

**Special Field Meeting 2 Blue Oaks Court, McClatchie, and
302 Portola Road, The Woodside Priory School, and
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Chase called the special field meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 2 Blue Oaks Court.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling

Absent: Warr

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the McClatchie project:

Martha and Iain McClatchie, applicants

Fred Herring, project designer

Wynne and Steven Benhayon, 4 Buck Meadow Drive

Win Yin Yuk and Patty Siu Leung Kun, 6 Buck Meadow Drive

Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-524, 2 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 36, Blue Oaks Subdivision), McClatchie

Vlastic presented the July 7, 2005 staff report on this proposal for new residential development of Lot 36 of the Blue Oaks. He noted that the project includes a two-level, 5,313 sf contemporary style residence on the subject 3.0 acre site and calls for approximately 2,300 cubic yards of grading to develop the required access and guest parking spaces. He added that this volume of grading requires a site development permit, that the planning commission is the approving authority for this permit and that the commission conducted a preliminary review of the proposal at the July 6 planning commission meeting. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 4/12/05 and prepared by Herring & Worley, Inc:

Cover Sheet (2), (photos of site model)

Sheet 1, General Site Plan, revised and received 7/6/05

Sheet 1.1, Site Plan, revised and received 7/6/05

Sheet 1.2, Planting Plan, 6/30/05

Sheet 2, Main floor Plan

Sheet 3, Upper Floor Plan

Sheet 4, Roof Plan

Sheet 5, West (Side) Elevation

Sheet 6, North (Entry) Elevation

Sheet 7, East Elevation

Site Grading and Drainage Plan, Berry and Associates, received 6/30/05

Tree Survey, April 19, 2005, McClenahan Consulting, LLC. (The site plans include the tree numbers that correspond to the comments in the tree survey.)

Also considered were an exterior materials and colors board received 4/25/05, a sample of the proposed roof material, cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received 4/25/05, and product data for the proposed roof mounted Heliodyne, Inc. solar hot water panels. The project architect also presented photos of the proposed stone siding.

Vlasic noted that Blue Oaks homeowner's association (HOA) president Kurt Jagers informed him that the HOA had concerns with the project, primarily with the western house extension for the solar panels, and the planned roof material, and had only just received the revised grading plan. Vlasic advised that the HOA would not formally consider the project until the August 1, 2005 HOA Board meeting and therefore, recommended that the ASCC review the request, provide comments and reactions and then continue project review to the August 8, 2005 regular ASCC meeting. The applicant concurred with this recommendation.

Herring provided an updated July 7, 2005 McClenahan Consulting, LLC arborist report. He also described the staking and story poles installed to facilitate the site meeting. He and the applicants led ASCC members and others present on an inspection of site conditions and offered the following comments:

- Following review of the staking and story poles it has been determined that consideration should be given to moving the house five feet to the east to provide more separation between the house and trees along the west side of the building envelope and also move the house further away from the Benhayon property to the west.
- The plans will be adjusted to resolve the exterior lighting issues raised in the staff report.
- The plan sheets are not fully consistent with each other and the long entry wall will not really be as shown on the current model. The house elevation sheets are correct with respect to the entry wall, but will likely be refined based on the most recent grading plans and other refinements including moving the house five feet to the east.
- The proposed roof material comes in other colors, but the proposed color is desired because of its energy efficiency.
- The house might be rotated slightly to the southeast to move away from the oak at the entry. Story poles demonstrated that the current siting requires trimming of the tree and it is preferred that the tree not be so pruned.
- The pool lights were incorrectly shown on the plans. Only the lights shown on the north side of the pool are actually proposed.

After considering site conditions, and at the request of Mr. and Mrs. Benhayon, ASCC members visited the neighbors' property and house to consider view impacts from the rear yard and locations within the house. During this visit, both Mr. and Mrs. Benhayon expressed concern over the proposed western 30 foot extension, roof color and lack of sufficient screen planting between the proposed house and the common property line. They, in particular, asked that the plans be revised to eliminate the western extension and questioned the appropriateness of the feature in terms of conformity to the PUD provisions for a "compact" house design. They also expressed concern that the extension was only for the purposes of supporting a portion of the proposed solar panel array.

Following the site inspection, ASCC members offered the following reactions and comments relative to the proposal.

