

Jennifer Wallis

From: D Bengston [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 12:11 PM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Cc: Christine Steiner; John Toms; George Schmitt
Subject: P-14-0829 - George Schmitt Application

To: Jennifer Wallis, Associate Planner, City of Pleasanton

I received a notice that my next door neighbor, George Schmitt, has submitted an application for Administrative Design Review for major additions to his home at 554 Hamilton Way. Please be aware that I have concerns regarding the proposal and would like a Zoning Administrator Hearing.

I saw the plans today for the first time. While the proposed plans certainly will enhance the Schmitts' home and provide considerable additional space for their family, I believe it has severe impacts on my home and outdoor living spaces. At this time I was able to only do a quick review of the plans so, after reviewing them again later at the hearing, I may identify other concerns.

I purchased my home in 1987. One of the primary reasons I purchased the home was it had a wonderful view of Pleasanton Ridge from both the front and back yard. The additions proposed for the Schmitt home will block my view of the Ridge from the patio and back yard and change the character of my back outdoor living spaces by imposing a massive roof line into the view shed.

A second concern I have is the loft and balcony from the loft. It is difficult for me to tell if those on the balcony will be visible or not from my yard. I also question if the sound generated from the loft and its balcony will be heard in my back yard and in my bedroom, especially if the balcony doors are opened. I assume that the room will be used as a loft room for the children thus will have music and TV etc available

The Schmitt's are good neighbors. I hope we can find a solution that works for them and works for me.

I will be gone until May 28th. so perhaps a meeting can be scheduled some time after that date.

Thanks so much for your attention.

Dolores Bengtson
[REDACTED]

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Jennifer Wallis

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:05 AM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: p14-0829 addition at 554 Hamilton

Ms Wallis-

My name is John Toms and I own the property at 575 Hamilton Way, diagonally across the street from 554 Hamilton. Though your notice about this was sent on May the 12th, I did not receive the notice until May the 17. I am concerned that the limited response window provided is inadequate for those of us concerned with the project.

Yesterday I was able to see the plans George and Jen have developed for a two story addition. to their home. The Rose Pointe development has remained a neighborhood of single family homes since the original design of the neighborhood. This was a major draw for me to purchase in the neighborhood in 1999 and has remained a selling point for those few houses that do come on the market in Rose Pointe. I am concerned that the intrinsic value provided by virtually all single family homes will be compromised to the economic detriment of area homeowners and especially to the to the aesthetics of the area. A single two story house in a neighborhood of one story ranch type houses does not maintain the established look and feel of the area. These are good neighbors and no animosity is felt for them.

Hopefully all involved can find a way to support their home remodel without raising roof lines above the remainder of the other homes in the area.

Regards,

John Toms
[REDACTED]

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Jennifer Wallis

From: christine steiner [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 4:42 PM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: P14-2829 544 Hamilton Way

Dear Jennifer,

As a long time owner in the Rosepointe subdivision I want to express my distress at the proposed addition of a second story at 544 Hamilton Way. I have known George Schmidt since he was a small child and a friend of my children so it does upset me that I cannot support his proposed addition.

When we purchased our home we were the 5th homeowners in the development and we were told that only single story homes would be built in the neighborhood. The original subdivision did not include the parcel adjoining Sunol Blvd. A proposal to build condominiums on that parcel was rejected by the neighborhood. Within the original subdivision only two homes were two story. One was built without us knowing on Amber and a second story was added and the neighborhood was not aware of the plan until it was too late to object. Other proposed additions were objected to and denied approval.

As our community ages the demand for single story homes increases and our neighborhood has always attracted young and old as the lots are larger than most in the city and many people appreciate the lower profile the homes offer and the views of the Pleasanton Ridge.

In the case of the Schmidt property it is one of the homes with an extra large lot that could accommodate the desired additional square footage on one level. This was the option the property owner chose when they proposed a second story addition on their home on Stanton Court several years ago.

While I would hate to see the Schmidt family relocate. With Greenbriar and Carriage Gardens nearby offering mostly two story homes I do hope the city will deny their application and help ensure the integrity of our unique neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Christine Steiner
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Click <https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/QugykUSHGyzGX2PQP0mvUhbKKPHn4qwN83MS03P7EnG19bJ1YuKo53bbFirEORivr5jrCpNq6HKYOI6K2KUB+Q==> to report this email as spam.

