

Vice Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Aalfs, Clark, Hughes, Warr
Absent: Breen
Town Council Liaison: Gilbert
Planning Commission Liaison: Richards
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-624, 9 Redberry Ridge (Lot 10 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Srinivasan

Vlasic presented the February 24, 2011 staff report on the continued review of this proposal for new residential development of this vacant, 2.52-acre Blue Oaks subdivision site. He explained that ASCC project review was initiated on February 15, 2011, that included a special site meeting with two planning commission representatives. He added that at the conclusion of the February 15th review, ASCC members indicated support for the plans, generally as proposed, but did concur that the plans needed a few corrections and modifications as identified in the February 10th staff report and discussed during the 2/15 site and evening meetings.

Vlasic noted that the ASCC, if possible, should complete action on the architectural review portion of the proposal and also forward any comments or recommendations to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the site development permit. He also noted the Blue Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA) had approved the plans as stated in the February 10, 2011 letter from the HOA.

ASCC members considered the staff report, and the original plan package submittal, as listed in the February 10, 2010 staff report and February 15 meeting minutes. Also considered were the following drawings by Maston Architects, identified as "**ASCC Revision Notes – Dated Feb. 28, 2011,**" prepared to replace or supersede data presented on the original plan sheets to specifically address February 15th review comments:

- Drawing #1, Sheet E1.01, Exterior Electrical Plan (lighting plan)
- Drawing #2, (garage dimension corrections)
- Drawing #3, (guest parking area dimension corrections and change to all asphalt surfaces)
- Drawing #4, (site plan corrections regarding tree location, front yard retaining wall height, and additional screen tree planting on the north side of the proposed house)
- Drawing #5, (landscape plan changes including additional planting on north side of the house and modification of relocated tree in response to request of neighbor at 8 Redberry Ridge)

Drawings #6 & 7, (corrections and clarifications to impervious surface area calculations, with IS now at 3,615 sf v. the 10,000 sf limit for the parcel.)

Vlasic commented that the revised plans appear to fully address the February 15 review comments except for the matters commented on in the staff report relative to tree protection, sewer service facilities and exterior lighting.

Vard Srinivasan and Bill Maston presented the plan revisions and offered that the symbol on the lighting plan labeled as "typical for removal" was intended to delete all such fixtures with a total removal of 23 yard fixtures.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

After brief discussion, ASCC members found the plans acceptable, including the grading proposals and had no site development concerns to forward to the planning commission. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0 approval of the architectural review plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member:

1. A final lighting plan shall be provided clearly identifying all proposed house and yard lighting and associated switching patterns.
2. The final tree protection and construction staging plans shall incorporate the recommendations set forth in the February 14, 2011 memo from Jim Gibbons to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. The building permit plans shall describe all sewer ejector pump facilities, including equipment panels and hardscape that may be required for panel access, and shall provide landscaping as necessary to minimize visual impacts along the Redberry Ridge road corridor. If an extensive system is necessary to meet sanitary district requirements, the designated ASCC member may elect to refer the proposal to the full ASCC for consideration.

The above action was taken with the understanding that the final landscaping plan would also be reviewed by a designated ASCC member for conformity with the proposed concept plan.

Continued Review -- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, installation of a wireless communication antenna facility, Golden Oak Drive at Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

Vlasic presented the February 24, 2011 staff report on the continued review of plans for conformity to the provisions of the subject conditional use permit. He noted that the ASCC last considered this matter at its November 22, 2010 meeting and since then review has been continued several times to allow for the applicant to develop plans responding to the directions from the ASCC as well as input obtained at a February 7, 2011 site meeting with neighbors.

Vlasic clarified that the ASCC is responsible for completing action on the detailed plans for the antenna facility including those for the faux tree and landscape plans. He noted that other use permit conditions, including those associated with site maintenance agreements and guarantees, would be addressed by staff and the town attorney before any permits are

actually issued. He also noted that provisions for RF and noise monitoring would be addressed as called for in the use permit and that these provisions are not the responsibility of the ASCC.

