

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Derwin

Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni (arrived at approximately 7:47 p.m.)

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

**Change in Agenda Order**

As the applicants for the Chung/Lacerte project were delayed in arriving at the meeting, the agenda order was modified and the Rubin architectural review request was considered first.

**Architectural Review of proposed driveway entry features, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Rubin**

Vlasic presented the staff report on this request for approval of plans for installation of a driveway entry feature that would consist of three, three-foot tall by 4.5-inch diameter, "automatic" bollards. He explained that the bollards would be installed on the subject 2.1-acre Oak Hills subdivision property as explained in the May 12, 2010 memorandum from project architect Bob Stoecker and shown on the plan prepared by Mr. Stoecker, dated May 13, 2010. He clarified that in support of the request, the applicant also provided the "Parking Sentries" product data with specifications for the bollards, including data on the LED lighting integrated in the bollard, and photo examples of the use of the bollards.

Vlasic advised that since the staff report was prepared, one communication had been received on the request. He distributed copies of and reviewed the June 12, 2010 email from Bret Rothenberg, 130 Golden Hills Drive, raising concerns with the proposed features relative to driveway navigation and impact on his driveway. Vlasic also shared data from the subdivision for the area and assessor's map showing the configuration of the existing joint driveway easement serving the subject property and 130 Golden Hills Drive.

Project architect Bob Stoecker presented the plans to the ASCC and reviewed the comments in his May 12<sup>th</sup> submittal memorandum. He offered the following additional clarifications:

- The concerns of the neighbor at 130 Golden Hills Drive were actually considered in selecting the design and location for the bollards. In addition to the easement, the applicant has installed grass pavers to allow for turnaround movements prior to the gate to minimize potential for any unauthorized vehicles to make movements extending up the separate driveway to the residence at 130 Golden Hills Drive. Further, the design

allows for passage of pedestrians and wildlife and also minimizes visual presence of the “gate” entry feature, while meeting the needs of the property owner to control vehicle access to the property.

- In response to a question, it was noted that lighting levels would be reduced if found necessary as explained in May 12<sup>th</sup> memorandum. It was stressed, however, that some level of illumination was essential for safety, as the bollards would not be highly visible at night. It was noted that the applicant feels strongly that the control of the illumination should be at his discretion due to the safety concerns.
- Also in response to a question, it was stated that a “Knox Box” with the control for the bollards would be provided to meet the fire district requirements for emergency access. It was further noted that the bollard system had low power demands and that the small size meant that the bollard could easily be driven through by a typical emergency vehicle. At the same time, it was stressed that the Knox Box system would be installed as is typically required by the fire district for any gate in town.
- Regarding the proposed brushed stainless steel finish for the bollards, and responding to staff report comments, it was clarified that the finish would “dull out” over time and would be preferable to a painted finish that would chip and peel. Reference was made to the experience with very large, similar, automatic bollards located on the Stanford University Campus. It was noted that these were painted and in the process of weathering and raising and lowering, the paint was damaged and the appearance of the bollards significantly compromised.
- In response to a question, it was explained that while the bollards could be located at the 20-foot side setback line, the location is preferable relative to the location of the existing electrical panel and better serves the needs of the applicant. It was also stressed that while this is not a front yard setback area, the location was developed to be consistent with the intent of front yard gate location standards as discussed in the May 12, 2010 submittal memorandum.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and were generally supportive, but did express concern over the level of illumination from the integrated LED lights. After further discussion with Mr. Stoecker, members concurred that illumination was necessary for safety, but because this was the first such “entry feature” members did want to field check the installation to determine if an adjustment in illumination level might need to be considered.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0, approval of the bollard installation as proposed subject to the condition that prior to permit sign-off, the LED illumination levels shall be field checked by a designated ASCC member and, if determined necessary for conformity to town lighting standards, levels reduced.

At the request of Mr. Stoecker, ASCC members again clarified that the approval allowed for the installation of bollards with illumination and that the only issue was the actual level of illumination.

**Continued Architectural Review for new residence with detached accessory structure, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-613, 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte**

Vlasic presented the June 10, 2010 staff report on this continued review of the subject project. He discussed the issues considered at the ASCC's May 10, 2010 preliminary review of the proposal and efforts that have been underway since the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting to respond to the input received and to specifically address the concerns raised by the neighbors.

