

## PIEDMONT PLANNING COMMISSION

### Regular Meeting Minutes for Monday, November 8, 2010

A Regular Session of the Piedmont Planning Commission was held November 8, 2010, in the City Hall Council Chambers at 120 Vista Avenue. In accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) the agenda for this meeting was posted for public inspection on October 29, 2010.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

#### ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Jonathan Levine, Jim Kellogg, Melanie Robertson, Bobbe Stehr, Clark Thiel and Alternate Commissioner Michael Henn

Staff: City Planner Kate Black, Assistant Planner Kevin Jackson, Planning Technicians Sylvia Toruno and Zach Rehm and Recording Secretary Chris Harbert

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

There was no consent calendar.

#### PUBLIC FORUM

There were no speakers for the public forum.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### **Resolution 18-PL-10**

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission approves as submitted its meeting minutes of October 11, 2010.

Moved by Henn, Seconded by Kellogg

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Henn

Noes: None

Abstain: Levine, Thiel

Absent: None

#### REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission considered the following items of regular business:

##### **Design Review 99 Wildwood Gardens**

Mr. and Mrs. Ron Pengilly are requesting design review to construct an approximately 133 sq. ft. upper level deck at the southwest corner of the residence, make window and door modifications and add exterior lighting.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Four affirmative, two negative response forms** were received.

**Public testimony** was received from:

Ron Pengilly stated that his proposed deck was originally approved in 1997 but never constructed.

Norman Givant objected to deck construction, stating that the proposed deck would block his view of a neighbor's oak tree, would be visible from his dressing room window and the design of its support piers is unattractive.

The Commission supported application approval, stating that the small corner deck has been sensitively designed, protrudes only 8 ft. into the rear yard, does not impact the view or privacy from the primary rooms of any neighbors, is located approximately 40 ft. to 70 ft. away from

the nearest neighbor, and is appropriate is scale, size, design and location for the 1950' style home. In addition, existing landscaping which was recently trimmed will grow back and screen the deck from view.

**Resolution 182-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Ron Pengilly are requesting permission to construct an approximately 133 sq. ft. upper level deck at the southwest corner of the residence, make window and door modifications and add exterior lighting located at 99 Wildwood Gardens, Piedmont, California, which construction requires design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the project is categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1(e) and the proposal conforms with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

1. The exterior design elements are aesthetically pleasing as a whole and harmonious with existing and proposed neighborhood development. These elements include but are not limited to: height, bulk, materials and the arrangements of structures on the parcel. The distance between the proposed upper level deck and adjacent residences is reasonable and appropriate due to the existing topography and neighborhood development pattern. The deck is located well away from all property lines, is modest in size and compatible with the architectural style of the residence, is similar to a previously approved deck for this property, is not readily visible within the immediate neighborhood because of existing topographical site conditions and is in keeping with other upper level decks located across the canyon. The project complies with Design Review Guidelines II-1, II-2, II-3 and II-3(a) through (d).
2. The proposed upper level deck has been designed in a way that reasonably minimizes view and light impacts on neighboring properties (as defined in Section 17.2.70). The proposed design accommodates neighbor requests to reduce the size of the deck and, as conditioned, allows existing vegetation to return to its former height to obscure deck view from 87 Wildwood Gardens. The project complies with Design Review Guideline II-5.
3. The size and height of the addition is commensurate with the size of the lot (excluding the portions of the lot that cannot reasonably be built on), and is in keeping with the existing neighborhood development pattern. The project complies with the above-mentioned Design Review Guidelines.
4. The safety of residents, pedestrians, and vehicle occupants and the free flow of vehicular traffic are not adversely affected, considering the circulation pattern, parking layout and points of ingress and egress. There is no change in existing circulation patterns.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Pengilly for construction at 99 Wildwood

Gardens, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City, subject to the following conditions:

1. Due to the scope and nature of the application, a construction management plan shall be developed and approved by staff prior to obtaining a building permit. Said plan shall be comprehensive while specifically addressing the duration of the project, construction hours, the staging of materials, and parking of worker vehicles to ensure the free flow of traffic along Wildwood Gardens;
2. Compliance with Chapter 9 Article III of the Municipal Code, which governs the recycling of construction and demolition debris, will be required on all phases of this project.;
3. The applicants shall maintain the existing mature vegetation along the west (left) side property line to preserve the 87 Wildwood Gardens neighbor's privacy;
4. The proposed door shall be painted to match the remaining doors throughout the residence.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Stehr, Seconded by Levine

