

ASCC Field Meeting, 155 Cherokee Way, Architectural and Site Development Review for a New Residence and Landscaping

Vice Chair Koch called the field meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

ASCC: Commissioners Breen, Ross, Wilson, and Vice-Chair Koch
(Chair Sill was absent)

Town Staff: Associate Planner Arly Cassidy

Conservation: Judy Murphy

Others present

Yvonne Harrosh, Owner

Michael Peadon, Owner

Kenneth Hall, Project Architect

Len Shustek and Donna Dubinski, 160 Cherokee

Linda Montgomery, 150 Cherokee

Associate Planner Arly Cassidy presented the report regarding the project which consists of a 4,553 square foot home and attached four-car garage on a 1.0 acre property located at 155 Cherokee Way. The proposed plans include a new single story residence with three bedrooms and a back patio and dog yard. The existing house will be demolished and pool will be filled. Landscaping of 16,173 square feet is proposed, primarily along the south side of the house. The property has a sloped rear and side yard with a cluster of existing oak trees along Cheyenne Point; a group of ponderosa pines in the rear corner is proposed for removal. The site is surrounded by single family homes. Planner Cassidy stated that more than ten neighbors had emailed her offering support for the project, but the immediate neighbor at 145 Cherokee had concerns around privacy and light spill, and would prefer a solid six foot fence at the interior side yard.

Following her presentation, Architect Hall offered a narrative of the house's craftsman design and reuse of the house site. He mentioned attention to views both of the house and from within. He explained that the owners have small dogs and would like to have a small fenced area within the rear fenced yard for their security. He stated that the site design takes advantage of the rear hill, which offers privacy from the rear neighbors. He mentioned the dry river rock swale, which both functions as a drainage channel in the wet season and adds a visual feature.

Conservation Committee Chair Murphy asked that there be no landscaping under the large heritage oak at the front of the property.

Owner Harrosh stated that the artificial turf proposed for the dog yard had been well researched and offered good percolation as well as heat reduction techniques, and also helped keep odors down.

The group circled the house through the south side yard to the rear. Owner Harrosh offered that there were quite a few ponderosa pines at the rear of the property, and they desired to take all of them out. Conservation Chair Murphy agreed with this proposal. Owner Harrosh stated that they were willing to bring the interior side yard fence into the property so as to not interfere with the existing trees along that property line, and that they were open to a solid six foot fence if the neighbors desired it.

Conservation Chair Murphy asked if the applicant had considered using the existing pool cavity as a place to store a water cistern for roof runoff. Architect Hall replied that both the geotechnical and engineering consultants had recommended against placing water storage uphill from the house.

Commissioner Breen stated that once the pines were removed, the existing oaks would respond by growing into that space, and additional oaks may not be needed to fill the space left by the pines. At the interior side yard, Owner Harrosh stated her desire to remove two smaller oaks under an existing larger oak, which Conservation Chair Murphy and Commissioner Breen agreed with.

The group stopped in the front yard, and Vice Chair Koch asked for any final comments. Neighbor Linda Montgomery asked that the project move forward quickly, and Commissioner Breen noted that it was nice that the owners had reached out to all of their neighbors before the meeting.

Vice Chair Koch stated that Commissioners would offer further comments on the proposal at the regular evening meeting that evening. Members thanked the applicant and architect for participation in the site meeting. The field meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Koch called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House Meeting Room, 765 Portola Road.

Planning & Building Director Laura Russell called roll:

Present: ASCC: Commissioners Danna Breen, Dave Ross, and Jane Wilson; Vice Chair Megan Koch
Absent: Chair Sill
Planning Commission Liaison: Judith Hasko
Town Staff: Planning & Building Director Laura Russell; Associate Planner Cassidy; Planner Cynthia Richardson

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

(1) Architectural Review for an Addition and Remodel, 10 Sandstone Street, Craig and Michelle Opperman Residence, File # PLN ARCH 18-2018

Planner Richardson described the proposal for an addition, remodel, and garage conversion located at 10 Sandstone Street, as detailed in the staff report. Staff recommended that the ASCC approve the proposed project, subject to the conditions in Attachment 1.

