

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 7:41 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr*

Absent: None*

Town Council Liaison: Comstock

Planning Commission Liaison: Wingert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

*Warr did not arrive until 8:00 p.m., i.e., at the start of the consideration of the Town Center Project

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Request for approval of installation of a temporary construction tent structure, Jelich Ranch Conditional Use Permit X7D-156, 683 Portola Road, White

Vlastic presented the December 1, 2005 staff report on this request to install a temporary tent structure over the Jelich house construction site on the subject property. He advised that house construction is proceeding according to the approved use permit plans and then reviewed the requested tent and need for it as described and explained in the December 1, 2005 letter from Mr. White. Vlastic noted that the attachments to the letter included the technical specifications for the tent, photo examples, a sample of the proposed tent fabric and a rendering of the proposal. The dark green fabric sample and other attachments to the 12/1 letter were reviewed by ASCC members.

Applicant Phil White presented his request to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- It will take three to six weeks to have the tent delivered and installed.
- The tent costs approximately \$50,000 and would largely be screened by existing redwood and other site trees along Portola Road.
- The tent is needed to keep the site dry and particularly help avoid mould issues associated with the new basement. The tent would be removed at the end of the rainy season, and no later than the middle of May 2006.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the matter and concurred the request appeared acceptable and preferable to the conventional "blue tarps" used for weather protection at town construction sites. It was noted that other similar requests would likely be received and that, at this time, it was agreed they should be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Members

also agreed any construction tent should adhere to the zoning ordinance height limits, as suggested in the staff report. Members then determined that in this case, the Jelich Ranch use permit provisions provided adequate assurance the tent would be removed at the end of the rainy season. It was acknowledged, however, that for other projects without use permit authority, other tent removal guarantees would likely be needed.

Following discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0 approval of the request subject to the condition that the tent be removed no later than May 15, 2006.

Approval of Minutes

Gelpi moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 4-0 approval of the November 7, 2005 special town center meeting minutes as drafted.

Continued Architectural Review of site, building, landscaping, and other proposed improvement plans, Town Center Project

Vlasic presented the December 1, 2005 staff report and explained that the ASCC last considered the town center project at a special November 7 meeting. He noted that at the conclusion of the 11/7 meeting, ASCC members indicated a general preference for Alternative A as described in the 11/4 architects report and asked that more details for this alternative, as well as architectural forms be developed for consideration at the December 5 special meeting. Vlasic also explained that the ASCC's comments and recommendations were shared with the town council at the 11/21 council meeting and that the council agreed that the project architects should develop the data requested by the ASCC, but also indicated that the Design Development, i.e., DD scheme, should remain a possibility. Vlasic further advised that Council members suggested the possibility of reconsidering the library "program," mainly ensuring long-term flexibility for uses of interior spaces.

Vlasic then referenced the December 1, 2005 memorandum and accompanying materials from Susi Marzuola of Siegel & Strain Architects. He noted that these materials focus on refinements of Alternative A and clarify program square footages. He advised that the project architects would be presenting the materials and that at this meeting it was hoped the ASCC could reach closure on the site plan, building massing and architectural expressions for the town center building cluster area. He also stressed that the ASCC should focus on these aspects of the town center project and that the ASCC had already scheduled its January 23, 2006 regular meeting only for consideration of the proposed overall town center site plan and plan details of grading, lighting, landscaping, etc. He added that the public as well as town center user groups had been informed of this January "site plan" meeting date.

Project design team members Larry Strain, Jim Goring and Susi Marzuola presented the materials transmitted with the December 1 memorandum from Marzuola including the following:

Usable Area Comparison Table
Site Plan Alternative A.1, 12/1/05

They reviewed the alternatives using both the town center site model, with building models for the alternatives, and a power point presentation. The power point presentation included photo simulations of the alternatives. They offered the following comments and clarifications and responses to questions from ASCC members:

