

1 Commissioner Chair Ateljevich closed the public hearing and called for Commission comment and
2 action.

3 Commissioner Chastain mentioned that changing the pitch would only change it by about a foot and
4 that is not significant enough to warrant the change. He didn't see this as something that would fix the
5 problem. If one were to shift the roof, Commissioner Chastain didn't see how that would affect the
6 appearance of the house and the appearance of the view. The plate height of 9 feet is something to
7 consider (on the drawing it actually says 9 feet 4 inches). This might be a concern if they are trying to
8 set the building as low as possible.

9 Chair Ateljevich spoke about the amount of birch trees to be added, and said that they will get tall.
10 There are existing birches already on the site (six of them), and that if one were to change the
11 landscape that is what should be changed. She didn't see this as a site that would be seen in the
12 context of a natural setting such that one should be planting trees because of their impact on the hills.
13 But one shouldn't plant tall trees on this site. The rest of the planning is sensible for this kind of area.
14 It shouldn't require final review of the landscape plan, and in fact they have used some native trees,
15 perennials and landscape shrubs. But there is no need for the Commission to change that. It would
16 be nice to continue the same birch pattern as the one that was started but of a reasonable quantity.

17 Commissioner Mitchell mentioned that he walked around the site, and he tried to visualize what
18 difference 2.5 feet would make. And in general, he found that the roof change would not make much
19 of a difference. Both Commissioner Mitchell and Chair Ateljevich felt that it was considered a low roof
20 and not something that would create a great impact. Vice Chair Mitchell's only comments included to
21 rethink the color board and the bright white color trim, and bring the height from 9 feet 4 inches to 9
22 feet.

23 Commissioner Humann agreed that the Commission offered that the City does not enforce the CC
24 and Rs. The Commission asked staff if the Homeowners Association is registered with the City and
25 how would one handle the claim that the owners did not approach the Homeowners Association. Ms.
26 Coburn responded that Chapel Drive HOA is registered with the City and she believed the notices
27 were sent to the Association and she would double check to see if they were sent a referral.

28 Commissioner Humann and Chair Ateljevich both concurred with Vice Chair Mitchell. Vice Chair
29 Mitchell stated that a small amount of the view of the freeway would be blocked, but there wouldn't be
30 a loss to the view of Mt. Diablo.

31 Chair Ateljevich asked about the birch trees, and said that they will get about 25-30 feet high, and
32 suggested that if there weren't existing trees, she would have recommended a change of the pattern.
33 But since they already exist, and they are lacey, not dense, the applicant should continue this pattern
34 but should possibly reduce the number that they plant. They should voluntarily bring this issue
35 forward to the Homeowner's Association. Commissioner Chair Ateljevich asked the architect if they
36 would consider reducing the amount of proposed birches— plant only 3 versus the listed 7 new
37 (working with the Homeowner's Association).

38 Vice Chair Mitchell asked the other commissioners if they had a problem with the color palette. The
39 Commission commented that this neighborhood is a subdivision style that does not have earth-toned
40 colors to begin with. Staff concurred and stated that normally they prefer not to have such a contrast
41 between the trim and the wood, but in this circumstance there is not a significant offsite visibility and
42 may not warrant a change in trim color.

43 Ms. Coburn questioned whether the Commission concurred with Vice Chair Mitchell's comment
44 regarding the maximum plate height of 9 feet to include in the motion.

45 Vice Chair Mitchell moved to approve resolution 2006-06 approving HDP103-05 with conditions
46 including the landscape change and the maximum height of 9 feet. Commissioner Humann seconded
47 the motion, which was carried by unanimous vote (4-0).

48 **B. HDP18-05 WARD-YOUNG ARCHITECTS (APPLICANT), PAUL & ALISON COCOTIS**
49 **(OWNERS) R-20 ZONING:** Request for: (1) Hillside Development Permit pursuant to Section
50 6-2015 of the Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC); (2) An exception to permit development within

1 a Class II Ridgeline Setback pursuant to Section 6-2027; (3) Design Review approval pursuant
2 to Sections 6-1903 & 6-271; and (4) Grading Permit pursuant to Chapter 3-7, to construct a
3 one-story, single-family residence in the Hillside Overlay District, located on a vacant lot at 11
4 Hawk Canyon Place. APN 238-190-002

5 **Recommendation:** Adopt resolution 2006-05 approving HDP18-05 with conditions.

