

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 8:01 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi

Absent: Von Feldt, Warr

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

**Continued Architectural Review for new, detached accessory “Hobby Barn” structure, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-587, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper**

Vlastic presented the comments in the July 24, 2008 staff report on the status of the subject application. He clarified that the applicant and project design team were still in the process of developing responses to comments and concerns identified at the June 23, 2008 ASCC preliminary review meeting. He added that, as a result, the applicant has advised town staff that the proposal should be “pulled” from ASCC consideration at least for the time being.

Chairman Breen requested public comments, but none were offered. Thereafter, based on staff recommendation, the matter was placed on temporary “hold” with the understanding that when the applicant was ready, a new meeting notice would be circulated indicating the specific date for continued ASCC project review.

Vlastic noted that staff had already informed the Chair of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) of the current status of the project.

**Continued Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-588, for New Residence and Swimming Pool & related site improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Bariteau**

Vlastic presented the July 24, 2008 staff report on this continued project review. He discussed the issues identified during the ASCC’s July 14, 2008 preliminary consideration of the project. Also, based on preliminary review concerns, Vlastic discussed the data developed at a July 22, 2008 site meeting with the fire marshal regarding driveway design and agreements for design adjustments to save a Blue Oak tree.

Vlastic then reviewed the comments in a July 22, 2008 letter from John and Steven Steinhart, owners of 121 Ash Lane. He presented a July 28, 2008 vicinity map prepared by staff showing property relationships in the area, particularly between the subject site and 121 Ash Lane. Vlastic advised that the Steinharts had informed staff that they could not attend the ASCC meeting, but asked that staff relate to the ASCC their concerns that plans for the subject project could impact options for future proposals for 121 Ash Lane. Vlastic referred to the vicinity map and noted it showed available building envelopes on the adjacent parcels, view orientations and topography and slope constraints data.

Vlasic noted that the revised project plans (listed below) were now before the ASCC for architectural review approval and that following ASCC action on the architectural portions of the application, the site development permit would be forwarded to the planning commission for public hearing and that this hearing was now tentatively scheduled for the September 3, 2008 planning commission meeting.

The ASCC considered the July 24, 2008 staff report, the July 22, 2008 letter from John and Steven Steinhart, and the July 28, 2008 vicinity map prepared by staff showing property relationships. The ASCC also considered the following revised project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated July 21, 2008, prepared by Arcanum Architects:

- Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Chappell Surveying Services, 10/3/07
- Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan, LTI, 6/17/08 (with 7/21/08 revisions, but not so dated)
- Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan
- Sheet A0.2, First Floor Plan/Second Floor Plan
- Sheet A0.3, Elevations
- Sheet A0.4, Elevations
- Sheet A0.5, Building Sections
- Sheet L-1, Conceptual Landscape Plan, Thomas Klope Associates
- Sheet L-2, Exterior Lighting Plan, Thomas Klope Associates
- Sheet C.O.P., Construction Operation/Tree Protection Plan, 7/1/08
- Sheet BMP, Better Management Practices, 7/1/08
- Arborist Report by McClenahan Consulting, LLC, 1/28/08
- Materials and Colors Board, received 6/11/08
- Exterior Light Fixture Cut Sheets, received 6/11/08

Tim Chappelle, project architect and Tom Klope project landscape architect, presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They noted that Mr. Bariteau could not attend the meeting due to a business commitment. They also offered the following plan clarifications:

- Options for a revised common driveway plan are still being considered and reviewed with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC). It is likely a request will eventually be presented to town for consideration of the revised driveway plans.
- The proposed plans include only a very small upper story and the house design and site and landscape plans have been developed to provide for privacy and separation from the building site on 121 Ash Lane.
- Plans are still in process for the desired photovoltaic system and the design will be responsive to any requirements of the WASC.

Public comments were requested. **Bev Lipman, WASC**, noted that while the Westridge Committee supported the house design and overall site plan, the details relative to the final driveway design, including "horse" fencing changes and relationships to the Westridge trial, were still being evaluated.

ASCC members briefly discussed the revised project plans and noted members could only act on the plan with the driveway configuration that conformed to the previously approved driveway design, but with adjustments agreed to by the fire marshal allowing for preservation of the Blue Oak tree at the driveway intersection with Westridge Drive.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0, to approve the project plans and supporting materials as revised through July 21, 2008 (and listed above) subject to the understanding that the site development permit needed planning commission review and approval and the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The approval is based on the one driveway option required with the Hurd subdivision and as shown on the driveway plan approved by the ASCC in 2006.
2. A detailed landscape plan shall be presented consistent with the concepts shown on the "conceptual" plan. The final details shall provide for reasonable screening of views relative to 121 Ash Lane, but shall ensure against over planting of the site.
3. Final, accurate details for the driveway alignment, horse fencing and trail shall be provided as worked out with the WASC.
4. The arborist report shall be updated to include consideration of the revised driveway grading plan, which no longer includes retaining walls. The review is to ensure the revised plan does not increase risk to the health of the oaks shown for preservation.
5. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall include a detailed schedule for the construction process.