Vlasic then reviewed the detailed plan materials provided in the February 23, 2011 project binder prepared by Zon Architects and Thomas Klope Associates, Landscape Architects. He noted that the binder contains the final site and equipment enclosure plans, faux tree plans and site landscape plans and details. He also commented that with the added landscaping and site maintenance provisions, the revised plan package appeared to respond to the directions offered at the November 22, 2010 ASCC meeting and to also respond to the concerns presented at the February 7, 2011 meeting with neighbors.

Vlasic then reviewed the comments in the February 27, 2011 communication from Chris Furmanski and those in the 2/18/11 emails from Carol and Mark Sontag and Diane and John Vedder stating support for the comments in the communication from Mr. Furmanski.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC had received copies of the new communications earlier in the day by email and that the comments calling for additional landscaping need to be judged by the ASCC. Vlasic noted, however, that the project does fall under the town's green building ordinance and that burdens and responsibilities for ensuring landscape and site maintenance must be on the town, property owner and applicant and cannot be extended to the neighbors. He also noted that the ASCC could ask for additional faux tree design data if it found the current proposal inadequate and that, in response to previous requests, the ASCC had concluded that no additional story poles were needed to demonstrate the visual conditions associated with the proposal.

Greg Guerrazzi and Tom Klope presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They discussed the process of developing the revised plans and, particularly the landscape plans. Mr. Klope reviewed and responded to questions regarding the size of materials proposed and reviewed the landscape planting details provided in the binder materials. He also offered that the proposed faux tree had been selected to fit into the plant palette proposed for the site and that this palette was consistent with the mixed forest design the ASCC had requested at the November 2010 meeting. Mr. Klope then outlined the following schedule for site improvement work:

- Construction of the faux tree will take 6 weeks.
- During or immediately after the tree construction, the site will be cleaned in terms of removal of deadwood, chemise, poison oak, and pampas grass. This will take approximately one week.
- During or immediately after site clean up the major irrigation lines and valves would be installed and the large container plantings brought to the site and placed in their containers according to the approved plan. This will take approximately one week and could overlap with the clean-up process.
- After the large container plantings are in place, a site meeting would be held with designated ASCC members, with neighbors invited, to make adjustments to plant placement prior to planting. Once the ASCC members have approved the final placement, the materials would be planted and this would take approximately one week.

- After all materials are planted, irrigation lines would be extended to the specific plants, including existing trees, from the main irrigation lines. Further, during this time the existing trees would be fertilized as called for in the arborist report. This step would take an additional week.

Mr. Guerrazzi presented branch and needle samples of the faux tree and discussed the photo examples provided with the revised submittal. He also noted that the final selection of needle length and color could be modified as determined necessary by the ASCC. He added that the tree design was, in his opinion, the best “faux’ example on the market.

Public comments were offered.

Bonnie Tenebaum, 25 Alhambra Court, raised concern over the adequacy of the “back-up” planting plan relative to the anticipated loss of the existing Monterey pines. She offered that more planting appeared to be needed.

Bill Kelly, 10 Peak Lane, raised concern with the adequacy of the landscape plan and noted that the neighbors should be able to review and comment on the maintenance agreement called for in the use permit. He also stressed his concern with the lack of adequate site maintenance by California Water Service and support for the comments in the communication from Mr. Furmanski.

Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, shared the comments offered by Mr. Kelly and also noted that there should be more time for the neighbors to review the current plans. He also expressed concern over the comments in the January 27, 2011 letter from California Water Service regarding the need to secure the site.

(Vlasic advised that any proposal by California Water Service to fence the site would require reconsideration of the Water District use permit for the property. He also clarified that T-Mobile is only required to ensure its improvements don’t block the path that has been used on the property.)

Karen Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, asked for and received clarification from Mr. Klope as to the plans for removal of invasive materials and clean of the site.

Chris Fermanski, 15 Peak Lane, reviewed the comments in his February 27, 2011 communication and stressed that the neighbors need more assurance that the site will not only be enhanced with landscaping, but also properly maintained as called for in the CUP conditions.

Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive, commented that she felt larger size tree should be considered for initial planting.

