

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Ross called the special teleconference-only meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Planning & Building Director Laura Russell called roll:

Present: ASCC: Commissioners Commissioner Cheung, Megan Koch and Al Sill; Chair Dave Ross and Vice Chair Jane Wilson

Absent:

Planning Commission Liaison: Commissioner Nicholas Targ

Town Council Liaison: Councilmember Sarah Wernikoff

Town Staff: Planning & Building Director Laura Russell; Assistant Planner Dylan Parker

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

NEW BUSINESS

- (1) **Architectural and Site Development Review of a new single-family residence, File #PLN ARCH03-2021, 77 Palmer Lane (D. Parker)**

Assistant Planner Dylan Parker presented the staff report for final review of this new residence with basement, pool and associated site improvements, located at 77 Palmer Lane, which the Commission saw at the December 7 Conceptual Design Review meeting. Feedback to the applicant at that time included advice for a simple landscape with natural groupings; ensuring fencing does not prevent on-site animal thoroughfares; removing invasive species; ensuring compliance with the outdoor lighting policy; incorporating motion sensors and timer controls; ensuring that interior light spills from windows and doors be minimized; ensuring any skylights have shades to minimize light spill; and ensuring that prominence of the driveway retaining walls is minimized and eliminating the third tier. Regarding the retaining wall, the requirements requested by the Town Engineer to conditionally approve the project are detailed in the staff report

The revised plans include maintaining the feel of open meadowlands with minimal planting and Spotted Oaks; minimal exterior lighting other than what is necessary for safety and site accessibility; roll-down shades at the large glazing areas to reduce light spill, which will be placed on the lighting control system. Assistant Planner Parker also highlighted condition number five, which is to make sure that there are motion and time controls for all of the outdoor lighting in addition to the implemented lighting control for the interior.

Assistant Planner Parker described the site, which is vacant, roughly one acre, with approximately 29.03 percent average slope. The significant slope reduces the size down to about 0.849 acres. It is located in the R-E, Residential Estate zone. He pointed out an existing 10-foot access easement with a roughly 10-foot asphalt access road which the West Bay Sanitary District uses to service the property above the ridge line. There is also a 15-foot “visual” easement – half of a 30-foot visual easement shared with the adjacent parcel. In addition, there is a five-foot access easement running parallel to the property, also shared with

the adjacent parcel, for access for future development, the actual purpose of which is not known.

Assistant Planner Parker described the proposed 4,150-square-foot house. Although it meets the setback, it is on the setback lines, 50 feet in the front, 20 on both sides, and 20 in the rear. There are two covered parking spaces and two uncovered. Staff included the existing utility easement road in the impervious surfaces total because it is an existing impervious surface; however, that amount was not considered in the calculations between the maximum allowed per code and the proposed. The easement is not necessarily owned by or benefitting the applicants, so this area was excluded from the calculations. The property is extremely sloped, so there will be significant soil movement on-site – 970 cubic yards, thus requiring ASCC review. The single story residence steps down into the extreme topography, and meets the 28-foot maximum height limit. There is a basement with an exposed portion. The daylight portions are included within the floor area calculations. A portion of the home has a second story element when looking at the garage from the east and west elevations, but from other directions there is a single story massing.

Assistant Planner Parker discussed the materials, which have not changed since the prior ASCC review, including natural, stone materials, stone veneer, and limestone on a majority of the wall facades with glazing in a black and matt finish. Site walls and stone paving will mimic the stone material proposed on the house. Assistant Planner Parker described the lighting plan as detailed in the staff report. Staff recommendations include reducing the quantity of recessed lighting by half. The garage lighting is acceptable as long as both have a combined 1125 lumens or less, per the Town's lighting policy. Regarding the pool lighting, there were three options provided in the plan. Staff proposes the lowest lumen count. He noted that the lighting reflects back into the house, which should minimize light spill cascading down the ridge line.

Assistant Planner Parker discussed the landscape plan. There are no trees proposed for removal in the landscape plan. The plan augments the existing landscaping on the site, particularly the existing canopy located adjacent to the parcel to the south. The tree planting plan proposes Coast Live Oaks, Fruitless Olive and Strawberry trees. The site is within the maximum allowable water allowance (MAWA), and they are using 52% of their estimated total water usage, giving an average ETAF of 0.30. The planting palette of the full site includes predominantly native plants in natural groupings, versus hedges, except closer to the home, which is acceptable per the Guidelines. The applicant proposes meadow restoration for ground covers, versus a lawn or turf area.

