

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: None
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Follow-up Review and Request for Modification – Architectural Review for residential redevelopment, 140 Meadowood Drive, Hilderbrand

Vlastic presented the April 24, 2008 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He discussed the February 25, 2008 ASCC conditional project approval and the following revised plans received April 18, 2008, provided to satisfy the requirements of the conditions:

Sheet A1.0, Sheet Index, Site Plan W/House Exterior Lighting,
Jonathan Jang, Architect, 4/16/08

Civil Engineering Plans, MacLeod and Associates:

Sheet C-0, Topographic Survey Plan, 10/22/07

Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan, 4/15/08

Sheet C-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Measures, 4/14/08

Sheet C-3, Notes and Details, 4/15/07

Sheet C-4, Sanitary Sewer Force Main Extension & Grinder Pump Installation
Plan, 4/15/08

Sheet C-5, West Bay Sanitary District Standard Details, 4/15/08

Landscape Plans, Studio Green, Landscape Architects:

Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan (with exterior yard lighting), 12/6/08

Sheet L2.0, Planting Plan, 4/2/08

Architectural Plans, Jonathan Jang, Architect, 4/16/08:

Sheet A2.1, Main Floor Plan

Sheet A2.2, Upper Floor Plan

Sheet A2.3, Basement Floor Plan

Sheet A2.4, Roof Plan

Sheet A4.1, Front and Right Side Elevations

Sheet A4.2, Rear and Left Side Elevations

Sheet PA2.1, Pool House Floor and Roof Plans

Sheet PA2.2, Pool House Exterior Elevations

The ASCC considered the revised plans and the following additional submittal information:

April 17, 2008 letter from the applicants detailing the plan changes made to address ASCC conditions and also a desired plan refinement, i.e., shifting the guest house 10 feet to the east.

April 14, 2008 Addendum arborist report, Ian Geddes, Arboricultural Consulting

Vlasic commented that the staff report also evaluates the proposed changes to the guest house siting, including request for tree removal. He noted since the staff report was prepared the town had received one communication on the project from Merijane Lee, 100 Meadowood Drive, outlining drainage concerns and also offering comments on the approved house design. Vlasic advised that the drainage concerns should be forwarded to the public works director for consideration in final action on the site development and building permits. He also advised that the appeal period on the architectural review approval had passed and that, at this point, there was no basis for reconsideration of the house design.

Mrs. and Mr. Hilderbrand and project landscape architect John Merten presented their revised, modified plans to the ASCC. They offered the following clarifications:

- An experienced tree mover has looked at the two oaks now proposed to be removed to accommodate the revised guest house siting. He has advised that the trees could not be moved because their roots were intertwined with those of an old tree stump and, because of the stump, any attempt to move the trees would result in significant root loss and the trees would not survive. Thus, the plan is to remove them and plant new, 24 inch box oaks for replacement.
- The number of swimming pool wall lights can be reduced from three to two as recommended in the staff report. Thus, there would be two wall lights and one light in the spa.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the pathway lights to the fire pit would be on a separate switch and only lighted when needed for evening use of the fire pit.
- In response to the drainage concerns in the communication from Ms. Lee it was noted that the plan calls for water runoff to be dissipated, or spread out, on the site allowing for more on-site percolation. It was also noted that the flatter meadow area with native grasses was intended to spread out the runoff and encourage slowing of drainage and on-site percolation.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and a few lighting issues. Members found the proposed guest house adjustment acceptable, including the planned tree removal and planting of replacement oaks. Some discussion focused on potential deer impacts on proposed plantings. Concern was noted over the use of ceanothus, and use of manzanita instead was suggested. Mr. Merten advised that he had achieved success with Dark Star ceanothus in the area, but had less success with manzanita relative to deer impacts. Mr. Merten, however, appreciated the ASCC suggestions and advised he would consider more use of manzanita in the final planting scheme.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up submittal, as clarified, subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The lighting plans shall be revised to reduce the number of swimming pool wall lights from three (3) to two (2) and to reduce the number of wall mounted lights on the curved wall on the pathway to the library from three (3) to two (2).
2. The drainage concerns in the April 28, 2008 communication from Ms. Lee, 100 Meadowood Drive, shall be forwarded to the Public Works Director for consideration and appropriate action in completing his final review of the project building and site development permits.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-584 for house additions, detached carport, detached accessory structure and new swimming pool, 135 Crescent Avenue, Aalfs

Vlasic presented the April 24, 2008 staff report on this proposal by Stan Field Architecture for house and accessory structure additions, totaling 1,959 sf, to be made to the existing 1,857 sf residential improvements on the subject .77 acre Brookside Park property. He explained the project architect has advised the proposal is being revised in light of preliminary cost estimates and, for this reason, has requested that the ASCC review be continued to the May 12 regular meeting. Vlasic stated that staff concurs with the request for continuance, but also recommends that the ASCC conduct a site visit as part of the May 12 review.