Jennifer Wallis

From: Janis O'Rourke [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 8:51 AM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: 554 Hamilton Addition

Dear Ms. Wallis:

We were recently made aware of a second story addition that is in the planning stages for the house at 554 Hamilton Way. It is our understanding that the homeowner is requesting a 781 foot increase to the original footprint, plus an additional 614 square foot second floor.

We would like to express our deep concern and disapproval of this project, most particularly the second floor addition. (We have viewed the 'story poles' that mark what the new elevation would be.)

As you are probably aware, there is only one home in this whole area - on Hanover Court - that added a second story over 25 years ago. Since then there have been no second story additions approved – albeit a number of home owners have tried – due largely to the concerns expressed by the neighbors.

The most striking feature of the RosePointe Neighborhood is that the majority of the homes still have the original look from the initial development of over 35 years ago. Everyone takes great pride in the neighborhood - indeed many of the homeowners are the original owners - and everybody works hard to maintain and refresh their homes and yards on a regular basis. All of this makes the RosePointe neighborhood a highly desirable area.

To have second stories added to any of the homes would create a totally different look to the neighborhood and diminish the privacy we have all come to enjoy.

While I am sure the owners of 554 Hamilton have worked hard to design an attractive second story, approval of one such addition would undoubtedly lead to others also asking for the same consideration – and then the general look and feel of the neighborhood would be forever changed to the negative.

A 781 square foot ground level addition to the rear of the house is one thing, but a second story is something else and should not be approved.

Thank you,

Sincerely

Michael and Janis O'Rourke

To: Planning Commissioners
cc: Jennifer Wallis, Associate Planner
From: Dolores Bengtson
Subject: P-14-0829, Application of Greg Munn for George Schmitt - addition to 554 Hamilton Way

July 31, 2014

Planning Commissioners and Staff:

I am writing to you without benefit of the staff report as I will be away until August 10th. After I return home and have the chance to review the staff report I may update this communication.

Background

May 15th. I received a notice regarding the Schmitt's application to remodel their home. Mr. Schmitt had mentioned to me a few days prior that they were planning an addition but noted it would just be a few feet higher. When I saw the application notice which clearly stated there would be a 614 square foot second story addition with rear deck I asked Mr. Schmitt if I could review the plans. He graciously agreed to allow me and my neighbors to review the plans.

Upon review of the plans it appeared to me the proposed addition would essentially block my open view west to Pleasanton Ridge. That view would be replaced with a sea of sloped roof. I doubted my grim assessment of the addition and asked staff if it would be possible for story poles to be placed on the home to provide an accurate picture of the remodel. The Schmitt's agreed to arrange for the placement of story poles on their home marking the outline of the roofline of the proposed remodel. The story poles confirmed my earlier grim assessment.

I have lived in my home since 1986. One of the primary reasons I purchased my home was the west facing back yard and my bedroom have a a great open view featuring Pleasanton Ridge. Over time I have landscaped my garden to provide privacy to the one bedroom window of the Schmitt home facing my deck as well as to mask the storage shed on Schmitt's property located about one foot from our common fence. I left the view to Pleasanton Ridge open. Any visitor to my garden can clearly attest to that.

It is unfortunate neither the Schmitt's nor the project's architect have taken enough interest in the impact of the proposed addition on my property to visit my back yard and home. I have invited them to do so. In an email to me Mr. Schmitt states the remodel impacts only "a small percentage" of my view – clearly, he has no idea of the impact.

All the homes in the neighborhood were constructed in the late 60's and early 70's. They are one story ranch style typical of that era. The neighborhood has made repeated efforts to maintain the character of the single story ranch style homes. The Planning Department will be able to verify previous applications for two story homes in the neighborhood that were changed to one story remodels due to neighborhood involvement. The developer of the homes backing up to the north east end of Hamilton Way was required to limit those few homes to one story in keeping with the character of the one story homes on Hamilton Way behind them. The proposed remodel is not only two stories, it is of contemporary design.