Assistant Planner Parker described proposed materials, which include the stone retaining wall mimicking the stone veneer on the house, timber decking, stone paving around the pool and pedestrian pathways, stone steps integrated in the gravel paths, and fencing. The applicant proposes to fence a portion of the property, predominantly for safety. The original material proposed was a vertical metal picket. Staff had concerns regarding safety and wildlife compatibility with this. In the final plans this has been changed to vertical wood pickets. Staff requests that the ASCC consider metal fencing with a flat cap versus a vertical wood picket. The main reason for the change was that 85 Palmer has the same fencing style but with wood. Staff supports the location of the fencing.

Assistant Planner Parker stated that notice was sent out per Town policy on June 18th. There were no comments received. He pointed out the required findings, stating that staff concluded that they can be easily made with the recommendations in the staff report. The proposed plan conforms to the Design Guidelines with the recommended changes to the lighting and the

fencing. The project conforms to the Zoning Code and is exempt from CEQA. Assistant Planner Parker concluded the presentation with a recommendation for approval of the architectural and site development permits, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Koch questioned what was meant by visual easement. Assistant Planner Parker said these can be called many things. They are typically in place to ensure that if you have a view line, it will not be impeded by any structures. Sometimes view easements are identified if they are light easements. He said there isn't any definitive information in the description of the easement of what it is intended for and staff pointed it out simply to note that the project is being mindful and respectful of all easements that are in place on that side of the property. In terms of the actual driveway, it is being used for the sanitary access, and there is no impediment or intent to improve or otherwise touch it at this point. Mr. Greg Layshock explained that the visual easement was between the previous neighbor and the adjacent neighbor. Essentially, if either party plans to build anything in that easement, they must show it to the neighbor and get their approval in writing. He said that his lot has the same rights over the other property should they want to build within that visual easement.

Commissioner Sill complimented Assistant Planner Parker on the staff report write-up. He recalled an issue previously on this property related to water pressure with one of the neighbors. He was surprised there were no comments from neighbors on this and wondered if that was addressed. Planning and Building Director Russell said they did receive a comment from a neighbor on this. There was an email exchange that she was copied on between that neighbor and the District Manager at Cal Water. Director Russell emailed her and asked for an update prior to tonight's meeting. She was not able to give a specific update, but the neighbor is speaking to a high-level person at Cal Water in regard to their concerns. For the purposes of the ASCC review they are okay as far as the findings and determinations that need to be made.

Commissioner Cheung said his understanding is that the impervious surface is a paved area, and the utility easement is not being counted in the totals. He wondered if the project is within the maximum, even taking the easement into account. Assistant Planner Parker replied that it may be slightly over the maximum. However, the intent of excluding the paved area was because it is fully within the easement, and to ensure that the applicant wasn't penalized for it. The applicant does not have the right or benefit to use the access road, so shouldn't be counted as part of their impervious surfaces.

Chair Ross invited the applicant to make a presentation, including a question regard the location and purpose of the fence.

Mr. Layshock shared his illustrations of the proposed plan. He said the basic idea was to set up a building that recedes from the street with low-slung forms, following the existing contours of the site as much as possible. This led to the broken up shapes and angled geometries. They tried to keep things simple, low and natural, so that the building would read like a sort of rocky outcropping. They plan to use natural materials, stone and have the house recede from view. As much as it pulls away from the street and works into the hillside, from within the building there are still amazing views and a lovely interior. He said it was a challenging site for the house. He addressed the retaining wall issue. There is only one way to enter the lot, as it is very steep heading up Palmer, and they couldn't come up the water district road to get to the site, so this is really the only spot to enter the lot as it gets steeper. With the stacked retaining wall, the idea is, with plantings to have go away as much as possible. Each of the walls is at the max four-foot

height, which took a lot of coordination to knock it all back into the hillside this way. He said he feels it is successful in a not overly-imposing way.