1. It was agreed that review would be continued to the August 8 regular ASCC meeting to allow time for the HOA to complete its review and for the applicant to pursue ASCC directions.
2. Study should be made relative to moving the house five feet to the east, to move away from the Benhayon property and the oaks along the west side of the house. ASCC members were particularly concerned that the story poles indicated that one of the oaks would need significant limb pruning.
3. Evaluation should be made of the possibility of reducing or eliminating the western feature for the solar panel extension. (At least one ASCC member felt the extension was acceptable but wanted a significant addition of landscaping, particularly larger oak trees to screen views.)
4. Provide more landscaping along the west side of the upper terrace to screen views to and from the Benhayon property.
5. An alternative roof material is needed. The current proposal is not acceptable in terms of color and reflectivity. Consideration should be given to real copper. Reference was made to the "Gibbons" copper roof used on Lot 12 of the subdivision and ASCC members indicated that this would be an acceptable option. One ASCC member noted that a lighter roof option might be acceptable due to the light grass color in the meadow, but it was also noted that the PUD called for a darker roof color on the site to blend with the tree canopy.
6. The landscape plan should be revised to be consistent with the Blue Oaks plant list. One comment suggested the elimination of the "ironwood" and the provision of more of a mix of Live, Valley and Blue Oaks.

ASCC members also asked for graphic sections though the front elevation of the house showing the fill and walls so there could be a better appreciation of the views and changes along the meadow side of the project. ASCC members also encouraged the applicant to make early contact with the HOA representatives so issues could be clarified and addressed prior to the August 1, 2005 HOA meeting.

At 4:55 p.m., the McClatchie field meeting was concluded and it was agreed that the ASCC would continue consideration of the project at the commission's regular evening meeting. It was agreed that this consideration would be only for the purpose of receiving any additional public comments and that, therefore, the application would be moved to the head of the agenda for the evening meeting.

It was noted that the special field meeting would continue at 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School, as soon as ASCC members could convene at the property. Chase advised she would not attend the Priory site meeting as she owns property within 500 feet of the school and, therefore, cannot participate as an ASCC member in deliberations on school proposals.

Architectural Review of plans for partial implementation of approved Master Plan, Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School

At approximately 5:12 p.m., ASCC members Breen, Gelpi and Schilling convened at the Woodside Priory School in the main meeting Room of Founders Hall. Joining them were deputy town planner Vlastic, planning technician Borck and the following school representatives and interested neighbors:

Tim Molak, Priory Headmaster
Brother Edward
Bill Roberts, Priory Board of Directors
Carolyn Dobervich, Priory staff
Ron Benoit, project landscape architect
Bob Waterman, project landscape architect
Mark Miller, project architect
Mark Ojanen, project architect
John Wilson, project contractor
Bill Cinquini, BKF Engineers, project engineer
Sharon Reich, 205 Georgia Lane

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the July 7, 2005 staff report and the initial discussion of the current project submittal that took place at the June 27 ASCC meeting on the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by MK Think:

Revisions to Architectural Vocabulary, June 13, 2005
Sustainable Building Guidelines, June 13, 2005
Landscape and Exterior Lighting Masterplan, received June 13, 2005, prepared by Ron Benoit Associates, Landscape Architects

Phase I "Pre-PAC" Construction Submittal for Parking Area, Berm, Tennis Court, and Performing Arts Center Excavation

Civil Engineering Plans (6 Sheets), dated June 13, 2005 and prepared by BKF Engineering, with attached submittal letter from project engineer Edward Boscacci

Landscape Improvements (3 sheets), dated June 13, 2005 and prepared by Ron Benoit Associates

Construction Management Plan, (5 sheets) dated June 13, 2005 with attached Construction Management Notes prepared by Plant Construction Company, L.P

Addendum #1, June 21, 2005, tennis court, softball field, fencing, pedestrian bridge, planting and drainage details, (10, 8.5"x11" sheets), prepared by Ron Benoit Associates

June 22, Supplement to Design Review Submittal of June 13, 2005, (10, 8.5"x11" sheets), providing details for the proposed athletic fields storage shed

Performing Arts Center (PAC) Plans, (11 Sheets) dated June 13, 2005 with proposed exterior colors board

Vlasic also noted that in response to comments on the proposals offered in the June 23 staff report and ASCC reactions at the June 27 meeting, the applicant provided the 12-page plan submittal prepared by MK Think and dated July 5, 2005. He clarified that the July 5 plans provide for a revised phasing scheme for the Pre-PAC (Performing Arts Center) improvements, a revised construction truck route (as described at the June 27 meeting), planned site circulation for the next school year and an illustration of the proposed athletic facilities storage shed. Vlasic also referred to the July 5 transmittal from the project architect and, with it, the revised proposed *Architectural Vocabulary Guidelines* and revised proposed *Sustainable Building Guidelines*.

