

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

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

**Continued Architectural Review for residential additions and major remodeling and site Development Permit X9H-627, 220 Golden Hills Drive, Pidwell**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2011 staff report on the continuing review of these applications for additions to and significant remodeling of the existing multi-level, traditional design residence on the subject 2.0-acre Oak Hills subdivision property. He explained that project review was initiated on May 23<sup>rd</sup> and continued to the June 13 meeting to allow time for more data to be developed and for plans to be clarified in response to comments offered at the May 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Vlasic added that clarifications made at the last meeting also made it clear that much of the existing site improvements would be removed and that the supplement data developed since the meeting clarifies that additional removal of oaks would be needed due to tree condition and the proposed construction.

Vlasic also referenced a new communication relative to the project received since the June 9<sup>th</sup> staff report was prepared. Specifically, he advised that the June 8, 2011 email from neighbor Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane, had been distributed to ASCC members and that copies of the email were available for reference.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following materials presented to the town by the applicant to address the comments offered at the May 23, 2011 ASCC meeting and in the original May 19, 2011 staff report prepared on the project:

Addendums I and II to the original arborist report both dated June 4, 2011. (The first deals with trees 88, 63 and 72, explaining the reasons why these trees are now proposed to be removed, and the second addresses measures to be taken to protect trees 13, 14 and 18.)

Revised plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by designer William M. Justi Associates, and received June 6, 2011:

Sheet 1, West and East (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011  
Sheet 2, South (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011  
Sheet 3, South and North (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011  
Sheet , Elevation Auxiliary Structure (Details/Sections) Paul Fronck, June 6, 2011

Proposed Main Floor Plan, with Fire District Turnaround, 6/6/11  
Proposed Lower (house) and (detached) Garage Floor Plans, 4/14/11  
Exterior Lighting Plan (Main Floor Level), 4/5/11 (fixture cut sheet attached)  
Exterior Lighting Plan (Lower Floor Level), 4/5/11  
Preliminary Area Study  
Preliminary Area Study, 6/6/11  
Landscape Plan and Topographic Map, Westfall Engineers, Inc., 4/8/11 (revised)  
Sheet 1, Site Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc., April 2011  
Sheet 2, Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc.,  
April 2011  
Drainage Data Compliance Sheet, Westfall Engineers, Inc., April 14, 2011  
Appendix D: Tree Inventory and Protection Map, Monarch Consulting Arborist,  
April 14, 2011  
Story Pole Plan, 5/9/11

In addition to the addendum arborist report and revised plans, the ASCC considered a box of materials and color samples including the proposed roof slate, rock siding, stucco color, window frames and window/door wood trim staining. It was noted that the stucco siding is the same color considered at the 5/23 meeting, as is the bronze window frame material, and that the wood timbers are still to be in a natural finish. A photo brochure provided by the applicant was considered and it was noted that the brochure images generally define the desired character with the proposed stone siding. Mr. Pidwell was present and clarified that the proposed wood window trim would be finished in the darker brown stain sample.

Vlasic advised that still part of the application are the completed 4/22/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project and the Build It Green checklist, now revised to reflect the "new house" condition of the proposal and goal of 181 BIG points, just over the 180 points required for this proposal.

Applicants Mr. and Mrs. Pidwell and project design team members William Justi, Paul Fronck and Lisa Moulton presented the revised proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following additional comments and plan clarifications:

- The proposed exterior materials were revised and, in response to questions, it was noted that the limestone sample was the material planned for framing of the entry door and that the limestone would be stained a "dark tea" color to achieve an aged "historic" character. It was noted that some siding areas would be finished in brick applied in a herringbone pattern as shown on the house elevation drawings.
- In response to a question regarding substitution of materials for "value engineering," it was noted that if that was necessary, the options that would be considered would be stone veneers and perhaps a synthetic roof slate, but with the general appearance of the proposed materials and finishes. In any case, it was stated that any such material changes would be presented to the town for review and approval.
- In response to questions regarding the arborists' reports, Mr. Pidwell explained that when the initial reports on trees 88, 62 and 73 was prepared, a second arborist was engaged and both the original and second arborist concurred that the trees were not in good condition and should be removed with the project. He emphasized that tree 88 had already been compromised and was in jeopardy even without potential construction impacts.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and the supplemental arborist report. Members recognized that the existing improvements would be largely removed and understood the conditions associated with, particularly, oak 88. Members, however, concluded that the revised plans and materials appropriately responded to most of the issues identified at the May 23, 2011 ASCC meeting. Members, however, also concurred that lighting plans required further refinement, i.e., reduction in the scope of exterior lighting, and a detailed landscape plan was needed. It was also agreed that if the exterior materials were to be changed in any way, particularly relative to "value engineering" considerations, such changes should only occur subject to ASCC review and approval.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0, to:

1. Make the findings in support of the proposed concentration of floor area as evaluated in the staff reports.
2. Approve the project as revised, including the clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC as a follow-up submittal to the commission prior to issuance of a building permit:
  - a. A final exterior lighting plan, with additional reduction in lighting, shall be prepared. The plan shall identify switching patterns for all exterior fixtures.
  - b. A final detailed landscape plan shall be provided consistent with the concepts shown on the proposed landscape plans. Oak(s) to replace removal of trees 88, 63 and 72 shall be with valley oaks or other deciduous native oaks. The final, detailed landscape plan shall be shared with the conservation committee for review and recommendations prior to being presented to the ASCC for approval.
  - c. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
  - d. The requirements set forth in the following site development committee communications shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the reviewing committee member prior to issuance of a building permit:

Public Works Director report of May 16, 2011  
Town Geologist report of May 17, 2011  
Fire Marshal report of May 10, 2011  
Trails Committee report of May 3, 2011

Further, any requirements of the health department shall be adhered to.

- e. Any changes to the proposed exterior materials and finishes, including any proposed for "value engineering," shall be subject to prior review and approval by designated ASCC member. If there are concerns that the project, with the changes, would not be in substantial compliance with the ASCC approval, the designated member may refer the changes to the full ASCC for review and action.

## **Continued Consideration of Subdivision X6D-210 and Planned Unit Development (PUD) X7D-171, 1260 Westridge Drive, Shorenstein Realty**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2011 staff report on the subject proposed subdivision and PUD applications. He reviewed the status of the project's environmental review, as well as the public hearing on subdivision and PUD proposals as evaluated in the May 25, 2011 memorandum to the planning commission and discussed in the unapproved minutes of the June 1, 2011 planning commission meeting.

Vlasic advised that since the June 1<sup>st</sup> planning commission hearing, work has continued to address the matter of the Madrone trees noted in the February 11, 2011 email from the conservation committee and a map of the tree locations has been prepared by project civil engineer Lea & Braze Engineering. He clarified that a copy of this map was provided to ASCC members and that he also had an opportunity to field check the trees just prior to the ASCC meeting. He noted that some of the trees fell into the category of "significant" as defined in the site development ordinance, but others did not. Vlasic also offered comments relative to the status of the applicant's request for FEMA change to the flood plain boundary, and further analysis of any impacts associated with use of the existing site wells, both as discussed in the June 9<sup>th</sup> staff report.

Vlasic suggested that based on the comments in the May 2011 initial environmental study for vegetation and habitat protection along the creek channel/corridor, and proposed mitigation monitoring program, as well as his review of the Madrone trees, consideration should be given to a project condition that would provide for preparation and implementation of a **detailed vegetation protection and management plan**. He noted that this should be a plan prepared to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to recording of the final subdivision map. He explained that the plan would ensure that with any efforts to protect existing vegetation and/or install new vegetation, the more native elements of the creek corridor would be preserved and protected.

Vlasic noted that no ASCC action was needed at this time, but that the ASCC should provide any additional comments and recommendations relative to the applications for planning commission consideration during the public hearing process.

Project representatives Betty Irvine and Kent Mitchell were present to review project proposals and status with ASCC members. In response to a question regarding use of the well water, it was noted that the intent is to only use the water as it has been historically used since the well permits were issued by the County health department, i.e., to supplement on-site irrigation of landscape materials. It was stressed that the existing well water distribution system would be maintained at least until the new lots are developed and that once the additional CEQA evaluation of the well water issue is completed, it is possible that some changes to the proposed PUD provisions could be considered.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the application materials and concurred with the staff recommendation for adding a project approval condition to provide for a vegetation protection and management plan. Members also concurred that the project design and use of the PUD was still considered appropriate, especially in light of the additional data provided in the initial environmental study and proposed mitigated negative declaration. ASCC members also offered the following comments for further consideration:

- While the PUD provides for replacement of any oaks that are removed on a basis of three new trees for each oak removed, this may be too much planting. Any replacement planting should be based on conditions in the area and, particularly, protection of the native character of the creek corridor.
- The vegetation management plan should include provisions for removal of exotic plantings over time in the creek corridor. Further, if possible, a plan should be pursued for phased removal of the chain link fencing, but replacement of habitat and screening with appropriate native vegetation.
- The up lighting on the property should be removed as soon as possible.
- The vegetation management plan should provide for installation of any necessary screen planting in anticipation of new development on the new subdivision parcels. In some cases, the existing non-native screen planting, particularly along the northerly boundary and outside of the creek corridor, has established important screening in the area. This should be recognized in any vegetation protection and management plan.