- The clad wood v. metal "storefront" window forms and materials were discussed. It was noted that the double hung wood clad windows were considered to be more informal and residential and would enhanced the "familiarity" of the architecture. In response to a question, it was noted that the storefront windows were "casements" and would open outward.
- The changes to the library's north elevation windows were discussed and it was noted they were modified to "bays" to open views into the library from the entry drive.
- The "A" alternatives for building massing and architectural expression were presented and discussed as defined in item 3 on page 2 of the December 1 architect's memorandum. Exterior views and interior light penetrations were described to clarify the differences in Alternatives A.1, A.2, A.3 and A.4. Also, the gable roof forms associated with the alternatives were explained and it was noted that Alternative A.3 was a "blending" of the DD and A.3 "massings." A.3 was explained as a "hybrid" scheme and it was noted that it includes a three foot lower roof height at the points of entry to the Library and Town Hall buildings.
- A 12/5/05 optional floor plan layout for Alternative A was presented with the Community Hall (CH) more fully fronting on the town plaza space between the CH/AR (Activity Rooms) and Library buildings. The space relationships and building/roof forms were discussed and evaluated. The indoor and outdoor relationships of the alternatives were discussed and the views through and into to the plaza area explained.
- The proximity of the plaza spaces to the northern end of the soccer field and the soccer goals and netting were discussed and explained.
- It was noted that the overall lowering of the library height at the east end, discussed at previous meetings, could only be achieved with an internal "ramp" between library spaces. It was stressed that this ramp reduced the usefulness of spaces as well as the flexibility for interior space use.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the visuals of the east facing elevation of the Library building in all cases did not include full presentation of the planned windows. It was stressed that the windows would be included on the "final" plans.
- In response to a question it was noted that at this point the materials and design were responsive to long term maintenance concerns. It was pointed out that cement siding, metal clad windows, metal roofing, and slab on grade floors all provide for durability and minimum long-term maintenance. It was also noted that the buildings and uses would have minimum demand for hot water. It was clarified, that wood siding might

be more desirable architecturally, but that it could add \$60,000 or more to the cost of the project and would also increase maintenance costs.

- In response to a question, it was noted that the sun screen louvers, with the current plan alternatives would be angled. It was noted that this modification results in the need for fewer louvers and enhances water runoff. It was also noted that with appropriate hardwood, the maintenance costs for the louvers would be minimized, although the initial costs for construction would be higher than for less durable woods.

Public comments were requested and the following offered. (Note: where clarifications were provided by design team members or others, the clarifying comments are shown in *italics*.)

Joan Matteucci, 135 Fawn Lane, expressed concern over the use of cement shingles and wondered about the use of board and batten wood siding. She also wondered about the use of a non-painted metal roof material, like copper or corrugated, galvanized steel. She stated preference for the DD plan and the metal, storefront windows.

Strain advised that board and batten siding was not viewed as consistent with the architectural character of the buildings, particularly the DD forms and that shingles were a better option. He stressed that the concrete shingles could be made more acceptable with appropriate color and uniformity of painting. He also advised that copper roofing was not considered because of environmental concerns and that copper is actually a "prohibited" material in some communities. He clarified that the pre-finished dark metal roof was cost effective and also would work with the environmental objectives of the project. He noted that a zinc roofing system might work well, but is a very expensive material and difficult to consider in light of budgeting realities.

Strain also advised that corrugated metal roofing was not a good option due to heat gain and loss concerns.

Sally Ann Reiss, 145 Golden Oak Drive wondered about the impact on desired functions of the reduced floor area in the CH/AR building. She also wondered about the soccer field netting and stated that "Blues and BBQ" and similar functions could be held outdoors and on, for example, the soccer field.

Strain referenced the usable areas comparison table and stated that the design represented a more efficient use of space with minimum impact on functions. He noted that the CH space, combined with the AR space was actually larger than the CH space shown on the "DD" plan.

Annelise Connell, Santa Maria Avenue, encouraged the town to maximize the "sustainability" of the project and use of "renewable energy" resources. She encouraged maximizing the roof area that can be effectively used for photovoltaic panels. She also supported the three building scheme and suggested the final decision on the window options be based on the physiological response to "looking out of the window frames." She suggested that the response to the scale and form of the window frames on the view experience should be considered.

Strain and Goring discussed the "sustainable" aspects of the project and that the objective has been to make the project as "sustainable" as possible. It was noted, however, that there has not yet been a full

calculation of anticipated energy loads nor have new calculations been done relative to the different "A" alternative plans. It was stressed that this will take place when final decisions are reached for the architectural forms for the buildings.

Kevin Westbrook, 1255 Westridge Drive, also discussed the energy use/demands of the project and the design of the mechanical systems. He suggested alternatives to ensure energy efficiency and stressed that future expansions and demands be considered. He also wondered about the long-term maintenance for the proposed sun louvers and overall long-term maintenance costs for the town center.