Vlasic also clarified that the ASCC is responsible for review and approval of all of the referenced documents except for the PAC plans and that the planning commission is responsible for the final action on the PAC plans. He stressed that the ASCC comments and recommendations on the PAC plans would be important to the Commission's consideration of the PAC proposals.

Mark Miller reviewed the proposed plans and presented additional revisions to the July 5 plan submittal, outlining parking and construction traffic contingency plans relative to the start of the 2005-06 school year to address some of the concerns raised in the staff report. He clarified that the grading associated with the Kalman Field drainage facility would take approximately two to four days to complete and that it was hoped to have the new front parking lot in place by the start of the school year.

Ron Benoit discussed the changes to the proposed master landscape and lighting plans and clarified that the intent of the plans is to provide for the minimum lighting needed for pathways and parking areas and to, over time, enhance the use of native plants on the site. He presented a revised landscape plan for the Kalman Field berm responding to the concerns with the plan discussed at the June 27 ASCC meeting.

After the presentation and discussion at Founders Hall, the project design team led ASCC members and others present on a site walk to review the areas of the proposed improvements. The inspection included review of the front parking lot area, consideration of the PAC site and improvements, review of the plans for the parking and planting on the south side of Gambetta Gym, and evaluation of the proposals for the new tennis court and drainage improvements in the Kalman Field area.

During the course of the site inspection, ASCC members concluded that the plans were generally acceptable as presented, but discussed a number of clarifications and adjustments that appeared needed in terms of grading, landscaping and lighting.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members thanked Priority representatives for the site tour and clarification of proposal details. ASCC members also concurred that project consideration should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the special field meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling

Absent: Warr

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-524, 2 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 36, Blue Oaks Subdivision), McClatchie

Vlastic reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on this application (see above site meeting minutes) and explained that the ASCC agreed the matter would be moved to the head of the evening agenda only for the purposes of receiving any additional public input.

Mrs. McClatchie and Fred Herring were present to receive comments as may be offered.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Further, ASCC members had no additional comments to offer beyond those presented at the site meeting. Thereafter, project review was continued to the August 8, 2005 regular ASCC meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Chase temporarily removed herself from the ASCC noting she owned property within 500 feet of the Priory and, therefore, could not participate in ASCC actions on school proposals.

Architectural Review of plans for partial implementation of Approved Master Plan, Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School

Vlastic reviewed the July 7, 2005 staff report on this request and summarized the events of the afternoon site meeting (see above site meeting minutes.) He reminded ASCC members that they were responsible for acting on all of the plan submittal items except for final action on the Performing Arts Center (PAC) plans.

Tim Molak and Mark Miller were present to further discuss the plans with ASCC members as may be needed. They stressed the willingness to pursue and interactive process with the ASCC in terms of final refinement of the landscape plans and actual field placement of plant materials.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members all agreed that the plans were well developed and responded appropriately to the provisions of the recently amended use permit. Members, in particular, found the PAC plans appropriate for the site in term of scale, massing and relationship to existing conditions.

After brief discussion of some plan issues, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by MK Think:

July 5, 2005 Revision to Architectural Vocabulary, June 13, 2005

July 5, 2005 Revision to Sustainable Building Guidelines, June 13, 2005

Landscape and Exterior Lighting Masterplan, received June 13, 2005, prepared by Ron Benoit Associates, Landscape Architects

Phase I "Pre-PAC" Construction Submittal for Parking Area, Berm, Tennis Court, and Performing Arts Center Excavation

Civil Engineering Plans (6 Sheets), dated June 13, 2005 and prepared by BKF Engineering, with attached submittal letter from project engineer Edward Boscacci