Public comments were requested but none were offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the May 12, 2008 regular ASCC meeting, with concurrence that the review would begin with a 4:00 p.m. site session.

Prior to consideration of the following request Warr left temporarily left his ASCC position, noting that his architectural firm was developing plans for a parcel neighborin the Reiss property.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-586 for house additions including new garage extension, 145 Golden Oak Drive, Reiss

Vlasic presented the April 24, 2008 staff report on this proposal to add 1,797 sf to the existing 3,306 sf residence on the subject 1.25 acre Alpine Hills area parcel. He noted that the project includes 419 sf of additions to the main living area of the existing house and a new garage with activity room that would be connected to the main house by an enclosed stairway. He clarified that with the additions, the house with attached garage/activity room would have a total floor area of 5,103 sf, that this is 95% of the allowed site floor area and that the ASCC would need to make special findings, as evaluated in the staff report, to permit more than 85% of the floor area in the single largest building.

Vlasic advised that the grading needed to develop the new garage/activity room site and guest parking totals 814 cubic yards, most of which is fill for the planned parking area. He stated that this volume of grading requires the subject site development permit and that the ASCC is the approving authority for such permits when the grading volume does not exceed 1,000 cubic yards.

Borck then reviewed the comments in her April 14, 2008 report on the sustainability aspects of the proposal, noting that a major goal of the project is to reuse and recycle as much of the demolition materials as possible including re-milling of "deconstructed" roof beams and grinding and reuse of existing asphalt driveway materials for site drain rock

ASCC members considered the staff reports and the following project civil, architectural and landscape plans:

Architectural Plans, Nii Architects, Inc., 3/21/08:

Sheet 1, Site/Roof Plan

Sheet 2, Main Floor Plan

Sheet 3, Reflected Ceiling Plan, Main Floor

Sheet 4, Garage and Habitable (Lower Level)

Sheet 5, Exterior Elevations Main Residence (Upper Level)

Sheet 6, Exterior Elevations Garage/ Activity Room (Lower Level)

Landscape Plan, Lands of Reiss, received March 26, 2008

Civil Engineering Plans, Alcon Engineering, 3/25/08:

Sheet 1, Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan

Sheet 2, Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan

Also considered were the following materials submitted in support of the proposal:

Applicant's project statement received 3/26/08

Cut sheets for the proposed Kichler "Zen Garden" bollard and Restoration Hardware pendant light fixtures

Materials and Colors Board, received March 26, 2008

Sally Ann and Peter Reiss, applicants, and project architect Paul Nii presented the proposal to the ASCC.

- In response to comments in the staff report, it was noted that the proposed grading plans were to be revised to be consistent with the objectives for site design and tree protection set forth on the proposed landscape plan. It was explained that the large oak near the new garage site would be protected and the new, lower parking area redesigned to more of a "Y" shape to better adjust to site topography and tree cover. It was also clarified that work around the oaks would be conducted under the direction of an arborist.
- The existing upper parking area is to be temporarily preserved and used for construction staging, including parking and materials storage as long as possible. It was noted that a final construction staging plan would be developed after a contractor has been engaged.

- The proposed architectural forms are to be very simple and “minimal.” The intent is to integrate interior and exterior spaces and views, including views to more distant landscapes. The design will incorporate screens and shutters to open and control spaces for indoor and outdoor relationships. Glass is considered as a “necessary evil,” required due to weather conditions and if weather were not a factor, light, air and views would be only controlled by shutters and screens. In concept, the design was described as “Japanese features in a California home.”
- With respect to exterior colors, the desire at this point is to only use the “sand” color for the stucco and dark “red chestnut” stain for the wood trim as presented on the materials and colors board. The stucco color was selected to bend with the native sandstone of the site, but will be adjusted to be darker to conform to the town’s policy limits on light reflectivity. Some preliminary optional darker color samples were presented for discussion and reaction. The roof deck over the garage would have a railing consisting of wood posts in the “red chestnut” stain, with metal cabling for the “rails.” The desire is to have the railing be as transparent as possible.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the intent is to install a photovoltaic system on the site with the panels mounted on the roof of the western and north western sides of the site.

Public comments were requested. **Nancy Banman, 15 Holden Court**, noted she was an uphill neighbor of the property and offered her full support for the Reiss project.

In response to a question, Vlastic advised that at this time the ASCC could only act on the architectural review request and grading concepts, but that any action on the site development permit would need to be delayed until the revised grading plans were provided, i.e., with the revisions needed for consistency with the objectives shown on the applicants proposed landscape plan.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and agreed it was generally appropriate for the site and concurred that findings could be made in support of the proposed concentration of floor area, as evaluated in the staff report. Members also supported the architectural concepts for the desired Japanese detailing, but agreed that more precise plans for the detailing were needed before a building permit could be processed.

