MILL VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 7:00 PM

26 CORTE MADERA AVENUE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

John McCauley - Co-Chair Heidi Richardson - Co-Chair Steve Geiszler - Vice-Chair Ricardo Capretta Chris Skelton

(00:00:12)

CALL TO ORDER

(00:00:21)

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: Time for comments from members of the public on issues not on this Planning Commission agenda. (Limited to 3 minutes per person.)

(00:03:36)

PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR'S ORAL REPORT: Report on items being considered by the City Council.

LIAISON REPORTS: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

(00:10:19)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

It was **M/s** by Co-Chair Richardson/Vice-Chair Geiszler to approve the agenda. The motion was carried 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(00:10:32)

1. 70 Lee Street – Markoff – Design Review– File No. 4037 (Svanstrom) A DESIGN REVIEW hearing for the construction of a new 2-story, 3,774 square foot single-family residence constructed as two detached buildings connected by a partially subterranean lower level, a 511 square foot attached garage, a 250 square foot

detached studio accessory structure and a swimming pool on a 41,367 square foot vacant lot. The subject property is in the RS-20 (Residential Single-Family -20,000 square foot minimum lot size) Zoning District.

70 Lee Street doc

(00:10:34)

Staff Presentation from Senior Planner, Kari Svanstrom

(00:13:58)

Presentation from Owner, Jill Benioff

(00:15:41)

Presentation from Applicant, Architect Antonia Markoff

(00:27:36)

Presentation from Landscape Architect, Jim Bradanini

(00:40:38)

Public Comment

(00:59:14)

Commission Deliberation

(01:13:36)

It was **M/s** by Co-Chair Richardson/Commissioner Skelton to approve the application and find that:

FINAL FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL 70 LEE STREET – APN# 027-042-48 – PL13-4037

- A. The project is Categorically Exempt from the CEQA requirement for the preparation of environmental documents under Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.
 - CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) exempts, "one single-family residence in a single-family zone."
- B. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan and the Municipal Code.
 - The new house is a single-family residential development project consistent with the single-family land use designation in the General Plan. As conditioned, the project meets the height, setback and floor area ratio requirements of the Municipal Code for single-family residences.
- *C.* The proposal is consistent with the residential design guidelines adopted by the City.

The construction of the new residence complies with Design Guideline 1 by using tiers to step the house down along the natural slope of the lot; Design Guideline 3 by maintaining the existing mature trees on site; Design Guideline 6 by providing landscape screening that maximizes privacy between the residence and the Lee Street right-of-way as well as providing a green roof to minimize the impact of the roof on views; Design Guideline 17 by reducing height by lowering the house into the hill to reduce visual impact to the neighbor; and Design Guideline 21 by providing additional guest parking where no onstreet parking is available.

D. The City has considered whether to apply any limitations on building, size, height and setbacks pursuant to Section 20.66.045.

No limitations have been placed on the project pursuant to Section 20.66.045.

FINAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL 70 LEE STREET – APN# 027-042-48 – PL13-4037

PLANNING DEPARTMENT: Any questions, contact Kari Svanstrom 415-388-4033 x 4805

- 1. Floor plans and building elevations shall be in substantial conformance with plans prepared by Markoff / Fullerton Architects dated and received by Planning Department August 14, 2013 on file with the Mill Valley Planning and Building Department, except as modified by these conditions of approval:
 - a. The fireplace shall be relocated out of the (rear) interior setback.
 - b. No retaining walls above 18 inches shall be allowed within the setbacks.
 - c. The house shall be raised 1 foot in height above natural grade to reduce the amount of off-haul.
 - d. Off-haul shall be limited to a maximum of 500 cubic yards (bank yards).
 - e. All retaining walls shall be 6 feet tall or lower.
 - f. Retaining walls may be up to, but may not exceed, 8 feet in height.

 Retaining walls proposed to be raised from 6 feet to 8 feet shall be reviewed and approved by City staff.
- 2. An "Off-haul Phasing Plan" shall be developed by the applicant and submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to receiving a building or grading permit. This plan shall be coordinated with the Lee Street Homeowner Association and their representatives to the satisfaction of the City. As part of this plan, the following conditions shall be met:
 - a. All soils to be removed must be stored on site at 70 Lee until in a location that is screened from the right-of-way until removal.
 - b. Removal of off-haul from site is limited to between the hours of 9:30 and 2:30 p.m. with a maximum of four truckloads per day.
 - c. The applicant shall maintain records demonstrating compliance with these requirements (receipts for truck loads from receiver of soils).

