

Chair Chase called the special field meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. at 300 Alamos Road.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Schilling  
Absent: Gelpi, Warr  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

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

Jim Christensen, applicant  
Karen Douglas, project designer  
Beverly Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

**Continued consideration -- Architectural Review for detached guest house accessory structure, 300 Alamos Road, Christensen**

Vlastic presented the November 16, 2006 staff report on the project. He explained that at an October 23, 2006 site meeting the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the proposal and offered a number of comments with respect to issues of concern and the need for plan clarifications and revisions. Vlastic then reviewed the following revised plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 11/7/06, and prepared by the Douglass Company to address the concerns identified at the 10/23 meeting:

Sheet A-1, Project Data  
Sheet A-2, Site Plan/Landscape Screening Plan  
Sheet A-3, Floor Plans  
Sheet A-4, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet C-01, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan and Notes, Clifford Bechtel  
and Associates, 11/8/06  
Exterior colors and materials samples board, received 11/10/06  
Hinkley pathway light fixture cut sheet, received 11/10/06  
Hinkley wall mount light fixture cut sheet, received 11/10/06  
Sustainable Buildings Checklist, 300 Alamos Road, received 11/10/06

Vlastic noted that the revised plans call for a total of 760 cubic yards of earthwork, to be a balanced cut and fill operation, and that since the volume of grading exceeds 100 cubic yards, a site development permit is needed and the ASCC is the approving authority for this permit. He clarified that this permit has yet to be filed and that the applicants are waiting to obtain ASCC and Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) reaction to the revised plans before filing the needed permit.

ASCC members considered the staff report and story poles and taping installed to demonstrate the potential visual conditions associated with the revised proposal. It was noted that the staking and story poles were not fully consistent with the site plan or proposed engineered grading plan. The applicant clarified that the proposed positioning of

the story poles did represent the desired location and that the site and engineered grading plan would be revised with the site development permit application to correctly identify the desired location.

ASCC members walked the site, considered issues in the staff report and views from the property to the southeast. Following discussion, Schilling moved seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the design concepts shown on the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC with the required site development permit application:

1. The site and engineered grading plans shall be corrected as necessary to consistently show the location of the proposed improvements, i.e., as staked and modeled with story poles at the site on 11/20/06.
2. The plans shall fully define all proposed materials and finishes consistent with the colors and materials board received 11/10/06. In particular, the deck and exterior stair railing shall be dark stained wood, similar to the proposed finish for the deck surfaces.
3. The plans shall be revised for the retaining wall that is to retain the cut to create the pad for the new structure. The revised design shall provide for a stepped wall system (i.e., as recommended in the staff report) to avoid a single wall as high as six feet.
4. The required site development permit shall have been approved by the ASCC prior to release of any building permits for the project.
5. The location of the proposed drainage outfalls shall be reviewed by a professional arborist and as necessary relocated to ensure that water is directed away from the oaks and not concentrated around the drip lines of the trees.
6. The plans shall be clarified to state that the maximum ceiling height of the basement level shall not exceed 7.5 feet. (The project designer advised that this is actually the maximum proposed height for the basement level.)
7. Complete impervious surface area calculations shall be provided with the building permit application to the satisfaction of planning staff.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a deed restriction shall be recorded for the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney, to ensure against conversion of the second unit to a guest house larger than 750 sf, or other use of the structure inconsistent with town zoning regulations.
9. The plans shall be revised to clarify location of all proposed wall mounted and pathway lights. Further, the proposed wall mounted fixtures for the east elevation shall be replaced with a shielded fixture that only directs light down. All fixtures shall be located in conformity with the zoning ordinance provisions for lighting of second units.
10. The proposed plan for planting shall be revised to add at least one larger sized new oak (i.e., 24 inch box size or larger) in the mound area to the southwest of the guest house site as recommended in the staff report. Further, the plan shall provide that the number

of plants and scope of planting shall be generally as shown on the plans, but that actual placement and number of plants shall be field determined after the guest house and deck are framed. The plan shall also state that the field placement of the plantings shall be done to ensure privacy between the guest house and improvements on the neighboring parcel to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member and planning staff. Once the revised planting plan has been approved, the planting shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

At approximately 4:00 p.m. the Christensen site meeting was concluded. Chase advised that the special field meeting would continue at 20 Zapata Way as soon as ASCC members could convene at the site.

**Continued Preliminary Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-553, for new residence, swimming pool and other accessory structures and improvements, 170 Mapache Drive, Holland/Yates**

At approximately 4:10 p.m., ASCC members Chase, Breen and Schilling convened at 20 Zapata Way. Also in attendance were deputy town planner Vlastic and the following individuals

Annette and David Jorgensen, owners of 20 Zapata Way  
Linda Yates, applicant  
Bob Glazier, project architect  
Mohit Bhargava, project architect  
Tom Klope, project landscape architect  
Beverly Lipman, WASC

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the November 16, 2006 staff report on this matter and noted that the purpose of the field meeting at the Jorgensen property was to consider their concerns with the subject proposal as shared at the November 13, 2006 ASCC meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Jorgensen thanked ASCC members for agreeing to visit their property and view the Holland/Yates project story poles from their house and outside activity areas, including the pool terrace. They led all present on an inspection of views and shared their concerns over views to the new structures and, particularly the proposed metal roofing.

Linda Yates and project design team members noted that alternative roof materials, with less potential for reflection, were being considered and that these would be shared at the December 11 ASCC meeting. It was also stressed that the landscaping plan was being adjusted to provide for early planting of landscape screen materials as committed to at the 11/13 ASCC meeting.

During the course of the site walk, Tom Klope noted that he would provide more details as to the screen planting on a revised planting plan and define the growth characteristics, as well as planting specification to ensure proper growth. He clarified that sections would be provided to demonstrate the impacts of planting to achieve necessary screening between parcels while not blocking distant views from the Jorgensen property.

Linda Yates advised that she would share the revised plans with the Jorgensens prior to submitting them to the ASCC. She also noted her hope that the planting would screen views from her property to the pool equipment facility on the Jorgensen property.

Mrs. Jorgensen stated that she had been informed "by a friend" that some "green" projects include "noisy" pumps and that she wondered if the Holland/Yates project would have any such special, but "noisy" mechanical equipment. Project design team members expressed surprise with this comment. They noted that all equipment currently being considered for the project was fairly conventional and did not generate what might be considered unusual noise for a low-density residential area.

ASCC members asked that in the materials provided for the next ASCC meeting, all proposed pumps, etc. currently anticipated for the project be identified, including information regarding any potentially unusual noise characteristics.

At approximately 4:50 p.m., the Jorgensen site visit was concluded and review of the Holland/Yates project continued to the December 11, 2006 regular ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The special field meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:52 p.m.

T. Vlastic