

Vice chair Schilling called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Schilling, Gelpi

Absent: Chase, Warr

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

**Continued Architectural Review -- proposed residential development of Oak Hills Subdivision parcel and Site Development Permit X9H-548, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Corman**

Vlastic referenced the comments in the February 23, 2006 staff report on this request and noted that the ASCC initiated project review on January 9, 2006 at a preliminary review site meeting, and then continued review, eventually to the February 27 meeting. He explained that the continuances were needed as work on plan revisions were still in process and that this effort has yet to be completed. He further explained that, as a result, staff and the applicant concur that project review should be continued again, this time to the March 13 ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter project review was continued to the March 13 meeting. Vlastic noted that on March 13 the review would start with an afternoon ASCC site meeting.

**Architectural Review for swimming pool addition, 7 Redberry Ridge (Lot 9), Blue Oaks Subdivision, Slanina**

Vlastic presented the February 23, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of a 700 sf of swimming pool within the established building envelope on the subject 2.53 acre Blue Oaks property. He noted that the pool can be installed with minimum grading and vegetation impact and, in fact, the majority of earth movement would be for pool cavity excavation, which is not counted against the grading limits in the site development ordinance. He clarified that in this case, only 25 cubic yards of fill are proposed on site and the remainder of the excavated materials would be "off-hauled" from the property. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following enclosed plans prepared by Lea & Sung Engineering, Inc. and dated 12/21/04:

Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan (Pool Area)

Sheet C-2, Detailed Grading and Drainage Plan (Pool Area)

Sheet C-3, Grading Specifications and Details  
Sheet C-4, Details

In addition to these plans, ASCC members considered two 8.5" x 11" sheets prepared by pool contractor Corby Gould Inc., describing the proposed pool equipment layout and 52 sf pool equipment shed.

Vlasic also advised that pursuant to the Blue Oaks PUD all plans for swimming pools are subject to both ASCC and Blue Oaks homeowners association (HOA) review and approval. He then referenced the January 4, 2005 HOA letter granting approval for the proposed swimming pool plan.

John Ridder, Corby Gould Pool, Inc. stated that the property owner could not be present at the ASCC meeting and then offered the following comments and clarifications on the proposal:

- The details needed to address a number of the issues discussed in the staff report are still being worked out between the pool company, project engineer and property owner. Revised plans, however, for the pool equipment enclosure have been developed and copies of the two sheet, 8"x11", plans were presented. It was noted that the revised plans conform to the pool equipment slab elevation and size shown on the engineer's site plan and that the equipment enclosure would be entered from the west side avoiding problems of elevation differences between the pool and equipment pad levels.
- The pool is to have an automatic pool cover for security and no fencing is proposed with the plans.
- In response to questions, it was noted that the equipment enclosure would have an open top and that the surrounding walls would be either solid board or stucco. It was also noted that a plan for screen planting would be developed.
- Also in response to a question, it was stated that the height of the pool trellis had not yet been finalized with the property owner.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members found the proposed pool location and design generally acceptable, but agreed that a number of details needed to be specified or clarified prior to issuance of a building permit for the project. Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0 approval of the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed with plan revisions prior to issuance of a building permit to, unless otherwise noted, the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member:

1. A landscape plan shall be prepared for the area to the north of the pool trellis and equipment enclosure to screen views from properties to the north. The plan shall include shrubs and other plantings from the approved Blue Oaks PUD plant list. Further, the plan shall contain provisions for reseeded of areas disturbed by construction with the approved Blue Oaks native grass seed mix.

2. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall include provisions for repair of slopes disturbed by construction operations including construction equipment access.
3. The specific wood materials, heights, finishes and other details for the proposed trellis feature shall be specified.
4. The materials and finishes for the retaining wall along the north end of the pool, and for the walls of the pool equipment enclosure shall be specified. Further the color and finish for the concrete deck surface around the pool shall be specified.
5. All proposed exterior lighting shall be specified, including any lighting within the pool, and shall conform to the towns lighting regulations and guidelines as well as those specified in the Blue Oaks PUD statement.
6. The proposed drainage plan shall be revised to the satisfaction of the town's public works director for conformity to the drainage provisions of the Blue Oaks PUD. In particular, the plan shall ensure that pool water drainage shall be to the sanitary sewer system and not to open space areas.

#### **Architectural Review of plans for entry gate additions, 30 Firethorn Way, Okada**

Vlasic presented the February 23, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the installation of four (4) foot high, wrought iron, automatic controlled driveway entry gates on the subject 1.0 acre parcel. He noted that access to the parcel is by way of Firethorn Way, which provides primary access from Los Trancos Road to the subject property and the 10 acre parcel immediately south of Firethorn Way. He explained that the most significant issue with the plan is verifying that the new gates would actually be setback 25 feet from the front property line in conformity with zoning ordinance requirements. ASCC members considered the staff report and the proposed one sheet gate plan set dated 2/1/06, prepared by Wrought Iron Gates, Inc.

Daren Okada and Ken Hill, Wrought Iron Gates, Inc., presented the proposal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The proposed new entry gates would replace previously existing, manually operated, wood and wire gates that are no longer serviceable and were essentially "falling down." In response to a question it was noted that the "existing" gates were roughly between five and six feet tall. (During review of photos taken by the Deputy Town Planner of existing conditions at the proposed site for the gates, an "old" gate panel was identified as being on the ground in the area of the existing guest parking spaces.)
- A topographic survey of the property was presented and the location for the proposed gates identified, i.e., the same location as the previously existing gates. It was noted that the location was at least 25 feet from the edge of the Firethorn Way pavement, but appeared to be near the front property line and not setback 25 feet into the property as required by the zoning ordinance. It was clarified that the survey was not a "boundary

survey" and that a note on it stated it could not be relied upon for precise location of property lines.

