

**Special Field Meeting 140 Degas Road, Seltzer, and  
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

The special field meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. at 140 Degas Road.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

Absent: Chase

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Others present relative to the Seltzer project:**

Adele Seltzer, applicant

Heather Campbell, project architect

**Architectural Review for detached accessory structure/Art Studio & Site Development  
Permit X9H-537, 140 Degas Road, Seltzer**

Vlastic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this proposal for construction of a detached, 1,435 sf art studio on the subject 3.3 acre Westridge Subdivision property. He reviewed the history of a similar, expired, 1992 application for the property and also commented on the few project issues discussed in the staff report. Vlastic also noted that the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) had issued a June 6, 2005 conditional approval letter for the project.

ASCC members considered the staff report, WASC June 6 letter and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Butler Armsden Architects, and dated April 19, 2005:

Sheet A0.0, Title Sheet

Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Property

Sheet A0.2, Landscape & Lighting Plan

Sheet C-1, Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control Plan, Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.

Sheet A2.1, Floor Plans

Sheet A3.1, Existing Elevations

Sheet A3.2, Sections

Also considered was the April 20, 2005 "Proposed Exterior Light Fixtures" document and exterior "Materials Sample Board" dated April 19, 2005.

Ms. Seltzer and Heather Campbell presented the proposal to the ASCC. They pointed out the story poles placed to facilitate the site meeting and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The copper references on the materials board are just for the proposed flashing and screws. These are the only copper details. Further, colored elevations were presented to clarify the use of the proposed exterior colors and finishes, particularly the "cranberry trim" finish.

- An example of the proposed metal roofing is on the existing poolside structure. The texture, color and finish of this existing roof are essentially the same as the roof proposed for the art studio. It was noted that this roof has been in place for approximately 12-14 years, but was "dull" within a very short time after installation.
- The exterior lighting plan will be changed as suggested in staff report. Specifically, the lights will be placed within the proposed canopy on the west side of the studio and the stairs at the northwest corner will be lighted for safety with only step lights.
- The proposed north elevation entry door light will only cast light down, and there is no light escape through the top of the fixture.
- The west elevation canopy will be constructed of metal and painted to match the color proposed for the metal siding and roof.
- The grading plan, and proposed retaining wall, will be adjusted as recommended in the staff report to ensure the oak at the northwest corner of the parking area is protected from impacts of grading.
- The doors at the west end of the structure will be glazed with a metal frame. Only the doorframes would be painted in the proposed "cranberry" trim color. It is believed that the WASC thought the entire door would be in the "cranberry" color and for this reason opposed the "red" color.

ASCC members walked the site and considered potential view impact from on and off-site locations. Members also inspected the roof on the existing pool house and agreed it was an acceptable material for use on the art studio as proposed. ASCC members also found the plans generally acceptable as proposed, but also offered the following comments and reactions:

1. A deed restriction is needed, as discussed in the staff report, relative to proper use of the structure and to help ensure against conversion to a second unit larger than 750 sf.
2. Light fixture adjustments are needed as discussed in the staff report and agreed to by the applicant.
3. Construction staging and tree protection plans are needed.
4. Change retaining wall design at northwest corner to protect oak.
5. The existing pampas grass located on the north side of the proposed structure needs to be eliminated, as it is a town discouraged, "invasive" plant.
6. The proposed "cranberry" trim color was found acceptable and deemed an excellent accent color for the proposed structure. It was noted, however, that if an alternative color were proposed to address the concerns of the WASC, the color change should be identified to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC.

8. The landscape plan should be revised to select a native vine for use on the proposed steel rod cross bracing features. California Grape, specifically Rogers Red Grape, is the recommended vine.
9. While it was acknowledged that the landscape plan would need to be revised to provide additional screening desired by the WASC, it was agreed that the added landscaping should not eliminate the significant views from the west side of the art studio site. It was suggested that one Black Oak and a few native shrubs (e.g., Toyon) be used to provide the WASC's desired screening along the southeast slope instead of the currently planned Big Leaf Maples.