Vice Chair Koch invited the applicant to comment. Ms. Opperman offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Breen asked why there was a light around the corner of the house since there is no door. The applicant said there is a curb that runs along the left side of the driveway that it is not visible in the dark and is a tripping hazard for guests who park outside the garage door. Commissioner Breen suggested using a path light. The applicant said there are no path lights along the driveway, and rather than adding more lights that would light the entire side of the driveway, they decided to have just the one light on the side of the garage.

The project architect said they need to add a light on the left side elevation at the door to comply with code and suggested adding one to the left of the door. Commissioner Ross said as long as the door was not a mandatory egress, it did not require a light. The applicant asked if they would be allowed to install a light at that door. Vice Chair Koch suggested building a light into the railing shining back toward the house. The applicant said installing any light there would require going back before the design review committee of the Portola Valley Ranch, so she would rather just leave it unlit if code does not require it.

Vice Chair Koch invited public comment. Hearing none, she brought the item back to the Commissioners for discussion.

Commissioner Breen was supportive of the project. She said she was pleased to see the

removal of the redwood tree.

Commissioner Ross was supportive of the project. He said it was an appropriate addition. He suggested the applicants be aware of illumination sources, such as chargers, that may be left on all night and glow through the frosted glass on the garage door. The applicant said because the area is currently a carport all of the workbenches are enclosed behind closet doors.

Commissioner Wilson was supportive of the project.

Vice Chair Koch was supportive of the project. She said it is an appropriate reworking of the site.

Commissioner Ross moved to make the required findings and approve the proposed addition and remodel project. Seconded by Commissioner Breen; the motion carried 4-0.

(2) Architectural and Site Development Review for a New Residence and Landscaping, 155 Cherokee Way, Harrosh/Peadon Residence, File # PLN ARCH 15-2018

A site visit was held at this property earlier this evening. Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposal for a new residence and landscaping located at 155 Cherokee Way, as detailed in the staff report. Staff recommended that the ASCC approve the proposed residence and landscaping, subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment 1).

Vice Chair Koch invited comments by the applicant.

Ken Hall, project architect, said that the skylight shades will be on timers and controlled by the daylight. He said the owners reached out to the neighbors and shared the project plans. He said they've been discussing saving the small existing maple tree with the arborist who suggested it would be safer for the tree to transplant it only once. He said the owners are working to satisfy the neighbors regarding the fencing.

The landscape architect said they will be staying within the Town's desire for minimal site impact, low water use with only temporary irrigation for plant establishment, and minimal plantings under oak drip lines. He showed the location on the plans where they will try to transplant the maple tree.

Vice Chair Koch invited questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Wilson asked the landscape architect if they had considered letting the oaks grow for a while after the pine trees come down to see how they develop rather than immediately planting more trees. The architect said the existing oaks have struggled and been stunted for many years. He said they will reestablish themselves, but said it will be 10 to 15 years before there is substantial screening. He said if they bring in three 36" boxes they can get some elevation there, and they will have a head start as the landscape goes in.

Commissioner Ross said the neighbor at 145 was concerned about being able to see the eave lights in front of the garage door from his bedroom window. He asked if the applicants had reviewed the sightline to that fixture. The project architect said the structure was rotated slightly instead of siting it at the same angle as the neighbor's house to reduce the neighbor's sightline impact from the garage lights. He said the lights are tucked up underneath the fascia, and the fixture is not visible. He said the light spill is tight and will wash directly underneath with an

approximately 4- to 5-foot pool of light. He said the combination of the rotation of the structure and selection of the lights, which are slightly less than 800 lumens, should minimize any light spill impact to those neighbors. Commissioner Ross suggested that, when the rough-in is complete, they check that sight line and, if necessary, adjust it. The architect added that the lights can be mounted at various angles.

Vice Chair Koch asked, with regard to the side gate at the trash enclosure along the garage, if the applicants were thinking of car storage on that side that would need to be screened from the neighbor. The architect said the owner wants to be able to back his truck in that area to unload and hose off his hiking and camping equipment after trips and then park his truck in the garage. He said the area would not be used for car storage.