Mr. Layshock said after seeing the story poles up, one thing that came to light was perhaps reducing the building even more. After submission of the project, they started considering another plan, basically the same plan, but reducing the square footage even further and pulling back a little more from the road. Mr. Layshock asked if he could show those alternate plans. Chair Ross invited him to do so. The revised plans would move the pool 10 to 12 feet further from the road, move the mass of the house back a little and also reduce the mass somewhat. The house would stay along the same lines that it was previously on, in aggregate, reducing the square footage by about 820 square feet. He feels not much would be lost in terms of use or design of the home. He said they realize this plan is not what was submitted but they thought they would bring it up in case the ASCC was willing to entertain approval on the condition that they return with revised drawings for them to look at. Ostensibly, everything would stay the same, only smaller. Mr. Layshock pointed out the location of the fence and explained that the fence is included mostly because the hill is so steep and the applicant has grandchildren and wants to ensure the steep area is fenced.

Mr. Ken Linsteadt added, in regard to the last-minute alternate plan, it came later in the process when the owners, after seeing the story poles, were hopeful that the plan could be reduced a bit. He said everything about the project is almost identical except that the massing has shrunk. He said their question is whether the alternate plan could come back at a staff level, with ASCC guidance perhaps, without coming back to a full hearing again.

Ben Langford, Ground Studio, added that in meeting with the Conservation Committee in April, there were suggested tree removals, some deodar cedars along the south property line on the other side of the utility road easement. They will be updating the drawings for the building permit submittal and will include those at that point, as recommended by the Committee. Chair Ross asked if those are in or near the visual easement. Mr. Langford thought that if anything they would open up the easement. Vice Chair Wilson said she thought there were a number of deodar cedars and junipers slated for removal from the landscape plan she saw. Mr. Langford said he was clarifying that those removals were indeed planned, since Assistant Planner Parker had mentioned that there were no trees slated for removal

Commissioner Sill said when he visits the site, the area between where the house is and the utility easement seems like a beautiful grassy hillside, and he was expecting it to stay pretty much like that, but the landscaping plan indicates quite a few shrubs that will be planted in that area. He wondered why that decision was made. Mr. Langford said there is a combination of things going on there. The shrubs planted closer to the access road would be to screen the view of the road to some extent, since it's not something they necessarily want on the property. The ones that are higher up and further west have to do with that situation. The groupings lower and closer to the road are more intended to work in conjunction with the proposed Coast Live Oaks, to help screen the road and screen the house from the road.

Commissioner Koch questioned the multiple pool lights. If they could be a lower lumen, it could work with the Guidelines, but it looked like there is no spa lighting. Mr. Langford confirmed that there is one spa light included. The others would be a matter of safety.

Commissioner Cheung said it sounded like it would have been a possibility to use the utility easement as a driveway, but he understood that it didn't work geometrically. Mr. Layshock said it was too long and too steep, and the climb straight up is too steep for a fire truck.

Chair Ross invited comments from the public.

Planning and Building Director Russell advised that if the Commission was interested in considering the alternative plans, then they would need to hear from them what their grading would be, if there would be any change to the grading, because it was fairly close to the Planning Commission threshold for a site development permit. Mr. Layshock said the grading would be reduced. Mr. Langford agreed and said there would be no real change to the area by the driveway. The primary changes would be from the eastern end, by the pool, and it is pulling in towards the house, so he believed it safe to say it would be a reduction in grade.

Nicholas Targ, Planning Commission Liaison, joined the meeting by phone, and mentioned that, as always, he is impressed by the deliberative process the Commission is going through.

Kerry Brown said he has enjoyed the last few presentations. His house is directly across the street at the top of Palmer Lane as it curves to the left to go into the cul-de-sac. He asked to know a little bit more about the fence, because most people there don't have a lot of fencing and he thought he saw that it was going to be a post fence, five-foot, that came down the driveway and wrapped up Palmer Lane, directly across from his home. He asked if they could expand on this. Mr. Langford responded that the purpose of the fence is to keep grandchildren safe. They are not planning on anything taller than four feet, and they have also set the fence quite a way back from the road within the 50-foot setback. Because of the nature of the pool and the slope there is not a tidier way to contain it close to the pool without it being a visual impediment, so they tried to strike a balance between the elevation of the pool, distance from the street, and the desire to make the fence as hidden and invisible as possible. They hope to soften it with plants, keep to the minimum height, and help the applicant feel safe about her grandchildren enjoying the pool and associated areas. They are proposing natural material left to weather, which will hopefully help minimize it visually. Mr. Brown appreciated the explanation and said he understands the reasons the reasons for the fence.