18.20.030 Scope of Review – Criteria

I understand staff will be providing a number of exhibits displaying the proposed remodel, homes in the neighborhood and views from my yard. I plan on attending the meeting and will also have exhibits to display. I urge you to carefully examine the exhibits keeping in mind the criteria for scope of review. I hope some of you have driven on Hamilton Way to become familiar with the neighborhood and the architecture and harmony of the existing homes. While it is never easy to evaluate the potential impact of proposed remodels on surrounding neighborhoods and adjacencies, I urge you to do so keeping in mind the following criteria:

The scope of review permits you to evaluate the scale of the building within its site and the adjoining buildings. *I believe an evaluation of the proposed Schmitt remodel confirms it is not in scale with the adjoining buildings.*

The scope of review permits you to evaluate the compatibility of architectural styles, harmony with adjoining buildings and consistency with neighborhood character. *I believe an evaluation of the Schmitt remodel shows it is not compatible nor in harmony with the architectural style of the adjoining buildings, and is inconsistent with neighborhood character.*

The scope of review permits you to evaluate the preservation of views enjoyed by residents. *I believe as you consider the negative impact of the proposed remodel on my property, the complete loss of my open and lovely view, to be replaced by massive sloped shingled roof, you will agree my property and its residents will have suffered considerable loss of view.*

Mitigation of Loss of View

So often in cases such as this, landscaping is looked upon as the answer to buffer the area and provide visual relief. The distance from the Schmitt house to the common fence is very narrow maintaining the seven foot minimum distance in places. Any landscaping done to significantly mask the proposed roof line to any extent would no doubt have to be on my property. I resent the fact that should you approve this application not only will I have loss of view, loss of property value due to the loss of view replaced by a sloping roof wall, I will also have to assume the financial and physical burden of landscaping my back yard in an attempt to mitigate the mass of roof that will be so highly visible from my garden and home. To achieve any buffering of the roof mass will take considerable time for plant material to mature. That buffer will likely not be effective during my occupancy.

Conclusion

I believe the criteria for scope of review provides ample reason for you to deny this application. The Schmitt's have a large lot providing space for an extensive one store remodel. Such a remodel could blend with the character of, and be in harmony with, the existing homes in the neighborhood while not impacting my open view. Such a project would no doubt enjoy the support of the neighborhood.

I urge you to deny this application and support my appeal.

Jennifer Wallis

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 03, 2014 4:54 PM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Cc: Barron, Beverly
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing: P14-0829, Greg Munn, Design Tech Associates/George and Mary Schmitt

Ms. Wallis,

If the proposed additions are made to the dwelling at 554 Hamilton Way, Pleasanton, CA, it would fundamentally detract the views of neighboring residences, my own, included. The proposed additions are extraordinary, and should not be undertaken by the owner of said dwelling.

The proposed additions are the following:

- (1)- Construct an approximately 781-square foot single story addition to the rear of the house.
- (2)- Construct an 88-square foot, 6" tall covered front porch.
- (3)- Construct an approximately 614-square foot second story addition with an approximately 177-square foot second floor deck.
- (4)- Change the overall roof pitch of the home, including raising the height of the ridge line and peaks by 1' 9" to 7' 4".

Zoning of this property is specified in: R-1-6,500, "One Family Residential District."

Sincerely,
John P. Barron, Beverly H. Barron

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Jennifer Wallis

From: christine steiner [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:32 AM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: Re: P14-2829 544 Hamilton Way

Jennifer, I will not be able to attend the planning commission meeting on Wednesday as I am vacationing with my family in the mountains. I did give several neighbors copies of a piece I wrote about the history of the Rosepointe development. A key point of the article was that when the developer, Ray Martin ran into financial difficulties and sold of the remaining lots in the 70's everyone who developed them adhered to the promise he had made to us all and they built one story homes. How the one two story home at the end of Amber Lane got in is a mystery except very few people were aware of it being built as it was at the end of a dead end street. Interestingly the homes adjoining it but not in the Rosepointe subdivision were required to be single story to be compatible with the adjoining neighborhood. How times change.

It concerns me greatly that the Schmitt family has not accepted Dolores Bengston's invitation to view the story poles from her property and see how their addition impacts her home. Given their reluctance to cooperate with the neighbors concerns I hope the commission will not approve the addition as planned.

Thank you for your work on this application. I know from past experience that these are the most difficult issues to resolve. I would greatly appreciate it if you could convey my concerns to the commission as I cannot be there in person. I did give Dolores a copy of the article I gave to some of the residents.