Strain and Goring noted that long term maintenance has been considered in project development and will be an important factor in final improvement plans. They also discussed options for the louvers to minimize maintenance costs. They noted that the alternative of angling the louvers results in fewer louvers and the angle helps ensure water runoff.

Leah Hamm, 331 Alamos Road, wondered about the timeline for getting the ASCC recommendations and the project plans to the town council.

Chase advised that the ASCC recommendations would be forwarded to the council after completion of final review of site plan issues scheduled to take place at the January 23, 2006 ASCC meeting.

Yvonne Tryce, 90 Joaquin Road expressed concern over proximity to the "creek" and the San Andres Fault zone.

Alice Von Felt, Creek Park Drive, stated a preference for the three building scheme and use of the "storefront" windows.

George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road, and council member, advised that the buildings as sited are substantially to the east of the fault zone and outside of the setback area. He clarified that the buildings were actually over 30 feet beyond the setback line.

Pierre Fisher, 10 Valley Oak, expressed concern over the emphasis on the use of native plants and landscaping in the areas between buildings. He encouraged more effort to ensure the space is usable for outdoor activities.

Angela Hay, 4570 Alpine Road, questioned the use of the louver screens and their impact on views from within the buildings.

Strain advised that they help bring light into the building and also control heat gain.

Lindsey Bowan, 195 Portola Road, expressed concern over the DD scheme roof forms and wondered about the use of longer overhangs/wider eaves.

Strain and Goring advised that the designs allow for capturing light and preserving views and that wide overhangs would severely impact the views from within the buildings.

Deke Hunter, 5 Cherokee Court, wondered about the decisions made to set the sustainable objectives for the project, and offered that a "Bronze" LEEDS rating might be a sufficiently

reasonable goal. He also suggested that the library building be moved closer to the town plaza to allow for more parking on the north side of the building.

Strain advised that many factors are being considered in project design and that "sustainability" was an important one. He stressed, however, that no specific LEEDS rating level had been defined as a specific objective and that a multitude of design factors were still being balanced.

Chase noted that moving the library building toward the plaza would only allow for the addition of nine parking spaces and that the design preference has been to not drive through a double loaded parking lot.

Ike Van, 330 Westridge Drive, expressed concern over what he perceived as being an effort to maximize the window area. He suggested limiting the glass area to avoid the need for the sun screen louvers and also suggested the use of glass coatings to control sun and heat gain.

After receiving the presentations and clarifications from the design team and public input, ASCC members offered the following comments and reactions:

Schilling:

- Prefer alternative A.2 with more gable forms.
- Window additions to north elevation of the library are positive and appropriate
- Not convinced that the double hung, clad windows are better than the storefront alternative.
- Prefer the external library ramp.
- Prefer lower roof forms.
- Remain concerned with maintenance of sun screen louvers., but less so with the suggested sloped louvers and proper seal of louver materials.
- Would prefer standing seam, galvanized to painted metal roofing.
- The CH/AR building form on Alternative A.4 is less preferable than what is shown on the other schemes. It might, however, work if it were rotated 90 degrees to the long axis of the building so as to be parallel to the plaza area.

Breen:

- Alternative A.4 results in less well defined plaza area and spaces. It might work if the CH/AR building was rotated as suggested by Schilling. As currently proposed, however, it does not include good "destinations" and the open views to the soccer netting is not desirable.

- Prefer the forms and massing with the DD scheme.
- Prefer the larger, metal frame windows, but they should be operable.
- The double hung windows look "choppy" and not as well integrated with the overall design as the storefront windows, and the storefront windows are preferred.
- Prefer zinc or galvanized metal roofing, but understand the cost issues.
- Prefer the shed roof and clerestory forms. The gable-end roofs are not as interesting or architecturally exciting.

Warr:

- Prefer the gabled end roof forms and Alternative A.2 in terms of form and massing. Also find A.4 interesting because of view preservation. Definition of outdoor spaces, however, would need additional work.
- Prefer wood window forms with outside metal cladding and wood exposed to the interior spaces.
- The upturning roof forms are not subservient to the environment and for this reason the gable forms are preferred.
- The painted metal roof probably makes the most long-term sense in terms of appearance, cost and maintenance. A zinc roof would be architecturally "great," but the cost is excessive and much of it would be covered with solar panels.
- The hardi-shingle siding sample is not acceptable. It is understood that it requires certain "pre" factory finishing to ensure the warranty, and this makes the finish selection options even more limiting and less desirable. It is likely a compromise finish could be found, but this would not be the most desirable approach for buildings of this importance to the character of the town. "Sustainable redwood" siding should be considered and explored, even if it costs more initially and in terms of long-term maintenance.