Landscape Improvements (3 sheets), dated June 13, 2005 and prepared by Ron Benoit Associates

Pre-PAC Site Improvements -- Construction Phasing and Management Plans, Athletic and Maintenance Shed Plans (total of 12 sheets) dated July 5, 2005 including Construction Management Plan Notes (four 8.5"x11" sheets) received June 13, 2005 and prepared by Plant Construction Company, L.P

Addendum #1, June 21, 2005, tennis court, softball field, fencing, pedestrian bridge, planting and drainage details, (10, 8.5"x11" sheets), prepared by Ron Benoit Associates

June 22, Supplement to Design Review Submittal of June 13, 2005, (10, 8.5"x11" sheets), providing details for the proposed athletic fields storage shed

Performing Arts Center (PAC) Plans, (11 Sheets) dated June 13, 2005 with proposed exterior colors board

The approval of the above plans and materials was subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to actual issuance of the site development permit or any building permits:

1. The twelve page, July 5, 2005 Pre-PAC plans shall be revised to include the additional sheets provided at the July 11 site meeting that outline parking and construction traffic contingency plans relative to the start of the 2005-06 school year.
2. The plans shall be revised to provide for the use of permeable asphalt to the extent possible wherever new paving authorized by the master plan is installed.

3. The landscape master plan and specific landscape plans for the Pre-PAC work shall be revised to eliminate the requirement for 2:1 replacement trees relative to trees that are to be removed.
4. The landscape master plan shall be revised to allow for preservation of unique, non-native plants that contribute to the special campus environment to the satisfaction of the ASCC.
5. The landscape plan for the berm at Kalman field shall be modified to provide for less shrub and tree planting. (Specifically the revised landscape plan presented at the July 11 site meeting was deemed generally acceptable as it eliminated much of the shrub planting shown on the original landscape plan. This plan, however, should be further revised to, as possible, allow for preservation of the walnut tree immediately to the northeast of the sewer district pump station. Further, the number of new oak trees should be reduced, particularly at the eastern and southern ends of the mound, and the landscape plan annotated to state that placement of all landscaping shall be field approved prior to installation by a designated ASCC member.)
6. The lighting plan for the main new parking area shall be revised to state that the bollard lights shall be those that direct light only to the parking surface and that do not have a 360 degree light spill. Further, the switching patterns, switching controls and hours of illumination for all the new and existing parking lot and entry lights shall be identified to the satisfaction of the ASCC and the bollard lighting shall be controlled so that it is only on as needed (i.e., typically at the times of larger, evening special events).
7. The landscape plan for the parking area shall be revised to provide for more of a mix of sizes of redwood tree plantings on the south side of the new parking lot. The new trees should include 5 gallon, 15 gallon and 24 inch box size plantings.
8. The proposed four-foot high, ball control fencing along the play field sides of the new main parking area shall only extend along the south side of the parking area and shall not extend along the west side of the easternmost parking area.
9. The tennis court grading plans shall be refined as possible to pull the court away from the adjacent hillside and to reduce height of, or eliminate the need for the retaining wall on the downhill side of the court.
10. The grading, landscape and construction management plans shall be revised as necessary to ensure all sheets are consistent with one another.
11. The PAC plans shall be revised to ensure consistency between sheets, particularly with respect to pine tree removal and identification of trees. Further, the plans may be revised to show elimination of the larger, 26" Monterey Pine immediately to the west of the auditorium building, but, if possible, the "volunteer" oak growing just west of the base of the pine, shall be preserved.
13. The landscape plan for the parking area along the south side of Gambetta Gym (i.e., sheet L0.2) shall be revised to state that the placement of the oaks and final number of oaks shall be field determined to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member with the

intent of keeping open views from the Priory to the western hillside, but also screening views to the PAC from the residential parcel to the south.