At the conclusion of the field meeting, it was agreed that the ASCC would continue consideration of the project at the commission's regular evening meeting.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the site meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:04 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

**Leitha Spetzler, 2 Oak Forest Court**, asked for ASCC assistance in enforcement of the Portola Glen Estates PUD provisions. She specifically referred to fencing and planting installed along the east side of Lot 3 (Taran) without the required ASCC approvals. She wondered if the ASCC could look into the situation and require the owner of Lot 3 to remove the unapproved fencing and non-native pittosporum plants.

Vlastic advised that staff had been in contact with representatives of the owners of Lot 3 and understood a plan was being developed to rectify the situation. He noted that staff would follow-up on this matter and report back to the ASCC and also advise Ms. Spetzler.

**Re-submittal of project to ASCC after Planning Commission granting of Asborno Appeal-- Architectural Review of Plans for house additions, 243 Canyon Drive, Kosling**

Vlastic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this matter and explained the actions of the Board of Adjustment on the Asborno appeal. He advised that based on the Board's action, Mr. and Mrs. Kosling resubmitted the following plans prepared by architect, Tobin Dougherty and revised through 3/29/05:

Sheet CS.1, Project Information and Vicinity Map

Sheet A2.1, Site Plan

Sheet A2.2, Construction Staging Plan

Sheet A3.1, Existing Floor Plan

Sheet A4.1, New Floor Plan

Sheet A4.2, New Lower Floor Plan

Sheet A5.1, New Roof Plan

Sheet A6.1, Exterior Elevations & Section

Sheet A6.2, Exterior Elevations

Vlastic noted that the plans were further modified as committed to in the May 11, 2005 memorandum from the applicants and project architect to the planning commission. In addition, Vlastic stated that a letter had been received at the end of the day from the applicants and their architect further revising the proposal by specifically agreeing to lower the ridgeline of the planned addition to be no higher than the level of the ridge of the main entry gable. Vlastic explained that this would be one additional foot of lowering to that

committed to at the May 18, 2005 Board of Adjustment meeting. He also noted that the letter received today from the applicant (i.e., June 13) was incorrectly dated May 11, 2005.

Vlasic presented annotated site and "left" and "right" elevations of the proposed addition plans to clarify the changes that had been made though the adjustments described in the letter received on June 13. He noted that the letter advises that the lowering would be achieved with modifications to the proposed plate heights as well as roof pitch. Vlasic pointed out that with the roof pitch change, likely from 7:12 to 5:12, the hip at the eastern end would be "flatter" and further open views from either adjoining property to the north and south.

Vlasic also referenced comments in the June 7, 2005 letter to the ASCC from Nancy Powell, 237 Canyon Drive, and June 10, 2005 letter to the ASCC from Mr. Dean Asborn, 265 Canyon Drive. Vlasic noted that each included excerpts from the town's design guidelines.

Mr. Kosling presented his re-submittal to the ASCC and offered the following clarifications:

- The plans have been modified several times to address concerns of the neighbors, board of adjustment and ASCC. As pointed out in the staff annotated elevations and site plans, the proposal is well within the setback and height limits.
- The proposed concentration of 94% of the permitted floor area is the only place where it is being asked that special consideration be given. The project architect and the ASCC in its January approval, recognized that slope, and other site circumstances support the concentration of floor area.
- The plans as currently purposed include the changes shown on the refined plan set, the additional lowering committed to "today" and the other changes described in the original May 11, 2005 letter to the board of adjustment. This project is not significantly different than other houses in the area, including the development on the Asborn property.
- All of the issues contained in the original Asborn appeal have now been addressed including the placement of story poles, additional site inspection by the ASCC and lowering of ridge height. It is hoped that this will satisfy the neighbors and town so the project can proceed.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Dean Asborn, 265 Canyon Drive**, appreciated the efforts made by the applicant, but referenced his June 10, 2005 letter to the ASCC and argued that a full reevaluation of the design approach was needed with more effort made to conform to the town's design guidelines. He stated that the project was not consistent with other houses in the neighborhood and discussed some of the history of the neighbors' interaction with the applicant.

**Beth Rabuczewski, 4540 Alpine Road**, supported the comments in the letters from Mr. Asborn and Ms. Powell and stressed that in her opinion, conformity with the design

guidelines for projects in the smaller lot areas was more important than on larger lots where there is more area to pursue design options.