Conditions Requiring Compliance Prior to Issuance of Building Permits

- 3. Except as otherwise modified by these conditions of approval, plans submitted to the Building Department for plan check shall be in substantial conformance with those approved by the Planning Commission. Any changes to the approved Design Review plans, including changes to windows or the demolition plan, must be reviewed with and approved by the Planning Department prior to submitting for a building permit or a revision to the building permit. Any changes must be clearly highlighted (with a "bubble" or "cloud") on plans submitted to the Planning Department. A list describing in detail all such changes shall be submitted and attached to the plans. Any changes that have not been explicitly approved by the Planning Department are not valid and may be subject to stop work orders and/or require removal.
- 4. All conditions of approval shall be included on the front sheet of the construction drawing submitted for a building permit.

- 5. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit Green Building Compliance Form, which includes a signature page for the certifying agency (Build it Green or LEED) to confirm Design Conformance based on the Green Building Checklist submitted during the planning application. The project plans referenced in Condition #1 show the project has targeted 160 points on the Green Point Blueprint Scoresheet.
- 6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, on the proposed project, the applicant shall arrange a pre-construction meeting with staff that shall be attended by Mill Valley staff, the owner, contractor and all sub-contractors to review these conditions of approval, permitted hours of operation etc.
- 7. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a sign shall be posted in a location where the sign is clearly readable from the public right-of-way. The sign shall adhere to the City's Construction Management Plan regulations for size and information to be included on this plan.

Conditions Requiring Compliance Prior to Final Inspection/Occupancy

8. Site landscaping shall be in substantial conformance with the Landscape Plan on file with the Mill Valley Planning and Building Department. The final landscape plan shall be stamped by a licensed landscape architect and filed with the Planning Department prior to occupancy. Plans for any irrigation of the site shall be incorporated into the landscape plan. All planting shown on the approved plan shall be installed prior to occupancy of the proposed residence. Upon the discretion of the Planning Director, installation may be suitably guaranteed by posting a cash bond equal to 100% of the cost and installation of any landscape improvements.

General Conditions

- 9. The applicant shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City, its officers, agents and employees (collectively "the City") from any and all claims, actions, lawsuits, damages, losses and liabilities arising or resulting from the granting of this permit by the City, the performance of the use authorized by this permit or the exercise of the rights granted by this permit. The applicant's obligation to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City shall include, but not be limited to, paying all fees and costs incurred by legal counsel of the City's choice in representing the City in connection with any such claims, actions or lawsuits, any expert fees, and any award of damages, judgments, verdicts, court costs or attorneys' fees in any such claim, action or lawsuit.
- 10. The light source of all exterior lighting fixtures shall be shielded from adjacent properties.
- 11. The project shall comply with all applicable Energy Efficiency Regulations in the Mill Valley Municipal Code.
- 12. All portions of the job site in view of the public and immediately adjacent neighbors shall be maintained in an orderly condition. All trash, debris, construction scraps and broken

or unused machinery shall be removed from the site at the end of each work week. Construction materials not used within two weeks of their delivery date shall be screened from public view. All sidewalks, driveways and public/private roadways fronting the subject site shall be broom cleaned at the end of each work day.

- 13. Prior to pouring a foundation, the applicant shall have the property lines string lined and marked by a licensed surveyor.
- 14. The hours of construction activity, including the use of power tools, shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Construction is not allowed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.

