

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:31 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: McKitterick
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Request for Modifications to Previous Approval -- 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 July 8, 2010 staff report on this request for modifications of the guest parking elements of the plans approved by the ASCC on June 14, 2010. He explained that the plan modifications had been worked out with site neighbors, as discussed in the staff report; and, in particular, would allow for the withdrawal of an appeal of the 6/14 ASCC decision filed by Mark and Mary Ryan, 20 Antonio Court.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the proposed revised site plan by David Solnick, dated 7/7/10. Vlasic clarified that ASCC approval of the modified plan would allow the applicant to pursue final grading and landscape plans in concert with Mr. Larson, 40 Antonio Court, as provided for in condition 1 of the 6/14 approval.

Mr. Lacerte presented the revised plan to the ASCC and noted that it had been shared with all of the neighbors, as noted in the staff report. He also advised that as final landscape plans are developed it is likely a trellis would be included over the guest parking space proposed immediately adjacent to the northerly side of the proposed garage. It was noted that this would help limit views from the house entry area to the guest parking space. In response to a question, Mr. Lacerte stated it was his hope to be able to present the revised landscape plan to the ASCC for follow-up consideration at the July 26, 2010 regular meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 5-0 approval of the plan modifications as requested. It was noted that the action maintained the same conditions as attached to the original June 14, 2010 ASCC approval.

Continued Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-616, for new residence, detached accessory structures & related site improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney

Vlasic presented the July 8, 2010 staff report on this continued project review. He explained that in response to the June 28, 2010 preliminary review the project design team has provided the following materials for ASCC consideration in completing action on the architectural review application:

Four sheet set (11" x 17") of "WASC/ASCC/PC" Responses, Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10, including:

- Site Plan with View Corridors
 - View from Westridge Drive
 - View from 177 Alamos Road
 - July 7, 2010 Revisions for ASCC Response
 - Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan and Utility Plan, LTI, 7/7/10
 - Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan, Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10
 - Sheet A0.2, First Floor Plan (with exterior lighting), Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10
 - Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Studio Green (with yard lighting), 7/7/10
 - Sheet L2, Planting Plan, Studio Green, 7/7/10
- July 7, 2010 letter from project architect Tim Chappelle explaining how the changes shown on the revised plans address preliminary review comments.
- July 8, 2010 email from project architect Austin Riley advising of the adjustments that were made to the story poles at the site to model the design changes.

Vlasic noted that still part of the project application are the following plans and materials considered at the 6/28 meeting and, unless otherwise noted, dated 5/14/10, prepared by Arcanum Architects:

- Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet
 - Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Chappell Surveying Services, 10/3/07, rev. 5/5/10
 - Sheet A0.3, Second Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)
 - Sheet A0.4, Elevations/Building Sections
 - Sheet A0.5, Elevations/Building Sections
 - Sheet A0.6, Elevations/Building Sections
- Arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC, January 28, 2008, revised May 11, 2010
- Cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received May 18, 2010
- Proposed materials and colors board, dated May 14, 2010

Vlasic advised that once the ASCC completed action on the architectural review proposal, the site development permit would be presented to the planning commission for public hearing and that, tentatively, that hearing had been noticed for consideration at the June 21, 2010 planning commission meeting.

Vlasic also advised that since the staff report had been prepared the town had received a July 8, 2010 email from Eric and Sonja Denys raising concern over the proximity of the proposed house to Westridge Drive and suggesting that it be moved further away from the street. Vlasic clarified that with the revised plans, the most visible southeasterly corner of

the house would be no closer than 93 feet to the front property line, whereas the minimum required setback is 50 feet. He also noted that the plans propose to plant new 48-inch box size oaks and relocate one existing oak for screening on the street side of the house.

Arthur and Rita Whitney, Tim Chappelle, project architect, and Piper Burnett, project landscape architect, were present to discuss the revised plans with ASCC members. In response to comments in the staff report and questions from ASCC members they offered the following comments and clarifications:

