

Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: None

Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt

Town Staff: Planning Technician Borck, Principal Planner Kristiansson

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

**Architectural Review for new driveway entry gate and fencing, 4 Grove Court, Howe**

Planner Kristiansson briefly reviewed the comments in the July 21, 2011 staff report on this application for installation of a new metal, four-foot high driveway entry gate and associated fencing and fieldstone covered gate support columns on the subject 1.2-acre Grove Court parcel. She noted that the project now provides at least 12 feet of driveway pavement within the easement at all points, and that applicant was considering adding a pedestrian gate at the request of the neighbors who will share access through the gate.

The applicant's architect stated that a pedestrian gate would be added to the project, to the right of the auto gate when facing the property. Responding to questions from the commissioners, the architect said that there would be a protocol for sharing the key/code for the gate with the neighbors. Also, a keypad will be located near the entrance on the left side, although it is not shown on the plans. There will be no lighting associated with either the gate or the keypad; the keypad will be use backlit LED technology. The architect also stated that rather than preparing a landscape plan, they would prefer to work with Commissioner Breen on the landscaping. The applicant's lawyer said that the applicant would be willing to clarify the terms of the easement to acknowledge that people entering 3 Grove Court might sometimes stray out of the easement boundary.

Public comments were requested. Jim Simpson, 3 Grove Drive, said that he has a lot of questions about how the gate would work given the shared access between #4 and #3. These include: How will the gate indicate to the public that it is the correct entrance to both #3 and #4? What is the mechanism for opening the gate; is it manual or automatic? How will pedestrians access the property? How do you get back out of the gate; is there a gate pad or sensor? Would the gate work if there were a power outage? What about emergency access; can the Fire Department get through the gate? How could #3 receive deliveries, such as from UPS? Also, the plans look like they show the fence extending across the entrance to both the garage and the walkway to #3; are there separate gates there? Mr. Simpson added that the new design does help with the problem of backing out of the garage.

In response, the applicant's architect said that the gate would open automatically during the day, and he was sure that the Fire Department has a way to open the gate, even during a power outage. ASCC members added that the Fire Department could require numbers on the gate, although none are shown on the plans. Also, the plans show the property line extending across the entrance from the driveway to the garage and walkway to #3, but not the fence.

David Cincada said that he would also like some answers to these questions, particularly about the pedestrian gate, the key code, housing numbers, the operation of the access gate, and the landscaping plan. He also stated that the plans have improved and he would like any revisions before they are approved. He does not feel that the fence issue has been resolved but is optimistic about being able to resolve issues in the future.

Peter Simpson, 3 Grove Court, said that the Simpsons have had unencumbered access for over 56 years, and the basic issue is that they want to continue to have unencumbered access.

Don Eckstrom, of the Conservation Commission, said that he had not had a chance to look at these plans, but in general fences and gates are problematic for wildlife movement.

Jon Silver, 355 Portola Road, stated that he was still concerned about the fencing for the 4 Grove Court, because the plans did not show the fencing that was installed. Either the fencing needs to be removed or the plans need to be amended. Also, by looking at the fence separately from the gate, the project has been piecemealed when it should have been looked at as a whole. There should be all possible options for emergency access, so that firefighters don't have to climb the fence or knock it down. In addition, there was no communication with the Simpsons regarding the July 11 continuance, which resulted in them travelling for hours to be here, only to have the matter continued. Given the contentiousness of this project, he hopes that the ASCC will list the full conditions of the project and will require the plans to come back to a public meeting.

ASCC members discussed the project. Their review was based on the revised Site Plan, dated July 14, 2011, prepared by F. John Richards, Architect.

Commissioners agreed that the alignment of the driveway and the gate were now acceptable, but felt that there are still a number of outstanding questions. These include the landscaping plan, the pedestrian gate, provisions for joint access, the address identification numbers, and emergency access. The redwood trees that have been planted under the oak trees should be removed. Commissioners also suggested that the applicant talk with the Fire Department about the emergency access and house identification numbers, and that the Fire Department should respond in writing. The Commission also agreed that the plans need to be clearer about the returns and particularly the heights of each section of fence. While the commission does not have jurisdiction over the easement terms, it was suggested that these be clarified.

Following this discussion, Commissioner Warr moved and Commissioner Breen seconded that the project be approved on the condition that the applicant bring back each of the following items to the ASCC for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A landscaping plan that includes removal of the redwood trees under the oaks;
2. The design for and location of the pedestrian access gate;

3. Provisions for a joint access system;
4. The location and design of the keypad and post;
5. An address system, including the location and design for any house numbers; and
6. Provisions for emergency access, as approved by the Fire Department.

The motion passed, 5-0.

In response to a question from the applicant, Commissioner Warr suggested that the applicant first work with their neighbors to resolve these issues and then route the plans to the Fire Department through the town's planning technician.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application Warr temporarily left the meeting room noting that his firm provides architectural services for the school district, which owns property adjoining this project.*

---

#### **Site Development Permit for a creek repair project in Corte Madera Creek, 245 Grove Drive, Walker**

Planner Kristiansson presented the July 21, 2011 staff report on this proposal for 215 cubic yards for grading to install a rip rap revetment along 100 feet of Corte Madera Creek. She clarified that the type of revegetation suggested would involve plugs of native vegetation placed at intervals in the rip rap, rather than a blanket covering of the entire upper portion of the rip rap. She stated that the CEQA document should be completed later this week so that the public comment period could open next week. While the ASCC would need to take final action on the permit once the CEQA comment period has been completed, the commission could reach tentative conclusions tonight.