Ayes: Levine, Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Thiel

Noes: None

Absent: None

**Design Review  
17 Cambridge Way**

Mr. Andy Madeira is requesting design review to replace the existing rear pergola with a new larger pergola and guardrail, remove an existing fence in the rear yard along the east (right) property line and replace it with a new gate and fence along the east (right) property line from the front of the house to the rear property line.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Six affirmative and one negative response forms** were received. **Correspondence** was received from: Brigid Gaffikin, Nov. 6; David Hou, Sept. 2 and Nov. 1

**Public testimony** was received from:

Andy Madeira stated that the intent of the fencing is to better define his property's border (per a recent survey) and to enclose his yard for the security of his children and pets. He also noted that the fence is intended to screen his view of his neighbor's property, which he felt was unsightly and to keep this neighbor from entering his property to check on drainage flows.

Bill Engelhardt, Project Architect, described the fencing proposal, stating that most of the project will be replacing existing fencing and that property topography and significant differences in grade between the applicants' property and his neighbor cause the range in fence height (from 4 ft. to 12 ft. 7 in.).

David Hou opposed the application, stressing that the enlargement of the existing pergola will block sunlight to his bedrooms, the proposal to add fencing within the front setback is contrary to existing neighborhood conditions/character and the relocation of the section of fence between the applicant's and his property will block light to the windows of his new addition. He also urged that if the project is approved, the applicant be required to submit and implement a drainage plan.

The Commission agreed that the proposed fence height was excessive and unnecessary, suggesting that a more effective privacy screen could be achieved through landscaping. The Commission further agreed that the proposed project does not change or affect the current drainage situation on the property, hence a drainage plan is not required. The Commission also felt that the proposed expansion of the pergola was unacceptable because of the significant adverse impact it would have on the Hou's light, sky view and air. The Commission noted various options available to the applicants to satisfy their objectives, agreeing that a proposed fence at the property line should not exceed 6 ft. in height as measured from the neighbor's property (as required by code).

**Resolution 212-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. Andy Madeira is requesting permission to replace the existing rear pergola with a new larger pergola and guardrail, remove an existing fence in the rear yard along the east (right) property line and replace it with a new gate and fence along the east (right) property line from the front of the house to the rear property line located at 17 Cambridge Way, Piedmont, California, which construction requires design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the proposal does not conform with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

- The design of the pergola and height of the proposed fence are not appropriate because of their deleterious effect on the neighbor's view, privacy and access to direct and indirect light. The project fails to comply with Design Review Guidelines II-2 with respect to the pergola and V-5 with respect to the fence.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission denies, without prejudice, the design review application of Mr. Madeira for construction at 17 Cambridge Way, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City.

Moved by Levine, Seconded by Stehr

Ayes: Levine, Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Thiel

Noes: None  
Absent: None

**Variance and  
Design Review  
25 Piedmont Court**

Mr. Al Hamid is requesting variance and design review to construct an approximately 75 sq. ft. master bedroom addition at the rear of the residence and make window and door modifications throughout. The requested variance is from Section 17.22.2(a) to allow a floor area ratio of 65.2% in lieu of the code permitted maximum of 55% for a parcel which does not exceed 5,000 sq. ft.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **One affirmative response form** was received. **Correspondence** was received from: Shaya Hamid, Nov. 4

**Public testimony** was received from:

Robert Nebolon, Project Architect, explained that the intent of the project is to correct the deficiencies of the existing master bedroom suite and to improve the home to modern family living standards. In response to Commission questions, he agreed that existing exterior plumbing pipes could be enclosed, the roof height could be lowered via the use of gutters rather than the inappropriate parapet wall, and a high bathroom window could be added to provide better ventilation.

The Commission acknowledged that the existing home already greatly exceeds the maximum floor area ratio coverage allowed and there is no justification for adding more living space onto this property in such a dense neighborhood. The Commission objected to expanding an already poorly designed, tacked on addition and felt that better design alternatives exist for accomplishing the applicants' objectives. In particular, suggesting that consideration be given to removing the master bath addition and redistributing this existing square footage to create a completely new master bedroom design. The Commission agreed that there was no justification for granting a floor area ratio variance for this property.