With no additional questions, Vice Chair Koch invited public comment. Hearing none, Vice Chair Koch brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Wilson was supportive of the design and color board. She was pleased the applicants had already spoken with and received support from the neighbors. She suggested the applicants deal with the invasives currently on the property right away. She was pleased about the removal of the pines and moving the trees from the front to the back. She suggested removing one of the recessed lights at the back near the dog park area. She said the landscaping appears overplanted, especially on the Cheyenne Point side. She said the Commission generally recommends less planting. She said it is a thoughtful design. She did not like the artificial grass, but did not object because the applicants had researched it and decided it was the best solution. The landscape architect agreed to wait and see how the landscape fills in, but he doesn't think it will be very dense.

Commissioner Breen was supportive of the project. She loved the view of the western hills through the distant trees. She suggested lifting up the one valley oak to get a bit more of the view. She was supportive of the color board and materials. She said the Town encourages open fencing and said the neighbor has the ability to landscape on their side. She was supportive of the planting plan. She said the property cannot accommodate four valley oaks. She suggested they didn't need any trees, except maybe one on the back hillside, and should just allow the existing trees to grow into the void that will be created by the loss of the pines. She said hopefully, the fence line on the back property line will get straightened out with the neighbor. She suggested reduced lighting at the dog area and said it could be mitigated with some planting. The architect said he'd like to readdress tree planting once the pines are removed.

Commissioner Ross was supportive of the project. He said he could support the design guideline findings. He said the massing and finishes are very compatible with the neighborhood. He said he is usually concerned about the number of skylights, but is satisfied with the use of timers and shades to mitigate the light spill. He appreciated the thought given to the light spill onto the 145 Cherokee neighbor. He said the Commission is usually not in favor of artificial grass if it is visible but in this instance, for their specific purpose and the very private space, he said it is acceptable. He agreed with the other Commissioners' comments about the trees and landscaping. He said the area to the south of the house is a nice opportunity for an open area that doesn't need much landscaping. He said while he would not suggest a condition banning the planting of more trees, he does not think they will be needed to fill in that corner. With regard to the fencing with the neighbor at 145, he appreciated the idea of leaving a wildlife corridor through there, but is not fond of solid-wall corridors and would prefer an open fence. He was supportive of the minor temporary irrigation under the oak trees and relocating the maple tree. He said he was supportive of replacing them if needed for sun-shading purposes for the bedroom wing of the house in the late afternoon.

Vice Chair Koch was supportive of the project. She appreciated using the same footprint and keeping it single story. She said the plans are very thorough. She agreed there were too many trees proposed for the rear of the property and said filling in with toyons was a good suggestion. She was supportive of the synthetic turf as it is part of their intimate space and low water usage. She was supportive of the lights in the dog yard because they are low lumens. She suggested open fencing but acknowledged that neighbor relations are important, and if that meant they had to have the solid fence, she could support that.

Commissioner Breen suggested they consider the noise level of the two air conditioning units. She said in Portola Valley, a well-designed house usually would not require air conditioning. Commissioner Ross agreed and said that there is usually a nice cooling breeze through the fog except for a few nights a year. He said although adding air conditioning to a house is quite standard these days, they might consider just adding a provision for air conditioning and wait to see if they need it.

Associate Planner Cassidy said the applicant was considering a 6-foot solid fence at the rear property line if desired by that neighbor. She asked if that should remain an option. The applicant said they walked that area again and decided that the fence would not benefit the neighbors, but they would potentially want to move the fence in more for the sake of the trees. The Commissioners said they would only support a solid 6-foot fence in a limited area between the 145 and 155 properties, at their discretion, but not the entire length. They suggested that detail be included in the final landscape plan.

Commissioner Ross moved to approve the new residence and landscaping with the proposed staff conditions; the option for the applicant to work with the neighbor to determine the nature and height of the fence near the boundary of 145 and 155; the suggestion of a mild reduction of planting and trees; a condition to check the sightline of the location of the eave light; and a condition that the final landscape plan including fence details comes back to a single Commissioner for approval prior to issuance of building permit. Seconded by Commissioner Breen; the motion carried 4-0.

