

An Excerpt from the Architectural Board of Review Minutes of January 7, 2013:**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING****4. 1911 CHINO ST****R-2 Zone**

(4:45) Assessor's Parcel Number: 043-121-013
Application Number: MST2012-00475
Owner: Alamar II, LLC
Architect: Gil Barry

(Proposal to demolish an existing detached 600 square foot two car garage and construct a new two-story single-family residence and attached two-car garage. The project is located at the rear of the 7,500 square foot lot behind the existing 990 square foot one-story single-family residence. A new driveway and two uncovered parking spaces are also proposed.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided.)

Actual time: 4:33 p.m.

Present: Gil Barry, Architect/Agent.

Public comment opened at 4:40 p.m.

- 1) Ryan Romero, opposed; concerns regarding privacy and loss of private mountain views, neighborhood compatibility, residential density, parking impacts, water drainage into his adjacent yard, and noise from new tenants.
- 2) Ralph Romero, opposed; concerns regarding privacy, water drainage into his adjacent yard, and residential density, and parking impacts.
- 3) Patrick Burns (adjacent neighbor), opposed; concerns regarding private mountain views, neighborhood compatibility, long-term sustainability, noise abatement, and residential density, and parking impacts.
- 4) Jeannie Perkins, opposed; concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility, residential density, parking impacts.
- 5) Richard & Lindsey Garrett, (submitted separate letters & some photos) opposed; concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility, residential density, parking impacts, long-term sustainability, privacy, and private mountain views.
- 6) Evelyn Lee, (submitted letter) opposed; concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility, safety, residential density, privacy, parking impacts, and private views.
- 7) Lou Truckenmiller, opposed; concurred with previous comments of neighbors.

Letters letter of expressed concern from Richard & Lindsey Garrett, and Evelyn Lee were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 5:01 p.m.

Chair Zink addressed the Boards lack of purview on issues of residential density and private views.

Motion: Continued two weeks to Full Board with comments:

1. Some Board members find the roof pitch design is too steep and inappropriate for the style of architecture; applicant to restudy a reduction in the angle of the roof pitch, and incorporate some flat roof elements for better design continuity with the front house.
2. Restudy the elevations.
3. Restudy the number of windows to better utilize the interior area.
4. Provide drainage details, and a more detailed topography showing drainage.
5. Provide a study of privacy impacts of the proposed second floor windows and balcony areas; include neighboring fenestration locations on the site plan.
6. Some Board members felt that the balconies should remain un-usable. Study faux balconies.
7. Study reducing the size of the second floor.
8. Provide a pedestrian pathway from the street to rear unit.
9. Study the trash enclosure.
10. To study the impacts the proposed addition would have on mountain views of neighboring properties.

Action: Gradin/Hopkins, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Poole absent).

An Excerpt from the Architectural Board of Review Minutes of Tuesday, January 22, 2013:**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM****8. 1911 CHINO ST****R-2 Zone**

(6:40) Assessor's Parcel Number: 043-121-013
 Application Number: MST2012-00475
 Architect: Gil Barry
 Owner: Alamar II, LLC

(Proposal to demolish an existing detached 600 square foot two-car garage and construct a new 1,320 square foot two-story single-family residence and attached 407 square foot two-car garage. The project is located at the rear of the 7,500 square foot lot behind the existing 990 square foot one-story single-family residence. A new driveway and two uncovered parking spaces are also proposed.)

(Second Review. Project was last reviewed on January 7, 2013. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided.)

Actual time: 7:19 p.m.

Present: Gil Barry, Architect.

Public comment opened at 7:29 p.m.

- 1) Ralph Romero, opposed; requested further review of drainage, expressed concerns about privacy.
- 2) Ryan Romero, opposed; seconded concerns regarding drainage and privacy.
- 3) Patrick Burns, opposed; second units in neighborhood should match front units, concerned that this project will harm the existing character of the neighborhood.
- 4) Johan Delsol, opposed; existing site has many residents and cars, outstanding violations, unkempt condition of property, traffic and street parking concerns, and blocking private views.
- 5) Rich Barrett, opposed; concerns about reduction of rear yard space, architectural style, prefers a single-story project, a neighborhood compatibility and window study was requested; expressed concerns regarding privacy and living standards issues; request drawings, elevations, and photos to show proximity to adjacent properties.
- 6) Evelyn Lee, opposed; seconds Mr. Barrett's and Mr. Burns' comments, would like to see proposed lighting for pedestrian walkway and a landscape plan; suggests a wall at end of driveway to block cars.
- 7) Louis Truckenmiller; opposed; supports all comments from neighbors, concerned about proposed windows in closets.

A letter of expressed concerns from Brian Wingate and Evelyn Lee regarding was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 7:41 p.m.

Motion: Project Design Approval with conditions:

- 1) The mass, bulk, and scale is appropriate to the neighborhood and to the site.
- 2) The architect has done a commendable job in considering the impacts to the neighbors, both in privacy and views.
- 3) Some Board members feel that additional simplification of the architecture could be made and that additional consideration on the south elevation, some changes to the balcony configuration or window configuration on the south elevation could be made to provide greater privacy to the neighbor on that side.
- 4) Some Board members find that window areas and sizes could be reduced, and that perhaps some windows should be eliminated, for example those in the closet areas on the west elevation. Other Board members feel that the windows as shown are fine.

Action: Gradin/Poole, 4/3/0. Motion carried. (Zink, Mosel, Wittausch opposed).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

ATTACHMENT