Christine Steiner

Sent from my iPad

Jennifer Wallis

From: Haps [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43 PM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: FW: 554 Hamilton way, application

From: Haps [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24 PM
To: 'jwallis@cityofpleasanton.gov'
Subject: 554 Hamilton way, application

Jennifer,

My name is James Connors, 6424 Randall Court, and I am writing in support of the application made by the Schmitt family for their addition to their house. I have read through all of the comments to those opposed to the addition and would like to add a few comments of my own. I have lived in this neighborhood for 12 years and have a two story house that looks down upon my backyard, in Rosepointe. Where were these same people that are so against this small addition when this was done to our space? Have you had a field trip with all parties involved to actually see how the addition would impact all of these homes? I have. The comments made by our "neighbors" are mostly fictional and bare no resemblance as to the actual impact on their homes. None. The home next door to the Schmitt home actually sits higher than the Schmitt home and the addition would barely be higher than her home. One comment is from a "neighbor" that is 5 houses away and his house cannot even see the Schmitt home. Field trip.

The neighborhood is no longer Rosepointe or Carriage Gardens. It is a collection of homes that have been built since the early 1970's. There are homes adjacent everywhere in this area with 2 story houses everywhere. The plan the Schmitt's have proposed pales in comparison to some of the 2 story homes in our area, including the 2 story home that looks down into my backyard. These same people who oppose this small addition did not seem to care about these other 2 story homes in our neighborhood until one of their homes was affected. I received "The History Of Rosepointe" handed out door to door by Christine Steiner. Her last paragraph states " if you are concerned about this issue and wish to retain the integrity of our neighborhood please attend the Planning Commission Meeting." Where was Christine when all of these 2 story homes were built years ago?

In closing, I highly recommend a joint field trip by those involved with the city, neighbors, and the architect to see just how much this addition will impact the neighborhood. Certainly a decision cannot be made by taking just the comments of some without an on-site review. I fully recommend that the city gives the Schmitt family this courtesy, which I believe will then allow the city to make the right decision, which is to allow the Schmitt's the right to proceed with their small addition.

Respectfully
James Connors

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

The Schmitt's rebuttal of Delores Bengston and Christine Steiner

I have lived in this neighborhood since 1976 and Rose Pointe has always been growing. I watched the fields where we used to play and ride our bikes be turned into an extension of our neighborhood, now Carriage Garden. These houses are nearly all two stories. My backyard is shared by two neighbors whom both have two story homes. We are NOT adding a second story, which would be close to a 30 foot roof ridge line, which is within the zoning guidelines. Rather we are increasing our top ridge by only 7 feet to modernize our roofline, which will allow for a loft. Even if we didn't add the loft, the roof line would still have to be raised 3-4 feet to allow for our addition. While planning we considered the impact of our addition and took great care to minimize its impact. In fact, we denied the first set of plans because we felt they were out of line with Rose Pointe.

We are not building a mansion, in fact with the addition we still would not be the largest house in the neighborhood. There are several two story homes in the original plan for Rose Pointe. Moreover, for someone to say the addition of the full two story on Hanover Court slipped through the process is a complete lie! I lived here and played with their kids, as did Mrs. Steiner's, everyone knew 100% that the Bentley's were adding a second story. Also for someone to say our addition would have a negative economic impact on their home is not true, nor is it in line with real estate market beliefs. Our addition would only increase the value of homes in this neighborhood.

We have attached a rendering, with help of photo shop and our architect to show the finished addition. I know some people do not want change in this neighborhood but we feel it is time to modernize our home inside and out. We have had several neighbors show excitement about our addition. Thanks in advance for taking the time to read our thoughts.

Sincerely, The Schmitt Family

George, Jennifer, Grace, George Jr, and Gavin

You have our Support ~ 100%
Wayne & Cynthia Burkholder

Jennifer Wallis

From: Tony Ferreri [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 5:03 PM
To: Jennifer Wallis
Subject: Fwd: 554 Hamilton Way

See below...

----- Original message -----

From: Tony Ferreri
Date: 08/13/2014 4:57 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: jwallis@cityofpleasanton.gov
Subject: 554 Hamilton Way

Jennifer-

Good afternoon. My name is Tony Ferreri. My wife and I reside at 6415 Amber Lane. I am writing this letter in support of The Schmitt Families pending application for a remodel of their personal residence. We live in the 'Rosepointe' neighborhood and are a neighbor of theirs. There are plenty of two story houses within the neighborhood, including ours. They have an oversized lot which can easily accommodate a larger dwelling. It would seem unfair for The Schmitt Family to be scrutinized while these other homeowners have been able to perform similar type projects.

They have a young, growing family and could really use the extra room. Please show your support for this project.

Regards,

Tony Ferreri & Michele Ferreri

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S™ III, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.