(3) Study Session on Accessory Dwelling Units: Design Issues

Planning & Building Director Russell said the Planning Commission has already completed two study sessions on ADUs. She explained that the Planning Commission has asked that a number of items be addressed by the ASCC, capitalizing on their design expertise and to provide direction as staff moves forward in further development and writing of code language.

Commissioner Breen passed out information regarding San Mateo County's "Second Unit Inspiration." Commissioner Wilson shared a second unit workbook she got at the library. Planning & Building Director Russell said Home for All and 21 Elements put together workbooks that staff has been passing out.

Associate Planner Cassidy presented the background and discussion items regarding this Accessory Dwelling Units study session, as detailed in the staff report. Staff requested that the ASCC provide recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposal to create an intermediate review level wherein staff would review ADUs using the Town Design Guidelines for design elements such as floor area, architectural style, height, location, 85% massing, and light wells.

Vice Chair Koch was supportive of creating an intermediate level staff discretionary review

process.

Commissioner Ross was supportive of granting staff discretionary review abilities. He said it was helpful for staff to work with an applicant to advise them on what items need to be reviewed by the ASCC. He asked if it had been considered to have a rotating assignment of a single ASCC member to serve as the liaison to staff for discretionary reviews. Planning & Building Director Russell said staff has considered two possibilities – one would have staff reviewing the projects together with an ASCC member to decide if it would be a staff level or ASCC level review, possibly as a phase-in period. The other possibility discussed was having staff perform discretionary reviews together with an ASCC member before granting final approval, which may be an intermediate or permanent step depending on the comfort level. Planning & Building Director Russell said the Planning Commission was concerned that there be a record, that neighbors are noticed and given opportunity for input, and that there is consistency.

Vice Chair Koch and Commissioner Ross preferred having staff perform discretionary reviews together with an ASCC member. Commissioner Breen said staff already has the job of bringing approvable projects to the ASCC. Commissioner Breen said the Townspeople need to have representation in the design review and it could be one ASCC member. She said ASCC members look through a different lens and are neighbors, and she feels it is very important that someone from the ASCC always has a seat at the table. Commissioner Ross liked the idea of rotating the assignment of ASCC members because it takes some of the pressure off of staff, and it will be helpful to them to have the support of an ASCC member who can further explain the design guidelines to applicants.

Commissioner Wilson asked if staff felt they could handle it if there were a rush of ADU applications. Planning & Building Director Russell said preparing a project for staff discretionary review is less work than preparing for a full ASCC meeting. She said they hope for an increase in ADU applications, and if that creates staffing issues she will bring that up with the Town Manager.

Commissioner Wilson asked if a list of preapproved ADU designs had been considered. Associate Planner Cassidy said that suggestion had been made by the Town Council and discussed by staff. She said they asked the Planning Commission if they were interested in staff spending time to develop a process that involved preapproved projects. She said that while the Planning Commission supported the idea, they did not want staff to spend a lot of time on it because it could snowball into a bigger project. She said the general idea is to look at making sure that an original proposal goes through the normal review process, coming to ASCC, vetted quite heavily, and then that exact blueprint could be ordered by the next person. Because staff would have already looked at that project quite closely, it could follow a more streamlined process. She said the question would be if it is was one specific unit or one specific vendor with different models that would all be preapproved. She said another possibility would be individuals recreating already-approved projects. Commissioner Ross said another possibility along those lines would be to create a gallery of approved projects that new applicants could view for ideas to see what might work on their lot. He said it may not be valuable to have two or three preapproved designs because they would need to be customized to fit on the different lots. Vice Chair Koch said it could be helpful for ideas, but pointed out that often times models are retired and replaced with new models. Planning & Building Director Russell said staff was thinking about the feasibility of it, but it is not a code amendment to be included in this package.

Commissioner Ross said an approved design gallery concept could be helpful if the requests for ADUs start to snowball. Associate Planner Cassidy said that is one of the reasons they're holding the open house tomorrow for people to tour existing ADUs. She said there is actually a

waiting list of people who want to share their ADUs.