With no further questions from the public, Chair Ross brought the item back to the Commission.

Commissioner Koch thought it was a gorgeous siting of the property, saying she loves the rock outcropping design element which will play beautifully in the hillside. She said, realistically, a metal fence will have a longer life and is a harder material for fire safety reasons, but she does understand that capping is necessary to mitigate the danger for wildlife. She said they've addressed all of their concerns. She is supportive of a smaller footprint for the house and thinks it will sit better into the hillside.

Commissioner Sill agreed with Commissioner Koch and thought it was a beautiful proposal, sited well, a well thought out plan that fits with the topography. He said he likes the material choices and thinks they will complement the retaining walls. He thinks the driveway placement makes sense, a lot of thought went into it, and a good choice was made. He said its good to see some of the non-native trees going away. He agrees with staff's findings and proposed conditions for approval, particularly on the landscaping. He said he doesn't feel like the landscaping plan is really done and thinks there are more comments from the Conservation Committee that should be evaluated. He is uncomfortable with the density of planting, primarily on the uphill side of the easement road, but even on the downhill side there could be fewer plants. Otherwise he said he thinks it is a great proposal, and he is also quite comfortable with the proposed smaller footprint. Visually, he thinks the wood fence would be more appealing.

Commissioner Cheung agreed with much of what Commissioner Koch and Commissioner Sill

said. He thinks the design intent to fit into the natural landscape is wonderful. He applauded the use of fire safe materials for exterior finishes and agreed with Commissioner Koch that the metal fencing would be better in terms of fire safety. He was sensitive to Commissioner Sill's comment on the appearance of a wood fence, but said the metal options have gotten pretty nice, and there are some older options of metals that rust in a protective way that could be interesting as well. He thinks the meadow restoration efforts are nice, but agrees that there is a bit of a conflict in the design intent in terms of making the project blend into the natural landscape versus the effort to hide the utility easement with plantings. Regarding the alternate plan, he is okay with it not coming back to an ASCC meeting, but could be checked by the staff, as long as the numbers for the various limits are satisfactory.

Vice Chair Wilson also liked the 820-square-foot reduction. She said the planning team has been very considerate of the current landscape and how it fits in, so she would be happy to have the condensing of the property dealt with by the Town rather than coming back to a full meeting. She had a concern about the metal fencing because of wildlife safety, sharing that when she was young they had a pet impaled on a metal fence, so she would like to see some sort of capping or a wooden fence, because at four feet, the deer will be jumping over. She liked the materials board and how the construction materials fit in. She was happy to see that the junipers and cedars are being removed. She said the Conservation Committee recommendations are very good and urged the team to follow them, especially regarding the Dittrichia and French Broom, as well as the oxalis when it returns next year. She said removing the invasives while allowing the Native Toyons and Live Oak to remain is a great idea. She said the Conservation Committee also made suggestions about more native grasses than the ones listed, and she would like that to be looked at again. Otherwise, she likes the design and is even more impressed with the reduction. She said her one suggestion would just be to have the landscape plan come back to one member of the ASCC to take a look at. Overall, she said it's a great design and will be a lovely site in the neighborhood.

Chair Ross was very impressed by how they articulated their design program and met it, as it focused on the idea of fitting into the topography and appearing as a sort of rocky outcrop. He said he thinks it succeeds well in that way, and he looks forward to seeing it. Aesthetically, he said he is indifferent on the fence. Given safety concerns and just blending into the natural materials, he thought wood was the best idea. On the downslope landscaping, he agreed with Commissioner Sill that it could be thinned out some and still achieve the goal of screening the utility road and preserving a bit more of the open meadow feel. One thing that occurred to him in looking at the elevations was that the retaining walls do appear to be very linear, because they follow the topography line. He suggested, if it wasn't a huge cost increase or logistical problem, that they might consider a little bit of articulation of the walls to break up the linearity of them and give an even greater impression of the limestone erupting out the site, just as an idea and not a condition of approval. He said he is very supportive of the smaller footprint and of the process mentioned. Based on what he is seen, he thinks it would be appropriate to turn in the revised plans, perhaps with updates to the landscape plan, and have it reviewed by staff and one member of the ASCC, without returning to a full ASCC meeting.