The above action was taken with strong encouragement for the applicant to install a photovoltaic system with the project. It was also understood that the driveway and auto court surfaces would be asphalt, but the ASCC encouraged the use of more permeable surfaces, e.g., grass-pavers or gravel in the auto court area.

### **Architectural Review for entry gate and features and front yard fencing, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young**

Vlasic presented the July 24, 2008 staff report on this request for approval of new driveway entry gates and associated columns and front yard "horse" fencing. He noted that the improvements proposed for the subject 1.2-acre Alpine Hills subdivision property are as shown on application plan Sheet 1.0, "Site Plan and Gate Elevation," dated 7/22/08, prepared by Nielsen Architects.

Vlasic presented issues with the proposal as discussed in the staff report. He also reviewed comments and concerns relative to the proposal set forth in the following communications received after preparation of the staff report:

July 25, 2008 letter from Carrie Lavine, 185 Golden Oak Drive

July 28, 2008 email from Claude Leglise, 170 Golden Oak Drive

Vlasic noted that both communications expressed concerns over the impacts of the proposed fencing on the open space conditions along Golden Oaks Drive and provided observations that front yard fencing did not typically exist in the neighborhood.

Vlasic then presented an 8.5"x11" site plan showing the fence alignment recommended in the staff report. He clarified that the staff report text only described the recommended realignment and the site plan was prepared to better explain the staff recommendation.

Mr. Young presented his proposal to the ASCC. In response to the comments and concerns discussed in the staff report, he presented a July 28, 2008 revision to Sheet 1.0, "Site Plan and Gate Elevation," prepared by Nielsen Architects. Mr. Young offered the following comments and clarifications on the revised plan and overall proposal.

- The revised plan specifically eliminates the previously proposed stucco columns and has the 6"x6" wire mesh installed in a vertical alignment and not diagonal pattern. Further, the mesh is mounted on the backside of the three-rail horse fence. The revised plan also notes that the new fence will be unfinished wood.
- The fence alignment on the revised plan is close to, but somewhat different than the alignment revision presented in the staff report and shown on the 7/28/08 staff plan presented at the ASCC meeting.
- The second driveway access, i.e., westernmost connection to Golden Oak Drive, will be preserved and a gate also installed at this access. The second gate would be designed to fully match the horse fence design, and would be manually operated.
- The fencing plan is viewed as a "temporary" plan. The long term plans for the property anticipate demolishing the existing house and construction of a new residence. At that time, the second driveway connection would be eliminated.

Public comments were requested. **Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive**, asked for the opportunity to review the revised plans and the plans were shared with her. She referenced the concerns in her July 23, 2008 communication, but also thanked the applicant for the plan adjustments.

ASCC members discussed the revised proposal. Members recognized that the adjusted plans appeared to conform to the fence ordinance standards and guidelines, but members also wondered about the need for the proposed fencing. Options were discussed for making the design less visually intrusive to the open space character of the street frontage.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 to approve revised Sheet 1.0, "Site Plan and Gate Elevation," dated 7/28/08, prepared by Nielsen Architects subject to the following conditions for plan revisions to be accomplished to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of the fence and gate permit:

1. The fence shall have only two rather than three rails.
2. The fence shall be unfinished wood (i.e., as noted on the revised plan).
3. The fence alignment shall be consistent with the fence alignment plan provided by staff at the 7/28/08 ASCC meeting. (Specifically, this alignment adjustment would move the fence behind the 20" and 18" redwood trees, essentially angling to the northwest immediately after the 66" pine. The fence would then connect to the alignment shown on the revised plan at the existing westernmost driveway connection to the street.)

*(Note: after the July 28, 2008 ASCC meeting staff determined that there is an issue with the proposed second driveway gate that was not focused on at the ASCC meeting. Specifically, any entry gate, by zoning ordinance limitations, must be set back 25 feet from the front property line. The planned second gate does not meet this requirement. Thus, it cannot be used as a regular access to the site. If the second gate design fully matches the "horse fence" and is closed most of the time and only used on occasion for maintenance, then it can be part of the plan. After the July 28 meeting the applicant was informed of this issue and that the final gate plan sheet should detail this second gate and note it will only be for occasional maintenance use.)*

### **Architectural Review for detached garage and office, 10 Grove Drive, Dhillon**

Vlasic presented the July 24, 2008 staff report on this request for approval of plans for construction of a new, detached garage with small office on the subject 1 acre, Grove Drive property. He noted that the proposed structure would be single story with a contemporary "box-like" form and have a total floor area of just under 610 sf, measured from outside walls as required by the provisions of the zoning ordinance. He clarified that the project can be accomplished with essentially no grading or vegetation impacts and there is ample room on site for construction access and staging.

