

Chair Chase called the special field meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. at 332 Westridge Drive.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Schilling, Gelpi

Absent: Warr

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Manager Lambert,
Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the Westridge LLC project:

Steve Kellond, CJW Architecture, project architect

Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect

Beverly Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

David Strohm, WASC

George Andreini, WASC

Helga and Leo Hoenighausen, 100 Bolivar Lane

Architectural Review for driveways and entry gates, 332 Westridge Drive, Westridge Properties, LLC

Vlastic presented the January 19, 2006 staff report on this request and briefly reviewed the discussion on the project that took place at the January 9, 2006 ASCC meeting. He noted that in setting the special January 23 site meeting, ASCC members agreed that if possible based on field meeting findings, the ASCC could complete action on the project at the meeting. It was also pointed out that the proposal would not be discussed at the evening meeting as that was reserved only for consideration of the town center project.

ASCC members considered the January 19, 2006 staff report and the following gate and fencing improvements plans dated 1/4/06, prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet A-1.1, Site Plan

Sheet A-1.2, Enlarged Site Plan and Details

Also considered were the proposed "Finish Board" dated 10/7/05, and the January 6, 2006 project review letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC).

Steve Kellond, project architect, and Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect presented the proposal and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- As stated at the 1/9 ASCC meeting, Parcels 1 and 2 are under contract for purchase by separate owners and escrow is to close shortly. Both buyers want Westridge Drive addresses. As a result there is no longer any plan to create a separate "private road" or name for the joint driveway access easement.

- It is understood that the plans would be modified to conform to the ASCC reactions provided at the January 9 meeting.
- Possible landscape plans prepared by Mr. Cleaver were presented showing plantings to screen views and vehicle lights from Westridge Drive. The scope of possible planting was explained and it was noted that the disturbed surfaces would also receive a native grass mix, including rye grasses, which would essentially reestablish the existing native grass condition on the property.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

WASC committee members Strohm, Lipman and Andreini discussed the concerns in the January 9, 2006 committee project review letter. They also discussed concerns with trail impacts, drainage, and premature installation of the driveways to Parcels 1 and 3. They asked that the trail be as far from Westridge Drive as possible and offered comments regarding safety of the trail.

Mr. Hoenighausen also stressed the need to keep the trail as far from Westridge Drive as possible.

Thereafter, ASCC member walked the site, inspected trail and driveway alignment conditions, and reviewed potential impacts of grading and driveway construction. It was also concluded that driveway headlight conflict with Westridge Road traffic was not an issue that required a landscape screening response.

Following review of site conditions and discussion of issues and concerns, including interaction with members of the WASC and site neighbors, the following action was taken. Schilling moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0, approval of the proposed plans for driveway and other improvements subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to installation of any of the improvements:

1. The plans shall be revised to eliminate the provisions for establishing a separate street name or any signage associated with such a name. Further, there shall be no signage other than address signs. This may be handled with one sign showing the address numbers and arrows directing the reader to the appropriate parcel or small separate directional parcel number signs for each address.
2. The plans shall be revised to place the alignment of the relocated equestrian trail as far away from Westridge Drive as possible. In particular, the trail shall be aligned between the two live oaks and the driveway to Parcel 1 (i.e., the easterly parcel), and between the native shrubs and driveway to Parcel 3 (i.e., the easterly parcel). The trail relocation shall not take place until the driveways to parcels 1 and 3 are actually installed in conformity with the other conditions of this approval. (The above condition was set with the understanding that some tree trimming will be required on the north side of the two live oaks adjacent to the driveway to Parcel 1.)
3. Except for the area of the trail crossing, all new driveway surfaces shall be asphalt. The trail crossing shall be in gravel or roughened concrete in conformity with town trail

standards. Further, the driveway to Parcel 1 adjacent to the realigned trail shall not include a final seal coat that could result in a slippery surface. (This is to avoid potential concerns with a horse stepping on the driveway because of the close proximity of the equestrian trail.) The same driveway surface provision shall apply to the driveway to Parcel 3 (i.e., the westerly parcel) for the first portion of the driveway that will also be in close proximity to the equestrian trail, i.e., based on the trail alignment adjustments required by preceding condition No.2.