Planning and Building Director Russell said right now condition for approval number seven is drafted to state two members of the ASCC for the landscape, so they might consider that in a revised motion. She said it's fairly unusual for them to entertain a large change after everything has been published, and staff didn't know about it, so she asked that they just confirm that everyone agreed that the finding of approval could be made for the smaller design as presented, so that this is reflected into the minutes and the record. Chair Ross polled each ASCC member to confirm their agreement that the reduced project would still meet the design

guidelines, and all Commissioners agreed on this, as long as the plan still meets all the required numbers.

Planning and Building Director Russell recommended that the revised plans for the house and the landscaping plans come back, and then they can do a staff consultation with the Conservation Committee if needed. Commissioner Sill said his preference would be to have two people look at the landscaping plan, but if the rest feel that one is sufficient he was fine with that.

Chair Ross suggested he make a motion as such.

Commissioner Sill moved to approve the project with the conditions outlined by staff. Seconded by Vice Chair Wilson, the motion carried, 5-0.

Chair Ross said this still is mostly an administrative process, and as such won't require advance notice, putting it on the agenda, et cetera. Vice Chair Wilson asked Director Russell if it costs any more for the applicant to have two members rather than one member, and Director Russell responded that it does not. Chair Ross thought two members was a good idea since the landscaping elements are distinct from the structure and each of the Commission has their own foci.

(2) Resuming Site Meetings and ASCC meeting time

Planning and Building Director Russell began by saying it is time to think about what is next in terms of ASCC meeting time and site meetings. They have been holding the ASCC meetings in the afternoon. Staff thinks it has gone quite well to hold the meetings in the afternoon via Zoom. They anticipate that, moving forward, meetings will be in a hybrid format, with a Zoom component and an in-person component, but they don't have a timeline on that yet. For now, they will continue to be on Zoom. She asked the Commission to consider keeping the meeting time at 4:00, since it has been successful during this time. If interested, staff would look into the formal procedure, whether it would require changing official rules and/or Council approval. She remarked that it is about time to resume site meetings. If staying with the 4:00 afternoon meetings, the site meetings would be as early as 1:30 to 2:00 in order to finish the site meetings and have everyone get back home and onto Zoom, or go back into the schoolhouse for in-person meetings. She suggested that possibly the second meeting in July they would be ready to do a site meeting; if not, probably the first meeting in August.

Chair Ross invited public comments on this item. Hearing none, he brought the item back to the Council.

Commissioner Cheung asked what the meeting time was previously. Chair Ross replied 7:00 p.m. Commissioner Cheung offered that as a parent with kids to take and pick up from daycare, later would work better for him. He said he could continue to make the current time work, but pushing meetings earlier would be more challenging for him.

Vice Chair Wilson asked if a 7:00 meeting would still be on Zoom. Director Russell said it would be on Zoom for now, but they anticipate going to a hybrid meeting where the commissioners would likely be in person, but the public would still have the opportunity to participate via Zoom. Vice Chair Wilson asked regarding vaccinations in regard to site meetings. She wondered if asking about or requiring vaccination is something they can do. Director Russell said she will check to confirm, but she doesn't think they would want to ask, but would put into place a policy

that would take into consideration everyone's comfort level, knowing that there may be people that are not vaccinated there. She said if the ASCC wanted to institute a mask policy for their own site meetings, they could do that. If they had further questions she would need to check with the Town Attorney. Vice Chair Wilson added that some may have compromised immune systems, another thing to consider and discuss. Commissioner Koch wondered if they could require those who have not been vaccinated to wear masks. Director Russell said it is certainly evolving, but the guidance is less strict for outdoor activities, so they are separating out the site meetings from the in-person meetings. Also, they are still a little ways off, at the soonest about a month from now having the first one. Commissioner Koch said the most valuable in-person meeting they have is the site visit, not being in the schoolhouse. The actual walking of the property and looking from neighbors' views is an impressive asset.

