

Vice Chair Schilling called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Gelpi, Schilling, Warr
Absent: Chase, Breen
Town Council Liaison: Merk
Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Continued Review for conformity with Conditions of Use Permit X7D-13, Building Permit Plans for new fitness building and other required use permit plan revisions, 4139 Alpine Road, Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club

Schilling referenced the comments in the May 18, 2006 staff report on the status of this request. He advised that ASCC review would be continued to an unspecified date, but with the understanding that a new notice would be circulated as to the date when the revised, proposed master lighting plan and other use permit compliance documents are actually ready for ASCC consideration.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter, project review was continued as recommended in the staff report.

Continued consideration of Architectural Review for New Residence and Site Development Permit X9H-551, 10 Mapache Court, Bennett-Malloy

Vlastic presented the May 18, 2006 staff report on this request. He explained that on May 8, 2006 the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this proposal with the planning commission. He further explained that at the conclusion of the May 8 review, ASCC members found the project generally acceptable as proposed, but offered comments and directions for some plan adjustments. Vlastic then reviewed the following revised project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated May 15, 2006 and prepared by Jon Sather Erlandson, Architect to address the concerns identified at the May 8 meeting:

- Sheet G1.1, Cover Sheet, 4/23/06
- Sheet G--2.1, Existing Site Plan, 2/22/06
- Sheet C-1.1, Site Plan, 4/23/06
- Sheet G-3.1, Lighting Plan
- Sheet A-2.1, Basement Floor Plan, 5/1/06
- Sheet A-2.2, Main Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A-3.1, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-6.1, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A-6.2, Exterior Elevations
Sheet L-1.1, Schematic Planting Plan. 3/14/06
Materials and Colors sheet received May 16, 2006

Civil Engineering Drawings, Luzuriaga Taylor, Inc.
Sheet C0.0, Civil Engineering Notes and Legends, 5/15/06
Sheet C1.1, Grading Plan, 5/15/06
Sheet C2.1, Utility Plan, 5/15/06

Vlasic noted that the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) had also reviewed the revised plans and that the committee provided a May 17, 2006 letter to the applicant stating project approval.

Kathleen Bennett and Tom Malloy, applicants, and project architect Jon Sather Erlandson presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications in addition to those set forth in the staff report:

- The height of the dining porch extension was lowered by reducing the plate height. This preserves the desired views from within the house, but also lowers the height in terms of views from Mapache Drive. Further, the wooded backdrop and green roof color will ensure that the upper portions of the dining porch elevation blend into the site.
- It is hoped that an arborist report can be completed prior to presenting the site development permit application to the planning commission for action. At the same time, the applicants are committed to ensure the site trees are protected and will be engaging the services of an arborist as soon as possible.
- In response to a question, it was stated that the hope is to make use of native stone from the site for the proposed stone walls, but that some stone may need to be imported to supplement site materials. It was stressed that any supplemental stone would be selected to match the site materials to the maximum extent feasible.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the revised plans and materials and found them responsive to the concerns identified at the May 8 meeting. Members identified a few remaining concerns, largely as discussed in the staff report. Following discussion, Warr moved seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0, to make findings in support of the proposed concentration of floor area, as evaluated in the staff report, and approve the project subject to the following conditions:

1. An arborist shall be engaged to review the plans and develop measures for tree protection and to ensure long-term tree health. This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to actual issuance of the site development permit. Once a tree/vegetation protection plan has been developed and approved, it shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

2. The revised Materials and Colors sheet received May 16, 2006 is accepted as the concept framework for exterior materials and finishes. However, prior to installation, a mock-up of the materials and finishes shall be provided at the site and this shall be subject to review and approval by the ASCC. In addition to the colors and materials for the house, at the time of the "mock-up" site review by the ASCC, samples of proposed driveway concrete with a gray color agent to reduce concrete reflectivity shall be provided for ASCC review and approval.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit the plans shall be revised to eliminate any reference to a driveway entry gate and/or associated fencing. This shall be completed to the satisfaction of planning staff.
4. The driveway concrete surface at the location of the trail easement shall be scored in anticipation of future trail use to the satisfaction of the public works director. The plans shall be modified prior to issuance of the building permit to identify where the scoring is to occur.
5. The proposed landscape plan shall be revised to show the retaining wall below the dining porch area consistent with the wall alignment shown on the architectural site plan and the grading plan. Further, the plan shall be modified to include additional planting of native shrubs below the wall to help screen views to the wall from Mapache Drive. The provisions of this condition shall be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of the building permit.
6. The landscape and architectural site plans shall be revised prior to issuance of the building permit to be consistent with the grading plans relative to the final driveway alignment (i.e., to reflect the changes made to conform to the 20% maximum grade). These revisions shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff.
7. A construction staging shall be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of the building permit. The plan shall include a description of the anticipated construction schedule with identification of projected dates for key construction milestones (e.g., demolition, completion of rough grading, foundation completion, framing, etc.).
8. The exterior lighting plan shall be modified and clarified to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of the building permit as follows:
 - a. Switching patterns for all exterior house and yard lighting shall be specified.
 - b. The number of lights at the house front door entry shall be reduced to ensure that there is not a glow of light around the entry area.
 - c. The details for mounting of the fixtures to be within the beam and trellis area shall be clarified to ensure that the fixtures will direct light down and not out.