6 **Project Planner:** Glenda Warmoth

7 Color photographs handed out, diagrams hung up and model brought to the center of the room.

8 Greg Wolff presented for Glenda Warmoth, as she was out of the country.

9 Mr. Wolff stated that the existing legal lot of record was created in 1978 when the Lafayette Planning
10 Commission approved the minor subdivision. The other three lots have been developed and lot
11 number four is the last and remaining vacant lot. The existing conditions on the site are that it is a
12 hilltop. The entirety of the site is 5.87 acres, although the developable portion of the site is
13 significantly smaller than that, and is constrained to the top of the lot. In April 2005 the Planning
14 Commission considered three possible sites on the property. The applicant prepared a constraints
15 and opportunities analysis including slope, offsite visibility and soils. The Commission concluded that
16 the proposed site A was the best building site on the property and at the time, the Commission
17 directed the applicant to illustrate any increase in offsite impacts and that would be created for a
18 home that would be larger than 4000 square feet. A home of 4000 square feet was set as a threshold
19 above which they would need to demonstrate any additional view impacts.

20 Prior to the Planning Commission's siting determination, the applicant attended a study session with
21 the Design Review Commission in September 2004. At the time, the Commission gave three points of
22 direction: to place the building to the rear of the hilltop, tucked up against the oak trees; to mitigate
23 the driveway and building through landscaping; and to keep the building height as low as possible.
24 Following the siting determination at the Planning Commission in April, the applicant went through
25 design development and returned to the Design Review Commission in November, 2005 illustrating a
26 project covering roughly 6700 square feet of gross floor area in a one-story elevation profile. The
27 Design Review Commission provided feedback to the applicant, asking them to:

- 28 - Demonstrate sufficient landscape screening for the house and outdoor areas
- 29 - Address concerns by the Commission about the amount of grading and manipulation of the
30 south side of the knoll
- 31 - Identify and illustrate current and future outdoor living area to take another look at proposed
32 planting that was illustrated to screen the driveway
- 33 - Eliminate driveway lights (or demonstrate their need)
- 34 - Take another look at the size of the house and answer how it fits the developable portion of
35 the site
- 36 - Be able to illustrate to the Commission how the project does when compared to a 4000 square
37 foot development on the property

38 The applicant came back in January to the Design Review Commission and addressed each of those
39 items. Ultimately the Design Review Commission at the time recommended to the Planning
40 Commission approval of the project and they offered ten points of comment and concern. Mr. Wolff
41 referred the Commission to the middle of page four of the staff report. Staff has asked the applicant to
42 address those issues in their presentation to the Commission tonight.

43 With respect to the environmental analysis, staff determined that the project, being a single-family
44 residence on an existing lot, is exempt from CEQA. There has been a fair to significant amount of
45 public comments that have been submitted since the initial study session, Planning Commission
46 hearing and Design Review hearing. Those are included and attached to the staff report. There have
47 been some additional letters and they have been forwarded to the Commission via email and they
48 have also been copied and printed and placed on the dais. There are 7 letters and the cover letter is

1 from Ward-Young Architects. There was a letter submitted in December that outlines the changes
2 that have been made in response to the City and Commission's comments and concerns.

3 When the Design Review Commission last saw the project, there was a proposed pedestrian bridge
4 spanning a driveway cut. While that wasn't fully banked as an idea, the Commission wanted it fully
5 detailed, the applicant offered to show offsite visibility. At this point, they have eliminated the
6 pedestrian bridge, and revised vehicular access to the garage. The landscape berm has been broken
7 into two smaller sections. The site plan has been updated to reflect the grading revisions. The site
8 sections have been revised to better show the existing topography. The floor plans have not changed
9 since the first design meeting. The project constitutes a 5335 square feet floor area with an additional
10 1300 square feet on the lower story on the back and east side. Elevations were revised and some
11 additional information was provided with respect to the proposed water tank to satisfy fire district
12 regulations.

13 Mr. Wolff added that the Commission has been provided with full sized plans illustrated in color, some
14 exhibits which show the difference between the proposed project and the 4000 square foot house.

