



## **Staff Report**

---

### APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE A SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN REVIEW AND VARIANCE AT 905 SOUTH ROAD

Honorable Mayor and Council members:

#### **Summary**

On October 4, 2005, by a 7-0 vote, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 2005-39 approving a Single Family Design Review and Variance to allow construction of a new single family dwelling for property located at 905 South Road. The Commission had previously reviewed the project on August 16, 2005, and directed staff to prepare a Resolution of Approval and Conditions of Approval for review at the 10/4/05 Commission meeting. A copy of the 8/16/05 and 10/4/05 staff memorandums, and verbatim transcripts from these items (at each respective meeting) is attached.

On October 14, 2005, Mary Lou South & Ann Parsons, representing Paradigm Healthcare LP, the adjacent property owners at 900 Sixth Avenue, submitted an appeal of the Planning Commission decision (see attachment B). The project applicant, Simmie Graves, Jr., has submitted a letter (See Attachment C – dated 2/2/06), requesting the Council uphold the Commission decision.

Based on a review of the appeal, subsequent submittal information, and the Commission's action, staff recommends that the City Council deny the appeal and uphold the Planning Commission's decision to approve the project.

#### **Background**

Specific actions relating to the requested Single Family Design Review and Variance prior to Commission action on 8/16/05 and 10/4/05 are as follows:

- On July 20, 2004, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution denying a Setback Variance and Single Family Design Review to allow construction of previous design for a new residence for the site. The Commission reviewed the project over several meetings and at the hearing of May 4, 2004 directed staff to prepare a resolution outlining the specific findings for denial made by the Commission based on discussion at that 5/4/04 meeting. On July 30, 2004, Mr. Graves submitted an appeal of the 7/20/04 Planning Commission decision.

- At an appeal hearing on October 12, 2004, the City Council voted 5-0 to direct back to the Planning Commission the request for a Variance and Single Family Design Review to allow construction of a new single family residence for the site. The Council’s action was based, in part, on the submission of a revised project by the applicant.
- In June/July 2005, the project applicant refined the project architectural design for the new residence; the subsequent plan submittals served as the basis for Commission review and approval of the project in August & October 2005.

**Site History/Project Description**

The subject property is Lot 55 of the Mezes Ranch subdivision, which was recorded in 1888. There have been no other actions for the undeveloped site. The 11,108 square foot irregularly shaped property is located at the east side of South Road with a 101-foot wide street frontage and an average slope of 43%. The lot has a pronounced downslope from the front (west) of the property to the rear (east).

Several of the properties along South Road to the north of the subject property are vacant; one single-family residence and a vacant property are set to the south; a commercial assisted living facility is to the east; and a recently vacated residential property is located to the west (residence was demolished in 2003).

The applicant proposes to construct a new multi-level craftsman style 3,060 square foot single-family residence for the subject property consisting of the following:

<b>Dwelling Floor Area Summary</b>	
<b>Proposed Floors</b>	<b>Type of rooms</b>
Garage Level – 459 Sq. Ft.	Two-car garage
Lower Split Levels – 2,601 Sq. Ft.	Living/dining room, family room, kitchen, master suite, three bedrooms, two & one-half bathrooms, elevator, laundry, stairs
Total = 3,060 Sq. Ft.	

**Groundwork /Geotechnical Recommendations**

The driveway, garage, subgrade and landscape excavation for the proposed dwelling requires approximately 461 cubic yards of earthwork (315 cut, 151 fill). Robert Chew Geotechnical, Inc. performed geotechnical investigations for the site in January, 2001. The report concluded that the proposed residential development is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint for the site. The City Geologist, Cotton, Shires & Associates (CSA), reviewed the applicant’s geotechnical report, and revised project design in May 2005, and recommended Conditions of Approval be provided and adhered to for the project prior to their determination of geotechnical approval for the project. The City Geologist’s recommendations for plan review and construction inspections were included in the conditions of project approval adopted as part of the Commission Resolution (2005-0039) approving the project on 10/4/05.