**Resolution 223-V/DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. Al Hamid is requesting permission to construct an approximately 75 sq. ft. master bedroom addition at the rear of the residence and make window and door modifications throughout located at 25 Piedmont Court, Piedmont, California, which construction requires variance and design review; and

WHEREAS, a variance from the requirements of Chapter 17 of the Piedmont City Code is necessary in order to exceed the City's floor area ratio requirement; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission makes the following findings:

1. The applicant has not shown that the underlying lot and existing improvements present unusual physical circumstances because of which strictly applying the terms of this chapter

would keep the property from being used in the same manner as other properties in the zone which conform to the zoning requirements. The property already exceeds the allowable amount of floor area permitted by code and there is no justification for increasing its existing floor area ratio;

2. The proposed design does not conform with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code;
3. A variance necessary in order to construct the proposed design has not been approved, hence the improvements cannot be constructed as proposed.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission denies, with prejudice, the variance and design review application of Mr. Hamid at 25 Piedmont Court, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City.

Moved by Thiel, Seconded by Stehr

Ayes: Levine, Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Thiel

Noes: None

Absent: None

**Variance and  
Design Review  
312 Sea View Avenue**

Mr. and Mrs. Tyler Johnston are requesting variance and design review to demolish the existing garage and "carport"; construct a new 2-car garage with attic and attached office with half bath; construct a new porte cochere attached to the north side of the house; construct new fencing with gates in the left (north) side yard; add exterior lighting; and make various hardscape and landscape improvements. The requested variance is from Section 17.10.7 to allow the porte cochere and garage to extend to within 1 ft. 5 in. and 5 ft., respectively, to the left (north) side property line in lieu of the code required minimum of a 4 ft. side yard setback.

Written notice was provided by neighbors. **Two affirmative response forms** were received. **Correspondence** was received from: Dean & Nancy Johnson, Nov. 4; Diane Allen & Kathleen Quenneville, Nov. 4.

**Public testimony** was received from:

Kirk Peterson, Project Architect, displayed renderings of the proposed design, noting that the garage replacement project will improve garage ingress/egress, create a convenient covered parking area immediately off the kitchen and provide an architecturally compatible home office for the applicant.

Tyler Johnston stressed that the design of the improvements maintain and enhance the elegant architectural character of his home. He noted that every effort will be made to preserve and protect an existing magnolia tree. However, he stated that this tree has a history of health problems and if it proves impractical to save this tree, a replacement tree will be planted in consultation with his neighbor.

The Commission agreed that the project was beautifully designed and not readily visible to neighbors. The variance situation is pre-existing

and required in order to allow porte cochere ingress/egress off of the existing driveway -- this porte cochere replaces an existing carport and is located adjacent to a neighbor's garage. In addition, the porte cochere is an important architectural element in integrating the improvements into a cohesive overall design.

In response to neighbor correspondence regarding the applicant's rear yard fence, the Commission acknowledged that this 1997 fence was constructed in compliance with approved plans and building permits and is not a subject of this application.

**Resolution 255-V-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Tyler Johnston are requesting permission to demolish the existing garage and "carport"; construct a new 2-car garage with attic and attached office with half bath; construct a new porte cochere attached to the north side of the house; construct new fencing with gates in the left (north) side yard; add exterior lighting; and make various hardscape and landscape improvements located at 312 Sea View Avenue, Piedmont, California, which construction requires variance; and

WHEREAS, a variance from the requirements of Chapter 17 of the Piedmont City Code is necessary in order to construct within the 4 ft. left (north) side yard setback; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission makes the following findings:

1. The project is categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1(e);
2. The underlying lot and existing improvements present unusual physical circumstances, including but not limited to the fact that the existing home, driveway and carport (that the porte cochere is replacing) are currently located within the setback. Because of these circumstances, strictly applying the terms of this chapter would keep the property from being used in the same manner as other properties in the zone which conform to the zoning requirements.
3. The variance is compatible with the immediately surrounding neighborhood and the public because the proposed porte cochere is essentially in the same location as the carport that it replaces. The design of the porte cochere is more architecturally compatible with the existing residence than the carport it replaces and there is no visual impact on neighbor light or privacy.
4. Accomplishing the improvement without a variance would cause unreasonable hardship in planning, design, or construction because the existing driveway could not be used for garage ingress/egress if the porte cochere was located out of the setback. The porte cochere provides an appropriate link between the house and garage, thus improving circulation patterns and property ingress/egress.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the variance application of Mr. and Mrs. Johnston for the above variance at 312 Sea View Avenue, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Kellogg, Seconded by Stehr