The applicant asked for more information about the revegetation, including examples. Planner Kristiansson stated that she would get addresses of projects that used similar types of revegetation for the applicant. The applicant also asked about the erosion control that is required, and whether the silt fence would be sufficient. Commission members responded that the Public Works director would provide guidance on the erosion control. The applicant stated that he was concerned because the permit was good for only one year, but for much of the year he would not be able to do the work because of the requirements being placed on the project, and he asked whether the timeline for the permit could be extended. Planning technician Borck responded that he would be able to get a renewal from staff if necessary, and that he should keep her informed of the progress of the project.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

The Commission discussed the project as described on the plans listed below, dated June 15, 2011 and prepared by EDC:

*Sheet C-0, Title Sheet  
Sheet C-1, Notes Sheet*

*Sheet C-2, Site Plan*

Commissioners asked about the ivy on the site, and said that the success of the revegetation effort could depend on the removal of the ivy. The applicant stated that they have stopped watering the ivy and started to remove it; they would eventually like to remove all of the ivy. Currently, the briars on the site are starting to push the ivy back. Commission members stated that the landscaping and maintenance of the revegetation were important, and they would like to see the landscape plan.

Project consideration was then continued to the September 12, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

---

*Following consideration of the Walker application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

**Architectural Review for Garage Replacement, 155 Grove Drive, Reimund**

Planner Kristiansson presented the July 1, 2011 staff report on this proposal for replacing an existing 932 square foot, single story detached garage with a new 792 square foot detached garage with a loft and lower level wine cellar. She mentioned that the proposal complies with town zoning standards. In terms of the design guidelines, there was concern about the proposed lighting, especially on the east and west elevations. Two neighbors expressed concern about the height and visibility of the structure. One of those neighbors was going to bring photos to the meeting of the view of the story poles from his house.

The project architect stated that the property owners have done a lot of work on the house, including improving the drainage and remodeling the master bedroom wing. The garage replacement is the next step. Currently, anyone who comes to the property needs to back out of the driveway. The garage appears disreputable and blocks the side of the house. A lot of attention in this replacement was paid to improving the access and materials used.

Chair Aalfs asked if any member of the public would like to comment on the project. Craig Brandman, 99 Stonegate, said that he had submitted a letter and had brought a picture of the story poles, as seen from his house, to the meeting. ASCC members viewed the photo. The photo was taken from the deck at 99 Stonegate, which is often used for meals. Mr. Brandman said that he had talked with several other neighbors, including the Fathmans and the Coes, who shared his concerns. The proposed garage would be significantly taller than other buildings in the area and would have a big mass. Neighbors are also concerned about the reflectivity of the metal roof. The existing metal roof on the wing of the house has significant reflectivity, especially in the mornings. Mr. Brandman requested that the weathervane and cupola be removed and that the pitch of the roof be reduced. He suggested that reducing the pitch of the roof would not be a problem since the loft will not be habitable. He suggested that there should be some room here for compromise and added that he would request that full-height mature trees be used for screening.

Larry Tesler, 351 Grove Drive, asked for a clarification of the location of the replacement garage. ASCC members showed Mr. Tesler the location on the project plans.

The project architect stated that he was surprised at the neighbors' comments. The materials are kind to the eye, and vegetation screens the views from above.

ASCC members then began to discuss the project as described on the plans listed below, dated June 8, 2011 and prepared by Scott Design Associates:

*Sheet: A-1.1, Title Sheet and Site Plan*  
*Sheet: A-2.1, Garage/Barn Plans and Elevations*  
*Sheet E-E1.1, Electrical Plan*

Commissioners agreed that the proposed lighting was problematic because of the exposed bulbs and that several fixtures could be eliminated. The lighting towards the guest cottage could be replaced with path lights, and step lights would be more important for the wine cellar. ASCC members also agreed that a landscaping plan would be helpful, as well as plans that clearly show the existing driveway, pathways and other hardscape.

The ASCC asked whether it would be possible to address the neighbors' concerns by reducing the plate height or reducing or eliminating the cupola. The applicant's architect and the applicant responded by explaining that the garage is designed like a romantic barn to celebrate a rustic, country feeling. The cupola is an important part of that. Adjusting the plate height would affect the proportions, which now are very pleasing, and would not significantly affect the view of the project from above. The property owner stated that she is firmly committed to ranch-style living and does not plan to add a second story on to the house. When the rest of the house is remodeled, the roof will need to be adjusted to match that of the master bedroom wing, but it will not be a two-story house. The height will be equivalent to 1.5 stories. The property owner added that she is planning to landscape the property, although that is not shown as part of this project.

When asked about the reflectivity of the roof, the applicant's architect stated that the metal would dull down over time.

Following this discussion, Commissioner Warr moved and Commissioner Breen seconded that the project be approved on the condition that the applicant bring back each of the following items to the ASCC for review and approval prior to issuance of the building permit:

1. An arborist's report and tree protection plan for the 48" oak;
2. A landscaping plan showing screening for the garage and rehabilitation of the construction staging area;
3. Reduced lighting on the garage as part of a comprehensive exterior lighting plan for the entire property;
4. Revised plans that clearly show the driveway, walkways and other hardscape.

In addition, the applicant should give consideration to lowering the cupola.

The motion passed, 5-0.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Commissioner Breen moved and Commissioner Clark seconded to approve the July 11, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion passed, 4-0-1 (Hughes).

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

K. Kristiansson