- While there is some inconsistency in the plan sheets regarding tree planting southeast of the house, i.e., along Westridge Drive, the intent is to plant two new additional 48-inch box oaks in addition to the one relocated oak (#11) or screening from the street.
- The house has been moved 4 feet further from the street to accommodate protection of Oak #9 and the story poles modified to reflect this adjustment.
- The plans were adjusted to accommodate the concerns of Mr. Comstock, 177 Alamos Road, as discussed in the July 7th letter. The photo simulations show the impacts of the house design adjustments and landscape proposals relative to the view issues. The other suggestions of Mr. Comstock were considered, but it was concluded that the original design approach, with the adjustments that have been made, were appropriate to provided for needed view protection and also preserve the view preferences of the applicants. Further, it was concluded that the two story elements as currently proposed were better screened by the tree backdrop on the site than would be the case with the more fundamental design adjustments suggested by Mr. Comstock.
- The plans include the adjustments the ASCC requested to protect the manzanita along the driveway and reduce the scope of exterior lighting. In addition, a modified windowsill material was identified to address the concern in the staff report over the sill material provided on the May 18, 2010 color board. A sample of the alternative sill material, identified as "Rohlen," was provided for ASCC consideration.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. (**Note:** See comments from George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road, offered on this project at the end of the ASCC meeting.)

ASCC members considered the revised and modified plans and supporting materials and found them generally acceptable. Some comments were offered suggesting use of some deciduous oaks, more "staggering" of the oaks to be planted and "early" planting of key landscape screen materials. It was also suggested that when the relocated oaks were to be moved, use of story poles be considered to judge how they should be placed in light of the other oaks to be installed as provided for on the landscape plans. The key concerns were to ensure adequacy of screening and to also avoid a linear, more hedge-like condition with the new plantings.

In addition to the above, Clark suggested that the applicant might want to consider stepping the auto court retaining wall at the southwest corner to reduce the visual presence of the wall within the auto court area. He noted that this was something that the applicants might want to consider and not a recommended ASCC condition, as the view impacts were all internal.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0 approval of the revised proposal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The exterior colors and materials palette as presented on the board dated 5/14/10 shall be revised to show the finish material for the precast stone window sill and balcony header to be the darker "Rohlen" sample material presented at the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting.
2. The architectural plans shall be revised for consistency with the revised site and grading plans, i.e., to reflect the house adjustments described on the revised plans and in the July 7, 2010 letter from the project architect.
3. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC. (**Note:** *It was understood that the neighbors and WASC would be given notice of this plan review so that they would have the opportunity to comment on the construction staging proposals.*)
4. Two of the proposed five new 48-inch box oaks shall be deciduous trees. One shall be placed along the Westridge Drive frontage and the other mixed with the evergreen trees proposed along the easterly property line. All of the oaks shall be installed as early in the site development process as possible and shall be in place prior to house framing inspection. It is understood, however, that relocation of oaks #11 and #19 would have to occur early in the site work. In any case, both oak relocation and placement of new screen oaks shall be done under the direction of a designated ASCC member to ensure the adequacy of the screening and also that the appearance is "staggered" and as natural as possible. (*It was understood that the WASC would also be informed of the process for tree placement and that the timing would be included in the detailed construction schedule provided with the building permit application. It was suggested that as necessary for the early transplanting of the oaks, story poles be used to guide placement taking into account the screening that would be afforded by the height of the new 48-inch box oaks.*)

In completing its action, the ASCC recommended planning commission approval of the site development permit. The ASCC encouraged the applicant to continue consideration of additional "green building" plan elements to achieve a higher Build It Green score as development of building permit plans proceed. Further, as suggested by planning commissioner Von Feldt at the time of the preliminary review, the ASCC encouraged the applicant to consider more use of California native oak grasses in development of the final landscape plans.

Architectural Review for house additions and Site Improvements 219 Wyndham Drive, Blair

Vlasic presented the July 8, 2010 staff report on this proposal for house additions and construction of a detached carport to provide required covered parking on the subject .58-acre Wyndham Drive parcel. He explained that the proposed house additions have a total net area of 800 sf and would increase the house size to 2,251 sf. He clarified that the plans are incomplete relative to the desired carport and that clarifications were needed relative to conformity with Building Code provisions in Chapter 7a (fire safety), exterior lighting and some of the exterior materials, all as discussed in the staff report.

Vlasic also advised that since the staff report had been prepared two neighbors had sent letters to the town relative to the proposal. He referred to a July 11, 2010 letter from Richard and Sondra Eckstein, 206 Wyndham Drive, in support of the proposal and a July 9, 2010 letter from Lyn and Bud Eisberg, 233 Wyndham Drive, also supporting the proposal, but requesting consideration of some additional screen landscaping along the southerly property line.

