

TOWN OF LOS GATOS
110 East Main Street, Los Gatos, CA 95030 (408) 354-6874

SUMMARY MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE** OF THE TOWN OF LOS GATOS FOR **JUNE 14, 2016** HELD IN THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CIVIC CENTER, 110 EAST MAIN STREET, LOS GATOS, CALIFORNIA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Chair Machado.

ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Sally Zarnowitz, Planning Manager
Jennifer Armer, Associate Planner
Erin Walters, Associate Planner
Jocelyn Puga, Assistant Planner
Doug Harding, Fire Department
Michael Machado, Building Official
Mike Weisz, Associate Civil Engineer

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 1: 14311 Mulberry Drive
Architecture and Site Application S-15-022

Requesting approval to demolish an existing single-family residence and to construct a new single-family residence on property zoned R-1:8. APN 409-15-038.

PROPERTY OWNER: Kwangho Lee (*Present*)

APPLICANT: Robin McCarthy

PROJECT PLANNER: Jennifer Armer

1. *Chair Machado* opened the public hearing.
2. Staff gave report on proposed project.
3. Applicant was introduced.
4. Members of the public were not present.
5. Public hearing closed.
6. *Jennifer Armer* moved to *approve* the application subject to the conditions presented with the following findings and considerations:

FINDINGS

Required finding for CEQA:

The project is Categorical Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15303: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

Required findings for demolition:

As required by Section 29.10.09030(e) of the Town Code for the demolition of a single family residence:

1. The Town's housing stock will be maintained as the house will be replaced.
2. The structure has no historic significance.
3. The property owner does not desire to maintain the structure due to its current condition; and
4. The economic utility of the structure is limited due to its potential condition.

Required Compliance with Residential Design Guidelines:

The project is in compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines for single-family homes.

CONSIDERATIONS

Required considerations in review of applications:

As required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code, the considerations in review of an architecture and site application were all made in reviewing this project.

7. *Doug Harding* seconded, motion passed unanimously.
8. Appeal rights were cited.

ITEM 2: 104 Alta Heights Court
Architecture and Site Application S-15-079

Requesting approval to demolish an existing single-family residence and to construct a new single-family residence on property zoned R-1:8. APN 532-29-044.

PROPERTY OWNER: Rajiv Parihar & Swati Shah

APPLICANT: Stuart M. Alderman (*Present*)

PROJECT PLANNER: Jennifer Armer

1. *Chair Machado* opened the public hearing.
2. Staff gave report on proposed project.
3. Applicant was introduced.
4. Members of the public were present.
 - Gerri and Bud Dandurand
Requested landscaped screening of the car back-up area and garage.
5. Public hearing closed.
6. *Doug Harding* moved to *approve* the application subject to the conditions including the addition of landscaped screening; presented with the following findings and considerations:

FINDINGS

Required finding for CEQA:

The project is Categorical Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15303: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

Required findings for demolition:

As required by Section 29.10.09030(e) of the Town Code for the demolition of a single family residence:

1. The Town's housing stock will be maintained as the house will be replaced.
2. The structure has no historic significance.
3. The property owner does not desire to maintain the structure due to its current condition; and
4. The economic utility of the structure is limited due to its potential condition.

Required Compliance with Residential Design Guidelines:

The project is in compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines for single-family homes.

CONSIDERATIONS

Required considerations in review of applications:

As required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code, the considerations in review of an architecture and site application were all made in reviewing this project.

7. *Jennifer Armer* seconded, motion passed unanimously.
8. Appeal rights were cited.

ITEM 3: 206 Forrester Road Architecture and Site Application S-16-021

Requesting approval of a grading permit to install a new retaining wall and patio area on property zoned HR-1. APN 537-29-001.

PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT: Douglas Chan (*Present*)

PROJECT PLANNER: Erin Walters

1. *Chair Machado* opened the public hearing.
2. Staff gave report on proposed project.
3. Applicant was introduced.
4. Members of the public were not present.

5. Public hearing closed.
6. *Mike Weisz* moved to *approve* the application subject to the conditions presented with the following findings and considerations:

FINDINGS

Required findings for CEQA:

The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 1530; Existing Facilities.

Compliance with Hillside Development Standards and Guidelines:

The project is in compliance with the Hillside Development Standards and Guidelines for site elements in the Hillside Area as the 420-square foot impervious patio and associated stairs meet the maximum graded cut and fill criteria. The project grades to the minimum amount necessary, and includes retaining walls less than five feet in height matching the site's existing retaining walls. There will be no removal of existing trees or vegetation as a result of the project.

Compliance with Hillside Specific Plan

The project is in compliance with the Hillside Specific Plan in that the site is developed as a single family residence with associated site elements on an existing parcel. The proposal is consistent with the development criteria included in the plan.

CONSIDERATIONS:

Considerations in review of Architecture & Site applications:

As required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code, the considerations in review of an architecture and site application were all made in reviewing this project.

7. *Doug Harding* seconded, motion passed unanimously.
8. Appeal rights were cited.

ITEM 4: 138 Wood Road
 Subdivision Application M-16-001

Requesting approval for a lot line adjustment between two lots for properties zoned HR-5. APN 510-47-027 and 043.

PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT: RADE Properties, LLC

CONTACT PERSON: David Propach (*Present*)

PROJECT PLANNER: Jocelyn Puga

1. *Chair Machado* opened the public hearing.
2. Staff gave report on proposed project.

3. Applicant was introduced.
4. Members of the public were present.
 - Ester Grant
5. Public hearing closed.
6. *Doug Harding* moved to *approve* the application subject to the conditions presented with the following findings and considerations:

FINDINGS:

Required Finding for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):

The project is Categorical Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15305: Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations.

Required Finding for State Subdivision Map Act:

The Development Review Committee has determined that none of the findings for denial specified in Section 66474 of the State Subdivision Map Act can be made.

66474. A legislative body of a city or county shall deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any of the following findings:

- (a) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.*
- (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.*
- (c) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.*
- (d) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.*
- (e) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.*
- (f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious public health problems.*
- (g) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision. In this connection, the governing body may*

approve a map if it finds that alternate easements, for access or for use, will be provided, and that these will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction and no authority is hereby granted to a legislative body to determine that the public at large has acquired easements for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.

7. *Mike Weisz* seconded, motion passed unanimously.
8. Appeal rights were cited.

OTHER BUSINESS

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:43 a.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Development Review Committee is the following Tuesday.


Michael Machado, Building Official