Landscaping/City Arborist Recommendations

Five protected trees (three Coast Live Oak and two Olive trees) are projected to be removed due to building footprint conflicts. The proposed landscape plan for the site provides twelve 24” box trees as mitigation for the loss of these trees. Conditions of approval have been adopted requiring either an additional three 24”-box plantings for the site, or an in-lieu fee paid to the City Tree Planting and Establishment Fund, should the site not be able to accommodate the additional tree plantings. Such measures would provide adequate mitigation for the loss of the aforementioned trees. Other City Arborist recommended protection measures were included as conditions of project approval.

Project Data

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Required or Max. Allowed</b>
Lot Size	11,108 sq. ft.	No Change	No Change
Slope	43%	No Change	No Change
FAR	None	0.275	0.277
Square Footage	None	3,060 sq. ft.	3,076 sq. ft.
Parking	None	Two-car garage, Plus 2 uncovered	Two-car garage, Plus 2 uncovered
Setbacks:			
Front	None	20 ft.	15 ft.*
Side (right)	None	16.6 ft.	7.5 ft.
Side (left)	None	16.25 ft.	7.5 ft.
Rear	None	15 ft.	15 ft.
Driveway length	None	20 ft.	18 ft.
Height	None	28 ft.	28 ft.

\* As there is only one other developed property on this side of the street for this portion of South Road, the proposed front yard setback, as per Section 9.7.4 (setback averaging), does not apply for this property.

**General Plan and Zoning Conformance**

The proposed construction of the new single-family residence does not change the land use of the site. The proposed residence is in conformance with the low-density residential general plan designation.

The proposed new single-family residence meets all Belmont Zoning Ordinance (BZO) setback, height, parking, floor area ratio, and permitted use regulations of the R-1B zoning district.

The project includes a driveway bridge/deck from the South Road street frontage to the proposed two-car garage. The bridge is located within the required 15-foot front yard setback and a Variance required to allow this encroachment. Associated retaining walls and driveway enclosure walls also require Variance approval; the Variance findings made in the affirmative for the driveway bridge and associated retaining/enclosure walls is described in Resolution 2005-0039 adopted by the Planning Commission on 10/4/05.

### **Environmental Clearance (CEQA)**

The proposed new single-family home for the subject site is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act by provision of Section 15303, Class 3(a):

*“Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures... Examples of this exemption include but are not limited to:*

*(a) One single-family residence, or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption.”*

The proposed residence meets the above requirements for CEQA exemption.

### **Discussion**

#### **Belmont’s Ordinances Regarding Single Family/Duplex Design Review entitlements**

Belmont Zoning Ordinance Section 13A provides:

#### **SECTION 13A – SINGLE FAMILY AND DUPLEX RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

*13A.1 PURPOSE – The Single Family and Duplex Residential Design Review process is established to preserve the wooded, low density character of the City’s single family and duplex residential neighborhoods, and assure that new single-family and duplex residential development achieves an appropriate balance amount the following:*

- (a) Consistency with existing site conditions*
- (b) Minimal disruption of site and surrounding topography*
- (c) Minimal visual building bulk and an attractive exterior building design*
- (d) Protection against erosion, ground movement, flooding and other hazards*
- (e) Preservation of existing trees and vegetation, use of native plants, and an enhancement of the overall landscaping in residential neighborhoods*
- (f) Safe on-site vehicular accessways to all covered parking*
- (g) Retaining walls that follow topographic conditions and enhance the appearance of surrounding slopes*
- (h) Right-of-way encroachments that are the minimum necessary to support private access and development and that enhance the overall appearance of the site*

*13A.4 HEARING BY COMMISSION – The Commission shall hold a public hearing after acceptance of a complete application for a Single Family and Duplex Residential Design Review by the Director of Community Development. Notice of the time,*

*place and purpose of each such public hearing shall be given in the manner set forth in Section 11.4.1 herein.*

*The Commission shall approve, conditionally approve or disapprove the site plan, the architectural elevations and landscape plan or shall request the owner to revise them.*

In rendering its decision pursuant to Belmont Zoning Ordinance Section 13A, the Planning Commission must consider all testimony offered and grant a Single Family Design Review (SFDR) only when it finds evidence to support the required findings of Section 13.A.5 (A-H) of the Zoning Ordinance<sup>1</sup>. Each of these findings must be made in the affirmative if the SFDR is to be granted.

