



---

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF CONCORD  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE NEW MEETING LOCATION\*\***

**Thursday, May 14, 2015  
5:30 p.m., Regular Meeting  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
1950 Parkside Drive, Bldg. D**

---

<b>Board Members Present:</b>	<b>J. Moore, R. Wells, E. Avila, P. Harmon, K. Shelby</b>
<b>Staff Present:</b>	<b>F. Abejo, J. Ryan, L. Simpson</b>
<b>Audience Attendance</b>	<b>40 people</b>

---

**AGENDA**

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – *None.***

**ADDITIONS/CONTINUANCES/WITHDRAWALS – *None.***

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. 3/12/15 Meeting Minutes**
- B. 4/9/15 Meeting Minutes**

**ACTION: *Both sets of minutes approved, 5-0. (Wells motioned, Harmon seconded)***

**STAFF REPORTS – *None***

**HEARINGS**

- 1. Chalomar Crossings Subdivision (PL150027 – DR) – Design Review for Rezoning from RS-7 to RL, Major Subdivision tentative map to create 20 lots, Planned Development Use Permit, Design Review, and a Tree Removal Permit on a 2.48-acre site located at 988 Oak Grove Road. The General Plan designation is Low Density Residential; Zoning classification is RS-7 (Single-Family Residential 7,000 square foot minimum lot size); APN 129-210-015. **Project Planner: Joan Ryan @ (925) 671-3370.****

**ACTION: *Many of the Board's comments were general in nature. The Board emphasized there is a problem with the fundamental design. They noted concerns with the one-way circulation, stating such designs are not always practical. They noted the product type was not lending itself well to the density. The Board indicated the applicant had provided no response in terms of designing the project to have unique character, stating that the product***

---

*type with the large homes on small lots seemed forced. The Board stated they could provide detailed comments, but that these would be minor notes on a bigger problem which was the overall design and voiced concern that there was minimal response to previous comments. The Board stated the applicant must rethink the orientation to the neighborhood and elevate the overall quality of design; noting currently there is much similarity, including the overall site plan layout.*

*The Board did provide some specific comments suggesting re-examining those units with side entries that were not on corners, in particular where there is only 5 feet between unit and fence and noted this may be improved by modifying floor plans or switching units. The Board requested a cross section for the asphalt on Sheet C6. In terms of landscape, one Board member questioned where the protective fencing was shown for those trees noted to be saved and requested that be shown. The Board noted that the height of the stonework had not been increased, per their previous recommendation. The Board indicated that walls along Oak Grove Road provide no favor to the community and noted trellis elements may help, but that this area also needed improvement. The Board suggested the rear elevations were as important as the front with respect to Oak Grove Road. They noted the side entries (on non-corner lots) though were clearly not working.*

*The Board noted that the fundamental issue is the site plan and that the applicant has not solved that problem yet. The Board indicated the project still appears as 2 story stacks, everything is tight and that there is no real transition. They noted the applicant could go with less homes, but indicated the current proposal is not compatible, and that there would probably be no easy solutions. The Board encouraged the applicant to go back and really look at the project as a whole to provide some overall solutions with some quality design concepts, emphasizing the project needed to integrate well with the neighborhood. The Board suggested some alternatives needed to be re-examined for circulation, noting that quality of life is critical to existing and future residents and that the design needs to meld with the neighborhood. The Board commented that small yards would require higher quality design; a design such as Scally Court could be the way to go, with larger lots; and that an alternative to a wall may be a heavy duty wood fence with a horizontal design on Oak Grove Road.*

*The Board indicated the applicant had a challenging task, but that the Board would have a difficult time supporting the project in its current form, noting that going into extensive comment on the details, would be premature, since they could not advance the project in its overall form. The Board urged the applicant to take their comments to heart and emphasized they are looking for a unique and high quality development.*

*Approximately 40 residents of the neighborhood attended the meeting. There were approximately 11 who provided comments stating that the project was not compatible with the neighborhood, noting the 2-story homes did not fit with the existing homes and the project appearance needed improvement. Some neighbors recommended a design similar to Scally Court (southeast of the project site). The neighbors voiced concerns with blocking of views. The neighbors recommended retaining the Italian Cypress trees on the north side of the property. The residents also raised concerns regarding density, traffic, parking, and the 2-story elements providing no similarity to the neighborhood.*

**BOARD CONSIDERATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS** – *Board member Avila asked about the ABAG award presented to the City of Concord for the Downtown Specific Plan.*

**STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS** – *Planning Manager Simpson discussed the upcoming Design Review Board re-organization meeting.*

**ADJOURNMENT** – *7:34 p.m. (Wells motioned, Shelby seconded)*

---

**NEXT DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETINGS:**

May 28, 2015

June 10, 2015

---