FIRE DEPARTMENT: Any questions, contact Tom Welch, Fire Marshal, 389-4130

- 15. VMP provided with a copy taken for the file. Prior to approval or issuance of a building permit, applicant shall provide a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) in compliance with Fire Department Standard 220. Please contact Battalion Chief Barnes with any questions at 389-4130.
- 16. This project is within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Zone as established by City Ordinance and shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance 1245 (Fire Code) and 1228 (WUI Code).
- 17. Fire Sprinklers:

A fire sprinkler system shall be provided for:

- a. All new construction.
- b. Fire sprinkler coverage shall be provided through the entire structure as per Uniform Fire Code Section 1001.9.
- c. Plans for fire sprinkler system design and hydraulic calculations shall be completed by a licensed C-16 sprinkler contractor and submitted to the Mill Valley Fire Department for approval prior to installation. Fire sprinkler system design and installation shall conform to the provisions of the Mill Valley Fire Department and N.F.P.A. Standard 13D.
- 18. The address shall be posted in accordance with requirements of the California Building Code, Uniform Fire Code, and Fire Department Standard 205. Final inspection and signoff of address posting shall be coordinated through the Building Department.
- 19. Smoke and CO detectors shall be installed in accordance with the California Building Code. Final inspection and signoff of smoke and CO detectors shall be coordinated through the Building Department.
- 20. Noncombustible roofing shall be provided for:

a. All new roofs shall be non-combustible.

NOTE: A "noncombustible" roof is a Class A roof (for other than Group R Occupancies, a Class A or Class A assembly) as defined in the Uniform Building Code and approved by the Building Department.

- 21. Final occupancy approval shall not be granted by the Fire Department unless all conditions have been met.
- 22. Fire Department and City personnel shall be granted access to private driveways and private roadways in order to enforce applicable ordinances related to fire codes, municipal and penal codes pertaining to maintaining road access for emergency vehicles.
- 23. To avoid inspection delays by the Fire Department, all requests must be made at least 48 hours in advance.
- 24. All permits and/or inspection fees required by the Fire Department shall be paid in full prior to final occupancy being granted.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS: Any questions, contact Tim McSorley, 388-4033

- 25. GENERAL A construction management plan/schedule is required from Department of Public Works as part of the building permit submittal and prior to building permit approval and shall be incorporated into the job set of plans. This plan shall be a binding document; failure to adhere to the plan may result in stoppage of the project. This plan shall be updated as project conditions may change. Updates to plan shall be provided to the Department of Public Works. Plan / schedule shall include (but not be limited to) work schedule (intended start of construction date, road or lane closure intent/dates, important milestones and proposed final dates), storage type and location and travel routes.
- 26. DRAINAGE All site drainage shall be dissipated in a manner that prevents erosion and conforms to current storm water discharge practices in Marin County. The applicant is responsible for ensuring storm water runoff is maintained in its natural path.
- 27. The applicant shall provide a hydraulic report prepared by a civil engineer, which includes the following:
 - a. Determination of watershed area containing proposed development.
 - b. Hydraulic grade line to creek (where appropriate).
 - c. Watercourse capacity.
 - d. Drainage rate quantities (existing and proposed).
 - e. Culvert design calculations.
 - f. Runoff calculations to determine increased flow from impervious surface areas.
 - g. Necessary mitigation from any increased flow.

- 28. Final drainage improvements shall be prepared by a Civil Engineer, and reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuing a Building Permit. Drainage improvements shall implement Low Impact Development standards. These shall include but not be limited to no increase runoff, maintain natural drainage patterns, no concentration of flows, allowing drainage to flow naturally and to percolate and mimic existing and sheet flow conditions. All stormwater runoff lines must be discharged in a manner that conforms to the current stormwater discharge practices in Marin County.
- 29. As a part of the drainage analysis, a percolation report will be required to properly determine the required sizes of the three infiltration trenches.
- 30. Rock rip-rap outfalls shall be located as far from property lines as possible and shall be designed to mimic existing drainage conditions (i.e. sheet flow, velocity dissipater, etc.)
- 31. Drainage improvements shall be installed as per the recommendation of the soils evaluation prepared for the proposed project and reviewed by the Department of Public Works.
- 30. Since drainage is not codified, but controlled by civil law, an Attorney should be consulted to verify that any proposed concentration of water that is currently sheet flowing over the property will not result in legal liability for the applicant.
- 31. All stormwater runoff lines (such as building downspout lines, landscape drain lines, etc.) must be discharged in a manner that conforms to the current stormwater discharge practices in Marin County.
- 32. STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION Applicant is responsible for ensuring that contractor uses Best Management Practices for the Construction Industry ("General Construction and Site Supervision" brochure available at the Department of Public Works) to prevent storm drain pollution. Applicant shall be responsible for any environmental damage caused by his/her contractors or employees.
- 33. SOILS AND GRADING –Grading is considered to be any movement of earthen materials necessary for the completion of the project that is not covered under a required building permit such as (but not limited to) miscellaneous site grading, grading for driveways, walkways and landscaping. Proposed grading activity shall comply with the requirements of Section 14.32 of the Municipal Code and are subject to the review and approval of the Department of Public Works.
 - a. All exposed areas resulting from excavation and grading shall be seeded or planted with appropriate vegetation and maintained until established to prevent erosion.
 - b. A Grading Permit is required from Department of Public Works <u>for site grading</u>. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of Section 14.32 of the Municipal Code (copies available at the Public Works office) by providing the Department of Public Works with the following:

Note: The applicant should submit the application and all supporting documents at least two weeks prior to the scheduled start of construction in order to avoid delay.

- i. A site map, foundation plan and grading plan.
- ii. A completed Grading Permit Application.
- iii. Submit 3 copies of the soil engineers report to the Department of Public Works along with 2 copies of the site plan showing the outline of the proposed structure, cross sections, a foundation plan if available, and \$1,500 refundable deposit to cover actual cost of peer review by City-retained soils engineer.
- iv. A construction schedule.
- v. A grading security for \$5,000 shall be submitted in the form of a Certificate of Deposit (CD) or cash to cover grading, drainage, and erosion control. Contact the Department of Public Works for details.
- c. An erosion control plan, which includes a signed statement by the soils engineer that erosion control is in accordance with CAQSA standards. The erosion control plan shall demonstrate protection of disturbed soil from rain and surface runoff and demonstrate sediment controls as a "back-up" system. (Temporary seeding and mulching or straw matting are effective controls.). This plan shall be part of the building permit submittal and is subject to review/approval by the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of the building permit.
- d. The Soils Engineer shall provide a letter to the Department of Public Works certifying that all grading and drainage has been constructed according to plans filed with the grading permit and his/her recommendations. Any changes in the approved grading and drainage plans shall be certified by the Soils Engineer and approved by the Department of Public Works. No modifications to the approved plans shall be made without approval of the Soils Engineer and the Department of Public Works.
- e. The existing vegetation shall not be disturbed until landscaping is installed or erosion control measures, such as straw matting, hydroseeding, etc, are implemented.
- 34. OFF-STIE IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS All improvements within the shall be in accordance with the Uniform Construction Standards of All Cities and County of Marin unless noted otherwise herein.
- 35. ENCROACHMENTS A Revocable Encroachment Permit is required from the Public Works Department for all work within the right-of-way. A Revocable Encroachment Permit shall be recorded at the Marin County Recorder's Office prior to any construction in the right-of-way.
- 36. SEWAGE SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS The applicant shall obtain a sewer connection permit from the Department of Public Works. The fee for this permit is \$5,000 for a

- single family home. Inspection fees may be added to the basic connection fee.
- 37. MATERIAL STORAGE All construction materials, debris, and equipment shall be stored on site. If that is not physically possible, an encroachment permit shall be obtained from the Department of Public Works prior to placing any construction materials, debris, debris boxes or unlicensed equipment in the right-of-way. The fee for using the right-of-way for storage of construction materials or equipment is \$10.00 per day in residential areas, and \$20.00 per day in commercial areas. A minimum of 12' clearance shall be maintained at all times along the roadway. The placing of portable restroom facilities in the City right-of-way will not be permitted.
- 38. ROAD IMPACT FEE All Projects with a construction value of \$10,000 or more will be charged a fee of 1% of the building permit value.
- 39. TREES AND VEGETATION Trees and vegetation shall be trimmed according to Section 11.24.090 of the Mill Valley Municipal Code. Trees and shrubs shall be kept trimmed so that the lowest branches projecting over public properties provide a clearance of not less than eight (8) feet. Bushes and other vegetation shall be trimmed so no portion hangs over the sidewalk or the road if no sidewalk is present.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT: Any questions, contact Dan Martin, 388-4033

40. The project shall be subject to the 2012 California Building, Plumbing, Electrical, Mechanical, Energy, and other applicable Title 24 codes.