Ayes: Levine, Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Thiel

Noes: None

Absent: None

#### **Resolution 255-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Tyler Johnston are requesting permission to demolish the existing garage and "carport"; construct a new 2-car garage with attic and attached office with half bath; construct a new porte cochere attached to the north side of the house; construct new fencing with gates in the left (north) side yard; add exterior lighting; and make various hardscape and landscape improvements located at 312 Sea View Avenue, Piedmont, California, which construction requires design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the proposal conforms with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

1. The exterior design elements are aesthetically pleasing as a whole and harmonious with existing and proposed neighborhood development. The massing, roof structure, detailing, openings and materials are well positioned to fit architecturally with the existing residence. The improvements are scaled correctly to create a positive, visual effect on the applicant's property as well as creating no material impact on neighboring properties. The project complies with Design Review Guideline II-1, II-2, II-3(a) through (d).
2. The proposed new multi-level structure/expansion has been designed in a way that reasonably minimizes view and light impacts on neighboring properties (as defined in Section 17.2.70). The proposed improvements comply with Design Review Guidelines II-2, II-3(a) and (b).
3. The size and height of the addition is commensurate with the size of the lot (excluding the portions of the lot that cannot reasonably be built on), and is in keeping with the existing neighborhood

development pattern. The scale and mass of the proposed improvements are in keeping with the existing house. The project complies with Design Review Guidelines II-1 and II-2.

4. The safety of residents, pedestrians, and vehicle occupants and the free flow of vehicular traffic are not adversely affected, considering the circulation pattern, parking layout and points of ingress and egress. The existing driveway is maintained, garage ingress/egress is functional and efficient and the porte cochere is well positioned to provide a weather-protected drop-off point to the residence. The project complies with Design Review Guidelines III-7 and III-8.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Johnston for construction at 312 Sea View Avenue, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Construction Management Plan.** A comprehensive Construction Management Plan shall be developed by the applicant. The Construction Management Plan shall address noise, vibrations, traffic control, parking, debris removal, dust control, sanitary facilities, and other potential construction impacts, as well as other details involving the means and methods of completing the Project including the construction route. The City Building Official shall have the authority to require modifications and amendments to the Construction Management Plan as deemed necessary throughout the course of the Project and until the final issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

2. **Construction Completion Schedule.** Work on the Project, once commenced, shall be promptly executed with continuous good faith and reasonable progress. Since timely completion of this Project is of the essence, the Applicant shall submit for approval a Construction Completion Schedule, which will specify, in detail, the duration and percentage complete of each phase.

a. The Construction Completion Schedule with associated construction values for each benchmark shall set forth completion dates for the following benchmarks:

- i. Completion of Excavation;
- ii. Completion of Retaining Walls;
- iii. Completion of Foundation;
- iv. Completion of Rough Framing;
- v. Completion of Electrical;
- vi. Completion of Plumbing;
- vii. Completion of Mechanical;
- viii. Completion of Fire Sprinklers;
- ix. Completion of Home;
- x. Completion of Hardscaping and Landscaping;

and of any further construction benchmarks and conditions of occupancy as may be determined by the Director of Public Works.

b. The Director of Public Works shall, before the Project commences, make a determination as to the completion dates applicable to the Project and such determination shall constitute the "Approved Schedule" and be binding on the Applicant. The

City may, at the Applicant's sole cost, engage the services of a consultant to review the Applicant's proposed Construction Completion Schedule and, to the extent the period allocated for any work appears unjustifiable, recommend to the Director of Public Works a reasonable completion date for any benchmark.

c. If the work for any specific benchmark has not been completed within 90 days after the completion date set forth in the Approved Schedule, and the delay in completion has not been caused by force majeure, the Director of Public Works shall have the option at any time thereafter to make claim against the Applicant's Performance Security in order to complete such benchmark.

3. **Stormwater BMPs for Construction.** Applicant shall implement stormwater treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) as well as Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association's "Start at the Source" criteria for stormwater quality protection. City Staff may impose additional requirements involving the prevention of storm water pollution during construction and permanent drainage, erosion and sediment control. These items will be reviewed as part of the Applicant's Construction Management Plan.