Commissioner Ross said staff discretionary review with a rotating ASCC member would cover all of the individual design elements listed under that category in the staff report.

Commissioner Breen said she thought heights of ADUs should be greatly reduced. She said ADUs should be subservient to the main architecture. Commissioner Ross said someone may add a couple of feet to their garage attic space in order to create an ADU above the garage.

Vice Chair Koch said if one ASCC Commissioner is involved, they can decide if the findings can be met.

Associate Planner Cassidy said the Commission can look at removing review and also the consistency of the code. She said, for example, the project at 99 Hillbrook has a few different elements proposed, including a 206-square-foot second-story addition above the main house. She said if the applicants were only proposing that, it would not trigger an ASCC review. However, if that were proposed as an ADU it would trigger review, so there is an inconsistency of how height is applied to ADUs versus other uses. The questions are if there should be ASCC review for height at all, if it could be made more consistent with use, and if ADUs should always be shorter than other residences.

Commissioner Ross said a detached ADU that is more dominant than the main structure creates an aesthetic disconnect that would be problematic. He said if it was a matter of adding a bit of height, such as at 99 Hillbrook, then he felt differently about the height restriction. Commissioner Ross said he was comfortable with staff discretionary review including the involvement of a single ASCC Commissioner as part of that review process.

Commissioner Breen said there cannot legally be a distinction made about use in determining what kind of review is required. She said she thinks that most people do not use their ADUs for housing. She said it is frustrating that a use restriction cannot be applied since the Town goal is to provide affordable housing.

The Commission was supportive of allowing staff discretionary review with a rotating ASCC Commissioner for the design elements of floor area, architectural style, location, 85% massing, and light wells, and with some additional sensitivity regarding height. They agreed that having an ASCC member involved in the process will help mitigate potential impacts on neighbors.

Planning Commission Liaison Judith Hasko asked if the same rules would apply to the scenic corridor. She asked how much the 85% massing has been an issue historically.

Commissioner Breen said the scenic corridor numbers seem arbitrary and is still something that needs to be looked at. She said there are different places on the scenic corridor that are more important. She said there are many subjective areas. Commissioner Breen said most of the time the 85% rule works, but sometimes it makes a building look massive.

Commissioner Ross agreed with the recommendation that a project not automatically come to the ASCC just because it's in the corridor or it exceeds 85%. He said if staff plus an ASCC member is concerned about a particular application because of its strategic location or because of the appearance of the more massive structure, then it can come to the ASCC on a discretionary basis. He said he would put the scenic corridor first in priority, then the 85% rule, then height, and then light wells. He said they can all have the same general rule applied.

Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposed policy and code changes to include more substantial code amendments regarding ADUs on all parcel sizes, floor area allowed for ADUs, parking, allowing ADUs in all zones, and second driveways. She said the Town Council heard quite a bit from residents who are desirous of building ADUs on smaller parcels.

Commissioner Breen expressed concern about changing the size rules that have just recently been developed, after a lot of thought and discussion. Commissioner Ross said the question is if those rules have created a barrier in some ways whereby a potential applicant does not bother applying to build an ADU with all the rules, or if the rules haven't had time to bear fruit. Vice Chair Koch and Commissioner Breen said it was premature to change this rule, and the size limits should remain as is.

Associate Planner Cassidy said this discussion item was generated from residents at the Town Council study session who clearly expressed they would love to build an ADU on their property, live in it, and free up their main home for their children. Their concern was that they only had one acre and 1,000 square feet did not feel like enough space for them. She said the older houses are smaller, but the newer housing stock tends to be larger. She said residents felt that downsizing from a 4,000- to 5,000-square-foot residence to 1,000 square feet was uncomfortable.

Commissioner Ross said as long as the AMFA (Adjusted Maximum Floor Area) is honored, then it doesn't really matter, although the distinction of an accessory dwelling is somewhat lost. He said many people buy a property with a smaller structure, build something bigger that will become the main residence, and then convert the smaller structure to an ADU or possibly tear it down. He said this proposal is a different spin on the same activity with the difference being whether it is labeled as an ADU or not.