ASCC members considered the plans and public input and concluded that the plan package as presented in the February 23, 2011 binder submittal did respond to the directions provided by the ASCC at the February 22, 2011 meeting. They also, however, agreed that site and plant maintenance were critical issues and that neighbors should have an opportunity to comment on the maintenance agreement before it is presented to the town council for approval. After discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0, approval of the plans as presented in the February 23, 2011 binder subject to the following conditions:

1. A designated ASCC member shall be involved in review of and providing recommendations for the content of the CUP required landscape maintenance agreement prior to the agreement being placed before the town council for acceptance.
2. The landscape materials provided for on the approved plans shall be field set after the antenna tree is in place and after the site has been cleaned of pampas grass, chemise and poison oak. The new plantings shall be located so as to provide for maximum possible screening of views from off site. The project landscape architect shall participate in this process and the materials shall be field set to the satisfaction of a subcommittee of no more than two ASCC members. The immediate site neighbors shall be provided notice of the time for the site meeting to place plant materials so that they may offer comments as to preferred placement. The subcommittee of ASCC members may, based on field conditions, determine that additional plant materials from those shown on the approved plans may be needed for screening, and the applicant shall provide for additional plant materials as determined necessary by the ASCC members. It is, however, understood that this supplemental planting, where found necessary, is only for the portion of the approved plan identified for the "Cal Water Plant List." The purpose of the supplemental screen planting is both for views to the antenna facilities and the water tank.

In clarifying condition 2., ASCC members stressed that while reference is made to "Cal Water" on the landscape plans, responsibility for all planting is with T-Mobile as the applicant. Relative to condition 1, ASCC members offered the following comments on the landscape maintenance agreement:

- a. The agreement should provide for monthly inspections during the first 6 months to one year of planting with assurance that any materials needing replacement are replaced within one month of the finding that a plant has died.
- b. Within the one to three-year period, there also should be monthly inspections to ensure that materials are healthy and that any materials needing replacement are replaced in one month. After three years, materials should be established and monthly inspections should not be necessary.
- c. After three years, inspections should be made on a 6-month basis and Cal Water is encouraged to do more frequent inspections to ensure materials are being properly maintained.
- d. The town staff/applicant inspections should provide for a proactive way to ensure site and plant maintenance is achieved and to relieve any neighbor burden for having to make the town/Cal Water aware of problems. Cal Water in particular needs to be a good neighbor regarding site maintenance.

Architectural Review for residential additions and Remodeling Permit, 255 Golden Oak Drive, Geenen

Vlasic presented the February 24, 2011 staff report on the status of this project. He noted that on February 15, 2011, the ASCC considered the proposal and, while finding the house plans generally acceptable, requested that detailed landscape and access plans be developed before action is completed on the project. Vlasic advised that the applicant has not been able to complete the additional work, and has asked that application review be

continued to the March 14, 2011 regular ASCC meeting. He added that staff supports this request.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the March 14th regular ASCC meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Wars advised that he would be leaving the meeting room as his firm was providing architectural services for the Rizvi project. As a courtesy to Mr. Warr, ASCC members completed action on the 2/15/11 meeting minutes, as recorded later in these minutes, so that Mr. Warr would not have to return after consideration of the Rizvi matter and because there were no other agenda items. After action on the minutes Warr left the ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for guest house/accessory structure, swimming pool, and sports court and Site Development Permit X9H-625, 55 Golden Oak Drive, Rizvi

Vlasic presented February 24, 2011 staff report on this proposal for architectural review and site development permit approval of plans for improvements to the rear yard area of the subject 1.1-acre, residentially developed Golden Oak Drive property. He explained that the project includes a new two-level detached accessory structure (including a guest unit), with a total floor area of 847 sf and a swimming pool, patio and sports court facilities, as well as a new spa.

Vlasic clarified that grading is proposed to cut the proposed new accessory structure into the slope below the southwest side of the existing house and for development of the pool, patio/cabana area and sports court area. He stated that the total volume of cut and fill has been calculated at 634 cubic yards and the ASCC is the approving authority for site development permits, where grading exceeds 100 cubic yards and is less than 1,000 cubic yards.