4. The plans shall be revised to show the paving for the driveway to Parcel 1 extending to the base of the Blue Oak that the original plans proposed for removal. This tree shall be preserved for the time being, with the understanding that eventually the driveway improvements may cause the demise of the tree. (This condition was set with the "hope" that the tree would survive, but the appreciation that its removal was anticipated when the subdivision requirements for a common driveway scheme were established.)
5. The plans shall be revised to specify that all disturbed surfaces will be seeded with native grasses, including the rye grass mix presented by the project landscape architect at the ASCC meeting. Otherwise no new landscaping is anticipated or required with this project.
6. The realigned trail shall be completed to town equestrian standards and shall include the drainage improvements required by these standards to ensure the trail along the parcel frontage is protected from impacts of erosion. Final plans for trail improvements shall be provided to the satisfaction of the town public works director and the trail work shall also be completed to his satisfaction, the timing to be in accord with the other conditions of this approval.
7. The plans shall be revised for the driveway gate designs so that the gates are as simple as possible. Specifically, the stone columns shall be eliminated and replaced with wood posts, or wood faced steel posts if such posts are needed for support of the gates. In addition, the wire mesh shall be no smaller than 6"x6" for conformity to current zoning ordinance limitations on horse fencing and gates.
8. The plans for the uphill stone retaining wall along the north side of the driveway to Parcel 1 shall be modified to include random placement of large boulders that mimic the natural stone outcroppings along the driveway alignment. The placement shall provide, as possible, for reducing the wall length to the minimum necessary for driveway installation with the intent that the larger boulder "outcroppings" would interrupt any needed wall segments. Further, the driveway grading and placement of wall stones and boulders shall be completed under the field direction of the project landscape architect and a designated ASCC member.
9. The approved new driveways, fencing and gates shall not be installed until plans for site development and house construction are presented to the town. Gates and fencing, and related driveway improvements and modifications may proceed for Parcel 2 (i.e., the center parcel), as part of the process of new occupancy of the existing residential improvements on this property. A specific plan, however, for such improvements shall be presented to the town for approval that is in general conformity with the provisions

of this action. Once this specific plan is approved, the improvements may be made to the satisfaction of planning staff.

10. There shall be no lighting associated with any of the improvements authorized by this approval.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the special field meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

T. Vlastic

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Schilling, Gelpi, Warr

Absent: None

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 of site, building, landscaping, and other proposed improvement plans, Town Center Project

Vlastic presented the January 19, 2006 staff report and explained that the ASCC initiated the current town center review process at its October 10, 2005 meeting. He briefly reviewed the architectural review efforts completed to date by the ASCC, as discussed in the staff report, including the decisions made at the special 12/5/05 ASCC meeting regarding the architecture for the town center buildings and arrangement of spaces within the building cluster area. He clarified that at "tonight's" meeting, ASCC members had agreed to focus on the proposed town center site plan including the site planning issues discussed at the October 10, 2005 ASCC meeting. He noted, however, that some final design clarifications for the buildings and building cluster area were presented in the January 19, 2006 report from Susi Marzuola, Siegel & Strain Architects, along with discussion of site planning matters, including details for landscaping, lighting, fencing, field and other improvements.

Vlastic also discussed the comments in the January 19 staff report on the matter of opening of a creek channel through the project site. He noted that this was not considered in the certified EIR for the project and, based on previous town council directions, would be more appropriately considered as a separate project.

Vlastic concluded the staff report by noting that it was hoped that at the conclusion of the January 23 meeting, the ASCC could complete its current review of the town center plans and forward final comments and recommendations to the town council. He added, that pursuant to the certified EIR, final building permit level plans would also require ASCC review for conformity with the EIR and the more conceptual design level plans that are finally approved by the town council. He clarified that if the ASCC completes action at this meeting, the town council would likely consider the plans and ASCC recommendations sometime in February, but that a date for such town council consideration had not yet been set.