ASCC members also recommended planning commission approval of the site development permit subject to the above conditions of architectural approval.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for new residence and detached accessory guest house and Site Development Permit X9H-544, 25 Possum Lane, Axe

Vlasic presented the May 18, 2006 staff report on this follow-up review request. He explained that on November 28, 2005 the ASCC conditionally approved plans for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.1 acre Possum Lane property. He then reviewed the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted dated May 2, 2006, submitted to address the seven conditions of ASCC approval:

Architectural Drawings, Thayer Hopkins Architect

Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet

Sheet A2.0, Main House Floor Plan

Sheet A2.1, Main House Roof Plans

Sheet A2.2, Secondary Unit Plans and Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.0, Main House Exterior Elevations

Revised colors and materials board received May 9, 2006

Landscape Drawings, Cottong & Taniguchi

Sheet LL-0, Cover Sheet

Sheet LL-1, Impervious Surface & Lawn Calculations

Sheet LL-2, Layout Plan

Sheet LL-3, Construction Staging Plan

Sheet LL-4, Images & Materials

Sheet LP-1, Planting Plan

Sheet LP-2, Planting Details

Sheet LP-3, Tree Protection Plan

Sheet LI-1, Irrigation Plan & Details

Sheet LI-2, Irrigation Details

Sheet LD-1, Elevations & Enlarged Plans

Sheet LD-2, Elevations

Sheet LD-3, Landscape Construction Details

Sheet LD-4, Landscape Construction Details

Sheet C-2.2, Grading and Drainage Plan (Phase II), Lea & Sung Engineering, Inc.
3/22/06

Sheet LT-1, Schematic Landscape Lighting Plan (including fixture cut sheets)

Thayer Hopkins, project architect, and Brent Cottong, project landscape architect, were present to discuss the revised plans with the ASCC. Mr. Hopkins advised that the applicants had to leave town unexpectedly and wanted him to apologize for them for their inability to be at the meeting. Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cottong offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The proposed stucco siding color is close to the desired color, but it is recognized that it is slightly more reflective than the town's 40% light reflectivity value (LRV) policy limit. The plan is to mock-up a stucco sample, including the proposed texture, at the site prior to application of the final "integrated color" stucco coat to ensure it is the correct color and texture for the site conditions and works well with the other proposed exterior materials and finishes. It is anticipated that the proposed color with a "pitted" texture would actually appear darker than the sample "color chip."

- The landscape plan symbols not identified in the legend were discussed and the materials were explained in terms of their conformity to the concept landscape plan approved in the November of 2005. It was noted that the plan would be revised to have a complete legend.
- The rear yard fencing shown on the plans is the desired fencing. The applicants do not desire to move the fence to the property line. It was noted, however, that the fence on the plans is slightly upslope from the guest house.
- The light fixtures to be used on the walls are the wedge shaped "Shaper" fixtures originally proposed for use on the house.
- Originally, a large trellis with lighting was proposed around the pool/guest house. The current plans don't include this trellis and for this reason more lighting was added to the pool house.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the follow-up submittal and, for the most part, concluded it adequately addressed the approval conditions. Members also indicated that the proposed stucco color would likely work well on the site due to the relatively dark site conditions. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0 to approve the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plant list on the landscape plan shall be revised to identify all proposed plant materials.
2. The revised materials and colors board received May 9, 2006 is accepted as the concept framework for exterior materials and finishes. However, prior to installation, a mock-up of the stucco siding color and texture shall be provided at the site and this shall be subject to review and approval by a designated ASCC member.
3. One of the two light fixtures proposed at the double doors on the north elevation of the guest house shall be eliminated from the plans.

Review of Building Permit Plans for Performing Arts Center and other proposed site improvements and modifications for conformity with provisions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30, Woodside Priory School Revised Master Plan, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School

Schilling referenced the May 18, 2006 staff report on this matter and advised that while this matter was noticed for consideration at the May 22, 2006 meeting, it must be continued to the June 12, 2006 meeting, due to a quorum problem.