**Nancy Powell, 237 Canyon Drive**, also stated appreciation for the efforts made by Mr. Kosling and advised she could "live with" the project as now proposed.

**David Ross, 237 Canyon Drive**, also commented that the project adjustments address a number of the concerns raised through the appeal process. He noted that this was a difficult position for the ASCC to be in and that he also remained concerned with the view impacts on the Asborn property.

ASCC members thanked everyone for their comments and acknowledged the difficulty of dealing with a project where, for the most part, only subjective "value" evaluations had to be made. It was noted that the project met or was well under all of the numerical standards of the zoning ordinance and the key issues really focused on guidelines and subjective findings. Thereafter, ASCC members offered the following individual comments and reactions:

#### **Warr**

- This is a tough situation and the adjustments agreed to by the applicant have improved the manner in which the house will fit the site and general conditions in the area. The basic approach to the addition is still supported and the design changes by the applicant are greatly appreciated.
- The design approach is consistent with neighborhood conditions, but it is recognized that there will be impacts on views from the neighbors' properties. The addition of landscaping will help, but there will be some loss of view from particularly the Asborn property.
- The findings for allowing 94% of the floor area in the main house have been again carefully considered. In this case, 94% means the house would be 295 sf over the 85% base limit. As noted in January, adjustments to reduce the project to conform to the 85% limit would not eliminate the two-story addition at the rear of the existing house. It would likely pull it back toward the existing house, but by no more than about eight (8) feet. The proposed two-story height would still be there, as would the impact on the views of the neighbors. More importantly, it is likely that a 295 sf, detached structure would also be placed in the rear yard area having more impact than the current design with respect to visual relationships with adjoining properties.

Options for placement of the addition in front of the existing house might be considered but these are limited by the location of existing significant trees. Removal of these trees would have a significant impact on views to the property from the street and also on the quality of the parcel's front yard area.

Looking at other adjustments to conform to the 85% limit, it is likely that more basement area and more grading would be considered. This would impact the site, and possibly the existing trees near the addition area.

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that a different design approach would not ensure less potential for impact, and it is possible there would be more impacts, even if the 85% limit were adhered to. Therefore, the findings to allow concentration of floor area as proposed, are still supported.

- Even though the project is still supported, one additional adjustment should be considered. Specifically, the new ridgeline should be adjusted to be no higher than the existing north-south trending cross ridge. This would mean one additional foot of lowering below that now proposed by the applicant. This could be achieved by cutting the project further into the site and some additional adjustment to the roof pitch and possibly further lowering of the plate heights.

**Breen:**

- Concur with Warr's comments on the matter of concentration of floor area and greatly appreciate the efforts made by the applicant to address the neighbors concerns.
- In this small lot neighborhood, it can't be expected that reasonable house additions will have "no impact" on views from neighboring parcels.
- The only issue previously was the height of the roof ridge and the adjustments now committed to by the applicant resolve this issue.

**Schilling:**

- Appreciate the efforts of the applicant and concur with the comments offered by Warr.
- This comes down to a matter of property rights and it is clear that there is no perfect answer for everyone.
- Concur with Warr that consideration should be given to one additional foot of lowering, i.e., to the height of the exiting cross ridge.

**Gelpi:**

- Was not involved in original January ASCC review and action, but did participate in the May 9 site meeting. The design approach is reasonable and the adjustments made by the applicant are appreciated.
- Can support the proposed concentration of 94% of the floor area and believe a "detached" solution adhering to the 85% limit is not the right way to go for the property.
- Can support the current plans and do not see the need for further lowering of the proposed ridge height.

**Chase:**

- Concur with most of the comments of other ASCC members and appreciate the efforts to modify the plans to respond to the concerns of the neighbors.
- Support the concentration of floor area for the reasons stated by others and particularly as articulated by Warr.

- Don't support further plan adjustments, as they would unreasonably compromise the function of the house. This would put a burden on applicant and result in a house addition program that is not consistent with conditions in the neighborhood, especially if it forced development of desired living area in a detached structure on the rear of the property.
- The reality is that it is highly likely there will be more additions like this in the neighborhood and this is the case because of the smaller lot sizes, slopes, tree cover, and pattern of existing improvements.
- Don't support the suggestion for lowering by one additional foot. This would create a step in the ridgeline, impact the architectural harmony of the overall design, and result in a design that appears to be more of an "add-on."

