

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, Breen, Clark, Hughes
Absent: Aalfs
Town Council Liaison: Derwin
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Follow-up Review -- 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 22, 2010 staff report on this follow-up review. He discussed the June 14, 2010 and July 12, 2010 ASCC actions on the project and then explained how the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 7/21/10 and prepared by David Solnick Architect, address ASCC approval conditions:

- Sheet 0, Project Data
- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 1.1, Building Exterior, Lighting Plan (with fixture legend)
- Sheet 2, Floor Plans
- Sheet 3, Elevations
- Sheet L1.0L, Landscape Plan, Thuilot Associates (revision received 7/22/10)
- Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Layout, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L4.0, Planting Plan, Thuilot Associates (revision received 7/22/10)
- Sheet L4.1, Plant List and Notes, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet 4.2, Protection Fencing Plan, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L5.1, Lighting Plan, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, MacLeod and Associates
- Sheet C-2, Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates

Vlasic also distributed copies of a July 22, 2010 email from neighbor Robert Larson stating support for the revised, follow-up plans.

Mr. Lacerte was present to discuss the follow-up plans with the ASCC. He presented reduced versions of revised Sheets L4.0 and L4.1 and used these to clarify plant materials and sizes. He also provided two Sheets, both identified as LX.01 to clarify the common driveway adjustments that were agreed to with Mr. Larson. It was stressed that although one of these sheets shows some improvements on the Larson parcel, the intent of the plans was to only show the alignment for the common driveway that has been agreed to by the neighbors. He offered that the neighbors were also in process of finalizing an agreement for maintenance of the common driveway.

In response to comments in the staff report and ASCC questions, Mr. Lacerte also offered the following plan clarifications:

- In response to a question, Mr. Lacerte advised that he concurs with ASCC members that the proposed landscaping for the front yard area still “feels” somewhat over planted and that when planting is actually pursued, there may be some reduction in the scope.
- In response to a question, Mr. Lacerte noted that the existing lower driveway area would be used for construction staging and the cul-de-sac would not be used for staging or storage of materials.
- The front pathway light closest to the cul-de-sac can be eliminated as recommended in the staff report. Further, the sconce fixtures are proposed over the garage door, as there is no soffit above the doors to accommodate a recessed light. The plans can, however, be modified to eliminate one of the now proposed three garage door lights.
- The trellis “LED” panels would accommodate small lights within the trellis and these would not be visible from off site.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans, scope of planting and the lighting observations offered in the staff report, as well as Mr. Lacerte’s plan clarifications and responses to questions. Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the clarified follow-up submittal 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. Details for the lighted driveway address sign shall be provided.
2. The final construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and shall include details developed by the project contractor to ensure that the cul-de-sac shall not be used for construction staging or storage of materials.
3. The exterior lighting plans shall be adjusted to eliminate the pathway light closest to the cul-de-sac and one of the three lights over the west side garage doors.
4. The applicant may reduce the scope of front yard planting at the time of landscaping, but any such reduction shall be subject to review and approval by a designated ASCC member.

Architectural Review for house additions, 20 Bow Way, Newman

Vlasic presented the July 22, 2010 staff report on this proposal for house additions and remodeling, that total 498 sf, to be made to the existing multi-level, 3,605-sf residence, on the subject 1.2-acre Bow Way parcel. He explained that the additions are proposed to the main, entry level of the house and are all to be within existing pathway or deck areas. He clarified that the improvements are to match existing conditions in terms of architecture, materials and colors; and, that due to the existing site and areas condition, and limited changes that are proposed, at the end of the project, there should be minimum potential for changes relative to the appearance of on and off site conditions.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by AHJ Engineering, PC and dated 6/4/10:

- Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet, 6/21/10
- Sheet A0.1, Proposed Site Plan, 6/21/10
- Sheet A0.2, Fire Notes, 6/21/10
- Sheet A1.0, Demolition Plan
- Sheet A1.1, Floor Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Floor Plan
- Sheet A1.3, Roof Plan
- Sheet A2.0, (Proposed) Elevations
- Sheet A2.1, (Proposed) Elevations
- Sheet A2.2, Building Sections
- Sheet B1.0, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet B1.1, Existing Lower and Upper Level Floor Plan
- Sheet B2.0, Existing Elevations

Also considered was a Colors Board received June 22, 2010 and photo images of existing house conditions with notes stating that new roofing, siding and trim would all match existing improvements, except that the flat, membrane roof would be replaced with a new membrane roof matching the darker rust-colored asphalt shingles on the pitch roof portions of the house.

In addition to the plans and above referenced materials, the ASCC considered the Build It Green (BIG) Greenpoint Rated checklist for the project showing that the applicant proposed to capture a total of 42 BIG points. It was noted that this level is well above the minimum 25 points for such an "elements" project and that the town allows for self-certification for sign-off for permits for these projects.

Mr. and Mrs. Newman presented the proposal to the ASCC. They acknowledged the exterior lighting comments in the staff report and advised that they have no issue with conforming to the staff recommendations regarding lighting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project. Members concurred the project would result in only minor changes to site and area conditions, but did agree that the site plan and project data needed to be modified to accurately show all existing and proposed floor and impervious surface (IS) areas, including, for example, the pool cabana. It was noted that conflict with town limits was not expected to be an issue, but that for the record the site plan and data should be accurate. Clark noted that the project was close to the IS limit and that some adjustments to existing IS areas may be needed when all data is accurately presented on a revised site plan.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0, approval of the proposed plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided.

2. An exterior yard lighting plan shall be provided consistent with town lighting standards and guidelines. Further, existing spotlights shall be removed or replaced with fixtures conforming to town standards and guidelines.
3. An accurate site plan shall be provided showing all existing structures and impervious surface areas and demonstrating compliance with town floor area and impervious surface area limits.

Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the July 12, 2010 meeting minutes as drafted. Breen commented that with respect to the Blair architectural review action and condition 4, it was her understanding that the ASCC would allow latitude for the applicant to work with the neighbors to develop landscape plans. Vlastic advised that the applicant was doing this and would have general provisions for landscaping along the common property line included in the follow-up submittal that would likely be presented to the ASCC for consideration at the August 9, 2010 regular meeting.

August ASCC Meeting Attendance

Clark advised that he would not be able to attend the August 9th regular meeting, but would be present at the August 23rd regularly scheduled meeting. Breen, Hughes and Warr advised that at this time they had no conflict with either of the regular meeting dates in August.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

T. Vlastic