### **Belmont's Ordinances Regarding Variance entitlements**

Belmont Zoning Ordinance Section 14 provides:

---

<sup>1</sup> *13A.5 FINDINGS REQUIRED – The Commission may grant approval of Single Family and Duplex Residential Design Review to the proposed development, as applied for, or in modified form, if on the basis of the application and evidence submitted the following findings are made:*

- (a) The buildings and structures shown on the site plan are located to be consistent with the character of existing development on the site and in the neighborhood, as defined; minimize disruptions of existing public views; protect the profile of prominent ridgelines.*
- (b) The overall site and building plans achieve an acceptable balance amount the following factors:*
  - (1) building bulk,*
  - (2) grading, including*
    - (a) disturbed surface area and*
    - (b) total cubic yards, cut and fill*
  - (3) hardscape, and*
  - (4) tree removal*
- (c) All accessways shown on the site plan and on the topographic map are arranged to provide safe vehicular and pedestrian access to all buildings and structures.*
- (d) All proposed grading and site preparation have been adequately reviewed to protect against site stability and ground movement hazards, erosion and flooding potential, and habitat and stream degradation.*
- (e) All accessory and support features, including driveway and parking surfaces, underfloor areas, retaining walls, utility services and other accessory structures are integrated into the overall project design.*
- (f) The landscape plan incorporates:*
  - (1) Native plants appropriate to the site's environmental setting and microclimate, and*
  - (2) Appropriate landscape screening of accessory and support structures, and*
  - (3) Replacement trees in sufficient quantity to comply with the standards of Section 25 (Trees) of the Belmont City Code*
- (g) Adequate measures have been developed for construction-related impacts, such as haul routes, material storage, erosion control, tree protection, waste recycling and disposal, and other potential hazards.*
- (h) Structural encroachments into the public right-of-way associated with the project comply with the standards of Section 22, Article 1 (Encroachments) of the Belmont City Code.*

*14.1 14.1 PURPOSE – The hearing body may grant variances to any and all site development standards to prevent or lessen practical difficulties and unnecessary physical hardships inconsistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance which may result, under specific circumstances, from the strict or literal interpretations of the regulations prescribed therein. The hearing body shall review all requests to variances to site development standards in excess of 10 percent of said standard(s). The Director of Community Development may administratively grant Exceptions to commercial and manufacturing site development standards up to an including 10 percent relief of said standard(s) as prescribed by Section 14.9 herein.*

*14.5 ACTION BY THE COMMISSION – The Commission shall receive, investigate, hear and take action upon every application for a Variance which is submitted in full accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 14.2 herein.*

In rendering its decision pursuant to Section 14.5, the Planning Commission must consider all testimony offered and grant a Variance only when it finds evidence to support the required variance findings<sup>2</sup> of Section 14.5.1 of the Zoning Ordinance. Each of these findings must be made in the affirmative if the Variance is to be granted.

### **Planning Commission Action**

At the conclusion of the 10/4/05 public hearing, the Planning Commission determined that it could make all of the findings required by Section 13.A.5 (a-h) and 14.5.1 (a-e) (See Attachment E - Planning Commission Resolution 2005-39). As discussed earlier, staff has also provided the 8/16/05 & 10/4/05 staff memorandums, and associated verbatim transcripts of these hearings for Council's review.

### **Belmont's Ordinance Regarding Appeals**

#### **SECTION 15 – APPEALS**

---

<sup>2</sup> To grant a variance, all of the findings in Section 14.5.1(a-e) of the Belmont Zoning Ordinance must be made in the affirmative. The findings provide:

- (a) *The strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specified regulation would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the Zoning Plan.*
- (b) *There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district.*
- (c) *The strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specified regulation would deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.*
- (d) *The granting of the Variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district.*
- (e) *The granting of the Variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or be materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.*

15.10 ACTION BY COUNCIL – The Council shall hold a public hearing on an Appeal from a decision of the Commission or a review of proceedings upon its own initiation after notice thereof shall have been given as prescribed herein. All evidence submitted at such hearing, except original public records or certified copies thereof, may be given under oath administered by the Mayor or the Vice Mayor. The Council may affirm, reverse or modify a decision of the Commission provided that if a decision for denial is reversed or a decision to grant is modified, the Council shall, on the basis of the record transmitted by the Zoning Administrator and such additional evidence as may be submitted, make the findings prerequisite to the granting prescribed in this Ordinance.