Vlasic referenced the June 10, 2010 email from the applicants describing the efforts that have been made and incorporated into the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 6/4/10, prepared by David Solnick Architect:

- Sheet 0, Project Data
- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 2, Floor Plans
- Sheet 2.1, Area Calculations
- Sheet 3, Elevations
- Sheet L1.0L, Landscape Plan, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Layout, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L4.0, Planting Plan, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10
- Sheet L4.1, Plant List and Notes, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L5.1, Lighting, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L7.0, Sections, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10
- Sheet L7.1, Sections, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10
- Sheet L8.0P, (Landscape) Materials Board, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10
- Sheet L8.0P, Perspectives, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet GB-1, Green Point Rated Checklist

Vlasic clarified that the engineering plan sheets submitted with the original plans had yet to be revised, but would be for consistency with the above listed plans following ASCC action. He noted, however, that the revised site and landscape plans were reviewed by project engineer, MacLeod and Associates, Inc., to determine the scope of change in earthwork. He referenced the sheet from the engineer dated June 7, 2010 showing that the revised plans would require a total of 975 cubic yards of grading counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance. Vlasic stated that this is 90 cubic yards more than was proposed with the original design, but still under the 1,000 cubic yard threshold requiring planning commission review.

Vlasic also advised that still part of the formal plan application are the arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting LLC, dated December 9, 2009, and the exterior colors board prepared by the project architect, received on March 5, 2010, and found generally acceptable by the ASCC at the May 10, 2010 meeting.

It was also noted that the story poles had been reset to model the changes to the house location as shown on the revised plans and that the story poles have been in place since June 7<sup>th</sup>. Vlasic then referenced the June 10, 2010 letter from Mr. Robert Larson relative to his concerns over the impact of the project and planned joint driveway use on access to his property at 40 Antonio Court. ASCC members acknowledged receipt of the letter and Mr. Larson's request that more time be allowed for him to work with the subject applicants on a final design for the driveway configuration and landscaping.

Vlasic stated that since the staff report had been prepared one new communication on the project had been received. Reference was made to this June 7, 2010 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Ryan, 20 Antonio Court, received by the town on June 11, 2010. ASCC members acknowledged that the letter had been included in the meeting packets and the concerns expressed in it over the street side parking and changes in house massing on the property with the proposed residential redevelopment.

Vlasic commented on the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Ryan and noted that whether or not the parking is developed as proposed there would be no loss of on-street parking space as suggested in the letter. He referenced the parking studies included with the staff report and pointed out that the existing driveway access takes up space along the street and this would be the case with a new driveway or the currently proposed parking plan.

Applicants Carolyn Chung and Rene Lacerte were present with design team members David Solnick and Stephen Thuilot to present the revised plans. Mr. Lacerte reviewed the information in his June 10<sup>th</sup> email and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The revised plans have been prepared to address the concerns of the ASCC and the neighbors. In particular, efforts continue to work with Mr. Larson on the joint driveway plans. There is a willingness to make adjustments as suggested by Mr. Larson and supported by comments in the staff report. The view corridor issue has been reviewed and it is concluded, as noted in the staff report, that there is not a significant view corridor over the driveway easement area.
- Efforts have been made to reach out to all neighbors. The plans reflect the desire to improve visual conditions at the end of the cul-de-sac and balance the public views and private needs for the site and joint driveway access. In general, there has been positive neighbor response, but Mr. and Mrs. Ryan have yet to respond to the outreach efforts.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the Big Leaf maple tree discussed in the arborist report was being preserved.
- In response to a question, it was confirmed that the PG&E box at the end of the joint driveway would be relocated to accommodate the driveway widening and that, at this point, no gate was planned where the project driveway leaves the joint driveway easement.

Public comments were then requested.

**Mr. Robert Larson** referenced the comments in his June 7, 2010 letter and thanked the applicants for the design changes made with the revised plans. He suggested that there would be more separation between the joint driveway and the driveway serving the subject project if a gate were added. This was discussed and the elevation differences between the cul-de-sac bulb and the driveway alignment considered. Mr. Larson asked that more and taller plants be considered between the joint driveway and subject project.

