

1 Vice-Chair Ateljevich moved and Commissioner Mitchell seconded to continue the Minutes
2 of May 5, 2005, in order to confirm the amendments made by the Commissioners.
3

4 **AYES:** Humann, Ateljevich, Chastain, Harris, Lovitt, Mitchell
5 **NOES:** None
6 **ABSENT:** None
7 **ABSTAIN:** Commissioner Holt

- 8 C. **HDP70-04 ERIC STRAND (APPLICANT & OWNER), LR-10 ZONING:** Request for
9 house site consideration from the Planning Commission to establish a house site
10 pursuant to Section 6-2015 of the Lafayette Municipal Code which requires a Hillside
11 Development Permit to ultimately construct a new, one-story single-family residence on
12 the existing 5.33-acre vacant, unaddressed parcel on Burton Ridge accessed via
13 Michael Lane, in the Hillside Overlay District. Once a house site has been established
14 by the Planning Commission, the applicant will submit full design plans for Hillside
15 Development Permit consideration by the Design Review Commission and Planning
16 Commission. Public notification will be provided again at that time. Only establishment
17 of an appropriate house site is under consideration at this time. APN 238-080-035.
18 **Recommendation:** Approve staff write-up of Planning Commission direction and refer
19 the matter to the Design Review Commission to review a single-family residential
20 development.
21 **Project Planner:** Greg Wolff, Tel (925) 299-3204, gwoff@lovelafayette.org

22 Chair Humann recused himself from this item.

23 Vice-Chair Ateljevich advised that she had concerns about the wording of condition 5, "A
24 modified Site 2S would be situated in a natural swale to the northwest of the property..."
25 because it implies that the site should go across the swale, which she did not want. She
26 suggested that the wording be changed to "to the side of the natural swale." She believed it
27 would be better to forward this to Design Review for comment.

28 Vice-Chair Ateljevich advised that Condition 6.b. stated, "...the house shall be no larger than
29 2,000 square feet ..." and believed it should be clarified to state whether or not that square
30 footage would include the garage. She assumed it would not, but did not know how the rest of
31 the Commission felt.

32 Commissioner Lovitt suggested that a two-car garage be included in addition to the stated
33 square footage.

34 Vice-Chair Ateljevich suggested that the language state "2,000 square feet, plus a two-car
35 garage." The language was satisfactory to the Commissioners.

36 Commissioner Mitchell understood that the house would be moved to the lowest portion of the
37 site, likely requiring a variance. Vice-Chair Ateljevich did not want it in the swale.

38 Commissioner Lovitt noted that he would like to add Item J, which recognized that the Design
39 Review Commission should exercise its discretion in making small adjustments. Vice-Chair
40 Ateljevich agreed with that addition.

41 Vice-Chair Ateljevich inquired about the language in Item G: "The development should present
42 as narrow a profile as possible downhill to minimize off-site visual impacts," and noted that would
43 require the rotation of the development to be perpendicular to the contours. She did not believe
44 the Condition should be worded that way, and suggested the following language: "The house
45 should present the narrowest possible face to the properties below the site."

1 Mr. Wolff advised that he believed the goal of the language as written was not to direct the
2 footprint be rotated to a perpendicular position, but rather to present the narrowest possible
3 elevation to the downhill vantage points.

4 Vice-Chair Ateljevich believed the goal was to rotate the house from the way it was shown
5 before, and to present the narrowest face to the properties.

6 Vice-Chair Ateljevich opened the meeting to the public comment period on this item.

7 Sherry Hoover, 3212 Sharon Court, expressed concern that this property was very visible from
8 public locations such as St. Mary's Road, Burton Drive, Lucas Drive, and Silverado Drive, not
9 just Sweet Drive and Woodview or other higher elevations. She was very concerned about the
10 loss of the pristine hillside, and believed it was a sad event for Burton Valley. She believed that
11 Class I and Class II ridges should be protected, and added that the Burton Valley residents did
12 not want this project to go forward.

13 Vice-Chair Ateljevich closed the public comment period on this item.

14 Mr. Wolff inquired whether there was consensus among the three commissioners that voted on
15 this item with respect to the exhibit submitted by Vice-Chair Ateljevich. There was consensus.

16 **Commissioner Lovitt moved and Commissioner Chastain seconded to approval of the**
17 **amended statement that is to be forwarded to the Design Review Commission, and of the**
18 **illustrative sketch that accompanies the statement.**

19
20 **AYES: Ateljevich, Chastain, Harris, Holt, Lovitt**
21 **NOES: Mitchell**
22 **ABSENT: None**
23 **ABSTAIN: Humann**

24

25 D. **HDP69-04 TIM WARD, WARD YOUNG ARCHITECTURE (APPLICANT), MIKE &**
26 **SHEILA BRADBURN (OWNERS), LR-10 ZONING:** Request for (1) Hillside
27 development permit per sections 6-2067 & 6-2070 of the Lafayette Municipal Code
28 (LMC); (2) Design Review approval pursuant to Section 6-1905 (LMC); and (3) Grading
29 Permit to grade more than 200 cubic yards pursuant to Chapter 3-7 (LMC) to construct
30 a new 4300 sq. ft. two-story single family residence located at 8 Hawks Hill Court. APN
31 167-060-007.

32
33 **V26-04 TIM WARD, WARD YOUNG ARCHITECTURE (APPLICANT), MIKE &**
34 **SHEILA BRADBURN (OWNERS), LR-10 ZONING:** Request for variance from section
35 6-7210 to reduce the side yard setback from the required 50-ft. to 8-ft. to construct a
36 new 4300 sq. ft. two-story single family residence located at 8 Hawks Hill Court. APN
37 167-060-007.

38 **Recommendation:** Approve HDP69-04 and V26-04 subject to the required findings
39 and conditions of approval contained in Planning Commission Resolution 2005-11.

40 **Project Planner:** Greg Wolff, Tel (925) 299-3204, gwoff@lovelafayette.org

41 Vice-Chair Ateljevich advised that she had spoken with Mr. Wolff that afternoon about this item,
42 and had given considerable thought to the implications of this application. She had asked about
43 the Class II ridgeline setback line, and noted that there had been an addition to the property via
44 a lot line revision that was not reflected in the illustrations in the staff report. She noted that the
45 house touched the protected ridge area in two places, and that the number of trees were not
46 accurately reflected in the plans. She believed the Commission needed to have more
47 information, and that the tree locations should be surveyed locations, which is the standard
48 requirement. The applicant explained to the Commission that the tree locations were drawn
49 using a combination of field measurements and an aerial photo. She believed that an arborist's