Expiration of Approval

- 41. This approval shall expire one year from the date of approval unless a building permit has been issued. Prior to the expiration of a design review approval, the applicant may apply to the Director of Planning and Building for a one-year extension from the date of expiration. The Director of Planning and Building may make minor modifications of the approved design at the time of extension if he/she finds that there has been a substantial change in the factual circumstances surrounding the originally approved design. If building permit is issued during the effective life of the design review approval, the expiration date of the design review approval shall be automatically extended to coincide with the expiration date of the building permit.
- 42. This approval is effective from the date of approval until the building permit is issued and shall expire one year after approval should a building permit not be issued.

The motion was carried 5/0.

(01:16:43)

2. 14 Escalon – Turnbull Griffin Haesloop – Study Session – File No. 4105 (Zanarini) A STUDY SESSION to consider the Design Review plans to demolish an existing 3,485 square foot single-family residence with a 488 square foot garage and construct a new 3,605 square foot single-family residence with a 722 square foot attached second unit and a 1,001 square foot attached 4-car garage. A Variance is required to locate the garage in the interior (rear) yard setback. The subject property is in the RS-20 (Residential Single-Family – 20,000 square foot minimum lot size) Zoning District.

14 Escalon doc

(01:20:07)

Presentation from Applicant, Architect Mary Griffin

(01:24:25)

Presentation from Applicant, Architect Jerome Christensen

(01:49:09)

Public Comment

None.

(01:49:25)

Commission Deliberation

Co-Chair Richardson began by stating this is an attractive project on a difficult site. She said she does not object to the amount of west facing glass, which is normally cut back when there are open railings. She stated she does not object to the garage variances because it is a good use for the site, it improves the outlook from the public path, it is a green roof, and because it is such a difficult site the findings could be made. She said she is fine with the side yard because the applicants own both properties in question.

Commissioner Skelton stated he doesn't have any real issues with this property. He said he doesn't have a problem with the west facing glass. He said he doesn't have an issue with the variance for 12 Escalon and could also easily make the findings for the rear yard variance because it is such a difficult site. He applauds the applicant's efforts to not only conceal the cars from the fire trail but also to make it aesthetically pleasing by incorporating a green roof. He likes the observatory and is impressed with the sliding rail system.

Vice-Chair Geiszler stated he also doesn't have an issue with the west facing glass because it is in keeping with other homes in the neighborhood that have two- and three-story mainly glass facades facing the view. He said a grading plan will be needed but he doesn't think the walls and pathways proposed for 12 Escalon would be beyond 18 inches above natural grade. He said he does not like variances, that there are many properties in the hills that are difficult sites and here there is a huge storage area but the garage isn't in it as it is at 12 Escalon where cars pull straight in. He also noted there is a four-car garage, which doesn't necessitate a variance. He likes the

green roof, which hides the cars, although the cars are seen more from the subject property than from Escalon. However, he noted the backup space is 32 feet from the face of the garage to the edge of the paving and there is opportunity to extend the flat area, so if the applicant decided to put the garage in that location he would not have an issue with site configuration where the garage could be pushed so it is out of the setback and either extend the flat area or reduce the backup or some combination thereof. He also suggested some of the garage could be put in the large amount of storage space under the house. He said the findings for a garage variance are not proven just because it is steep site. He said with the exception of the variance he is behind the project. He said when the Commission looks at the stairs he would be interested to see what those heights are. He likes the swimming pool in that location. He also likes that the house is being kept lower.