Commissioner Sill said as far as meeting time, he is flexible and is fine with whatever works for people. He is looking forward to site visits again and thinks they are very valuable. Commissioner Koch said she can be flexible, although taking account that daylight savings will end in the fall. Director Russell said from staff's point of view it has been valuable to do the meetings in the afternoon, because of the number of night meetings they have. With the addition of the Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee it is common for planners to have five evening meetings per month. They are trying to use technology and move forward, rethinking how to do things and determining the right time to have public engagement, and what is good for Commissioners, who are volunteers. Vice Chair Wilson said it's also important to consider staff's safety going home from the meetings. Commissioner Koch remarked that they have been in the schoolhouse at midnight before, but she is flexible.

Chair Ross said he is also flexible about time and that the site meeting is very valuable. They can ask questions, get a great presentation, and neighbors are often able to attend and get a feel for the project. He asked about the special rules that currently allow commissioners to attend electronically and if they would still apply to hybrid meetings, so that they might occasionally have a combination of in-person and virtual commissioners. Director Russell said it might be possible, but they don't know yet. They are waiting for additional guidance from the State, and they do not have a timeline on that. They are currently under an Executive Order from the Governor that allows participation in the meetings remotely. Otherwise, there are numerous rules under the Brown Act around what has to be done. Chair Ross said he loves the idea of hybrid format for attendees. They have seen an increase in public attendance at the meetings, which is valuable from a community engagement point of view. He said that he is flexible regarding meeting times. He would prefer scheduling site meetings no earlier than 3 or 4 in the afternoon, but could work around a 2:00 site meeting if necessary. He said that lately, the agenda hasn't been large enough to need more than one or two site visits before a meeting, but suggested the possibility of scheduling a meeting on a Friday afternoon if there was a large agenda. Director Russell thought this was an interesting point and something to consider. Commissioner Koch said one of the reasons the meetings are on the same day is that the architects, or whoever you want onsite for the meeting, is also in the vicinity for the evening's full house. Commissioner Cheung said hybrid meetings could make things easier. Chair Ross remarked in regard to COVID safety concerns, the beauty of a site meeting – and downside – is that people tend to scatter a little bit and create whatever distance they're comfortable with.

Betsy Morganthaler said she was gathering from the comments that neighbors and perhaps the community are invited to attend site meetings. She imagines there would be a future meeting she would enjoy and would learn from attending, in particular, the Spring Ridge Winery CUP when it comes around. Chair Ross said traditionally, before the pandemic, site meetings were open to anybody from the public. He imagines that would continue. Even then, it was really rare

to have a crowd, but typically a handful of neighbors and occasionally other people from town interested in either the process or a particular project, along with the consultants and design team and members of staff. He said they've had groups as large as 25 to 30 people, but more typically 10 or 12. He said he wouldn't expect there to be any larger crowds than previously. The personal spacing option is still there for people to exercise, as well as masking and distancing and still be able to be informed by it.

Commissioner Sill summarized that mostly they don't care what time the meeting is, but Director Russell has a slight preference for earlier and Commissioner Cheung has a slight preference for later. Commissioner Cheung said it will make a big difference whether or not virtual attendance is provided. Director Russell said a decision is not needed immediately, but she wanted the Commission to start thinking and talking about it. She said the July 12th ASCC meeting is cancelled. Staff is preparing to open the front doors of Town Hall, so that will be the first week back in the office and there wasn't anything ready for that meeting. She proposed that on July 26th there would be two projects, and to try the afternoon time for now and by then they may have more information from the State about the Executive Order and they can talk about it more at that meeting or the next and figure out how to go forward. The Commissioners agreed to this proposal.

Director Russell said the two projects for July 26th will be 531 Wayside and 385 Westridge, which she thinks would benefit from site meetings. There will also be a final review of 35 Possum, of which ASCC has already done a conceptual review. There is a minor project for a mailbox, so that might be a good one to have two site meetings in the afternoon. Vice Chair Wilson thought is sounded like a long meeting. Director Russell reminded that they used to review as many as four on a regular basis. Her goal has been to move everything slowly forward, but there will now be more staff coming on during the summer, and they will be in the mode of catching up. Vice Chair Wilson asked how far behind they were. Director Russell thought it would take a couple months to catch up, with the new planner coming on in the next week or so, and recruitment for senior planner.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(3) Commission Reports

