present in the audience introduced themselves. Richard Hannum recused himself from considering the item, since he is the project architect.

The applicants and their project architects Richard Hannum and Roger Wong were present. Richard Hannum reviewed a model for the project and described its location on the steep slope. He believed they had addressed the issues that had been raised at prior meetings regarding development of this site. The setbacks dictate the location of the house. The project would provide two covered parking spaces and a two bedroom residence. He reviewed the design. He felt the small home provides a prototype missing in Ross and that the project would further the housing policies in the Ross General Plan.

Roger Wong reviewed a digital design for the project on a computer. The project is designed to the topography of the site using a pier and grade beam foundation and minimal cut. A lift system is used in the garage for the cars. There is landscaping between the elements.

In response to questions from Jaqueline Ryan, Baywood, the proposed concrete street curb and drainage plan was discussed and clarified. They propose to change the grade of the road to direct runoff from the 55 Baywood driveway into a detention and dissipation system. No improvements are proposed to the road or drainage beyond the site. He indicated there is an existing drainage problem and the project would not make the drainage worse. He suggested the applicant's engineer speak with the engineer for 50 Baywood.

The project architect indicated the project would not be visible from below and that they are working on final materials. They would build the parking area first and the first floor platform to reduce construction impacts.

John D'Alessio, Crest Road, asked about the fencing proposed at the street. The fence would be transparent. The project architect reviewed the materials proposed for railings.

Neighbors questioned the lot size and if there was a survey. The project architect indicated that Larry Doyle has surveyed the site.

Jeremy Coon, Madera Avenue, asked if there was precedent for allowing projects to exceed the hillside guideline floor area, particularly on hillside sites as steep as this one. Ms. McMillan indicated that the Town had restricted development to the guideline floor area for steep hillside sites. Gary Broad indicated the floor area would be a policy issue that the Council would consider.

## June 26, 2008 Minutes

Ms. McMillan expressed concern with allowing the development to exceed the hillside guideline floor area. She noted the road is narrow, the slope is steep, and the site is small. She was also concerned with the construction impacts that would be associated with this project. She was concerned that residents would feel they were driving through a tunnel between this project and the large driveway retaining wall at 55 Baywood.

Senior Planner Semonian was pleased with the design of the residence but was concerned with the north-east (street) elevation, which the public would view. She was also concerned with the 30 foot tall stucco wall proposed for the north-west elevation of the garage. She would prefer a garage design that was more like the residential portion of the structure. She questioned if the garage width proposed was sufficient.

Elaine Shultz was concerned with the drainage, safety, the condition of the road and traffic impacts. She felt the construction must be innovative in order to address these issues.

Mark Fritz was pleased with the design, including the bridge and car lift.

Jim Kemp felt the large areas of deck add bulk and mass to the structure. He questioned the green wall proposed on the street elevation.

### 8. Discussion of group review procedures.

Due to the late hour, the group postponed discussion of the group review procedures.

### 9. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.