After the sharing of individual comments, in order to move the project ahead, Gelpi suggested a tentative motion to approve the project as proposed by the applicant. Thereafter, debate followed on the need for one additional foot of lowering of the new ridge height (i.e., to the height of the "cross ridge" rather than to the gable over the main entry). After discussion, it was agreed that the plans could be supported as currently proposed by the applicant, i.e., without further lowering.

After discussion, Gelpi finalized his motion to approve the project as proposed, and the motion was seconded by Schilling and passed 5-0 subject to the following conditions to be met, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The approved plans and materials consist of the following, including required clarifications or modifications that shall be made to the satisfaction of planning staff:
  - a. The plans prepared by architect, Tobin Dougherty and revised through 3/29/05, as further modified by commitments listed in the May 11, 2005 letter to the planning commission and the ridgeline adjustment described in the letter from the project architect received at the June 13, 2005 ASCC meeting and incorrectly dated May 11, 2005.
  - b. All new exterior finishes and roofing will match existing conditions and the building permit plans shall clearly define such materials and finishes.
  - c. The railing to be used on the new deck areas will match the wood post and wood rail design of the existing deck railings on the site and will not be post and cabling as suggested by the details on the project plans. The plans shall be revised to show the correct rail design.
2. Detailed construction access and tree/vegetation protection plans shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plans shall include the recommendations of an arborist to ensure protection of the large oak on the south side of the addition site. The protection efforts shall include, but not be limited to, a well-defined construction access pathway, including chain link fencing with metal posts, and protective boards banded to the oak tree.



3. A detailed construction staging plan, including provisions for parking of construction vehicles, shall be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The staging plan shall include provisions for posting a sign on the site reminding construction operators of the town's limitations on construction days and hours.
4. A final, detailed landscaping plan shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall provide for screen landscaping between the proposed addition and neighboring properties. Prior to the time the plan is presented to the designated ASCC member for approval, the plan shall be shared with neighbors to receive input and any input received shall be included with the landscape plan submittal.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Chase and Warr temporarily removed themselves from the ASCC. Chase noted she owned property within 500 feet of the Priory and could not act on requests associated with it, but could comment as a potentially affected property owner. Warr noted that his architectural firm was providing services to the Priory and, therefore, could not participate in ASCC reviews of Priory applications.*

---

**Review of fencing plans for conformity with provisions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30, Woodside Priory School Revised Master Plan, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this request for ASCC approval of the proposed Georgia Lane fencing plan dated May 19, 2005 prepared by Waterman & Sun. Vlasic explained that the plan has been submitted to partially satisfy the requirements of Woodside Priory Conditional Use Permit Amendment Mitigation Measure LU-1 as approved by the planning commission on February 22, 2005 and that the planning commission will also need to review and approve the fencing plan. He noted that in addition to the plan, the current submittal includes a letter from Bob Waterman received 5/19/05 describing signing that is to be included with the new fencing and a copy of the proposed design for the 11" x 17" sign.

Tim Molak, Priory Headmaster and Bob Waterman, presented the proposal to the ASCC. It was noted that taping had been installed to show the proposed fence alignment. The following clarifications were also provided:

- The Priory is willing to adjust the fence alignment, as recommended in the staff report, to pull it more into the existing trees and to also pull it away from the trail at the southwest corner of Kalman field.
- The number of proposed signs can also be reduced as recommended in the staff report.

Molak stressed the Priory's willingness to make any adjustments desired by the town within the limits of the conditions of the use permit.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Laura Chase, owner of property at 281 Georgia Lane**, recommended that there be no more than two to three signs and that the signs should be no bigger than the minimum needed to alert people to the parking provisions associated with community field use.

**Leah Zaffaroni, 175 Georgia Lane**, supported the staff recommendation to pull the fencing into the trees and stressed that the fence should be aligned to have minimum visibility.

**Michael Reich, 205 Georgia Lane**, also supported the staff recommendations to locate the fence within the existing vegetation and minimize its visibility. He encouraged removal of the existing barbwire fencing and fewer and smaller sized signs.