The City Council is required to conduct a public hearing on the submitted appeal. The City Council, during its public hearing, is required to receive and consider this information and any additional evidence submitted prior to the conclusion of the Council's public hearing.

### **Appeal Analysis**

Staff has reviewed the basis for the submitted 10/14/05 appeal and has provided the following response:

#### **Appeal Argument (Main Excerpt from 10/14/05 letter):**

**Appellant:** "...Issue A. We quote section (e) of the Zoning Ordinance (14.5.1) of the Resolution: "The granting of the Variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity."

*In spite of the many attempts of the representatives of Paradigm Healthcare at every Commission meeting and one Council meeting to point out the real and present danger to the health and even lives of the thirty-three helpless, frail, elderly patients of Belmont Convalescent Hospital, the subject was never discussed in a meeting or reflected in any minutes or resolutions including the one we are now appealing. The project plans for extensive procedures to protect the trees, but not one word about the seriously-ill elderly that are living at Belmont Convalescent Hospital.*

#### *I. Hazard Number One – Mud Slides.*

*There is a distinct possibility that rivers of mud could flow down the hill, through the glass doors injuring or killing patients and causing extensive property damage to the Belmont Convalescent Hospital building.*

- A. There is no building wall barrier between the ill, elderly patients who are lying in hospital beds behind sliding glass doors which open to the patio.*
- B. The patient rooms run parallel to the property line with sliding glass doors 15-feet from the bottom of the slope.*
- C. The 42-degree slope of the hill is considered severe for a project site with no close neighbors. This project has 33 ill, elderly lying in hospital beds only 15-feet from the foot of the hill.*

- D. The stability of the soil is questionable according to the Geological Report of May 23, 2005 by Cotton, Shires & Associates*
- E. It is a well-known fact among the construction industry that the hills of Belmont have many underground springs. Some contractors refuse to accept projects in this city because presence of a spring is unpredictable.*
- F. The plans for this project call for a 115-square foot cut into the hillside which poses another slide hazard.*

*Even though two geotechnical consultants have investigated the property to assure us that there is no possibility of any unforeseen events taking place, we request that another consultant who is independent of the city review the property and submit a report regarding soil stability addressing directly the prevalence of underground springs, the sharpness of the slope, the severe cut into the hill and the proximity of the nursing home. In fairness to the builder and his liability, this step should be taken.*

*II. Hazard Number Two – Out-of-control machinery and equipment could come crashing down the steep slope through the patios and the sliding glass doors and crush the hospital bed occupant on the other side and/or injure one of the 25 employees at Belmont Convalescent Hospital.*

- A. The 42-degree slope is considered extreme for any building site, but for this project which has no staging area, the danger of run-away equipment is clearly present.*
- B. From the planned staging area on South Road it is a 20-foot drop for bulldozers and materials to reach the top of the 42-degree slope.*
- C. There are reports that South Road is sinking. Adding the weight of all the heavy equipment and materials to the road in front of the project could bring the entire hill down into the nursing home.*

*It is appropriate for the safety of Belmont Convalescent patients and property, and in the best interest of the builder's liability to request a Constructability Review to determine how the developer would complete the task of building this project. It is one thing to design the project on paper, but the process of completing a task with milestones as serious as those being identified must be outlined to our satisfaction.*

*Issue B Design Review Decision - While the approval shows a changed building placement which improved the public view of the home from South Road, there was no consideration of the impact the change would have on the view and privacy of the residents of Belmont Convalescent Hospital.*

- a. A mitigation measure should be included to off-set the privacy impact by requiring the fencing on the common property line, near the housing, to be set back 10 feet This will avoid creating dark rooms and allow more air circulation. This mitigation would be a reasonable trade-off for the reduced privacy resulting from the home relocation.*

- b. *It is not expected that the home owner would dedicate land to Belmont Convalescent Hospital and we would sign an agreement stipulating that the land belongs to the home owner at 905 South Road. We would also agree to maintain the landscaping between Belmont Convalescent Hospital and the common fence line.*