14. The new softball field arch style backstop shall be finished in either a black or dark green coating.
15. In order to avoid potential for construction conflicts with parking demands for larger school events as well as the community use activities, the Priory shall provide a detailed calendar of school activities with the use permit required 2005-06 pre-school year report to the planning commission. This calendar shall provide for temporary suspension of those activities that cannot be accommodated on site (i.e., parking and traffic demands) during the portion of the school year where significant construction work is tentatively scheduled. Further if, based on the calendar, it becomes clear that community use of Kalman or the other fields will not be possible for portions of the year where they normally take place, the Priory shall advise teams and organizations as to the situation as soon as possible.
16. Sheets 10 and 11 of the July 5 Pre-PAC plans shall be revised to clearly show the locations for staff and visitor parking.
17. The lighting master plans and other plan documents shall be revised to state that the marquee at the north end of the entry driveway shall not be illuminated.
18. The proposed landscape plans shall be revised to address the following comments provided by the conservation committee:
 - a. Sheet L0.1. Redwoods are too close together; shade will make the mahonia grow poorly. A better screen would be tall shrubs such as holy leaf cherry and toyon. Oak grove is over planted; fewer oaks and a mix of valley oak and coast live would be nicer than a thicket.
 - b. Sheet L0.2. Planting of manzanita under coast live oak will not work; they like a dry area and do not like shade.
 - c. Sheet L0.3. On the berm, the oaks are planted too close together to have healthy mature trees; dry land species like manzanita and ceanothus will not do well in an area with so much water, and should not be under oaks. Toyons would be a better choice.
 - d. All areas are over-planted; they will interfere with each other as they grow.
19. All site development permit requirements of the public works director, town geologist, fire marshal and health officer shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the appropriate site development permit committee member.
20. Define/revise the lighting of the main entry sign at Portola Road, to conform to town lighting policies, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member

Actions were taken with the understanding that the use permit required on-site storm drainage master plan would have to be approved by the public works director and the Kalman Field storm drainage easement would have to be in place prior to the start of the proposed August 2005 improvements.

Following consideration of the Priory application, Chase returned to her ASCC position.

Follow-up Review and Modifications -- Architectural Review for new residence, 15 Montara Court, Flynn

Vlasic presented the July 7, 2005 staff report on this submittal. He noted that on March 22, 2004, the ASCC conditionally approved the proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.20 acre Alpine Hills property and on November 8, 2004 considered follow-up plans submitted to satisfy conditions of the March 22 approval. He explained that at the time of the follow-up review, the ASCC found the plans generally acceptable, but directed that a more complete submittal package be prepared to fully respond to all conditions. Vlasic clarified that the project design team has now completed this package and has also decided to include plans for the swimming pool that was tentatively described to the ASCC with the original project application. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following revised plans and materials, unless otherwise noted prepared by Harrison Design:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan and Project Data, 6/30/05
- Sheet 2, First Floor Plan, 6/28/05
- Sheet 3, 2nd Floor Plan, 6/29/05
- Sheet 4, Basement Floor Plan, 6/30/05
- Sheet 5, East and West Elevations, 6/30/05
- Sheet 6, North and South Elevations, 6/30/05
- Sheet 7, 1st Floor Plan Electrical (with light fixture cut sheets)
- Sheet 8, 2nd Floor Plan Electrical (with light fixture cut sheets)
- Sheet 9, Basement Electrical Plan
- Sheet C-1 Grading and Drainage Plan, Smith, Randlett, Foulk & Stock, Inc.
June 6, 2005
- Sheet 1L, Landscape Site Plan, CL Gardens, 5/26/05
- Sheet 2L, Planting Plan, CL Gardens, 5/26/05
- Sheet 3L, East Elevation w/Proposed Stucco Wall
- Topographic Survey, Smith, Randlett, Foulk & Stock, Inc., December 2003

- June 30, 2005 memo from Kristen Harrison discussing how the new submittal responds to the outstanding items described in the minutes of the 11/8/05 ASCC meeting.
- June 27, 2005 Plant Legend (five sheets)
- Impervious Surface Calculations (also shown on plan Sheet 1)
- May 16, 2005 letter from project arborist, Urban Tree Management
- April 7, 2004 Tree Survey, Urban Tree Management

In addition to the above listed plans and materials, ASCC members considered a sample of the proposed mix of roof tiles.