Architectural Review for new residence and accessory structure and Variance X7E-130 for guest unit replacement, 163 Brookside Drive, Cocco

Schilling referenced the May 18, 2006 staff report on this request and advised that due to a quorum problem, project review must be continued to the June 12 meeting. It was noted that the June 12 review is tentatively scheduled to start with a 4:00 p.m. afternoon site meeting.

Site Development Permit X9H-552, 4115 Alpine Road, Cianfichi

Schilling also referenced the May 18, 2006 staff report on the request, noted that staff and committee review of the proposal is still ongoing and, therefore, staff has recommended that ASCC review be continued to the June 12 meeting. Public comments were requested. But none were offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the June 12, 2006 ASCC meeting.

Continued Discussion -- ASCC Post Construction Analysis of Residential Projects

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the May 18, 2006 staff report on the status of the subject project and distributed copies of the following draft "summary" of comments and findings from the ASCC's May 15, 2006 site inspections:

1. There appears to be the need to require periodic inspections during project construction, and sign-off for project conformity with project requirements, by the project architect and landscape architect. Essentially, there is a need to keep these professionals involved to the extent feasible during the course of project implementation. Perhaps the town should also require "as built" conformity letters from them as is required by geotechnical consultants, engineers, etc. At the same time, there would be the need to provide options for situations where an applicant and the professional(s) may part ways during the course of project work.
2. More attention appears needed relative to review of exterior colors at the site, with more shared ASCC responsibility. It seems that it may be difficult to make the most appropriate color decisions with samples considered under lighting conditions in the Historic School House or even the smaller color samples typically considered at the ASCC site meetings. Perhaps the town should also obtain a light reflectivity value meter to test actual colors at the site.
3. There appears to be the need to provide oversight of the actual process of planting installation to ensure that the sizes specified on plans (e.g., 24 inch box) are actually used. This is needed to avoid conflicts over plantings that appear, upon actual town inspection after installation, too small, but there is no way to check against actual container size.
4. Key landscape screen materials should be installed prior to the framing inspection with vegetation protection also added for the new plantings. This could help ensure at least some screening is in place when the house is ready for final inspections and occupancy.
5. Consideration should be given to setting some policy standards for plate heights to control the apparent bulk and mass of structures. This issue is debated often, but perhaps a more proactive evaluation of plate heights is needed to provide additional policy direction. Use of gable ends may help encourage lower plate heights. Hip forms

may encourage higher plate heights. This should be considered in terms of any design policy or "guidelines" additions or modifications.

6. There appears to be the need to take steps to ensure people understand commitments made with architectural review approvals and that changes can't simply be made after a project is "finalized," particularly exterior lighting or colors changes.
7. Consideration should be given to adding provisions to the design guidelines relative to the use of exterior materials of proper scale and mass. Essentially, the selection of materials should help ensure massing and scale would be in keeping with other houses in the neighborhood.
8. Consideration should be given to adding provisions to the design guidelines regarding the use of landscape soil berms. If soil berms are to be used they should either be close to the improvements they are intended to screen/protect, and/or to cut into the site, or the berm should be more spread out to ensure as natural an appearance as possible.
9. A requirement should be considered calling for a planning staff inspection at the time of the rough electrical inspection to ensure that the number, location, and, as possible, switching patterns for exterior fixtures are consistent with the ASCC approved lighting plans.
10. The data requirements for ASCC architectural review projects should specifically include location for proposed trash and recycling containers and the plans should include screening of such containers from public view corridors.

ASCC members briefly discussed the above comments. Warr stressed that there should be deposits made to ensure planning inspections could be made during the course of project construction. He also noted that utility installations, including those required by the sanitary district, have taken on significant scale and impact the character of front yard setback areas. He stressed that project plans should show all proposed utility installations (i.e., as required by the utility companies) so that potential visual impacts could be considered and mitigated to the extent feasible.

Gelpi commented that he found the post construction project and what has been learned from it a good use of time. He concluded that much has been learned from the review of actual projects that can help make the process better.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the tentative findings noted above, and those set forth in the May 3, 2006 project evaluation report should be reviewed by members prior to the June 12 meeting, with the hope that a final list of findings and "next steps" actions could be acted on at that meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0 approval of the May 8, 2006 meeting minutes as drafted.

Attendance at Upcoming ASCC Meetings

Schilling advised that he would not be able to attend the June 26, or July 10, 2006 meetings.
Warr advised that he would not be at the June 26 meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

T. Vlasic