15 Staff also received a letter from Tom Olsen, 3237 Lucas Circle. This letter states that Mr. Olsen is
16 pleased to have neighbors that take care of the property. He inquired into the possibility to move the
17 house back as far as possible, as it would become intrusive to his vantage point.

18 Mr. Wolff also submitted the colors and materials board and pointed out that the applicant has passed
19 out new enlargements of the color photographs.

20 The architecture of the house is in a Craftsman style, well detailed, the colors and materials are
21 natural and dark and in staff's opinion the house is kept low. The house will recede into the
22 background and the trees. With respect to the residential design guidelines, it meets in every respect.
23 The overriding issue is the offsite visibility. In regards to this, the applicant has prepared various story
24 poles to illustrate the offsite visibility. It is staff's opinion that they have successfully mitigated the
25 offsite visibility by primarily keeping the structure very light. From existing grade to roof ridge it is 16
26 feet. All the roof pitches are 3:12.

27 Staff has noted that there are no immediate neighbors that will have a significant view impact. Those
28 that will be able to see it are a fair to a long distance away. When the Commission looks at the story
29 poles that illustrate the 4000 square foot and 5300 square foot, staff fails to see a significant
30 difference.

31 Initially, Mr. Wolff had concern with a 7000 sq. ft. structure, but when he went to the site and saw that
32 1300 square feet is basically subterranean, he saw that the 5300 square foot structure above grade
33 wouldn't be that much different than the 4000 square foot structure. Staff has not been able to
34 develop a quantitative analysis, so it has been a qualitative analysis that staff has come to. Given that
35 the structure is low and dark, there would not be a significant difference between the two because of
36 the way it is sited.

37 Staff recommended approval of the applicant and the deadline is approaching on March 24. He noted
38 that there is one additional Planning Commission between now and then. Staff has drafted a draft
39 resolution and Commission's approval that would require certain things pertaining to drainage and
40 landscaping. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission consider this and approve the
41 project.

42 In regards to a question from Chair Ateljevich, Mr. Wolff noted that the water tower has not been dug
43 in yet. The water tower has not yet been determined as a condition of approval.

44 Commissioner Chastain clarified that the size is a qualitative issue and not a quantitative because the
45 main concern is the size of the structure. He then asked Mr. Wolff if he felt that the comparison set
46 before the Commission between the 4000 square foot footprint and the proposed footprint is an
47 honest and legitimate comparison.

48 Mr. Wolff stated that the analysis and exhibits that have been prepared by the applicants are of high
49 quality, but he also stated that they are not entirely objective. He then referred to one of the examples

1 and stated that it was simply a hypothetical comparison between the proposed footprint and a more
2 compact and taller version of the footprint. Mr. Wolff mentioned that the proposed footprint is lower
3 than the 4000 square foot footprint and illustrated that if the volume were more compact, the structure
4 would be higher. He added that staff is confident that looking at the comparison an opinion can be
5 made.

6 Vice Chair Mitchell asked if the black box of 4000 square feet on exhibit A included the garage or not.
7 Mr. Wolff clarified that the 4000 square foot footprint does not include the garage. The garage would
8 be in addition to the 4000 square feet and would be a subterranean structure.

9 Vice Chair Mitchell then asked questioned why the blue ridgeline for the 4000 square foot proposal is
10 outside and not tucked in where it would be more hidden.

11 Mr. Wolff replied that the rear of the house would go back to the drip line of the trees. He reiterated
12 that the house has not been moved away from the drip line and towards the top of the slope, allowing
13 for additional space in the rear. It has been pushed back, although there is a small cutout.

14 Vice Chair Mitchell countered that based on the blue footprint, theoretically, the house could be pulled
15 back further if it were reconfigured. The patio space and the bay would need to be filled in and would
16 effectively make the building taller.

17 Commissioner Humann reminded the group that it is a 6700 square foot home but for comparison
18 purposes should use the 5300 sq feet, and not the 6700 square foot number.

19 Mr. Wolff agreed that there is no 6700 square foot single structure anywhere in the City and that the
20 largest, single-story ground structure is the proposed 5300 square feet. The illustrated comparison is
21 between the 4000 square foot block and the 5300 square foot ground level.

22 Mike Mussano, of Ward-Young architects, and Paul and Alison Cocotis (owners) were present at the
23 meeting. Chair Ateljevich invited Mr. Mussano to speak.