*Without this solution, we may be forced to address the privacy issue with the planting of trees. This would not be to anyone's benefit as they would be a maintenance problem for our property and would eventually block the view of the new home owner. We believe that these solutions are in everyone's best interest and request the Council to add these conditions to the project approval.”*

**Staff Response:** Through the course of project evaluation for a new residence for the subject site, geotechnical issues were appropriately considered. This evaluation centered on the submittal of the applicants Geotechnical Study (by Robert Y. Chew & Associates) and peer review of this study by the City’s Geotechnical Consultant, Cotton & Shires Associates (CSA). In their recent review of the revised project (May 2005), CSA recommended certain project conditions of approval prior to their geotechnical approval of the project. As discussed earlier, such conditions were included as part of Resolution 2005-0039 adopted by the Commission in their approval of the project 10/4/05 (See Condition I.A.6 as part of Attachment E).

In addition, as part of their deliberations to approve the project on 10/4/05, the Commission levied additional conditions of approval to address:

- Safety impacts associated with ingress/egress of construction equipment within the site
- Provision of a required “catchment fence” to be installed on the lower elevations of the property to prevent construction debris from entering the adjacent Belmont Vista property to the east
- Submission of construction management, dust control, and erosion/drainage plans, and coordination of mandatory pre-construction meeting(s) with sign-off by all City Departments
- Provision of liability insurance (including a letter of credit, deposit, or bond) to the satisfaction of the City to address construction-related damage to off-site properties in association with development of the single family dwelling for the subject site

The above conditions (in conjunction with other adopted conditions of approval) provided the Commission with a reasonable to basis to conclude that geotechnical, safety, and construction issues were appropriately addressed at this stage of the development review process to warrant approval of the required Single Family Design Review and Variance entitlements for the project.

The second concern raised in the appeal is that the proposed residence would disrupt privacy and private views from the Belmont Vista Convalescent Facility. There are no provisions within the Single Family Design Review findings to require consideration of privacy impacts on adjacent properties. Noise associated with development is a reality for all construction projects. Any noise associated with construction is governed by the City’s Noise Ordinance. It provides that

construction noise is permitted so long as applicants abide by the hours of construction outlined in the ordinance.

The applicant has also agreed (via the adopted project conditions of approval) to engage in no construction activity or related activities outside of the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, nor on Saturday's, Sundays, and City-mandated holidays (this is over and above the City's current construction noise ordinance limitations). As a result, there is no factual basis to support a denial of the project based on construction noise or privacy impacts to the adjacent Belmont Vista property to the east.

In reference to the private view issue, the Single Family Design Review finding that is questioned (13.A.5.A<sup>3</sup>) requires the minimization of disruptions of existing *public views* such as the profile of prominent ridgelines, rather than the views from a private facility. A public view has been used to mean "views from public areas, such as streets and parks", however, there is no adopted definition of the term. In practice, since January of 1999, the public view protection has applied to:

- Long range vistas
- Views of the bay
- Protection of the profile of prominent ridgelines

Staff believes this finding seeks to achieve three objectives. First it seeks to assure consistency between the proposed project and the character of the existing site development (one/two story designs, exterior materials used, etc.) and that of the neighborhood.

The second part of the finding seeks to "minimize disruptions of existing public views". The Ordinance language does not prohibit view disruption nor require a specific measure of view be preserved. It affords the Commissioners flexibility to balance effects of what the Ordinance could allow (maximum building height and the maximum floor area ratio) with the proposal and the applicant's efforts to minimize the public view disruption. This balance would apply to both the project site in front of the public view as well as the project site at the top of a prominent ridgeline (the third objective).

For the project at 905 South Road, the applicant has proposed a two story residence (consistent with the character of the low density residential neighborhood) and has proposed a reduced building height (the main body of the residence would be stepped down to below the grade of the street and the garage was stepped down as far as the ordinance would allow to maintain a 18% driveway approach) so as to minimize the disruption of existing public views from South Road. Based on the revised site layout/architectural design of the residence, the Commission was able to positively affirm this finding.