ASCC members considered the staff report, letters from neighbors and the project as shown on the following plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Florian Architects and dated 6/16/10:

- Proposed Site Plan
- Existing 1st Floor Plan
- Existing 2nd Floor Plan
- Existing Elevations (West & North)
- Existing Elevations (East & South)
- 1st Floor Plan
- 2nd Floor Plan
- West (front) Elevation
- East (rear) Elevation
- North (left side) Elevation
- South (right side) Elevation

Also considered was a materials and colors board dated 6/16/10. It was noted that the color board proposes to largely make use of the existing materials and colors palettes. In addition to the above identified materials, the ASCC considered cut sheets, received July 2, 2010, for the proposed exterior light fixture locations shown on the site plan.

Applicant Margo Blair and project architect Paul Florian presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications relative to the project:

- The plans have been developed to enhance the existing house, to make it more useful and to bring more natural lighting into it.
- The design for the carport needs to be finalized taking into account required setbacks from the property line as well as the creek. Also, it is hoped that the plan can be developed so that views to parked cars from the street are minimized to the extent possible.
- The Eisberg planting concerns will be addressed with the neighbors and it is believed that these can be readily mitigated.
- An arborist has been involved with the project and it is hoped that the Crape Myrtle can be preserved and not moved. If it can't, then an effort to move it will be made. If there is any problem with the moving, a replacement for the plant would be provided.
- All windows would be wood, Douglas fir, with metal cladding and would be finished in the a dark green color similar to the existing windows. Further, all trim would match existing conditions and new gutters would be dark galvanized metal.
- The existing roof is approximately eight years old and it is hoped it can be preserved and added to with the planned project. The potential impacts of building code Chapter 7a

are not yet fully appreciated, but it is hoped that they will not impact the ability to preserve the general character of the existing house. This will be discussed further with the building official.

- The plans also are directed at increasing the energy efficiency of the house and final designs should readily surpass the 50 point BIG target noted in the staff report.
- The final lighting plans would be clarified to provide only the exterior lighting at the house required to satisfy code requirements. Further, the entry post light noted in the staff report and shown as new on the site plan actually exists. The applicant is willing to removal this light if the ASCC concludes removal is appropriate for consistency with town guidelines. In response to a question, it was noted that the light shown on the site plan at the carport would be on a motion switch.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the fireplace on the rear elevation is the rear side of the interior firebox and that no exterior firebox is proposed.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and concurred that the house addition plans were acceptable but concerns were expressed over the impacts of Chapter 7a on the proposed exterior materials and design details. They also offered that action on the carport was not possible until complete plans were available that addressed not only required setbacks, but also adequate provisions for driveway access, vehicle back-up and maneuvering, etc. Warr also commented that due to conditions at the proposed carport location, the structure should have a very low profile and be as visually transparent as possible. He also noted that the structure would need to maintain a minimum setback, likely 10-feet, from any septic system leachfield lines and that the driveway design and space for vehicle maneuvering needed to be sensitive to "public" views from the street.

Following discussion, Clark moved seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0 approval of the house addition plans 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. A complete plan shall be provided for the carport that addresses the comments in the 7/8/10 staff report and those discussed at the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting. This shall include conformity with all required setbacks and details relative to driveway access and necessary space for vehicle maneuvering.
2. The exterior lighting plan shall be revised to include all lighting required to satisfy building code requirements. The plan shall be modified to eliminate the driveway post light and lighting shall not be on motion switches unless required to be so switched by the building code.
3. A final, complete exterior materials board shall be provided that includes any adjustments necessary to satisfy requirements of Chapter 7a of the town building code.
4. The landscape plans shall be modified to provide screen planting along the southerly parcel boundary to address screening to and from views to the south (i.e., in response to the comments offered in the July 9, 2010 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Eisberg).

5. The ability to save or move the crape myrtle shall be evaluated by the project arborist and the landscape plan modified as necessary for consistency with the recommendations of the arborist.
6. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Minutes

Aalfs moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 5-0 approval of the June 28, 2010 meeting minutes with the correction to the name identified in the second paragraph on page 8. It was noted that the name should be "Loverine Taylor" and not "Marie Taylor" as recorded in the draft minutes.

George Comstock Comments on Whitney Project, 300 Westridge Drive

Mr. Comstock, 177 Alamos Road, arrived near the end of the ASCC meeting, and well after ASCC consideration of the Whitney project. Chair Warr asked if he had any comments to offer. Mr. Comstock stated that he had seen the revised plans and thanked the applicant and ASCC for actions taken to consider the concerns offered at the June 28, 2010 preliminary review meeting. He clarified that he found the revised plans acceptable and that he looked forward to having the Mr. and Mrs. Whitney living in the neighborhood.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

T. Vlasic