Commissioner Ross said he could support removing the specific restriction for an ADU as long as the AMFA is respected. Commissioner Breen agreed.

Commissioner Wilson asked about a two-acre property allowing more than one ADU. Associate Planner Cassidy said that Chair Sill suggested that the current maximum numbers become the triggers for ASCC review with AMFA as the cap. She said the Planning Commission also raised the issue of the description of "accessory." They pointed out that building a larger building is clearly not an accessory building and suggested there should be some consideration of proportionality or percentage. Planning & Building Director Russell said the Planning Commission discussed the possibility of the two units becoming more like duplexes of similar size, which is an important policy question regarding what is considered to be accessory. Planning & Building Director Russell said staff believes that the secondary unit should still be accessory, secondary to the primary use, but are interested in hearing the ASCC comments and feedback.

Associate Planner Cassidy confirmed that if there was a smaller building in existence and someone wanted to build a larger structure, that would be allowed and would go under the normal, non-ADU review process.

Commissioner Ross asked if that was, in effect, turning R-1 Zoning into R-2. Planning & Building Director Russell said the Town wants to be thoughtful about that. She said the State has defined ADUs not as density, but since the Town is going beyond the State law requirements, it really is a Town decision to understand how far to go. Commissioner Ross said the definition of accessory would have something to do with that.

The Commission was supportive of using the current maximum numbers as the triggers for ASCC review with AMFA as the cap.

Commissioner Wilson asked if building an ADU raised the property tax. Associate Planner Cassidy said, per the Finance Director, building an ADU does not trigger a reevaluation of the entire property, but the ADU's value itself is added.

Associate Planner Cassidy described the current parking requirements and the proposal to allow the required parking space for external ADUs to be shared with existing guest parking space. She said this would allow the ADU parking requirement to be satisfied by an existing parking space on the property without needing to create a new one.

Vice Chair Koch expressed that certain narrow streets in Town could not handle using their extra space for the ADU. Commissioner Breen said there could be a rule about no on-street parking to handle that. She predicted that there will be a lot of garage conversions to ADUs because it is less expensive and makes sense. She said she does realize that on some streets, if somebody has a party, a firetruck could never get through.

The Commission recommended that the option to share an existing parking space with an ADU be allowed, perhaps through the process of staff discretionary review with an ASCC member.

Associate Planner Cassidy explained the proposal to allow ADUs in non-residential zones as long as the unit is accessory/subservient to the primary use, such as an ADU Unit at the PV Garage, Roberts, churches, Village Square, etc. She explained that this proposal is separate from the Affiliated Housing Program with the Sequoias, the Priory, and the Stanford Wedge, which have different allowances for building residential uses on their property. Planning & Building Director Russell asked the Commission to comment on specific design considerations for these types of uses.

Commissioner Wilson said the Glen Oaks Equestrian project was done very well. The Commission agreed the units should be made to look like they've always been there.

The Commission was supportive of allowing ADUs in non-residential zones.

Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposal to allow second driveways for ADUs. She noted that the Conservation Committee feels they should be rarely approved unless there is a special need such as a large parcel with significant road frontage. Associate Planner Cassidy said there is also the requirement that a fire truck must be able to get within 150 feet of the ADU, and there must be a firetruck turnaround.

Commissioner Ross said that situation may result in adding a lot of impervious surface. Commissioner Breen was also concerned about impervious surface.

Commissioner Ross said he could support second driveways as long as the impervious surface and Fire Department requirements were met. He said he could imagine a roughly rectangular lot on a corner with an ADU built at the far corner from the main house, maybe with a very short driveway to the cross street, which would make more sense than an extra long driveway. Commissioner Wilson said owners may get annoyed with tenants blocking the driveway, and it is better if tenants have their own access to their parking space with a second driveway. Commissioner Breen said she would require that the second driveway be a pervious surface such as gravel.