---

<sup>3</sup> 13.A.5.A *The buildings and structures shown on the site plan are located to be consistent with the character of existing development on the site and in the neighborhood, as defined; minimize disruptions of existing public views; protect the profile of prominent ridgelines.*

Each project is evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if specific factors related to the subject property warrant approval of the request. By and large, the Planning Commission believed there was not a necessary or required design/site layout change that would achieve a significantly better balance between the four stated factors necessary for affirmation of Finding 13.A.5.B<sup>4</sup>. The Planning Commission, at the conclusion of their deliberations, believed this finding and the other seven required findings were appropriately met to grant approval of the requested Single Family Design Review permit for the project.

The Appellant has failed to demonstrate that all Single Family Design Review and Variance findings made in the affirmative by the Planning Commission were an abuse of discretion. Overall, the Appellant's arguments to the contrary are not supported by the evidence and do not constitute grounds to overturn the Planning Commission's decision.

### **Applicant Submittal (Subsequent to 10/14/05 Appeal)**

As discussed earlier, on 2/2/06 the City received a letter from the project applicant, Simmie Graves Jr., requesting the Council uphold the Commission decision. This letter also provides specific responses to address the concerns raised by the appellants (See Attachment D).

### **Conclusion**

Staff recommends that the City Council deny the appeal in its entirety. The Appellants have not, in their appeal, demonstrated that the Planning Commission abused its discretion. They have been unable to do so because the record contains substantial evidence to support the Planning Commission's decision that it could make all Single Family Design Review and Variance findings of Belmont Zoning Ordinance Sections 13A.5 (A-H) & 14.5.1 (a-e).

Absent this showing, there is no basis upon which the City Council should overturn or modify the Planning Commission's decision.

### **Fiscal Impact**

None.

### **Public Contact**

1. The City Council is required to hold a public hearing on an appeal of a Planning Commission decision as per Section 15.10 (Appeals) of the BZO. The City placed a public notice display

---

<sup>4</sup> 13.A.5.B *The overall site and building plans achieve an acceptable balance amount the following factors:*

- (1) *building bulk,*
- (2) *grading, including*
  - (a) *disturbed surface area and*
  - (b) *total cubic yards, cut and fill*
- (3) *hardscape, and*
- (4) *tree removal*

ad in the local newspaper of general circulation (San Mateo Times) for a minimum 10-day period beginning on February 4, 2006, for the scheduled public hearing by the City Council on February 14, 2006. The City also mailed the appeal hearing public notice to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject site and other interested parties to inform such persons of the scheduled appeal hearing.

2. The Appellants, and applicant/property owner for 905 South Road were also informed of the appeal hearing.

### **Recommendation**

Staff does not find sufficient basis in the Appellant submittal to overturn the Planning Commission's decision and recommends the City Council adopt the attached resolution upholding the Planning Commission's decision to approve the Single Family Design Review and Variance to allow construction of a new single family dwelling for property located at 905 South Road.

### **Alternatives**

1. Direct staff to prepare a resolution based on findings provided by the City Council to grant the appeal, overturn the decision of the Planning Commission, and deny the Single Family Design Review and Variance to allow construction of a new single family dwelling for property located at 905 South Road.
2. Continue the matter and direct staff to prepare an alternative course of action.

### **Attachments**

- A. City Council Resolution Approving the Single Family Design Review and Variance and Upholding the Planning Commission Decision
- B. Appeal Application – 10/14/05
- C. Applicant Letter Supporting the Project – 2/2/06
- D. August 16, 2005 Planning Commission Staff Memorandum and Verbatim Transcript
- E. October 4, 2005 Staff Memorandum, Adopted Resolution 2005-39 Approving the Single Family Design Review & Variance, Conditions of Approval, and Verbatim Transcript
- F. Project Plans & Materials

Respectfully submitted,

---

Carlos de Melo  
Community Development Director

---

Jack Crist  
Interim City Manager

Staff Contact:

Carlos de Melo, Community Development Director  
(650) 595-7440  
[cdemelo@belmont.gov](mailto:cdemelo@belmont.gov)

***PLEASE NOTE:***

***Attachments B, C, D, E, & F are not included as part of this document - please contact the City Clerk's Office at (650) 595-7413 for further information on these attachments.***