

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Hughes, Warr
Absent: Aalfs, Breen
Town Council Liaison: Richards
Planning Commission Liaison: None
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

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

Vlastic presented the March 10, 2011 staff report on this application and noted that the applicant's design team is still in the process of developing plan revisions to address ASCC comments and directions provided at its February 15, 2011 meeting. Vlastic advised that, therefore, the applicant has again requested a continuance and while staff supports this request, it was uncertain as to when the plans would actually be ready for ASCC consideration.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion, ASCC members concurred that the project should be continued, but also directed that it not be placed on an agenda until plans were ready and a new notice for the meeting could be distributed to neighbors.

Architectural Review for house additions, with attached guest unit, 55 Adair Lane, Rayfield

Vlastic presented the March 10, 2011 staff report on this proposal for architectural review approval of plans for additions to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.1-acre, Adair Lane panhandle parcel. He advised that the project includes demolition of an existing detached accessory structure and carport at the northerly end of the house and replacing these facilities with a new attached three car garage, a small 301 sf guest unit "in-law" suite, wine room, bathroom, and hallway areas. He commented that these new additions have been designed to meet the handicap access needs of the applicant and include a "lift" to accommodate wheel chair access from the garage level to the floor level of the existing house. It was noted that also planned is a handicap access ramp along the rear elevation of the house.

Vlastic clarified that the total area of the proposed additions is 1,351 sf and that the total site floor area would be 3,928 sf as detailed in his March 14, 2011 email to the ASCC. He noted that the email clarifies both floor area and impervious surface area calculations and is based on data provided by the applicant after the March 10, 2011 staff report was prepared.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the clarifications provided in the March 14, 2011 email and the following project plans and materials prepared by TES Engineers:

Sheet A0, Cover Sheet and Existing Site Plan, 6/10/10
Sheet A1, Proposed Site Plan, 6/10/10
Sheet A2, Main Building Partial Floor Plan, 12/10/10
Sheet A3, Electric Plan, 1/10/10
Sheet A4, Main Building Exterior Elevation, 2/3/11
Sheet A5, Sections, 2/4/11
Exterior colors and materials board, received February 25, 2011
Cut sheet for the proposed wall mounted lights (fixture is to be used at the two locations shown on Sheet A3 on the front elevation of the garage)
1/26/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project
Completed Build It Green project checklist (revised and received 3/14/11) targeting a total of 138 points for this proposal

Gina Rayfield was present to discuss the project with ASCC members. She offered that she had no concerns with the comments offered in the staff report. In response to a question, she advised that she had prepared the revised BIG checklist and assumed that the items identified could be completed with the project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discuss the proposal and staff report. Members found the project acceptable subject to the conditions recommended in the staff report. Members also concurred that a deed restriction was not needed for the proposed, small, attached second unit. Members concluded that in this case, it would be difficult to reconfigure the addition area into an attached second unit larger than 750 sf.

Warr commented that, due to its small size, this should be considered an elements or whole house project and only be held to the BIG point totals and review process for such a design. He concluded that it would not be "easy" or reasonable to assume the project could achieve the 138 points identified by the applicant with the revised checklist. He encouraged staff and the applicant to review the matter and ensure the project was processed under the appropriate BIG program. Vlasic advised that even if 138 points were targeted, the project would only be held to the limits required by the town's adopted sustainability program.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the project as proposed subject to the BIG clarification comments offered at the meeting and to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A tree/vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. The building permit shall be referred to the health department for review and approval.
3. Complete impervious surface area calculations shall be provided.
4. A complete site lighting plan shall be provided showing all existing lighting that is to remain in addition to the proposed new lighting and any existing unshielded spots shall be removed for conformity with town lighting standards.

Approval of Minutes

Vlasic revised the comments in the March 10, 2011 staff on the draft minutes of the February 28, 2011 ASCC meeting. He explained that Greg Guerrazzi, representing T-Mobile, requested clarification of condition #2 of the T-Mobile approval (i.e., CUP X7D-170) on page 5 of the draft minutes.

ASCC members considered the comments from Mr. Guerrazzi as noted in the staff report and concurred that a clarification was appropriate. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the February 28, 2011 ASCC meeting minutes with the following correction to the language associated with condition 2 of the T-Mobile approval (corrected wording identified by shading):

“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. . . .”

Miscellaneous Comments

ASCC members asked that, when possible, staff look into changes made to ASCC approved projects after the project has been completed and “finaled” by the town. It was noted that during the site inspection for the Rayfield project at 55 Adair Lane, modifications not consistent with approvals were noticed at 35 and 45 Adair including planting and lighting inconsistent with town policies and standards and house color changes from what was approved by the ASCC. It was also noted that when a house is staged for sale often considerable exterior lighting is added that is to “show off the house,” but is inconsistent with town standards. It was agreed that realtors should be informed that such additions were not consistent with town standards and regulations and that data on this matter also be placed in parcel files as a “notice” at the time the files are made available for inspection when a property is for sale.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

T. Vlastic