Members also shared concerns stated in the staff report regarding the extent of the proposed recessed eave lighting and, based on the final grading plans, the need for complete impervious surface calculations.

Some comments were offered with respect to the use of rosemary around the “rock garden” and it was suggested that dwarf coyote bush be considered. The applicants noted that they preferred rosemary to coyote bush.

All ASCC members concurred that a critical aspect of the project would be the development of a complete and comprehensive construction staging and vegetation projection plan. It was stressed that the staging plan should include details for project phasing to ensure the upper parking area would be available for use as long as possible and that options were in

place for construction parking during the process of removal and redevelopment of the upper parking area.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0, approval of the proposed architectural review request 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 civil grading plans shall be revised to coordinate with the landscape plan with the intent being achieving the tree protection shown on the landscape plan and a more organic form for the new guest parking area. Further, the final plans shall include the grading and landscape details for the improvements proposed to the existing upper parking area to be eliminated with this project.
2. A comprehensive construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided that includes description of construction phases and accommodation of construction parking and staging by phase with the objective of preserving the existing upper parking area for construction use as long as reasonably possible. Once approved by the ASCC, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. A complete description of exterior materials, details and finishes shall be provided consistent with the concepts and clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting. Detailing shall address window and door frames and surfaces, eaves and gutters, fascia boards, exterior shutters or other such features if proposed or planned. The exterior elevations shall be annotated to describe the details for materials and finishes. Further, the proposed stucco color shall be adjusted for conformity to the town's 40% limit relative to light reflectivity value.
4. The exterior lighting plans shall be revised to reduce the number of recessed eave lights. The lights should only be at locations of doors and where necessary to provide light for safe use of outdoor terrace or pathway areas adjacent to the house.
5. Based on the revised site and grading plans, final impervious surface area calculations shall be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff.

The action was taken with the understanding that the revised grading plans would need to be circulated to site development permit committee members for review and comment before being presented to the ASCC for final review and approval.

In response to a question from the applicant, it was noted that the project civil engineer should be capable of developing a construction staging plans that anticipates the various construction phases and that this plan could be revised by the contractor prior to issuance of a building permit. It was noted that the final plan would be "worked out" between staff and the contractor at the standard preconstruction meeting that is a prerequisite to the issuance of any building permit.

Following action on the Reiss request, Warr returned to his position on the ASCC.

Planning inspections associated with ASCC project approval conditions - General Discussion

Vlasic reviewed in the comments in the April 24, 2008 staff report on this discussion item. He explained that recently there had been some concerns identified over the timing and circumstances associated with site checks and inspections mandated or necessitated by ASCC project approval conditions. He noted that these range from learning "after the fact" that improvements do not fully match plan approvals, construction fencing not being installed under required inspections or, for example, a house being completely painted at the time of a field check when an approval condition calls for only color samples to be applied to test wall surfaces so final color decisions and directions can be made.

Vlasic commented that it appears there is the need for a very detailed construction schedule, at least for the more significant projects, that identifies very specifically and clearly planning staff and ASCC "designated" member inspections and ties these to specific critical inspections and "sign-offs" by the building official.

Warr concurred and stated that the typically required construction staging plans should include a detailed construction schedule with key planning/ASCC inspections tied to critical building inspections. He noted that building permit sign-off at these inspection points should only occur if compliance with planning/ASCC conditions has been demonstrated. For example, he noted that field checks relative to colors and materials samples should take place at the time of a framing inspection and hose relative to lighting at the time of the rough electrical inspection.

Von Feldt expressed concern over planting, e.g., large lawn area additions, and yard lighting installations after all permits have been "finaled" and the ability of the town to control such changes. Breen shared these concerns and referenced over-planting with trees blocking views on one Westridge project. It was noted that in some cases the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) requires more "screen planting" than the ASCC would typically find necessary. It was agreed that at some point a session should be scheduled with the WASC to discuss such plantings as well as other areas of mutual concern and interest on development projects for the Westridge Subdivision area.

Vlasic noted that the town attorney had advised that permit requirements remain a responsibility of an applicant even after all permits have been "finaled." He added that this information needs to be made clear to applicants and perhaps should be in the form of a handout provided at the time of final inspections, just prior to occupancy.

At the conclusion of discussion, Vlasic stated he would work with other staff, particularly the building official, to develop a typical inspection schedule that could be used to link planning/ASCC condition site checks to critical building inspections and bring this "schedule" back for additional ASCC discussion.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0-1 (Clark), approval of the April 14, 2008 meeting minutes with the following typographical corrections:

Page 6, second bullet item from the bottom of the page, correct the last word in the item to be "delivery" instead of "deliver."

Page 7, second bullet from top of the page, correct the first word in the item to be "Detailed" instead of "Details."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

T. Vlastic