Kristen Harrison and project landscape architect Connie Lefkowitz presented the plans to the ASCC. They clarified that the new front yard fencing would be a post and wire fence with a 4"x4" wire mesh fabric. It was also noted that any yard lighting would be the subject of a future plan that would be submitted to the town for ASCC approval.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members found the submittal acceptable and, after brief discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as submitted subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A detailed construction staging/parking and tree protection plan shall be developed and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The final construction staging and tree protection plan shall fully incorporate all of the requirements of the project arborist as set forth in his tree evaluation reports.
2. The building permit plans shall provide details for the guardrails and all retaining wall surfaces. Further, details for the proposed pool trellis and the new front yard post and wire fence shall be included on the building permit plans.
3. Any plans for yard lighting shall be provided with the building permit submittal and shall conform to town guidelines and regulations for exterior lighting.

Architectural Review for house replacement, and Variance X7E-129, 152 Wayside Road, Hughes

Vlasic presented the July 7, 2005 staff report on the subject application. He stated that on September 13, 2004 the ASCC considered and approved plans for remodeling of and additions to the existing house on the subject 30,180 sf parcel and that the plans included continuing existing yard encroachments and there were no issues with this, as the project was for additions and remodeling. He explained that after the building permits were issued, it was discovered that the house foundation was in such poor condition, that it could not support the improvements and that the existing house would need to be demolished. Vlasic clarified that, since the house is to now be removed, the preexisting yard encroachments are no longer available to the applicant and that the applicant is seeking a variance to allow the plans to be implemented as approved last year by the ASCC.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the June 30 report to the board of adjustment on the variance. They also considered the following enclosed plans prepared by Stan Field Associates submitted in support of the variance request and desired carport revisions:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan, June 16, 2005
- Sheet A.1, Carport Plans, June 29, 2005

Mr. Hughes briefly reviewed his proposal and the circumstances impacting his property and house plans.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 to recommend board of adjustment approval of the variance and to approve the new carport plans. Members "enthusiastically" supported the project, variance and carport revisions.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Chase temporarily removed herself from the ASCC noting she owned property within 500 feet of the application property and, therefore, could not participate in ASCC actions on the proposal.

Architectural Review, Conditional Use Permit Amendment X7D-132, 302 Portola Road (at Woodside Priory School), Verizon Wireless

Vlasic presented the July 7, 2005 staff report on this request and stated that currently Verizon Wireless has a use permit for an existing antenna facility located near the monastery building on the hill to the north and above the main part of the developed Woodside Priory school campus. He explained that the subject request is to amend the permit to allow for installation of additional antenna on the two existing Verizon poles as shown on the three-sheet plan set prepared by JES Engineering, Inc., revised through 2/11/05.

ASCC members considered the staff report and further descriptions of the proposal contained in the June 8, 2005 report to the planning commission. Vlasic advised that the planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the request on June 15, that the commission would be responsible for acting on the use permit amendment and that the ASCC should offer comments on the potential visual impacts that the commission can consider in completing its review of the amendment request.

Public comments were requested. **Leah Zaffaroni, 175 Georgia Lane**, while not opposing the application, did express concern with the potential for added visual impact. She cited examples in other jurisdictions where considerations were given to alternative locations so that the antenna would not be silhouetted against an open sky, but understood the limitations in terms of topography and other local conditions.

Following brief discussion of the request, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 to recommend planning commission approval of the use permit amendment subject to the condition that the new and existing antenna extensions and the two existing Verizon poles all be painted in a darker, muted color that would blend more with the site and the backdrop conditions. It was agreed that the color selection should be to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and should be similar to the muted, brown-gray color used on the pole that is adjacent to the Verizon poles.

Following consideration of the above application, Chase returned to her ASCC position.

Architectural Review for detached accessory structure and other yard improvements, 188 Georgia Lane, Gurley

Vlasic presented the July 7, 2005 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for a detached, 852 sf pool house, and site plan modifications and improvements proposed for the subject 2.0 acre Georgia Lane property. He noted that the north and east side boundaries of the property are common with the lands of the Woodside Priory and discussed the proposed improvements as shown on the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 4/3/05 and prepared by Fargo Farnesi, Inc. and/or Landscape Group:

Sheet A0.1, Existing and Proposed Site Demolition Plan

Sheet A0.2, Proposed Site Plan

Sheet A1.0, Poolhouse Schematic Design

Sheet A1.1, BBQ Patio Plan and Section

Sheet L-1, Landscape Lighting Plan

Sheet L-2, Planting Plan

Sheet L-3, Tree Protection Plan

Proposed light fixture cut sheets received June 7, 2005

Annotated photo of the front elevation of the existing house on the property with notes stating that the proposed pool house will match the existing house in terms of architecture, and exterior materials and colors.