- A photo of the proposed black, wrought iron gates was presented and it was clarified that the vertical pickets were relatively thin, i.e., .75 inches, and spaced sufficiently apart, i.e., 4.5 inches on center, that the overall openness would meet the current 50% opacity limit for gates located in the front yard setback area.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter, considerable discussion followed on the precise location of the existing front property line relative to existing site improvements and the proposed location for the gates. It was recognized that while the currently proposed location for the new gates is the same as the location of the previously existing gates, the location did not conform to the zoning ordinance required 25 foot setback. After discussion, Vlastic offered the following clarifications for consideration by the applicant:

- Any new gates, i.e., gates different in design than the previously existing gates, must conform to the 25 ft. setback from the front property line. The previously existing gates could, however, be repaired/replaced with the same design and in essentially the same location as long as the location is within the boundary of the parcel. It was clarified that if the previous gates were within the public Firethorn Way right of way they could be moved back on to the subject property and replaced "in kind" at that location.
- Any new gates, i.e., different design, would need to meet the current zoning limits including the minimum 25 foot setback, maximum four (4) foot height and maximum 50% opacity. Further any mechanical equipment, including the motors and their enclosures for the electrically operated gates, would have to also meet the 25 foot setback and four foot height limits. The gate call box could, however be closer to the street, but would have to also meet the four foot height limit.
- If the new gates are desired and placed to meet the required setbacks, fence extensions, matching the existing post and rail fencing, could be installed from the existing front parcel line fencing to the new gates and this would conform to current zoning ordinance provisions.
- The ASCC does not have the authority to grant an exception to permit "new" gates to be closer than 25 feet to the front property line.

Following consideration of options, it was agreed that in any case a property boundary survey locating the front property line would be needed whether the applicant was to replace the existing gates or install new gates.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0, approval of the following gate requirements and options:

1. A property boundary survey shall be provided to the satisfaction of the public works director that clearly identifies location of the front parcel line in relationship to existing and proposed site improvements.

2. If new gates are desired, the gate plan shall be revised based on the property line survey to accurately show the proposed gates 25 feet back from the front property line. Further, the plan shall detail all gate equipment by location, height, finishes, etc., and the plan shall verify conformity to all current zoning ordinance provisions for gates and associated equipment. Also, the plan shall show the proposed four foot high fence extensions from the existing front yard fence to the new gates. The plans shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member.
3. If the existing, manually operated gates are to be repaired or replaced in kind, the plans shall be revised to show this and shall be based on the design of the existing gate located on site. The replacement gates shall be located within the parcel boundary as verified by the boundary survey. The plan for replacement/repair of the existing gates shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member.
4. There shall be no lighting associated with any new gates or replacement of existing gates.

**Architectural Review of plans for detached accessory garage and guest house structures, 4205 Alpine Road, Raines**

Vlasic referenced the February 23, 2006 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for a construction of two detached accessory structures on the subject 1.18 acre Alpine Road parcel. It was noted that due to rain and wind, the special site meeting scheduled for earlier in the day had to be cancelled and that full project review would be continued to a site meeting to be rescheduled for the afternoon of March 13, 2006.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the March 13 meeting, with the understanding that the review would begin with an afternoon ASCC site meeting.

**ASCC Post Construction Analysis of Residential Projects -- "Start-up" of Study**

Vlasic presented the February 23, 2006 staff report on the subject study. He referred to the scope of work for the study described in the town planner's May 10, 2005 memorandum to the planning commission and the clarifications to the scope made by ASCC members at the 8/8/05 meeting, as recorded in the 8/17/06 memorandum to town administrator Angela Howard. He also discussed the tentative schedule for the project as set forth in the February 23 staff report.

Vlasic explained that review was currently underway as to the specific project examples to be considered and, in line with the tentative schedule, that this list would be presented for ASCC consideration and acceptance at it's March 13 meeting. Vlasic noted that he was attempting to identify projects in various areas and zoning districts of the town, for a broad perspective, and to ensure a wide range of issues and concerns are considered. He also noted that there would likely be a more general review of house and site improvements in the Blue Oaks project. He stressed that the effort was not to specifically identify "good" or "bad" elements of projects, but to gauge the successfulness of accomplishing all of the design review objectives of the town. He added that the process would also allow the opportunity to consider matters such as the impacts of the construction process on neighbors, the need

for additional oversight during the construction process and changes that occur typically after a project has been "signed-off" by the town.

In response to a question, Vlastic noted that in most cases projects with very unusual conditions or circumstances would likely not be included in the tentative list of examples unless it is concluded that what can be learned from them could have broader applications in terms of possible changes to guidelines and/or regulations.

Schilling expressed some concern over the potential for individual criticisms of specific projects by neighbors and how this might influence what should be an objective and broader view effort. Vlastic stressed that any effective design review process like that of the town's is, in large part, subjective and one that will be based on compromise and trade-offs. He stressed the need for clear but flexible guidelines and acknowledged that in certain situations there will be differences of opinions as to appropriate design solutions and that this is just part of the reality of any public design review program. He added, however, that the goal was to ensure that for the most part the basic objectives of the design guidelines are being achieved and to identify if any adjustments or refinements to policies as may be needed to keep the process on course.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Breen moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 3-0 approval of the February 13, 2006 meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

T. Vlastic