Commissioner Ross suggested that allowing a second driveway would include a condition that it must create less impervious surface than extending the existing driveway. The rest of the Commission agreed.

Associate Planner Cassidy asked for clarification regarding pervious surface – something allowing water to percolate, or something that is not impervious surface as defined by the code, pointing out that the code definition for impervious surface is quite wide. Commissioner Breen said the problem with the code definition of impervious surfaces needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Ross suggested that at this time the existing definitions should apply noting that those definitions need to be addressed in the future.

Associate Planner Cassidy asked the Commission to comment on potential impacts related to design and neighborhood compatibility if any or all of the policy items were approved. She asked if there were specific criteria which would help reduce potential impacts.

Commissioner Ross said the process of more staff discretion along with the participation of a rotating ASCC member, setting aside things that would be clearly ministerial, mitigates both questions. The rest of the Commission agreed.

Associate Planner Cassidy asked for clarification of the Commission's opinion regarding allowing ADUs on all parcel sizes and if there were any design concerns.

Commissioner Ross said they should be allowed as long as the AMFA is respected. Commissioner Breen said the Commission had not yet discussed parcels of less than one acre. Vice Chair Koch said ADUs still have to be within setbacks and have to follow all the rules. Commissioner Breen said allowable square footage for parcels under one acre should be discussed before considering building on all parcel sizes. Commissioner Ross said if someone built a pool house of 900 square feet on their property of less than an acre, with headroom in their AMFA, it would be allowed. He said that should also be the case for an ADU. He said other things such as setbacks, daylight plane, and available space under the AMFA will provide the constraints on the size of the ADU.

Associate Planner Cassidy said if the smaller than one-acre parcel built a pool house, that existing structure could then be converted to an ADU under the current code, and this suggested policy would simply eliminate the two-step process.

The Commissioners supported allowing ADUs on all parcel sizes while respecting the AMFA.

Commissioner Wilson asked about restricting how many ADUs can be built on a property. Commissioner Ross said if the restriction for the quantity is removed, somebody could build five 200-square foot ADUs. Commissioner Ross supported limiting the allowance to one ADU unless it is a very large parcel.

Associate Planner Cassidy said, with regard to shared housing, currently a normal single-family residence can have five non-related people in the household. This discussion is regarding the design of the construction. She said 155 Cherokee is one acre with a maximum floor area of 5,366 feet with a slope of 12 percent. Commissioner Ross said if that application was for a 3,000-square-foot house they could have two 1,000-square-foot ADUs if the quantity restriction was removed.

The Commission supported retaining the current maximum allowances.

Associate Planner Cassidy said the Commission appeared to be supportive of the staff discretionary review with ASCC coordination process. She said if the Commission wanted to brainstorm more on potential criteria or ways to work with ADUs and mitigating for impacts, staff developed a few diagrams to help lead that discussion. She also shared examples of existing ADUs. She said usually, people prefer to build their ADUs far from the main house; however, there are some that are built near to the main home. She asked the Commission to consider how that should be controlled and to comment on the good and bad qualities of different siting scenarios for ADUs.

The Commission felt it was important to not regulate the siting [location on the lot] so that applicants had the flexibility to decide how they would use their ADUs. Commissioner Ross said it may be an in-law unit close to the main house so the whole family experience can be shared and, when it's sold someday, the new owners can decide what they want to do with it. He said if someone is building an ADU for the purpose of renting it out, and they want to put it on the other side of the garage, they should have that option.

Associate Planner Cassidy said this feedback will be presented to the Planning Commission at their November 7 meeting, and they are hoping to get some draft language proposed.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(4) Commission Reports

Commissioner Breen reviewed and approved the re-landscaping on Iroquois.

(5) Staff Report

None.

(6) News Digest: Planning Issues of the Day

Staff shared articles of interest with the Commissioners – “The New American Dream Home Is One You Never Have to Leave” and “Transforming Trailers”

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(5) ASCC Meeting of September 24, 2018

Commissioner Breen moved to approve the September 24, 2018, minutes as submitted. Seconded by Commissioner Wilson, the motion passed 4-0.

ADJOURNMENT [9:24 p.m.]