1	<u>A P P E</u>	EARANCES:
2		
3	Los Gatos Planning Commissioners:	Emily Thomas, Vice Chair Jeffrey Barnett Susan Burnett
4		Melanie Hanssen
5		
6	Town Manager:	Chris Constantin
7	Community Development Director:	Joel Paulson
8	Town Attorney:	Gabrielle Whelan
9	-	
10	Transcribed by:	Vicki L. Blandin (619) 541-3405
11		(019) 341-3403
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

LOS GATOS PLANNING COMMISSION 12/11/2024, Item #3, 120 Oak Meadow Drive

25

PROCEEDINGS:

public hearing portion. The first item on our Public

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: We will now move to the

Hearings agenda is Item 3, which is requesting approval for modification of Planned Development Ordinance 1412, subdivision of one lot into two lots, construction of a single-family residence, and site work requiring a Grading Permit on property zoned O:PD. Located at 120 Oak Meadow Drive, APN 529-10-131, Subdivision Application M-20-011, Planned Development Application PD-20-002, Architecture and Site Application S-22-021. Categorically exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15315: Minor Land Divisions, 15303: New Construction, and 15304: Minor Alterations to Land. Property owner: Marty and Penny McFarland. Applicants: Terence J Szewczyk (M-20-011 and PD-20-002) and Jay Plett, Architect (S-22-021). Project Planner is Mr. Mullin.

First, by a show of hands, Commissioners, can I see all those who have visited the property? Are there any disclosures? Seeing none, Mr. Mullin, will you be giving the Staff Report tonight?

SEAN MULLIN: Yes, thank you, Vice Chair, and good evening.

The request before you this evening is for modification to an existing Planned Development Overlay Zone that would allow subdivision of one lot into two lots and construction of a new single-family residence.

On January 24th of this year the Planning
Commission received the Staff Report, Applicant's
presentation, and public comments. Included in the public
comments was testimony from a neighbor and a board member
of the Regency Court HOA who indicated that the HOA
maintained architectural control over the subject property
and that this architectural review had not taken place.
After discussing the matter, the Commission voted to
continue consideration of this item to a date uncertain to
allow the Applicant sufficient time to complete
coordination with the HOA.

Following the July meeting the Applicant and the HOA met and reached agreement on the project as provided in the letters attached to your Staff Report. The HOA's approval of the project included several conditions enforceable by the HOA, including requiring the secondstory windows on the west elevation to utilize obscured glass; restricting the current and future owners from removing or modifying the existing brick wall along the west properly line, and that this wall is to be extended to

the north using the same vertical siding as is included on the proposed second story of the residence; and several conditions related to construction activities, garbage collection, access, road maintenance, and costs related to updating the CC&Rs are also included.

The Applicant has agreed to these conditions and provided revised plans responding to the conditions. Noted in the revised plans are some of the physical changes to the residence, obscured glass on the second story, and notes regarding access and extending the wall.

To refresh the Commission on the proposal for your consideration, the Applicant is requesting approval to modify PD Ordinance 1412 to allow subdivision of the subject property into two lots, and the construction of a new two-story single-family residence. Parcel A would include the existing residence, and Parcel B would be developed with a new residence.

The requested modifications to the PD include performance standards affecting both parcels to allow deviations from the underlying Office zone requirements, and applicable sections of the Hillside Development Standards and Guidelines as detailed in the July 24th Staff Report.

If the Commission finds merit with the proposed project, Staff recommends taking the actions included on page 4 and 5 of tonight's Staff Report, and to forward the PD, Subdivision, and Architecture and Site Applications to the Town Council with a recommendation of approval.

This concludes Staff's presentation and we are available to answer any questions.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Do any

Commissioners have questions for Staff at this point? Yes,

Commissioner Hanssen.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: It was mentioned in the Staff Report that the conditions that came from the HOA were included as Conditions of Approval that would be monitored by the Town, and if I recall correctly from our last meeting I think our Town Attorney had said that the Town has no authority over a matter that relates to HOAs, although I guess you can consider this like a neighborhood compatibility issue. My question is, is it legally appropriate to have those as Conditions of Approval?

ATTORNEY WHELAN: Good question. The only elements that have been incorporated into the planning approval are the physical changes. There is information in the packet that talks about the property owner promising to pay the HOA for the cost of amending the CC&R agreement,

Item #3, 120 Oak Meadow Drive

LOS GATOS PLANNING COMMISSION 12/11/2024,

and that agreement has not been included in the approval that is before the Planning Commission, so only the physical changes to the structure are reflected in what the Planning Commission is being asked to approve.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: Are the conditions clearly objective in that if our Town Staff said that it was completed and the HOA did not.

ATTORNEY WHELAN: I think there are physical things that can easily be verified, but I'll defer to Mr. Mullin.

SEAN MULLIN: Thank you. If we walk through the conditions—which I will do, because trying to keep things moving this evening—you'd notice that the building has been updated to note that there is obscured glass. There are some notes on here about extending the wall. These are the physical changes to the property. There are also noted on here about construction access and future access, access restrictions on one of the properly lines, and garbage collection. Those types of things are noted on the plans and any approval of the project tonight would carry those, because the Applicant has included those with their plans.

