

MEETING NOTES
ROSS ADVISORY DESIGN REVIEW GROUP
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 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, Richard Hannum and Mark Fritts were present. Town staff were Gary Broad, Town Manager, and Dani Hamilton, Senior Planner.

2. Posting of Agenda.

The agenda was posted according to government code.

3. Approval of Minutes of October 23, 2008.

The draft meeting minutes of October 23, 2008 ADR meeting were unavailable. No action was taken.

4. Open Time for Public Expression.

There was no public input.

5. 205 Lagunitas Road/Lagunitas Country Club, A.P. Number: 73-211-40 (R-1: B-A)

Amendment to an existing use permit to allow the operation of a recreational club to permit addition of a third paddle tennis court in close proximity to the existing two courts. The 60.5 foot long by 30 foot wide court will have 14' high fencing with steel tubing and a hexagonal wire mesh. Four 22-foot high pole mounted, downward directed Halide lights are proposed at the court perimeter (a use permit is required for nighttime lighting and use.) Design Review is required for 690 cubic yards of cut and construction of two, terraced retaining walls totaling 224' in length, maximum height 4 feet.

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Lot area | 1,223,333 square feet | 28.08 acres |
| Existing Floor Area Ratio | .006% | |
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | .006% | (15% permitted) |
| Existing Lot Coverage | .008% | |
| Proposed Lot Coverage | .010% | (15% permitted) |

Shay Zack, project architect, presented plans showing comparative elevations for several possible locations for new paddle court, and calling out the preferred new location close to the easternmost existing court. Also representing the Lagunitas Country Club were Tom Mayes, and John Pogue, club president. Plans presented at the meeting had been revised since distribution of the packets to show corrected elevation measurements at the surface of the existing courts and the proposed court. The ADR group agreed to review and comment on revised plans.

Public comments were received from Miriam Montesinos, attorney with Sheppard Mullin, representing the Gabrielsons at 2 Glenwood Avenue. The Gabrielsons object to the new paddle

November 20, 2008 Meeting Notes

court because the proposed lighting would increase the negative effects of light and glare. Ms. Montesinos had previously submitted a letter with four reasons for denying the project. Jim Owen, the neighbor at 200 ½ Lagunitas Road questioned whether a western location had been considered.

The overall discussion focused on issues of court placement, light, glare, and noise, as well as effects of grading and construction. The lighting discussion focused on the angle, amount, and direction of perimeter lights on the existing paddle courts and the need to mitigate the existing problems of light and glare in conjunction with plans for the new paddle court.

The ADR group concurred that the applicants had not addressed the negative effects of the proposed lighting, and strongly encouraged them to do so. They discussed doing a mockup of the lighting. The ADR group suggested that the height of the surface of the paddle tennis court be lowered since the 36' clearance is provided on the pre-fabricated structures to allow installation of floor heaters which are unnecessary in this setting. The ADR group further noted that a soils report would be needed when the project goes to Town Council for consideration.

6. **19 Brookwood/ Les Sherman and Patricia Duffy, A.P. Number: 73-311-02 (R-1: B-10)**
Demolition of existing garage, removal of 1,000 square feet of paving, conversion of unfinished basement area into a residential second unit and construction of a new, two car garage partially underneath the existing residence. Garage doors would face the street, accessed by a new, split driveway. Exterior changes to the existing, non-conforming residence include addition of architectural details to the building including trim and eaves. The existing residence is non-conforming with regard to building height and front yard setbacks pursuant to a variance approved in 1996. Based on the draft plans, the project would require design review for exterior changes to the existing residence plus an addition of 1,129 square feet to an existing residence, and a variance to exceed the maximum 20% permitted Floor Area Ratio.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Lot area | 17,119 square feet |
| Existing Floor Area Ratio | 3,435 square feet (20%) |
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | 4,564 square feet (26.6%) (20% permitted*) |
| Existing Lot Coverage | 2,599 square feet (15.2%) |
| Proposed Lot Coverage | 15% (20% permitted) |

Architect Greg Johnson presented the project to the ADR group. Property owners Les Sherman and Patricia Duffy were also present. The discussion centered on two main considerations: proposed architectural details on the existing house, and the configuration of the new garage. The ADR group suggested that the existing gambrel design of the roof ends is soft and that proposed decorative elements clutter the original design. They wanted to see the historic context preserved. The group also asked the applicant to consider re-orienting the garage entrance away from the street in order to retain the foliage between the driveway entrance and the house. The applicant agreed to re-work the design to include simpler details on the existing house and to put the garage doors on the north side of the house. ADR requested the architect to calculate basement

exposure to determine whether the ground level addition counts as a third story. The ADR group indicated general support of the concept of the project, and appreciated that the additional FAR and second unit do not noticeably change the perceived mass and scale of the existing home.

7. **191 Lagunitas Road/Paris and Martha Royo, A.P. Number: 73-211-06 (R-1: B-5A)**
Application to demolish an existing single family residence, guest house, pool and cabana, and remove 5 trees, all under 18" in diameter. Proposal to construct a new

10,504 square foot (including basement level garage) single family home, swimming pool, 2,000 square foot guesthouse with two bedrooms, workout room, kitchenette/bar, and wine cave. The existing garage and shed, both located within required side yard setback, are proposed to remain. 2,750 cubic yards of cut are proposed.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Lot area | 136,289.2 square feet |
| Existing Floor Area Ratio | 6,145 square feet (4.5%) |
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | 12,904 square feet (9.4%) (15% permitted) |
| Existing Lot Coverage | 2.7% |
| Proposed Lot Coverage | 4.8% (15% permitted) |

The slope of the lot is approximately 35%. This project is subject to Town Hillside Lot Regulations.

Project architect Marty Zwick made a presentation to the ADR group. The group encouraged the applicant to redesign the project, taking into consideration the following:

- This is a really ambitious house and proposed design presents massing issues on the north, east, and west elevations where there are expanses of blank wall with very small windows. It has a commercial sense of proportion and the sense of repose is missing. Would need to see stone coming out of ground in more detail. There is a really big retaining wall at the rear.
- The house is oriented toward the interior and ignores the natural setting of the site.
- Important features of the project were omitted from the elevations submitted for Town and ADR group review, including the tunnel entrance to the driveway, the existing garage and shed proposed to remain, and the retaining wall that would be required to hold back the hillside south of the house and pool.
- The ambitious nature of the house necessitates a model, perspective drawings, and other visual aids to convey the intended character of the design.
- Have a row house sitting in the middle of the woods since setbacks have been respected. House could work its way in and out instead. Pavilion could be further apart to create more of a sense of a courtyard. The arrival area has too many parts and could be much simpler.
- Cisterns are great, but would want to see a drainage report.
- Section drawings (existing and proposed) should include the n/s length of the area to be developed, including the front yard, house, swimming pool, guest house, and wine cave.
- Look at the rules for fire defensible space.

November 20, 2008 Meeting Notes

8. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.