



MINUTES ARCHITECTURE AND SITE REVIEW COMMITTEE

6:00 p.m., February 20, 2008
Room A at the Hillview Community Center
97 Hillview Avenue, Los Altos, California 94022

Call to Order

Vice-Chair BRESSACK called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Roll Call

Present: Vice-Chair BRESSACK, Commissioners LORELL and HULL (for BAER)
Staff: Senior Planner KORNFIELD, Associate Planner DAHL, and Assistant Planners LACEY and KOO

Minutes

Consideration of the minutes from the February 6, 2008 Architecture and Site Review Committee meeting.

Motion: LORELL/BRESSACK

Moved to adopt the February 6, 2008 meeting minutes as amended.

PASSED: 2/0/1 (HULL abstained)

Consent Calendar

None.

Discussion

1. 07-SC-41 – Chapman Design Associates – 500 University Avenue

Re-consideration of design review for a remodel and addition to a historic landmark residence. The project includes an addition of 469 square feet to the first floor, remodeling of the second floor, replacement of an existing detached garage with an attached garage, and upgrading and expanding an existing basement. *Project Planner: Dahl*

Associate Planner DAHL presented the staff report and made himself available to answer questions.

Public Comment

The project designer spoke in favor of the project and discussed the extent of the original, 1990 and proposed addition and that the project only affected two percent (2%) of the original structure. A former historical commissioner spoke in opposition to the project and stated that the project jeopardizes the historic integrity, obscures the original form, and that the 1990 addition was the maximum change allowed by a previous Historical Commission. The former property owner of the subject lot spoke in support of the project and stated that the project balances preservation with the owner's right to develop with the preserving of the structure's historic integrity and the work protects the public façade. He also said that the house qualified in 1990, with the remodel work, for national landmark status.

Discussion

Commissioner HULL stated that the City compromised in allowing the project in 1990 and that he could not support this project because it deteriorates the historic integrity. Commissioner LORELL said that he was concerned about the extent of the project and the scope of work in light of the new information. Vice-Chair BRESSACK stated that the Architecture and Site Review Committee's direction was to limit the amount of work within the specified direction and that the applicant had met that. She said that there were only minor issues remaining such as the open rail and sliding doors that were not historic and suggested using closed rails and swinging doors. BRESSACK stated that the Committee should approve the project with minor conditions, but that if the majority of the Committee was concerned about the policy implications of approving a project that substantially modified a historic structure, then the Architecture and Site Review Committee should deny the application and let the City Council hear the merits of the project.

Motion: HULL/LORELL

Moved to deny application 07-SC-41 per negative findings and the following:

- The extent of the changes jeopardize the Historic Resources Inventory rating; and
- That the approval would raise significant policy issues in maintaining historic structures.

PASSED: 2/1 (BRESSACK opposed)

2. 07-SC-50 – L. Lee – 1460 Montclair Place

Consideration of design review for a second-story addition of 571 square feet and single-story addition of 775 square feet. *Project Planner: Koo*

Assistant Planner KOO presented the staff report and made herself available to answer questions.

Public Comment

A neighbor spoke in support of the project.

Discussion

Commissioners LORELL and HULL stated that they supported the design. Vice-Chair BRESSACK said that the master bedroom windows did not appear to meet egress and that the deck at the rear had privacy impacts in the two gaps in the landscaping.

Motion: LORELL/HULL

Moved to approve application 07-SC-50 per the staff report findings and conditions with the following additional condition:

- Add landscape screening in both gaps along the rear property line for staff review and approval.

PASSED: 3/0

3. 07-SC-52 – Studio 3 Design – 653 Kingswood Way

Consideration of a new, two-story house. The project includes 2,541 square feet on the first floor and 927 square feet on the second floor. *Project Planner: Lacey*

Assistant Planner LACEY presented the staff report and made himself available to answer questions.

Public Comment

The project designer spoke in support of the project and stated that the project meets code and is not at the maximum height allowed. She said that they met with the surrounding neighbors and the neighbors were opposed to any two-story house and some privacy issues were expressed. The designer stated that the street trees mitigated the massing, that the seven-foot-deep deck allowed seating and if they reduced it to four feet

in depth, then it would only be a standing deck which would create more privacy issues, and suggested raising the balcony railing. Several neighbors spoke in opposition to the project due to the design being out of character with the rest of the neighborhood, allowing a two-story house would set precedence, and privacy issues with the balcony and bathroom windows. The applicant stated that he understood the concerns and tried to limit the addition to the house and limited the mass of the second floor. He said that he spoke to the surrounding neighbors and got good feedback, but there were concerns raised about a two-story house and some of the neighbors were pressured into signing the petition.

Discussion

Commissioner HULL stated that the scale and massing of the house was okay, but that the rear balcony was a privacy issue. Commissioner LORELL said that the design was not appropriate in the neighborhood. Vice-Chair BRESSACK encouraged the neighbors to be proactive on banning two-story houses in the neighborhood and noted the single-story overlay re-zoning process. She stated that she could not support the project because the design needed to be more modest, the rear balcony was an issue that was not mitigatable and should be removed, and because of the complex roof design. BRESSACK said that the nine-foot plates and size of the second floor created too much mass and needed to be reduced, and that the architectural details needed simplification.

Motion: BRESSACK/HULL

Moved to continue application 07-SC-52 with the following direction:

- Align better with the surrounding setbacks;
- Reduce the second story mass;
 - Lower the plate heights and/or reduce the size of the second story;
 - Simplify the hip roofs;
- Simplify and unify the architectural details including the entry;
- Define the obscure glazing on the bathroom windows; and
- Remove the balcony and door on the back.

PASSED: 2/1 (LORELL opposed)

Adjournment

Vice-Chair BRESSACK adjourned the meeting at 8:25 PM.

Prepared by:

David Kornfield, AICP
Senior Planner