24 Mr. Mussano referred to the Planning Commission meeting on April 21 and stated that the Planning
25 Commission approved the site shown at Site A nestled back towards the trees, utilizing the existing
26 access road. However Mr. Mussano and the owners of the property felt that with the mass of the
27 house in scene A, the elevation is not what they wanted to see. The Commission directed that the
28 applicant demonstrate the difference between a 4000 square foot property and any size larger than
29 that, and illustrate the degree to which the building design and location can successfully mitigate the
30 impacts.

31 At the design review meeting, the Design Review Commission liked the house and felt that it was the
32 appropriate style for the lot, but the main concern was site development. The applicant has made the
33 recommended changes to both the drawings and the model. Any recommendation that the Design
34 Review Commission makes to the Planning Commission must address and consider the house size
35 comparison issue. Mr. Mussano read quotes from the last Design Review Commission of January 24.
36 He quoted Commissioner Blodgett, Commissioner Hertel, Commissioner Lee and Commissioner
37 Cleaver and each of their quotes complimented the proposal and the building design and stated that
38 there is very little difference between the 4000 square foot model and the proposed model.

39 The plans proposed have been modified to satisfy the requests of the Design Review Commission to
40 reduce the amount of site development.

41 Mr. Mussano would then like to demonstrate that that the 4000 square foot house and the proposed
42 house appear virtually the same size when viewed off site. Mr. Mussano pointed to exhibit A, which
43 showed three houses for comparison. The proposed house is shown with orange ridge, in the
44 Craftsman style with a lower roof pitch and perimeter configuration consistent with Design Review
45 recommendations. The Craftsman 4000 is shown with blue ridge and eave stakes. This footprint uses
46 the same type of Craftsman characteristics as the proposed house. The 4000 square foot box house
47 is shown with a wide gray outline and no ridgepoles or eave poles were done on site. The visibility
48 map showing viewing contours. If you are closer than 900 feet, you cannot see the house. If you are
49 at 1800 feet you can just start to see the house. The closer you get to the site, the less you see. The

1 reason for this is because of the unique characteristics of the site. The site has steep side slopes,
2 with a flat lot on top, which conceals any house from close up visibility. The trees in the back provide
3 a backdrop and do not allow the house to silhouette against the skyline.

4 Exhibits B and C are elevation comparisons. The top drawing shows the box 4000. The larger wall to
5 wall length creates a tall roof profile even when using the same low roof pitch of the proposed house
6 which results in more visible roof area in a shade of blue. The additional area of the proposed house
7 on the north side is behind the trees and cannot be seen from off site. The additional area of the
8 proposed house on the south side is approximately 198 square feet. Both of these areas are shaded
9 in yellow. The lower drawing compares the Craftsman 4000 house (same roof pitch as the proposed
10 house – 3:12). The increased area to the north again cannot be seen from off site. The area
11 difference from the south is approximately 104 square feet, or about 10 feet in length. There are 2
12 viewpoints to be used for demonstration. The first view, Exhibit E, is from Merriewood at Indian Way.
13 This is the closest full view of the site from about 1900 feet. The second view, Exhibit F, is a view
14 from Sandalwood Court; this view is from about 2050 feet away. Both of these photographs show the
15 staking of the house as proposed and the Craftsman 4000. Exhibit D is the visibility analysis and
16 shows view angles and distances from specific viewpoints. The view angle section at the top of the
17 sheet demonstrates that the closer you are to the site, the less you see. The visibility angle
18 comparison in the middle of the sheet demonstrates that the proposed landscaping will have the
19 ability to conceal a great portion of any house when viewed from below. The graphs at the bottom
20 show the relationship between distance and size and it shows that as size halves, distance doubles.

21 Exhibit E prime and F prime is an overlay of the Craftsman 4000 house and the proposed house. The
22 green are the overlaps, the blue is the Craftsman 4000 and the yellow is the proposed house. There
23 is very little area of yellow that shows beyond the boundary of the blue.

24 Mr. Mussano feels these exhibits showed, the proposed house appears no larger than a similarly
25 styled house of 4000 square feet.

26 The owner, Paul Cocotis mentioned that the footprint of the house is 5300 feet, which is 20.8% of the
27 28,200 feet flat area lot. The 4000 square foot house would be 16% and noted the difference of 4% of
28 the area.

