

**MINUTES**  
Meeting of the  
Ross Advisory Design Review Group

Thursday, June 4, 2020

Video and audio recording of the meeting is available online at the Town's website at:  
[townofross.org/meetings](http://townofross.org/meetings).

**1. 7:00 p.m. Commencement**

Chair Mark Kruttschnitt called the meeting to order. Josepha Buckingham, Mark Fritts, and Stephen Sutro were present. Dan Winey was absent. Planning and Building Director Patrick Streeter and Planner Matthew Weintraub representing staff were present.

**2. Open Time for Public Comments**

No public comments were submitted.

**3. Old Business – None.**

**4. New Business**

**a. SUBAY, LLC Residence – 1 Upper Road**

**Applicant:** Andrew Mann Architecture

**Owner:** SABUY, LLC

**DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is requesting approval of a Design Review Amendment to revise a previously approved project to add a new box dormer to the east elevation of the main house, and to modify the trash enclosure and wall along Upper Road.

Planner Weintraub introduced the project. Project Architect Andrew Mann and Landscape Architect Todd Cole described the project. No public comments were received. ADR Group Members discussed the merits of the project.

ADR Group Members provided the following comments:

Mark Fritts:

- Characterizes the dormer as an “interesting little folly” with limited to no impacts on neighbors; prefers a “lighter” design.
- Recognizes necessity of adding mass to accommodate PG&E enclosure; acknowledges shielding and screening efforts; not preferred location, but not overly detrimental.
- No issues with wall extension.

Stephen Sutro:

- Supports all of the proposed changes as designed.
- PG&E vault is an extension of the existing approved wall.
- Confirmed that the front wall will be sinuous.

Josefa Buckingham:

- No problem with trash enclosure and PG&E vault, considering pre-existing condition of house footprint.
- Pulling back the wall is a positive; should be screened with landscaping.
- Dormer would not be visible offsite; no strong preferences though prefers more traditional style.

Mark Kruttschnitt:

- Wall adjustment is a positive; electrical enclosure is a negative; in combination, minimal impact.
- Recommends a more traditional style for the dormer.

Chair Summary:

- Unanimous support for wall adjustment and trash enclosure/electrical vault.
- Majority support for the dormer.

The Chair closed the hearing.

**b. Sweeny Residence – 70 Ivy Drive**

**Applicant:** Imprints Landscape Architecture

**Owner:** Charlotte & Doug Sweeny

**DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is requesting approval of a Variance and Design Review to construct a new pool measuring 16 feet by 46 feet (736 square feet) and associated coping, a new 7-foot-tall fence, new stone patios, walkways, and stairs, and a new house deck located within the minimum required yard setbacks for an existing single family residence. The proposed project also includes: constructing new low fences and retaining walls; replacing a decomposed granite patio with a new low-water turf area; replacing the existing driveway; installing new landscape plantings; and removing five trees.

Planner Weintraub introduced the project and summarized public comments received including: 3 written comments stating support (Steve Daane & Sheryl Garrett at 63 Ivy Drive; Julian & Geoff Nichol at 8 Hill Road; Michael & Judy Phillips at 59 Ivy Drive); 1 written comment stating objection primarily based on concerns about potential privacy impacts (Melinda & Ward Ching at 102 Ivy Drive); 1 written comment stating both general support, and concern about potential construction impacts on circulation and the road surface (Andrea & Daniel Elkort at 100 Ivy Drive). Landscape Architect Brad Eigsti described the project and addressed the public comments. Property owners Charlotte & Doug Sweeny described the background and intent of the project. Ward Ching at 102 Ivy Drive provided

public comment stating objection regarding concerns about potential privacy impacts. ADR Group Members discussed the merits of the project.

ADR Group Members provided the following comments:

Stephen Sutro:

- “Unresolved” on the project.
- There are previous examples of pools being approved in setbacks on constrained lots.
- Setbacks are intended to provide noise and activity buffers for pools (in addition to mitigating for building bulk and mass).
- The side property line is being respected within the tight quarters.
- Concerned about the neighbor’s claim of potential “injury”; would like to see more collaboration on noise mitigation between neighbors.

Mark Kruttschnitt:

- Prefers to avoid new construction within setbacks, primarily for privacy and noise; however, in this case the encroachment is adjacent to a street, not a neighbor.
- The subject lot has an unusual shape that restricts conforming development.
- ADR Group advised on Design Review, not Variances.
- The design is lovely.
- The applicant could move the pool 30 feet to the east and 5 feet to the north, which would involve reconfiguring the entry steps. This would be a more ideal location with respect to impacting the neighbor.

Josefa Buckingham:

- Strict setback rules create many nonconforming situations in Ross.
- Pool sites add value to properties.
- Street setback encroachment does not impact anyone; the concern is potential impacts to the neighbor.
- The applicant could change the residential entry in order to move the pool further east away from the neighbor. The pool dimensions could also be reduced.
- Questions the use of setbacks for pools based on the number of nonconforming situations.
- “Lukewarm” on the project.

Mark Fritts:

- Finds it “difficult to get on board with the proposal”
- There is no other better location on the property for the pool.
- The distance between the pool and the neighbor could be increased.
- Applicant may investigate using berms/walls for noise mitigation
- Recommends moving the west edge of the pool away further from the neighbor
- Does not support in current design due to potential negative impacts; encourages further discussion with the neighbor on potential noise mitigation.

Chair Summary:

The overall recommendation of the ADR Group is to not support the pool in its current configuration due to the setbacks, and to attempt to move the pool to increase setbacks.

The Chair continued the hearing.

**5. Communications**

**a. Staff**

Director Streeter announced the June 16, 2020 ADR Group Regular Meeting; and reported ADR Group Member current term end dates and upcoming announcement for open positions.

**b. Advisory Design Review Group – None.**

**6. Approval of Minutes – None.**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:29 PM.