Commissioner Capretta agreed with Vice-Chair Geiszler that a 32-foot driveway is very large for backup purposes and he stated he also does not support a variance, saying that a variance for a four-car garage is unprecedented in Mill Valley's history. He noted the garage is 23 feet deep, which could be lessened, and it could instead be a three-car garage moved to the left, and there would be five or six feet before the house, plus there could be an outdoor parking space where the fourth spot is and a variance would not be needed. He echoed Vice-Chair Geiszler that the enormous storage area could easily be a garage and that if the garage were reduced by a foot and the backup area reduced by two feet there would be a 30 foot backup space and a 22 foot garage, which is generous, so there is no reason for a variance, as well as he would be hard pressed to ever approve a variance for a four-car garage. He stated on the parking he doesn't like where the second unit is located as it does not seem to be a separate second unit and the parking for that second unit needs to be addressed separately. He believes the site layout is appropriate, except for the garage. He said the square footage is fine as long as the codes are met. He said he also thinks the off haul is fine. He noted it is possible the homes could be seen from the Enchanted Knolls neighborhood, so the applicant should ensure the Design Review Guidelines are met. He likes the green roof. Lastly, he noted that the fact that these two homes are owned by the same people cannot have bearing in the approval process, because they are two separately legal parcels that could be owned separately in the future.

Co-Chair McCauley stated that because the large family room downstairs could be converted into bedrooms he is okay with the idea of the second unit being substantial and real, particularly with the new requirements for a robust kitchen, so he is okay with the second unit. He said he was originally fine with the variance for the garage, but after hearing comments from Vice-Chair Geiszler and Commissioner Skelton he would like the applicant to explore the suggested alternative solutions or convince the Commission that they don't work. He said he remained concerned about the FAR calculations and the FAR map and wants to be convinced they are doing everything right. He said without the section through there it is hard to understand why the large component of storage doesn't count, so if it is simply because the roof height will be adjusted he would not favor that because it would contribute to height, bulk and mass and it could be used as garage space as pointed out by his fellow commissioners. With respect to the glazing and the glass, if Eucalyptus Knolls can see it he would like there to be some quieting of the amount of glazing because of its effect at night.

Co-Chair Richardson suggested the applicant consider a three-car garage, pull it forward in the rear, and have only three covered spaces. She said there is still the issue of how the handle the stairs from one to the other, which she is sure the applicant could figure out.

Commissioner Capretta stated the front elevation is long and uninterrupted and more architectural articulation on that elevation should be looked at.

Co-Chair Richardson stated the applicant might want to consider less deep, compact parking spaces on some of the spaces.

Vice-Chair Geiszler agreed with the applicant that there is a difficult turn coming to the property and suggested the retaining wall could be changed, having a slight slope in the parking area and slide the backup area backwards with no grading at all, making access easier because vehicles would not be driving all the way around the retaining wall, and then move the garage forward and have the same solution they have now except with three parking spaces within the setback.

(02:19:33)

3. 275 Sycamore – Haegglund – Study Session – File No. 4107 (Zanarini) A STUDY SESSION to consider the Design Review plans to demolish an existing single-family residence and consideration of a Minor Subdivision to split the lot into two lots to construct a 2,576 square foot 2-story residence with a 363 square foot attached garage at 275 Sycamore Avenue and to also construct a 2,286 square foot 2-story residence with a 306 square foot attached garage on a proposed lot facing Nelson Avenue. The subject property is in the RS-6 (Residential Single-Family – 6,000 square foot minimum lot size) Zoning District.

275 Sycamore Avenue doc

(02:19:47)

Presentation from Owner, Scott Kalmbach

(2:26:10)

Presentation from Applicant, Architect Kelly Haegglund

(03:00:55)

Public Comment

(03:17:17)

Commission Deliberation

Commissioner Skelton began by stating the project needs a substantial redesign due to the frontage requirement under the current zoning requiring they move over seven feet to allow for the setback, which will affect how the Sycamore house addresses the street and its setbacks. He said he generally supports the lot line split because this parcel sticks out in the community and he is in favor of building two new houses to support growing families. He noted that with respect to winning the favor of neighbors and the community that the project does not have the advantage

of mature vegetation on the site to assist in people's imagination of what can be there. He said he would like to see the Sycamore house shifted a foot or two away from the Nelson house to create more separation. He noted there are some height, bulk and mass issues but he has confidence the architect, who has created some beautiful local homes, can find a way to get over those hurdles.