Vlasic commented that since the staff report was prepared, the town received a February 25, 2011 email from Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive, raising concerns over drainage and risk associated with the fault feature on the southerly side of the property. Vlasic advised that the town geologist's February 7, 2011 report provided with the 2/24/11 staff report addressed the fault matter and that detailed drainage plans would be provided subject to the requirements of the public works director as set forth in his February 1, 2011 project review report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated January 20, 2011 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet: T-02, Geotechnical Report (dated November 20, 2010)
- Site Survey, BGT Land Surveying, November 10, 2011
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet: A-2.1, Guest House Plans and Elevations
- Exterior colors and materials board, dated January 19, 2011
- Cut sheets for the proposed accessory structure and yard light fixtures shown on plan
Sheet: A-1.1
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project dated 1/25/11
- Build It Green project checklist (received 1/31/11) targeting a total of 50 points

Mr. and Mrs. Rizvi and project architect Kevin Schwarckopf presented the plans to the ASCC and also offered the following comments and clarifications:

- A sample of the proposed blue stone siding was presented and it was noted that the desired finish, as represented by the sample, included more “tan” hues than “blue.” It was also noted that the finish was a uniform matte without any noticeable sheen.
- There will be no white trim on the building, and the range of finishes would only be as presented on the proposed finish board.
- Permeable surfaces are being considered for the pool patios and sports court. If pursued, these will be defined with building permit plans, and these plans will demonstrate conformity to the town’s impervious surface limits.
- The guest house plans would be modified to conform to the height limits as necessary to address the concerns noted in the staff report.
- The pool and spa equipment would be located within the guest house. If, however, this location is not pursued, the final location shall adhere to town setback and noise standards, and this shall be verified with the building permit submittal.
- The applicant is willing to reduce the retaining wall extension into the east side setback area and to also eliminate the path light in this area. It is, however, desired to maintain the small lawn extension and service path.
- The property is served by sanitary sewer, and the project will also be served by the sanitary sewer.
- No fencing or lighting is proposed around the sports court. The only new fencing is the six-foot high post and wire fencing identified on the plans around the southern portion of the property.

Public comments were requested. **Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive**, reviewed the concerns in her February 25, 2011 email to the town regarding drainage and fault line and fault setback issues. She wondered why a larger setback was required for the accessory structure than for the pool and expressed concern that in a major earthquake water would be released from the pool causing downstream risk. She also requested the minimum exterior lighting for the project.

Vlasic advised that typically, there would be a larger fault setback for a building that is to be occupied for living purposes than for an accessory structure such as a swimming pool. He also noted that it was his understanding that the drainage and pool damage issues were considered in developing the review comments and recommendations provided by the public works director and, particularly, by the town geologist.

ASCC members discussed the project and found it generally acceptable as proposed. They suggested that the neighbors also work together on any general neighborhood drainage issues, but understood that the drainage matters associated with this project were under the review and conditional approval of the public works director as noted in his project review materials. Members also concurred that a deed restriction was appropriate for the accessory structure as suggested in the staff report.

Following discussion and consideration of the clarifications offered by the applicant, Hughes moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the project plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of the site development permit or a building permit:

1. The site/landscape plan shall be revised to eliminate the extension of the planned pool retaining wall into the required east side yard setback area. Further, the pathway light associated with the east side pathway shall be eliminated.
2. The landscape plan shall be modified to identify the proposed replacement oak as a Valley Oak rather than a coast live oak.
3. The plans shall conform to all the requirements set forth in the following reports from site development permit committee members to the satisfaction of the specific committee member:
 - February 1, 2011 report from the public works director
 - February 7, 2011 report from the town geologist
 - February 10, 2011 report from the health officer

Further, the final drainage plan shall address the concerns presented the February 25, 2011 email from Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive, to the satisfaction of the public works director and town geologist.

4. The building permit plans shall demonstrate compliance with the impervious surface and height limits of the zoning ordinance.
5. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided.
6. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property providing that the guest unit shall only be used in conformity with the town's second unit and accessory structures zoning provisions and policies.
7. If the pool and spa equipment is not located within the guest house accessory structure, then the alternative location shall be identified on the building permit plans to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

In addition to the above conditions, the ASCC encouraged the applicant to consider moving the proposed east side pathway and lawn elements away from the east side parcel boundary line and reducing the amount of encroachment of these facilities into the 20-foot side yard setback area.

Approval of Minutes

Clark moved seconded by Hughes, and passed 3-0-1 (Warr) approval of the February 15, 2011 special site meeting minutes as drafted.

Clark moved seconded by Hughes, and passed 4-0 approval of the February 15, 2011 special evening meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

T. Vlasic