4. **C&D Compliance.** Compliance with Chapter 9 Article III of the Municipal Code, which governs the recycling of construction and demolition debris, is required for all phases of this project.

5. **Arborist's Report and Tree Preservation Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall submit an Arborist's Report and Tree Preservation Plan that includes tree preservation measures to preserve existing trees proposed to remain on-site, particularly the magnolia tree north of the garage and the birch tree east of the office. The tree preservation measures shall be on the appropriate sheets of the construction plans. The arborist shall be on-site during critical construction activities; initial and final grading to ensure the protection of the existing trees. The arborist shall document in writing and with photographs the tree protection measures during these critical construction phases. If some trees have been compromised, mitigation measures must be specified in writing, and implementation certified by the Project Arborist. Trees proposed for removal shall have an in-lieu replacement tree planted elsewhere on the property, which shall be shown on the final landscape plan. At the conclusion of the project, prior to Final Inspection, the Arborist shall file a report to the City of Piedmont certifying that all tree preservation measures as recommended have been implemented to his/her satisfaction and that all retained trees have not been compromised by the construction.

6. **Garage Door.** The garage door shall be electronically operated.

7. **Notice of Non-Habitation.** A Notice of Non-Habitation shall be filed for the garage attic storage room, that indicates that this room may only be used for storage purposes.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Kellogg, Seconded by Levine

Ayes: Levine, Kellogg, Robertson, Stehr, Thiel

Noes: None

Absent: None

The Commission recessed for dinner at 6:40 p.m. and reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

### **Design Review Guidelines**

The City Planner recommended that the Commission begin considering possible improvements to the City's Residential Design Review Guidelines, which have not been updated since their adoption in 1988. She stated that the Commission is well positioned to review and update these guidelines since all the Commissioners have had at least three years experience in working the guidelines. The City Planner also encouraged residents to provide input regarding the guidelines and to provide the planning department with their e-mail addresses so as to be notified in advance of the dates and times hearings on the guidelines will be held.

The Commission requested that for purposes of review and update, the guidelines be divided into sections/chapters and the timetable for discussion be flexible so as to take into account the length of Commission meeting agendas and staff workload requirements. The Commission requested that the review begin with *Fences, Retaining Walls and Garages*.

During discussion, the Commission requested that the following issues be addressed during the review/update process:

- the possible need for separate guidelines dealing with cell antennae installations, signage and other types of utilitarian projects wherein findings of "aesthetically pleasing" can be quite challenging;
- the desirability of considering roof material as an important architectural element of a design, rather than just having composite asphalt shingles as the de facto choice;
- whether the routine finding that a project "is categorically exempt from CEQA" can be presumed rather than explicitly stated in each motion;
- the desirability of easing the current restriction that "new residential construction be compatible with the predominate architectural style of a neighborhood" so as to add more

flexibility in approving modern, contemporary designs. Design compatibility be based more on sensitivity to the surrounding architectural environment, mass, bulk, siting, scale, size, etc.

- provide more flexibility regarding front yard fence heights for upsloping lots and tall houses so as to create proper visual scale and proportion;
- expand the definition of front entry points such as gates, arbors, finials, etc. to provide flexibility in allowing such elements to be higher than 4 ft. if a higher height enhances the overall architectural design;
- revise the zoning code to allow architectural detailing and ornamentations that enhance the overall architectural integrity of a project to encroach into setbacks, if such encroachment does not adversely impact adjacent properties. Provide a list of the types of minor architectural features that may be allowed to encroach into setbacks, subject to staff review and approval of such "minor variances."
- revise the guidelines to meet the new General Plan Housing Element recommendation that a multi-zone definition be considered in Zone D;
- insure that the revised guidelines encourage, rather than discourage, housing improvements and new home construction;
- incorporate the City of Lafayette's design guideline encouraging the retention of the natural features of a property;
- include illustrations in the guidelines depicting how building mass should be treated on steep, upslope properties;
- provide flexibility to Commissioners to determine that repeated site visits are not required unless substantive changes to a previously submitted design are proposed.

**Public testimony** was received from:

Arleta Chang, a former Planning Commissioner, stated that overall the consensus of her architectural firm is that the Design Review Guidelines are comprehensive, flexible, useful and not difficult to understand or follow. She urged that the City's Zoning Code be revised to address issues related to parking requirements, architectural projections into setbacks and most particularly, the financially burdensome conditions being placed on new home construction projects.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Robertson adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