Waterman advised that the Priory is willing to remove the existing fencing and pull the new fencing into the trees and other existing vegetation.

ASCC members briefly discussed the proposal and thereafter, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 to recommend planning commission approval of the proposed fencing and signage plans subject to the following conditions:

1. The fence alignment shall be "pulled" into the existing trees and vegetation for it's full length from the east end of the redwood tree grove to the west end of the property, i.e., at the point where Georgia Lane changes to the common driveway. Further, the existing barbwire fencing the area of the new fencing shall be removed.
2. The fence alignment shall be pulled further into the site in the area of the existing opening at the left field corner of Kalman field, i.e., to provide for more space for the exiting trail.
3. The proposed sign shall be reduced to 8.5 inches by 11 inches and no more than a maximum of two signs shall be used. One sign shall be located at the corner, near where Georgia Lane changes to the common driveway and the other shall be at the west end of the 165 foot mark shown on the fence plan.

---

*Following completion of the above Priory review, Chase and Warr returned to their ASCC positions.*

---

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Breen temporarily removed herself from the ASCC, explaining that she had provided landscape design services to the applicant.*

---

**Request for Modifications of Previous Approval -- Architectural Review for house reconstruction and additions, and garage replacement, 10 Kiowa Court, Turner**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this request for approval of plans for replacement of the existing detached garage on the subject 1.1 acre Arrowhead Meadows

subdivision site. He reviewed the background relative to other, recent approvals by the ASCC for site improvements and the following garage replacement plans prepared by ADL Design:

- Sheet A-1, Site Plan, Project Data, 4/25/05
- Sheet A-1, Garage and Pool Room, 5/1/05
- Sheet A-3, Elec/Mech/Plumb Plan, 5/1/05

Vlasic clarified that the submittal documents state that all exterior materials and finishes associated with the garage project would match those approved for other site improvements by the ASCC at the January 10, 2005 ASCC meeting.

Mr. Turner presented his proposal to the ASCC and clarified that in addition to the lighting shown on the proposed plans there would be two recessed lights within the proposed breezeway connection to the main house and that the utility closet would not have exterior access doors as it would have internal access.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 4-0, approval of the plans as presented and clarified, subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit for the replacement garage:

1. A plan for protection from construction impacts of all existing plantings along western property line shall be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney to ensure against conversion of the proposed detached structure into a guesthouse larger than 750 sf.
3. A final, complete lighting plan for the garage and breezeway addition shall be prepared to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

-----  
*Following completion of the above Turner review, Breen returned to her ASCC position.*  
-----

**Architectural Review for detached accessory structure/Art Studio & Site Development Permit X9H-537, 140 Degas Road, Seltzer**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this proposal for a construction of a detached, 1,435 sf art studio on the subject 3.3 acre Westridge Subdivision property. He reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the proposal (see above site meeting minutes which include a complete listing of the proposed plans and materials). Vlasic also discussed the reports received from various staff and committee members on the site development permit for the proposed 240 cubic yards of grading to cut the structure into the hillside location.

Adele Seltzer and Heather Campbell presented the plans to the ASCC and reaffirmed the clarifications offered at the afternoon site meeting.

Public comments were requested. **Beverly Lipman, representing the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)** reviewed the comments in the committee's June 6 approval letter and also acknowledged that the project architect had provided the committee with copies of the colored elevations shared with the ASCC at the site meeting. She advised that the WASC would reconsider its comments relative to the "cranberry" trim color based on ASCC comments and the colored elevations.

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the project as proposed and clarified subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, prior to the issuance of a building permit or the actual start of grading to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member:

1. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of town attorney stating that the art studio structure can only be used in conformity with the zoning ordinance and, in particular, shall not be converted to a second unit that would be inconsistent with the zoning provisions of the town.
2. The exterior lighting plan shall be modified to place the west elevation lights within the canopy and provide only step lights at the exterior stairs at the northwest corner of the proposed structure. Light fixture cut sheets shall be provided for all proposed lights and light switching patterns identified. In addition, the lighting plan shall be revised to clearly specify that the fixture to be used at the rear entry door shall only direct light downward.
3. A complete construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided and once approved shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
4. The grading plan shall be revised to modify the design of the retaining wall proposed at the northwest corner of the parking area to protect the adjacent oak, i.e., as recommended in the staff report.
5. The landscape plan shall be revised to state that the existing pampas grass located on the north side of the proposed structure shall be eliminated.
6. The proposed "cranberry" trim color is deemed acceptable as an accent color for the proposed structure. If, however, an alternative color is proposed to address the concerns of the WASC, the color change shall be identified with the building permit submittal.
7. The landscape plan shall be revised to select a native vine for use on the proposed steel rod cross bracing features. California Grape, specifically Rogers Red Grape, is the recommended vine.
8. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for the additional screening, generally as suggested in the June 6, 2005 WASC approval letter. Care, however, shall be exercised in the selection of plants so as to provide for some screening but not to eliminate the significant views from the west side of the art studio site. Further, it is recommended that the plan be revised to provide one Black Oak and a few native shrubs (e.g., Toyon) along the southeast slope instead of the currently planned Big Leaf Maples.

9. The requirements set forth in the following site development permit review documents shall be adhered to:

Town Geologist, June 7, 2005 report/approval conditions  
Public Works Director, May 5, 2005 report/approval conditions  
Fire Marshal, May 18, 2005 letter/approval conditions

**Architectural Review of plans for conformity with Conditional Use Permit X7D-156, Jelich Ranch -- rebuilding of garage, remodeling of apple barn, fence and gate Additions, 683 Portola Road, Phil and Cindie White**

Vlasic presented the June 9, 2005 staff report on this request for approval of plans for garage, barn, fencing and gate improvements, for conformity to provisions of conditional use permit X7D-156 as amendment by the planning commission on May 4, 2005. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated May 25, 2005, and prepared by Walker Warner Architects:

Sheet A1.1, Site Plan (enclosed)  
Sheet AB 2.1, Barn Floor Plans (enclosed)  
Sheet AB 3.1, Barn Building Elevations (enclosed)  
Fence and Gate Plan (two 8.5 inch by 11 inch sheets, attached)  
Exterior Light Fixture Cut Sheets F1, F3 and F4, received 5/27/05 (attached)

Vlasic advised that the light fixture sheets are the same as those found generally acceptable for the project during a March review of the proposal. He pointed out, however, the concerns set forth in the staff report relative to lighting plan conformity to previous ASCC approval conditions and also discussed concerns with the proposed main entry gate plan.

Greg Warner, project architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- It is acknowledged that the lighting plan needs to be adjusted to conform to previous ASCC conditions. This was missed in preparation of the current plans.
- In response to a question, it was stated that proposed fixture F1, could be in either the "Green" or "Brown" patina finishes instead of the proposed "Polished Nickel" finish.
- A revised main entry gate plan (two 8.5 inch by 11 inch sheets dated June 13, 2005) was presented to the ASCC. It was noted that this plan responds to the key concern stated in the staff report regarding gate design. In response to a question, it was noted that the gate design, including needed "call box," could be modified to ensure that the gate, call box and associated new fencing did not exceed the four foot height limits for such features when located in the required 50 foot front yard setback area.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members then discussed options for the front yard gate that would be variations of the design with the gate located at least 25 feet into the property, i.e., as shown on Sheet

A1.1, dated 5/25/05. After discussion, it was agreed that the June 13, 2005 revised plan was preferred as long as all new improvements adhered to the four-foot height limit.

After discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 5-0, approval of the plans as submitted subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The lighting plan shall be revised to conform to the conditions of the March 14, 2005 ASCC approval. Further, the plan shall be modified to specify either the "Green" or "Brown" patina finishes for fixture F1.
2. The plans shall be revised to show the main entry gate design as being the plan dated June 13, 2005, provided by Walker Warner Architects with the stipulation that gate, "call box" and associated new fencing shall not exceed four feet in height. Further, all new improvements, including the "call box" shall be located on the project property and not in the public right of way.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Gelpi moved, seconded by Warr and passed 4-0-1 (Breen) approval of the May 23, 2005 meeting minutes as drafted.

### **June 27 Meeting Attendance**

Chase and Warr advised that they would not be in attendance at the June 27 regular ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

T. Vlastic