Vice Chair Wilson received an email from Danna Breen regarding the driveway on the Dolan residence on Westridge, which she is hoping will be included in the final whenever that one comes back to the ASCC. Director Russell said 228 Westridge will be coming back for approval of the Redwood trees. Staff had initially declined that and told them they could not keep the Redwood trees that they had planted, so they are asking for a full ASCC review of that, which will probably come forward in August. Vice Chair Wilson said that would be the time to look at the driveway then, because there will probably be a site visit. Director Russell wasn't aware of the driveway issue. Vice Chair Wilson said she sent it to her and Howard Young. Director Russell asked her to forward it to her, to make her be aware of the issue.

(4) Staff Report

Planning and Building Director Russell said everything she was going to report has been covered – upcoming projects, doors opening at Town Hall, additional staff. On Wednesday, the 30th, there will be a joint ASCC and Planning Commission meeting related to Stanford. They anticipate a lot of public participation in that. She will be sending comments that have come in from the public to the Commission members. There are Planning Commissioners and an ASCC

member that are recused from the project, and they will only be discussing that item, so those members need not be in attendance for that. Commissioner Sill said he can come as a member of the public, but not as a Commissioner. Director Russell said this is correct. Vice Chair Wilson asked if there will be plans. Director Russell said there are no plans, but there are diagrams within the packet.

Chair Ross invited public comments.

Betsy Morgenthaler inquired about the return of the Spring Ridge CUP, because it is into the heart of summer vacation season in August, but with the substance being so large and summer being so hot in August, she wondered about their thoughts on that. Vice Chair Wilson asked if she meant the Neely vineyard. Ms. Morgenthaler said yes. She knew they had been talking about relatively frequently at Planning Commission and occasionally at ASCC but she hadn't heard anything for a few weeks. Director Russell confirmed it would be on an ASCC agenda in August at the soonest and they will be working on a system for everyone to be able to do site visits, because they anticipate more people being interested in site visits. She said there is a component of the project that requires ASCC review and recommendation, but that portion is relatively minor. The majority of the decision rests with the Planning Commission. Ms. Morgenthaler said the CEQA report that has been in process for a year and more will be fairly substantive and lengthy, and she wondered how much time they will have to review it and if the ASCC would have enough notice for such a substantial piece of work. Director Russell said they don't know the schedule currently. Since the ASCC's role in reviewing the CEQA is quite minor and the Planning Commission really has the lead role in reviewing the document, it wouldn't be uncommon for the ASCC to receive the CEQA information in the packet the Friday before, since it would be informational and is not really that much in their purview.

Ms. Morgenthaler said that the townspeople consider it to be a substantial project and highly controversial and will draw attention. She urged Planning and Building Director Russell to consider not scheduling it in August because it is the heart of vacation times, because the CEQA report has been looming large and to have such a little time to review would be difficult. Chair Ross commented that the appropriate place to give feedback on the report will be to the Planning Commission, and he expects the ASCC probably has no decisions to make involving issues evaluated in the CEQA report. He also thought the report would probably be published and publicly available long before the ASCC sees it in their packet. Given the information about where it is in the process, he said he would be surprised to see it on an agenda during the summer, but more likely September or October at the earliest. Director Russell said they are working on a number of very important Town priorities and projects, and they do have a reasonable due process obligation to take projects forward to Commission meetings when they're ready. She said the Town has had a practice of keeping lighter agendas during the summer, but the volume of very important topics that they have now necessitates them to hold the meetings throughout the year, even at times they've tried to avoid in the past. When projects are ready to forward, they do have a reasonable obligation to the applicant to move them forward. She said the CEQA document needs to be substantially ready, but the ASCC review can happen earlier in the process even if they are still finalizing some things. Those are details they are trying to work out, but they do recognize that it is a project with a lot of interest from the community.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(5) ASCC Meeting of June 14, 2021

Chair Ross invited comments from the public regarding the minutes.

Commissioner Koch moved to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2021, ASCC meeting, as submitted; seconded by Commissioner Sill.

Chair Ross invited comments from the public regarding the minutes. Hearing none, he called for the vote.

The motion carried, 4-0-1, with Commissioner Cheung abstaining.

ADJOURNMENT [5:37 p.m.]