

MINUTES
Meeting of the
Ross Advisory Design Review Group

Tuesday, December 6, 2016

1. 7:05 p.m. Commencement

Advisory Design Review Group members Mark Fritts, Chris Nuemann, Joey Buckingham, and Dan Winey were present. Heidi Scoble was present representing staff.

2. Open Time for Public Comments-

ADR Group Member Nelson requested for the second time that there be an agenda item to address the Brown Act, a discussion regarding why the October 2016 meeting was cancelled, and requested the Draft November minutes include his comments.

3. Approval of minutes-

November 15, 2016 minutes continued to the January 24, 2017 meeting.

4. Old Business- *None*

5. New Business

a. Jones Residence, 103 Lagunitas Road (Application No. 2016-048)

The project architect, Wendy Posard, provided a presentation explaining the proposed design of the residence, which included the demolition and new construction of a single family residence. Ms. Posard stated that the mass and bulk calculations associated with the project are essentially the same as what is existing, but the architectural features are shifted around.

The following members of the community provided testimony as follows:

1. Richard Tormey, 2 Allen Lane. Stated he has concerns the project would block light and air, impact privacy, would create a loss of view of the ridgelines.
2. Gail Conway, 107 Lagunitas, supported the project.

In general, the ADR Group identified significant concerns regarding the project as follows:

1. Concerned with the impact of the design relative to the public vantage points.
2. Concerned the massing of the project would be out scale with the project site and the neighboring residents.
3. Concerned with how close the story poles were located to all property lines.

4. Concerned the siting of the residence relative to the parcel and the architecture appeared to be out of balance.
5. Concerned pushing the residence closer to the street would disrupt the pattern along the streetscape.
6. Concerned that visually the house appears much bigger than it is.
7. Concerned the project was too large for the parcel and that it would be better suited on a larger parcel.
8. Concerned with the height of the project.
9. Concerned with the location of the garage within the front property lines.
10. Concerns the Historic Preservation letter prepared for the project underestimates the architectural significance of the residence.
11. Recommended property lines should be staked to understand the project story poles relative to the property boundaries.
12. Recommended any parking associated with the site should be located in the back.
13. Recommended that the future design of the project would consider the fabric and rhythm of the built neighborhood.
14. Recommended the applicant rehabilitate the existing home or at least consider an “L” shape design that is balanced with the narrow parcel.

6. Communications- *None*

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.