The following project design team members were in attendance and presented the revised project plans:

Larry Strain, project architect
Jim Goring, project architect
Susi Marzuola, project architect
Ron Lutsko, project landscape architect
Laura Jerrard, project landscape architect
Bill Fee, project landscape architect

The design team members presented the materials transmitted with the January 19, 2006 memorandum from Marzuola including the following documents all dated 1/23/06:

Sheet L0.0, Site Plan
Sheet L1.0, Materials Plan
Sheet L2.0, Plaza Plan
Sheet L4.0, Site Plan with Planting Zones
Sheet L5.0, Site Plan with Irrigation Zones
Sheet L6.0, Elevations
Sheet L7.0, Fence Details
Sheet LA1.0, Landscape Site Plan
Sheet LA1.1, Landscape Site Plan
Sheet A1.01, Plaza Floor Plan
Sheet A1.02, Plaza Roof Plan
Library Elevations
Community Hall Elevations
Town Hall Elevations

Area Information Comparison Table
Community Hall Floor Plan with seating and table layouts
Exterior Lighting Sketch

Design team members presented the revised and updated plans using both the town center site model and a power point presentation. The power point presentation included photo simulations of the revised building cluster and demonstrated the opening of views and spaces within and through the cluster area. It also included details for site landscaping, lighting and fencing and photos to show the character of the proposed building siding and window materials. Samples of proposed "hardscape" materials were available for reference as were samples of the proposed metal roofing, windows, and the redwood siding that would be milled from old redwood olive tanks. During review of the revised plans and materials, and in response to questions, design team members offered the following comments:

- The refined plaza plans include shortening the library building by a few feet to move it further away from the culvert to preserve options for future consideration of opening of a creek channel.

- The plaza plans now include larger spaces within the area, more open views through it, with an improved hierarchical distribution of outdoor spaces, particularly around the community hall and activity room (CH/AR) building.
- Finding the source for the redwood siding has been exciting and this material is viewed as being directly responsive to the objectives recommended by the ASCC at the 12/5 meeting. There is, however, some variation in the grain of the wood samples that have been made available by the supplier and care would need to be exercised in final selection of the actual materials to be used. (The design team is researching other sources for reclaimed siding.)
- The architectural design team feels strongly that the project architecture and building cluster plan have benefited greatly from the ASCC design review efforts. The 1/23 plans include refinements to integrate common design elements in all three of the buildings. They provide for a more "quiet" east facing elevation with gable forms that reflect traditional elements of town architecture. These forms are viewed as being subservient to the natural setting of the site and the backdrop afforded by the western hills. The proposed wood siding will enhance this character.

Views to the town plaza from the driveway turnaround, near the main entries to the library and town hall buildings, experience the more unique and interesting architectural elements of the original DD design. It was noted, however, that the roof heights have been reduced somewhat and otherwise modified in response to concerns over potential view impacts.

The revised plans present a unified and cohesive design approach that is not only responsive to the ASCC directions and public input received during the current ASCC review process, but also consistent with the original design objectives developed through the charrette process. Specifically, these objectives sought to maintain a subservient character to the outside of the building area and more exciting conditions from within the building area and inside the buildings.

- The shape of the CH/AR building is now more rectangular than square and this allows the form and shape of the three buildings to be very similar. Further, with this change, the character of the architectural elevations could be unified and this is reflected in the revised plans. Again, the current plans ensure that the three buildings have a unified character and meet the original, fundamental design objectives of the project.
- The design of the eastern gable end of the CH/AR building needs further development and will continue to be worked on while final building plans are being prepared. Specifically, the eastern gable end of the library has more of an asymmetrical form and is considered as being more successful with the other architectural design elements than is the case with the eastern end of the CH/AR building. Additional work on the CH/AR will proceed with the objective of achieving a similar character to the eastern end of the library building. (Breen and Chase shared this view, while other ASCC members did not.) It was also noted that more work was needed relative to the "daylighting" and ventilation aspects of the CH/AR building, but that the current plan is "close" and seems to be capable of meeting the basic heating and ventilation objectives of the project.