Mr. Lacerte, responding to Mr. Larson with approval by the Chair, concurred that additional work could be pursued to refine the driveway area design. He added that he did not want a gate, but would consider a different surface for the auto court area to distinguish it from the joint driveway. He also concurred that taller plants could be used.

**Mr. Craig Brown, 30 Antonio Court**, spoke in favor of the project and noted that the applicants had “gone out of their way” to respond to concerns of the neighbors and ASCC. He supported more screen planting along the joint driveway and noted that a “view corridor” did not really exist from the end of the cul-de-sac. He also supported the parking plan as currently proposed.

ASCC members considered the staff report, comments from the applicant and public input. They concluded that the site plan changes were effective in addressing the concerns raised at the 5/10 meeting, but also concluded that the landscape plan still included overplanting in the front yard area, particularly with evergreen trees. Members did, however, understand the applicants’ and Mr. Larson’s desire for more screen landscaping along the joint driveway easement and suggested that some of the currently proposed off-haul of cut materials, up to 25 cubic yards, could be used to enhance the landscape effort. Members also discouraged any gating on or along the joint driveway easement. They agreed that a different pavement material could be considered to distinguish between the joint and individual driveway areas.

ASCC members also concluded that the proposed guest-parking plan was appropriate given the unique site conditions and joint driveway access situation as outlined in the staff report. Warr, on behalf of the ASCC, stressed that in most other circumstances in town, this approach to guest parking would not be consistent with town design standards. He offered that after carefully considering the guest parking and driveway options, that the proposed design was appropriate and would have less impact on the site and allow for a better solution for development of the joint driveway access. He noted that while he would like to see more opening of views, he appreciated the need for privacy along the joint driveway.

Clark struggled with the guest parking plan and suggested that perhaps an additional alternative would be to have the guest parking spaces immediately north of the proposed garage. ASCC members considered this and concluded that, while possible, it would result in more grading and create additional screening problems along the joint driveway easement. After careful consideration, Clark concurred with other ASCC members.

ASCC members also concurred that the scope of yard lighting needed to be reduced, particularly from what was proposed along the entry walkway. Vlasic advised that there was still the need for a house lighting plan.

Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0, to make the required accessory structure findings as evaluated in the staff reports and to approve the revised project plans and materials as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to reduce the scope of front yard planting, particularly the use of evergreen trees. Further, the plan may be modified, as discussed at the ASCC meeting and in the staff report, to enhance the privacy along the joint access driveway. (It was understood that this would be based on further interaction between the applicant and Mr. Larson, but that the final plan would be presented to the ASCC for approval.)
2. The engineered grading plans shall be revised for consistency with the final architectural and landscape site plans.

3. Complete exterior lighting plans for the house and yard shall be presented. The scope of yard lighting shall be reduced from what is shown on the plans, particularly to reduce the scope of lighting along the entry pathway.
4. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. Details for the replacement four-foot high post and wire fence shall be provided.
6. The requirements set forth in the following site development committee review reports shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the reviewer:
  - a. Public Works Director, March 29, 2010 memorandum.
  - b. Town Geologist, March 22, 2010 memorandum.
  - c. Fire Marshal, March 29, 2010 memorandum.

## **Minutes**

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0-1 (Hughes) approval of the May 10, 2010 meeting minutes as drafted.

## **Early Start for June 28, 2010 Regular ASCC meeting**

Vlasic advised that the June 28, 2010 regular ASCC meeting would begin one half hour early, i.e. at 7:00 p.m., to allow for a meeting with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) to discuss matters of mutual interest and concern. He explained that over the years the ASCC has conducted periodic meetings with the WASC, essentially to ensure that lines of communication remain open and effective for the benefit of the town, the Westridge homeowners association (HOA), and applicants for properties in Westridge.

Vlasic also advised that an afternoon site meeting is scheduled for June 28, 2010 to begin at 4:00 p.m. for the purposes of preliminary review of plans for a new residence at 300 Westridge Drive and within the Westridge subdivision/HOA area.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

T. Vlasic