Vlasic advised that these comments would be considered in preparing materials for the next planning commission public hearing on the applications now scheduled for the July 20, 2011 planning commission meeting.

#### **Architectural Review, proposed residential additions and remodeling, 115 Shawnee Pass, Waschura**

Vlasic presented the July 9, 2011 staff report on this request for approval of plans that would replace an existing attached fire damaged 3-car garage with a new attached 4-car garage and family room/study addition. He clarified that the project would result in a net increase in floor area of 581 sf, i.e., from 3,130 sf to 3,711 sf and that all new construction would be single story and would match the architecture, including materials and finishes, of the existing single story.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials prepared by Clay Baker Design, LLC and dated 5/5/2011:

- Sheet A-0, Project Data
- Sheet A-1.0, Site Plan
- Sheet A-2.0, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.1, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.2, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-3.0, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-3.1, Sections
- Sheet A-3.1, Build It Green Checklist
- Cut sheet for proposed exterior light fixture, received May 10, 2011
- Materials and Colors Board, received May 10, 2011
- Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, dated 5/1/11

It was also noted that the applicant placed story poles and taping at the site to model the proposed improvements.

Mr. Waschura and Clay Baker were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. They offered the following clarifications:

- The plan data regarding the distance of the new garage doors from the south side property line is “conservative” and there is ample distance for vehicle maneuvering as confirmed in the staff report.
- The new garage doors will be finished in stained wood or painted to match the existing siding. They will not be white.
- The addition has been designed so that the new roof areas do not transition directly into existing roof materials. Thus, this allows for the use of the proposed asphalt roofing for the addition and phased replacement of the existing simulated shake with the new asphalt roofing. This will take place over time according to budget allowances.
- In response to a comment from the ASCC, it was agreed that the new and existing gutters would be either copper or painted a darker trim color for consistency with town policies for light reflectivity value.
- Also in response to a comment, it was agreed that any non-conforming exterior lighting would be removed with the project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the project as proposed and clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plans shall be modified to provide that the new and existing gutters will all be either copper or painted a darker trim color for consistency with town policies for light reflectivity value.
2. The plans shall be revised to show removal of non-conforming exterior lighting.
3. A construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

**Architectural Review, proposed residential additions, 30 Hayfields Road, Hayfields Planned Unit Development (PUD) X7D-71 - Lot 8, Oliver/Van Voorhis**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2011 staff report on this request for approval of plans to add 717 sf of floor area to the existing 5,070 sf residence, on the subject 2.6-acre Hayfields Subdivision/PUD property. He clarified that the additions include expansion of the existing main level, attached two-car garage to add a third garage/workshop space and a 420 sf study over the existing garage area and that also planned is a west side deck extension off of the upper level study. Vlasic noted that the additions would match all existing improvements including the contemporary Ranch Style architecture of the existing two-story residence, that no tree removal is needed, and only minor grading is proposed to add guest parking to the north of the existing/proposed garage.

Vlasic discussed the Hayfield PUD provisions as they pertain to the property and also noted that an email string had been provided by the applicant, received by the town on June 10, 2011, with supportive comments from most Hayfields homeowners.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects Incorporated, dated 5/6/11:

Sheet A1, Title Sheet and Site Plan  
Sheet A2, Existing & Proposed Floor Plans  
Sheet A3, Existing and Proposed Ext. Elevations  
Build It Green (BIG) Checklist, received May 11, 2011

It was also noted that story poles and taping had been installed at the site to model the proposed additions.

Ms. Van Voorhis and Jim Stoecker presented the project to the ASCC and offered the following clarifications:

- The proposed upper level addition has been set back from the wall lines of the lower level to reduce the apparent mass and scale of the improvements.
- A geotechnical consultant is part of the project team and is assisting in the design of building permit plans.
- The maximum depth of cut/fill for the parking area will be 10-12 inches.
- In response to a comment in the staff report, the applicants will be replacing existing exterior light fixtures with new fixtures consistent with town exterior lighting standards.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Following brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Warr and passed 4-0 approval of the project as proposed and clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The existing and proposed exterior light fixtures shall be changed to a shielded design consistent with town exterior lighting standards. A cut sheet for the new fixture shall be provided with the building permit application.
2. A construction staging and tree protection plan, particularly for the tree in the driveway circle, shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

### **Approval of Minutes**

War moved, seconded by Clark and passed 2-0-1 (Breen), approval of the May 23, 2011 minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

T. Vlasic