29 Chair Ateljevich opened the hearing to public comment.

30 Debbie Slack, 249 Margarido Drive, Paul and Alison have lived in her neighborhood for 12 years.
31 Paul bought and beautifully renovated a house in her community. Paul and Alison care about their
32 community, are active members of the Walnut Creek education fund, volunteer for their daughter's
33 brownie troop, and participate in neighborhood watch. Give an example of how considerate they are
34 to their neighbors and she is sorry to see them go.

35 Robin Picard, Lafayette Valley Estates. Mr. Picard pointed out that his house would view from where
36 the Commissioners are sitting what he would view from his house. There is a pristine ridge running
37 behind the house (at the same level) and on it, the house will be quite noticeable. He is concerned
38 about the violation of the scenery (no matter what the square footage of the house) and the damage
39 to the ridgeline and its impact on a very well-preserved ridgeline. Mr. Picard summarized his
40 comments on a note and submitted it to the Commission.

41 Chair Ateljevich pointed out that they have to allow a house on this property. The owners do carry the
42 development rights. She pointed out that it is unfortunate that some of them are very close to
43 ridgelines.

44 David Messinger, 3156 Somerset Place, is located to the west of this site, down the hill. He supports
45 the development of this property, which he stated before. But he has one concern about drainage and
46 refers to the report on drainage and grading. He noticed that the plans showed water being
47 intercepted by pipes that ran down the driveway to Lucas Circle and wondered if that condition on the
48 plan still exists.

49 Chair Ateljevich noted that this will be addressed during the rebuttal. She also advised Mr. Messinger
50 to read the city engineer's report on the staff report.

1 Ellen Hubauer, 157 Margarido Drive, was present to speak on behalf of Paul and Alison Cocotis. She
2 has lived next door to them for six years. They are friendly, dependable and trustworthy neighbors.
3 Ms. Hubauer pointed out the many volunteer activities the Cocotis family participates in. Paul
4 maintains the home very well, updating the appearance, landscaping, planting flowers and shrubs.
5 She has no doubt that this couple will build a home that will not distract from the natural beauty of the
6 environment. Mr. and Mrs. Cocotis will be an asset to the Burton Valley community.

7 Elizabeth Hammond, 18 Chapel Drive, showed support for Paul and Alison, whom she has known for
8 15 years. She is excited to see that they are moving to Lafayette. Alison is a member of the Logos
9 Program at the Lafayette Presbyterian Church, also a member of Junior Women's Club, been a
10 Meals on Wheels driver, and helped raise money for the library. She can concur that they have
11 thought through the fact that they are building on the ridgeline.

12 Denise Stenberg, 2622 Cherry Lane in Walnut Creek. Ms. Stenberg is in support of Paul and Alison.
13 She has known Paul for 22 years and he has devoted his time and energy towards building a strong
14 religious community. Paul grew up in the area, works for the same employer for Cal-Berkley, which
15 shows that he is dedicated and will see a project through to the end. Paul and Alison support the
16 local school and the school's values.

17 Paul Cocotis wanted to clarify that he doesn't want to drain anything down the hillside. He is
18 dedicated to the community. They are trying to build their dream house and this is the best place for
19 the house to be. The stakes/poles have been up for three months and there has not been very much
20 outcry against the building.

21 Mr. Mussano mentioned that they reduced the grading of the turnaround and eliminated all the
22 lighting off the driveway. He also wanted to add that they have eliminated the bridge, reduced the
23 retaining walls only to the backside. The landscape materials are now dense enough to connect the
24 existing group of trees with the new trees. Points 3, 4, and 5 are no longer applicable. The water
25 tower is still a point of contention because of the elevation. They did redo the model to show more
26 accurately how it looks as far as the grading. This will go back to the Design Review Commission for
27 review. He has also extended the grading lines further to the edges of the sheet. He showed Ms.
28 Coburn the model of the tree surveys and tree elevations.

29 Vice Chair Mitchell liked the evolution of how the driveway is changed. He asked for an explanation of
30 the berming that helps screen the house.

31 Mr. Mussano has changed the location of the fire district turnaround, which eliminated some of the
32 grading. They have extended the 2:1 slope, which is shown on the site sections and the elevation
33 report. To the right of the new turnaround the berming is 2 or 3 feet higher than the existing grade.