Vice-Chair Geiszler stated he appreciated that the applicant dropped the second floor over the garage so there is variation and the bulk of the upstairs is reduced. He questioned if the proposed galvalume siding is appropriate because it is reflective when facing south and would draw attention to the tall roof. He noted that the height is out of scale to the neighborhood because of the FEMA requirement of four extra feet. He stated he understands the applicant is trying to create a compact house footprint to maximize the yard and open area, but it creates a lot of elevated bulk, so there will have to be some tradeoff of reducing the bulk on the second floor more. He agreed with Commissioner Skelton that they do not have the benefit of mature vegetation to make the house appear nestled in and it appears to be sticking out without those natural elements to pull the height down. He requested that in the Sycamore house closest to the street that there be more richness in the details with grace and articulation. He applauded the applicants for exploring getting rid of the power lines with undergrounding, which would be an enormous benefit for the neighborhood and the people who occupy the homes. He stated he does not have an issue with the driveway for the Sycamore property being that close to the corner because the oncoming traffic is stopped by the stop sign. He summarized by stating that for him it would come down first to wherever the lot line falls and secondly the bulk of the second story on these two projects.

Commissioner Capretta began by encouraging the applicant to include sections in each direction and color and landscape plans for a future study session. He said he supports the lot split as long as the zoning ordinance is met. He appreciated the applicant's community outreach efforts. He said he likes the single-car garage. He agreed with Co-Chair Richardson that the driveway needs to be on the other side of the house. He also stated having the garage on the corner is detrimental to the overall design and feel to the neighborhood. He said there was too much house for the lot and there should be more on the first floor and less on the second floor, because while second stories are allowed they should be pushed back, because the neighborhood character is one-story homes. He stated the 9 foot first floor plates are reasonable. He didn't like that both houses look the same and asked that they be differentiated using different materials, colors, window treatments, etc. He suggested solar panels on the southern side would be a wonderful community statement.

Co-Chair Richardson stated she is not against the lot split but thinks it needs to conform to the zoning requirements of RS-6. She believes the upper story needs to be reduced to conform to the neighborhood character of one-story homes. She said colors would be very important. She wondered if it made sense to push the Sycamore house back from Nelson. She likes how the stepped garage bedroom level is handled. She agreed with Commissioner Capretta that the upstairs should be reduced with more on the first floor.

Co-Chair McCauley echoed the comments of his fellow commissioners. He believes FEMA's 4-foot height elevation requirement is wise because of past flooding in the area. He also agrees that some of the second story should go down to the first floor. He encouraged the applicant to

evaluate the overall size of the property and then tighten up the accuracy of the FAR measurements.

Vice-Chair Geiszler noted that flipping the driveway onto Sycamore would put a car right next to the neighbor and put the yard out on the corner instead of keeping the yard private. He said the Sycamore house takes its relationship from the rear property line, so it is exactly parallel to the Nelson Street house instead of addressing Sycamore Street and if that were tipped to be parallel to Sycamore the house would then splay and there would be more open space between them. With respect to the driveway, he said although one would have to back out of the driveway to get onto the corner he would rather back out there next to a stop sign than 70 feet up when people have gone through the intersection and are accelerating away.

Co-Chair Richardson agreed with Commissioner Capretta's comment about addressing the corner with a garage. She likes the idea of splaying the Sycamore house a bit to loosen up the geometry and the sameness of the designs, and it would also help the back yards on Amicita Avenue to open it up, and would probably help from across Sycamore as well.

Commissioner Skelton said he liked Vice-Chair Geiszler's comment about the angling of the driveway but he still agrees with Co-Chair Richardson that there is a safety issue there. He said there is also an architectural issue there and the applicant should look at the home on Walnut and Park where the garage is away from the corner and the corner has a nice landscape and architectural presentation. He doesn't believe that a garage element would affect the next-door neighbors too badly. He also said that the front yard is already on Sycamore, so if it is moved over towards the corner with a picket fence he doesn't see that as a negative and it could be nice for the neighborhood. He said with respect to the garage, there is not a lot of yard left where the deck is, so if there is a thin driveway there with a garage it could be a good use of that land that is not very usable now.

(03:47:57)

ADJOURN

It was **M/s** by Co-Chair Richardson/Commissioner Skelton to adjourn. The motion was carried 5/0.

Any decision made by the Planning Commission on the above items may be appealed to the City Council by filing a letter with the Planning Department <u>within 10 calendar days</u> describing the basis for the appeal accompanied by the \$250 appeal fee.