Vlasic noted that after completion of the staff report, the applicant provided a revised Sheet A-3.2 eliminating windows on the northern elevation of the garage structure and also eliminating "person" entry doors on the south elevation. He clarified that the revised elevations also included new windows and sliding glass entry doors on the east elevation.

The ASCC considered the July 24, 2008 staff report and the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, received July 10, 2008:

- Sheet A-1.0, Title Page/Site Plan, 1/1/08
- Sheet A-3.2, Proposed Garage, 1/2/08, revised plan received July 25, 2008
- Product data for the proposed "Avante Collection" glass faced garage door
- July 7, 2008 memo describing the proposed "Flos-All Light" light fixture with a photo image of the fixture.
- Material sample for "R-Span" polyurethane form core siding panels

Borck presented her July 11, 2008 report on the sustainable elements of the project and, particularly, noted insulation and fire resistant properties of the proposed R-Span siding material.

Sania Dhillon presented her proposal to the ASCC. She stressed that the design was intended to be as sustainable as possible and that the proposed materials were "100%" reusable. She also provided the following project clarifications:

- The roof of the new garage building will not be the "R-Span" material, but would be metal, matching the metal roofing used on the existing residence. The "shed" roof would be within the parapet walls.
- In response to a questions, it was noted that the "glass" for the garage doors would have a frosted or obscure finish and that there would be minimal lighting inside the garage.

- The proposed light fixture was selected for its contemporary design, but an alternative fixture with less potential for light spill will be selected to address the concerns noted in the staff report.

Public comments were requested. **Clair Jernick, 33 Grove Drive**, asked that consideration be given to the installation of some additional screen landscaping along the Grove Drive frontage.

ASCC members discussed the project and found the design, including siding materials, acceptable. Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 to approve the project subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to release of a building permit:

1. An alternative light fixture shall be selected that is shielded, with shielded top, so that light is directed downward.
2. The plans shall be revised to clearly state that the new roofing material will match the metal roofing used on the existing house.
3. A plan for the addition of some native shrubs and/or trees on the Grove Drive side of the proposed garage shall be provided. Once approved, the planting shall be installed prior to "finaling" of the building permit for the new garage to the satisfaction of planning staff.

In completing the action, and in response to comments in the staff report, ASCC members concurred that the plans for renovation of the existing attached garage into living space need not be presented to the full ASCC if only minor exterior changes are proposed. Further, it was agreed that any such remodeling plans need only be shared with a designated ASCC member.

### **Architectural Review for Swimming Pool, garden wall and related landscaping, 16 Buck Meadow Drive, Lot 33 Blue Oaks, Lopez**

Vlasic presented the July 24, 2008 staff report on this request for approval of plans for installation of a new swimming pool, pool terrace, privacy wall and related landscape improvements on the subject 2.76-acre Blue Oaks subdivision property. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed project plans dated July 2, 2008 prepared by Warnecke Rosekrans, Inc.

Sheet L.1, Landscape and Lighting Plan, including cuts sheets for proposed light fixtures

Sheet L.2, Construction Details

Mr. Lopez presented his proposal to the ASCC and offered the following project clarifications:

- The lighting plans will be revised to address the concerns noted in the staff report and, specifically, all spots lights will be removed or replaced with fixtures that conform to town and Blue Oaks PUD design standards and guidelines.

- In response to a question, it was noted that while the Blue Oaks community pool is nearby, it is not convenient for young children and that the proposed pool would provide more opportunity for use by the family.
- In response to a question, it was agreed that the proposed olive trees would be replaced with a more appropriate plant, selected from the Blue Oaks approved plant list.
- The proposed exterior fireplace will be gas fired and not a wood burning installation.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0, to approve the proposed plans as clarified by the applicant subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final detailed landscape plan shall be provided that includes replacement of the proposed olive trees with a planting that is in keeping with the provisions of the Blue Oaks landscape guidelines and approved planting lists.
2. The proposed lighting plan shall be revised to detail the plans for arbor and outdoor kitchen lighting. The plan shall be consistent with the Blue Oaks and town lighting guidelines and regulations and shall include elimination of all existing unshielded spot lights at the site or replacement of these lights with lights consistent with town and Blue Oaks standards.

The approval action was taken with the understanding that Mr. Lopez had yet to receive Blue Oaks homeowners association (HOA) approval, and that he was assuming some risk if the HOA did not act to approve the plans.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 2-0-1 (Clark), approval of the July 14, 2008 meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

T. Vlastic