34 Mr. Cocotis mentioned that the slope steepness is a continuation of the existing steepness. Mr. Wolff
35 clarified that in an earlier version, they increased the slope to greater than 2:1. But now it has gone
36 back to 2:1.

37 The applicant did not have a materials board.

38 Chair Ateljevich would like to change the color of the tile to a darker green to match the trees around
39 and behind the site. That suggestion will be a part of the Design Review Commission final review.

40 Paul Cocotis stated that the actual height is 14 feet from finished floor to top of the roof. And 16 feet
41 from the existing grade to the top of the roof. The City's measurement is from the garage entrance to
42 the mid- point of the roof is 21 feet 6 inches. The height of the house is 694 to the top and the finished
43 floor is 680 and the finished grade is 679.

44 Vice Chair Mitchell asks if there has been any modification to the building design since the original
45 proposal. Mr. Cocotis stated that the footprint is exactly the same, but the pitch and the roof have
46 been adjusted and they have increased the overhangs. They have changed the colors and adjusted
47 the landscaping and berming and feels they have done everything they could do to make the house
48 harder to see.

1 Mr. Wolff mentioned two additional points. Should the Planning Commission approve the project, it
2 would return to Design Review for final design detailing inclusive of location and style of exterior light
3 fixtures. This would include shielded light fixtures so there would be no bright spots of light on the
4 hillside. The water tower would also be discussed. Chair Ateljevich also specified that the stone and
5 clay tile be darker than the background trees.

6 Chair Ateljevich closed the public portion of the hearing and called for Commission comment and
7 action.

8 Commissioner Chastain noted that this process has been a challenge. He appreciated the work that
9 has gone into this project since it first came before the commission. Everyone who has worked on the
10 project has understood the sensitivity of the view and the problems that this site presents. Given that,
11 the applicant located the house where it was and then the Commission asked that it be pushed back
12 and is limited to 4000 feet and the changes continued from there. Given the comparative analysis that
13 Design Review Commission looked at, the house is as visible as it is going to be, unless the house
14 size is drastically reduced. Commissioner Chastain's only reluctance was that the plan has never really
15 been looked at concerning its actual size, which shows him that there hasn't been an effort to reduce
16 the size of this building. He wished there had been more work put into the floor plan. But, he still
17 agrees that it would have to be a drastic reduction in size to really make an impact.

18 Commissioner Humann agreed with Commissioner Chastain. It is a big house, but the difference
19 between the 4000 and the 5300 will not be any visual difference, unless it is cut way back. The
20 applicant did a good job of convincing Commissioner Humann. The only concern he has is the color.
21 If the Commission approves this, then the Design Review Commission will really need to look at the
22 colors.

23 Chair Ateljevich stated that the roof color is very important and she is concerned about the color
24 choices. The roof will be the most visible from a distance. The copper will not be a problem, as it will
25 darken with age as long as it is not treated. The white stones on the chimney are also a concern.
26 Also, since not everything grows that is planted (especially on slopes and south facing slopes), in this
27 project there will need to be a monitoring plan to monitor the plant growth. The Commission cannot
28 rely on neighborhood complaint, the Commission has got to have a way of knowing that the
29 landscaping either makes it or gets replaced. This is a large part in the decision of approving
30 something of this size. A concern is how to deal with these highly-visible hillside lots. Ultimately size
31 does lead to visibility.

32 Vice Chair Mitchell asked staff about the 4000 square foot illustration. This illustration shows a garage
33 at grade-level rather than the subterranean garage of the proposed illustration and wondered if that is
34 correct.

35 Mr. Wolff asked the applicant to answer this question. Paul Cocotis answered that the 4000 square
36 foot Craftsman assumes a subterranean garage as well.

37 Vice Chair Mitchell would like to commend the applicant on the work they have done on reconfiguring
38 the grading and the driveway. But he disagreed with Mr. Mussano's statement that DRC was fine with
39 everything. Their number one concern was overdevelopment of the site and it wasn't just the bridge.
40 Commissioner Lee was saying that it was going to be a longer line. Vice Chair Mitchell believes the
41 DRC is very comfortable and liked the details and designs and the architectural details that would
42 make it blend in more. But he also agreed with the DRC in their worry over the overdevelopment of
43 the site. He thought that the 4000-foot example is placed up there so that it works to the applicant's
44 best advantage. He referred back to Commissioner Chastain's comment about an effort being made.
45 The proposals state 8/11/05 but the floor plan hasn't changed any and he thought that improvements
46 could be made. Vice Chair Mitchell stated that he is not supporting this application. While Mr.
47 Mussano did a good job presenting this argument for the applicant, Mr. Mitchell felt that they could
48 have been done better seeing that it is right along a Class-II ridgeline.