The conditions of the HOA that Staff could recommend not including have to do with the private party agreement, such as cost sharing or cost responsibility for

updating the CC&Rs; that's not something that the Town would historically get involved in.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: Okay, thank you.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Are there any additional questions for Staff? Seeing none, I will now open the floor to public comment. First, would the Applicant like to provide an opening statement to be five minutes?

JAY PLETT: Good evening, Commission Members. Jay Plett Architecture, 16 Linden Avenue.

We believe that the project has been very well designed through much time with the Planning Department and Fire Department. It respects the native trees and mature oaks that are there. As a matter of fact, the house was intentionally designed around the trees and their preservation.

Marty McFarland and I met with the HOA members in my office and came to the agreement of the debris fence and the obscured window, and they were fine. We resubmitted our plans to them and they consented that they agreed with these changes, and they submitted an email to Mr. Mullin to that effect.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Would anyone else from your team like to speak tonight?

1 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Mr. Szewczyk has his hand 2 raised, Jay, so I don't know if he wants to speak as well, 3 but I'm going to allow him to speak. Mr. Szewczyk, if you 4 have anything additional, go ahead and speak. 5 TERENCE SZEWCZYK: No, I don't. Thank you. 6 VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Before you leave, 7 are there any questions for the Applicant? Okay, thank you. 8 Is there anyone from the public wishing to speak on this item, or anyone on Zoom? I don't have any cards. 10 DIRECTOR PAULSON: No one with their hand raised 11 on Zoom. 12 VICE CHAIR THOMAS: So, are we still sure that 13 there are no questions for the Applicant? You have another 14 three minutes if you need to say anything else. You're 15 16 good? Okay. Are there any questions for the Applicant at 17 this point before I close the public portion? Okay. 18 I will now close the public comment portion and 19 look for discussion or a motion from the Commission. 20 Commissioner Burnett. 21 COMMISSIONER BURNETT: Yes, after reviewing the 22 information given to us from Staff and the response from 23 the architect, homeowners, and developers, it seems that 24 the request that the suggestions we had at the last

> LOS GATOS PLANNING COMMISSION 12/11/2024, Item #3, 120 Oak Meadow Drive

Planning Commission meeting were met, and that with the

25

architect's letter description of what will be followed up on and carried through on the project, it seems that all the questions we had regarding the project were answered. From my perspective, I think that you met all the requests that we had and so I feel that I would vote for moving forward and approving your application.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Commissioner Barnett.

th

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: I just wanted to point out that although the physical requirements by the HOA had (inaudible) amended plans that there is the intention to have a CC&R amendment so that the CC&Rs apply to the newly created lot, and that that issue is apparently not going to be decided tonight as part of the approval. I think that's okay, but it troubles me a little bit, for example, if the CC&R amendment were not approved, what would happen then? Unlikely, perhaps, but possible.

ATTORNEY WHELAN: Alternatively, the Commission could continue this item until the CC&Rs have been amended.

DIRECTOR PAULSON: I'll just offer from a historical perspective, the Planning Commission never sees CC&Rs, which are handled after the approval is done, so those modifications would also be handled by Staff; they wouldn't come back before a deciding body.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Thank you for that.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Commissioner Hanssen.

meeting, we had reviewed the elements in the requested variances that would be required from our code to make this Planned Development Ordinance a reality, and that the only issue was the HOA coming up at the last minute and saying we have... And even though we aren't accountable to the HOA as a body, being the Town, they seem to have met the requirement. They met with them and they have an agreement, so I think we could move forward. And as Staff pointed out, we would have no jurisdiction over those private agreements anyway, so that, like I was saying earlier, I think the obscured window and the fence are planning issues, so I'm comfortable with this application.

VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Commissioner Barnett.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: I have a proposed motion, if the Vice Chair agrees. I'll do my best to present that.

I move to recommend approval by the Town Council of the application requesting approval for modification of Planned Development Ordinance 1412, subdivision of one lot into two lots, construction of a new two-story single-family residences, and site work requiring a Grading Permit on property zoned O:PD located at 120 Oak Meadow Drive, APN

1	529-10-131, Subdivision Application M-20-11, Planned	
2	Development Application PD-20-002, and Architecture and	
3	Site Application S-22-021. Categorically exempt pursuant to	
4	CEQA Guidelines 15315, Minor Land Divisions, and New	
5	Construction in 15304 as well.	
6	I can make each of the findings as set forth in	
7	pages 3 and 4 of the Staff Report, which are pages 97-98 of	
8	the package, including the revised development plans	
9	included in Exhibit 21 and the approvals included in	
11	Exhibit 4. I think that's it, unless Staff has proposed	
12	additions.	
13	VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Do I have a second?	
14	Commissioner Hanssen.	
15	COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: I second the motion.	
16	VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Any discussion? Seeing none,	
17	by a show of hands, all those in favor of the motion,	
18	please raise your hands. It passes unanimously, 4-0. Thank	
19	you.	
20	Staff, are there any appeal rights, or no,	
21	because this is just a recommendation to Council?	
22	SEAN MULLIN: Since this is a recommendation,	
23	there are no appeal rights.	
24	VICE CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.	
25	(FND)	

This Page Intentionally Left Blank