Shawn Smith, project designer presented the proposals to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to issues raised in the staff report:

- The pool house height can be lowered to meet the 18 foot, single story limit.
- The cabinet proposed in the middle of the pool house is not full height and the structure is designed so as to contain one large room. The size of the structure is largely defined by the size of desired exercise equipment and the clerestory feature is to bring light into the exercise portion of the building. The height can be lowered and skylights used to obtain the desired light.
- A revised site plan dated July 11, 2005 was presented showing a modified, and corrected plan for the apple orchard trees. It was noted that 25 apple trees would be removed or moved and many of the trees to be removed are not in good condition. It was clarified that the trees that can't be removed would be replaced with new trees according to the 7/11 plan and that the desire is to preserve the apple orchard character of the property. In response to a question, it was noted that the best time of the year to move any orchard trees is January and February and this would be when the trees on the subject site would be moved.
- The lawn area will be modified to specify a native meadow grass mix for the grass areas within the orchard areas.

- The fencing plan will be adjusted to address the fencing issues stated in the staff report. Specifically, only a post and wire fence would be used along the southwestern boundary.
- In response to a question, the project designer stated he did not realize until today that construction work was taking place outside of the work hour limits set by the town's noise ordinance. He advised that he would inform the contractors and property owners that all construction work must be restricted to the hour limits set by the ordinance, (i.e., 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday and no work on weekends or Holidays).
- Pool security will be provided by a pool cover.
- Prior to removal of the exiting front yard pavers, the paver area would be used for construction parking for the rear yard improvements. After the rear yard work is completed, the front yard will be improved according to the currently proposed plans.

Public comments were requested. **Council Liaison Merk** raised concern with the proposal for two, 500-watt pool lights and questioned the plan note calling for a photocell timer.

Leah Zaffaroni, 175 Georgia Lane, supported the proposed front yard improvements and encouraged the preservation and enhancement of the apple orchard trees. She stressed the need to carefully maintain the apple trees and that moving trees required great care. She encouraged planting to screen views to the pool house structure, but stressed that her main concern was the construction process. She noted that currently, construction activities on the site occur outside of the limits set by the town's noise ordinance and that, previously, trucks associated with site work have used neighbors driveways for turnaround maneuvers. She stated concerns over parking on the public pathways and safety for pedestrian traffic, particularly when school is in session.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and shared concerns expressed in the staff report regarding the pool house height, fencing and lighting. Members agreed that the clearstory portion of the pool house should be removed and that modifications to the lighting plans were needed. It was also agreed that a deed restriction relative to pool house use was needed as suggested in the staff report.

Following discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as revised and clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney ensuring that the pool house is not converted to a guest house larger than 750 square feet.
2. The clerestory shall be removed from the pool house. Skylights may installed to provide for the desired natural light above the exercise room area of the pool house.
3. The exterior lighting plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. Clearly define the switching controls and switching patterns for all exterior light fixtures.
 - b. Eliminate any photocell light switching.
 - c. Eliminate the driveway lights.
 - d. Eliminate one of the proposed front door pathway lights.
 - e. Provide for only one pool light and it shall be located the end of the pool so it faces the pool house.
4. The landscape plan shall be revised to reduce the scope of lawn area in the rear yard. Further, meadow grasses shall be used for any grass area that would extend into the apple orchard.
 5. The plans shall be revised to provide for only open, post and wire fencing along the southwestern property line or extending from the house to the southwestern property line.
 6. The landscaping plan shall be revised to include details for restoration and maintenance of the apple orchard and the plans shall be implemented as part of the project to the satisfaction of the planning staff.
 7. A detailed construction staging/parking, tree protection plan shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

In taking the action, ASCC members stressed that the applicant and project contractor should be placed on notice that all construction activities must be limited to the work hours permitted by the town's noise ordinance.

Approval of Minutes

Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0-1 (Chase) approval of the June 27, 2005 field and evening meeting minutes with the following corrections:

Page 3. In the first line of the third full paragraph under the Alpine Hills application review correct the spelling of "purpose".

Page 8. In the second to last line of the fifth bullet item correct the spelling of "create".

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

T. Vlasic