49 Chair Ateljevich agreed with Vice Chair Mitchell in that this is a point of concern. She added that she
50 doesn't think 500 or 600 square feet could make that much of a difference. Vice Chair Mitchell
51 disagreed and said that 500 or 600 square feet could make a difference and he felt that there was no
52 effort on the part of the applicant to show that.

1 Commissioner Humann stated that he believed that ultimately this building could blend into the
2 hillside. There are other compelling factors such as distant views vs. close up views. Essentially less
3 is seen from a distance. Chair Ateljevich disagreed and said that it is a more disturbing site to see it
4 from a distance; especially when one sees an open space plan and then sees the house.

5 Vice Chair Mitchell repeated that he felt that the applicant made no effort to show that there is a
6 difference between the 4000 square foot model and the proposed model. Chair Ateljevich asked if the
7 footprint could really have been reduced. An attempt wasn't made, in her opinion, to reduce this
8 house. She recommended that larger sized foliage be planted and that would help blend the house
9 into the site. Commissioner Humann interjected that although there weren't attempts to adjust the
10 square footage, there were attempts to adjust the height, the roof etc.

11 Commissioner Chastain appreciated Vice Chair Mitchell's comments and he admitted that he is
12 annoyed that the plan has not changed. From the very beginning the problems were the visibility of
13 the site and also the size of the house. The fact that the applicant has not taken that into
14 consideration is of concern. The applicant has done everything they can to mitigate building on this
15 site. The design is a good design and Commissioner Chastain appreciates the materials and the
16 style, but he is also trying to figure out what would happen if they went back and had to redesign it.
17 He wondered if the it would be significantly different. The house would still be very visible. He is still
18 uncertain. No matter what happens, there will be a house up there. This applicant has not shown the
19 ability to modify their program. But he felt that even if the house was reduced that would not take
20 away the fact that one would still see a house up there. At this point Commissioner Chastain is willing
21 to support the proposal.

22 Commissioner Chair Ateljevich agreed with Commissioner Chastain and she will support it, but not
23 with enthusiasm. She would like to see the three trees at the corner of the house planted in 48-inch
24 box size. In addition, she would like a monitoring plan for the landscaping.

25 Commissioner Humann agreed. He was not sure there is much that can be done with the size. He
26 supported the project.

27 Mr. Mussano would like to make a comment about the conditions of the approval outside of his
28 presentation and rebuttal. Mr. Mussano mentioned that one of the conditions of approval mentioned
29 an 8 foot plate maximum. He was planning on having 9-foot plates and a 3:12 roof, which he doesn't
30 consider unreasonable.

31 Mr. Wolff Stated that staff is comfortable deleting that condition provided that the house is built in the
32 design plan shown. The drawings are consistent with the model.

33 Chair Ateljevich confirmed that condition 19 would send it back to Design Review. Also the water tank
34 would adequately be dug in and the colors would be darker than the trees. She requested from Mr.
35 Wolff that he send via email to the Commission Chair these conditions.

36 Commissioner Humann moved to adopt resolution 2006-05 approving HDP18-05 with conditions.
37 Commissioner Chastain seconded the motion, which carried with Commissioner Chair Ateljevich
38 voting aye and Commissioner Vice Chair Mitchell voting no (3-1).

39 The applicant was advised of a 14-day appeal period.

40 Niroop K. Srivatsa recommended that the Senior Housing Task Force be discussed first, as there are
41 members in the audience.

42 Commissioner Chastain mentioned that he would like to talk about size at the next meeting, as it has
43 caused confusion. Commission Chair Ateljevich requested a handout be made up and Mr. Wolff
44 volunteered to do research on average home size, and query other jurisdictions to ask how they
45 handle it. He recommended that the Planning Commission meet with the Design Review Commission
46 to discuss the issue of size and a special meeting is scheduled for March 30th, 2006.

47 8. OTHER BUSINESS