

TOWN OF LOS GATOS
110 East Main Street, Los Gatos, CA 95030 (408) 354-6872

SUMMARY MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN COMMITTEE
OF THE TOWN OF LOS GATOS, **JUNE 14, 2006** HELD IN THE TOWN COUNCIL
CHAMBERS, CIVIC CENTER, 110 EAST MAIN STREET, LOS GATOS, CALIFORNIA.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. by *Chair Jane Ogle*.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Jane Ogle, Joe Pirzynski, Barbara Spector, John Bourgeois, Tom O'Donnell, Phil Micciche, Marcia Jensen

Members absent: Margaret Smith, Barry Waitte

Staff present: Bud Lortz, Community Development Director; Randy Tsuda, Assistant Community Development Director; Sandy Baily, Associate Planner; and Larry Cannon, Cannon Design Group

VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

ITEM 1 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Bud Lortz introduced the first draft of the Residential Design Guidelines and noted the following items for discussion:

- Need for a glossary.
- Further discussion about frontage and street improvements.
- General Plan Policy regarding demolishing a house and replacing it with a house of similar size.
- Designing driveways along fence lines and ribbon strip driveways.
- When is a second story appropriate?
- View protection.
- Are cellars still acceptable or an intensification issue?
- Town/County interface.
- Neighborhood support of a project vs. Town issues.

Committee members were asked to turn in editing comments separately and to bring up issues at the meeting.

Baily gave further background regarding the development of the first draft and the status of the work needed to draft the historic section of the guidelines.

Larry Cannon stated he is still working on the Neighborhood Workbook and encouraged Committee members to review the draft and make comments.

General Comments:

Micciche and *Spector* felt it is a good document.

Bourgeois made the observation that pages 8 & 9 are all photographs and suggested a text lead-in to the photos. The question arose as to how far the document should address landscaping? Reference was made to the Master Tree Plan that the Parks Commission has developed.

Pirzynski questioned the formatting of the sidebars and clarification on whether or not the photographs were good or bad examples.

O'Donnell agreed with all comments that had been made.

Jensen also agreed with all comments made and had some hesitation regarding the photographs. Concern was expressed if an applicant said their house looked like one of the pictures in the document. More clarification should be provided with the photographs.

Ogle commented that the content is good.

Lortz stated the document is written as a positive document focusing on what should be done as opposed to what is not wanted. The cover sheet will be a collage since the Town is eclectic.

Review of Introduction Section

Micciche - Page 11: For a corner parcel, show an example which faces the other street.

Pirzynski - Graphics for neighborhood identification may not do justice to the concept. The Committee discussed keeping it small and maybe expand during the review process if applicable. The use of the sidebar was recommended to further define a neighborhood. For easier reading, look at basic principles with bullets to address anomalies.

Spector - Last paragraph comment regarding "substantial weight" reinforces comments made. Remove "substantial" and expand sentence.

Pirzynski - Page 5: Questioned how will guidelines be applicable to building permits. *Lortz* responded that we need to further refine properties with a slope of 10% or greater to ensure the hillside standards and residential guidelines interface adequately with each other.

Cannon asked for feedback on the Community Expectations section of the introduction on page 10. The fifth bullet needs to be refined.

Jensen reiterated the concern about how far should landscaping be addressed? Structural features (i.e., landscaped retaining walls, etc.) are important to address. Discussion ensued regarding

planning application requirements, building permits and zoning ordinance requirements. Concern was expressed about micro-managing landscaping. Architecture will drive some of the landscaping. Use it as a recommendation/guideline, not an enforcement requirement.

Neighborhood Patterns Section

Page 13 - Questioned sidebar comment regarding "Santa Cruz Avenue Corridor". Under "Basic Design Principles" clarification is required for the difference between adjacent and immediate neighborhood.

Page 15, Section 2.2.3 - The sentence regarding the fences is not clear. Discussed different fence alternatives for corner lots. Further discussion required.

Garage patterns - Questioned how compatibility would work for a neighborhood that has large garages with wide driveways. Discussed ways to keep it compatible but soften appearance.

Circular driveways - More work will be done on this section. There may be exceptions where circular driveways may be appropriate within the front setback.

Page 20 - Questioned how much light/sky a neighbor is entitled? Suggested being more explicit regarding view sheds not being a "right." Language should include working with neighbors to resolve issues.

Building Design Section

Page 23, 3.3.2 - Second sentence in first bullet needs to be revised. Discussed intensity with the use of cellars (Cellar Policy). Consensus of Committee is to re-look at Cellar Policy.

Page 21 - The heading in the footer is misleading. This is not the message the Town wants to emphasize.

Page 24 - Questioned if juliet balconies should be encouraged. Look at providing more information on this as a design issue or provide a different photograph.

Page 23 - May be the place to discuss when a second story addition is appropriate.

Page 25 - Photographs do not all indicate if they are good or bad examples. This comment applies throughout the document. Bottom photograph needs a description.

Page 26 - Bottom photograph was questioned. A different example may be better.

Page 27 - Recommend using a different top photograph.

Page 33 - The material change section is confusing. Suggested using the phrase "wrap material color changes". Discussed composition roofs. Recommended that more photographs be provided.

Page 32 - Questioned what is the test used for determining whether or not material substitutes are acceptable and how this would work.

Page 34, 3.10.1 - fourth bullet - describe "shape."

Page 35 - Expand discussion on privacy and solar.

Solar Panels - Comments are recommended, not required. State does not allow jurisdictions to regulate aesthetics of solar panels. Jurisdictions can only review health and safety issues.

Exterior lighting needs to include discussion of up-lighting of trees and architectural detailing. Include lamp posts.

Lortz stated the next step is to revise the draft. Separate items will be brought back to the Committee.

Public Comment

Ray Davis questioned the status of the North 40 and questioned the process of the Residential Design Guidelines. *Bud Lortz* responded. *Davis* registered his unhappiness that he has to pay for copies of the document under discussion. Difficult to provide comments without documents.

ITEM 2 POSSIBLE CANCELLATION OF JULY MEETINGS

There was consensus to cancel July meetings.

ITEM 3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Phil Micciche made a motion to approve the minutes of March 8, 2006. The motion was seconded by *Tom O'Donnell* and passed unanimously.

Phil Micciche made a motion to approve the minutes of April 26, 2006. The motion was seconded by *Barbara Spector* with the correction that *Bud Lortz* was not at that meeting.

ITEM 4 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m. by *Jane Ogle*. The next meeting of the General Plan Committee is tentatively scheduled for August 9, 2006.

Prepared By:

Sandy Baily, Associate Planner