Gelpi:

- Alternative A.4 is too open and does not allow for a good definition of outdoor plaza spaces. While the building massing seems good, the site plan is not.
- Prefer the building forms and massing presented in Alternative A.3. This alternative appears to be a reasonable trade-off in terms of form and architectural character and results in massing and heights that are reduced from those presented with the DD option. At the same time, "I" still "like" the DD forms with Alternative A.1.

- With Alternative A.4 the design objectives are not clear nor it is clear as to what is actually being accomplished in terms of site design.
- Remain "comfortable" with the storefront windows.
- Biggest concern is with the long-term maintenance of the sun screen louvers.

Chase:

- Echo the concerns of others relative to the poor definition of outdoor spaces associated with A.4. The site plan does not have a hierarchy of open spaces and the outdoor spaces don't have the richness of the spaces associated with A.1. Further, the plan is too open in terms of the views to the soccer goals. The views to the goals should not be so direct and open.
- A.4 results in a loss of the identity of the public plaza and the plan should "stick" with that associated with the DD scheme.
- It is possible that rotating the CH/AR building in A.4, as suggested by Schilling, might work and allow for lower building heights and massing.
- In terms of massing, the original DD scheme is favored because of the more exciting and interesting exterior forms and interior spaces. The roof forms embrace the key views and bring light into the buildings. They result in an "airy and open feeling" particularly from within the library.
- Architecturally, the sun screens are positive additions to the design and enhance the character of the buildings.
- The storefront windows are preferred. They are less obtrusive and have less impact on views out from the interior spaces.

Thereafter, the differences of design opinions of ASCC members were discussed and debated between members. It was agreed that, in general, the three-building scheme was preferred, but this assumed that the quality and character of outside spaces would be ultimately refined to achieve the functions and objectives captured with the original DD scheme. Breen and Chase, in particular, remained concerned with the hierarchy of the outdoor spaces and indoor/outdoor relationships and also the loss of "existing" and interesting architectural character presented with the original DD scheme as referred to the ASCC by the town council. Ultimately, the ASCC charged the design team with considering the comments and bringing forth a final, a coherent, integrated design.

Following considerable discussion, including questioning of the project design team members to obtain some understanding of their thoughts and ideas on the alternative "A" plans, and particularly the evolution of the A.4 alternative, Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-2 (Chase, Breen opposed) to support Alternative A.3.

Warr, stressed that he felt A.3 was a an appropriate compromise in terms of ASCC reactions and, in particular, was responsive to the public concerns expressed at both the 11/7 and 12/5 ASCC meetings. He noted A.3 included reduced heights, less massing and more open views through the building cluster area. At the same time, he stated it preserved a number of the elements of the DD architecture, particularly in terms of the main entry off of the driveway turnaround.

In taking the above action, the all ASCC members generally concurred that the architects should proceed to address the following:

1. Develop in more detail the indoor/outdoor plaza relationships to, as possible, achieve the hierarchy of the outdoor spaces that appear to exist with the DD plan.
2. The use of redwood siding is strongly preferred and this should be fully explored in development of final plans. The siding is viewed as the most critical exterior materials issue and the proposed concrete shingle siding is, as currently presented, unacceptable. The redwood will add "familiarity" to the design and ensure a better fit to the site and harmony with the character of the community. The redwood is recommended even if it adds cost to the project. Perhaps cost tradeoff can be found in other plan details.
3. The general concepts presented for the sun screens were accepted, but it was agreed that the details associated with design, including final material selection, sealing, etc, needed to be finalized with the final building plans to minimize concerns over long term maintenance.
4. More consideration should be given to the CH/AR building on A.3 with the objective of making it more rectangular than square to help keep it as low as possible and more consistent with the form of the town hall and library buildings.

Some discussion followed on the window options. While there appeared to be some preference for the "storefront" windows, a final consensus was not reached. It was agreed that the architects should consider all aspects of the ASCC comments and provide their best recommendations as to the windows that are most appropriate for Alternative A.3.

Following the above actions, town center project review was continued to the January 23, 2006 regular ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

T. Vlastic