- The lighting plan still includes wood bollard and pole lights. The wood material would match what is proposed for the fencing. The plans at this point do not show the needed wall mounted lighting nor the location for bollard lights that are to be within the town plaza area. This will be added as final building permit plans are developed. Also, all lighting would be controlled by timers with manual overrides to ensure that lights are on only when needed.
- The height of the proposed poles have been reduced to a maximum of 14 feet. This provides for a maximum of .5 foot candle of illumination. The poles have been located at the points where there is high potential for nighttime conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. (As reflected below, ASCC members concluded that a mock up of the lighting proposals would be needed before final recommendations could be made on the appropriate plans for site lighting.)
- The solid fencing proposed between the Church property and the town center is shown with horizontal wood boards. It is more likely, however, that the fence boards would be mounted vertically, especially if vertical wood siding is used on the proposed buildings.
- The plans no longer show the extensive baseball field fencing and the current plan for the backstop is only a tentative design. The plan anticipates that the town would work out the actual, final design and the current proposal is essentially "backstop by owner." This is the case because of the concern that had been expressed over the extent of baseball field fencing shown on the plans considered at the 10/10/05 ASCC meeting and the feeling expressed by many that the scope of the baseball field improvements should be similar to the existing facilities.
- The tennis court chain link fencing would eventually be covered with vines and it is hoped that these relatively fast growing vines would cover the chain link quickly and avoid the need for installation of wind screens. Also, the vines would eliminate the need for a vinyl coating on the chain link that has been suggested to reduce visibility. As pointed out previously, there are environmental issues with the manufacture of the vinyl coating the design team recommends the town not participate in.
- The landscape plans have been developed using the concept set by the town that "less is more." The scope of paving and "hardscape" are considerably less than what now exists at the town center. The plan calls for a more open and green setting. Using the power point images, the landscape plans were explained in detail including the proposed pathway system and pathway and other "hardscape" surfaces. Further, the plant materials concepts and planting zones were explained.
- It was noted that the central pathway would be 12 feet wide and provide for emergency and service access. It was also noted that the proposed concrete surface for this pathway would facilitate user group desires for use by "kids on wheels."
- In response to questions, it was noted that the landscape plan and concepts for use of plant materials had been developed in concert with town design guidelines and to provide for a seamless transition between planting zones and "peaceful" setting. It was stressed that native plants are emphasized, existing significant tree areas protected, and maintained lawn area minimized. It was also stated that low maintenance, drought

tolerant plants are proposed, but that even such materials require maintenance and watering initially to ensure they establish themselves for long-term survival. It was clarified that the plant materials had been selected taking into account potential for impacts by deer.

- In response to a question, the proposed metal roof sample was displayed and discussed. It was noted that the color was a medium warm gray and the sample was placed adjacent to the proposed redwood siding. It was pointed out that the roofing, even with the darker gray color carries and energy star rating
- In response to a question, it was noted that the "bollard light" location references shown on Sheet L2.0 were incorrect and that the proposed lighting locations are correctly shown on Sheet L1.0.
- In response to a questions, it was noted that the current plans do not proposed any significant changes to the scope of paving and walkway improvements in front of the existing school house meeting room building.

At the end of the presentation, Strain, Marzuola, and Goring emphasized that they found the current design for the buildings and building cluster area to be a significant improvement over the plans initially presented to the ASCC. They agreed the plans did not represent a "compromise," but a good solution that locating the "right things in the right places."

Public comments were requested and the following offered. (Note: where clarifications were provided by design team members or others, the clarifying comments are shown in *italics*.)

Bernie Bayuk, 198 Paloma Road, expressed concern over the proposed landscaping plan and suggested it was more formal and organized and less rural than appropriate for the town. He wondered if the plan would result in the feeling of a more urban park like in Palo Alto or Menlo Park. He also expressed concern that the buildings designs were not sufficiently "rural" and wondered about the location of public bathrooms and noise from the air conditioning equipment in terms of "quiet use of the library."

Strain discussed the air conditioning systems and explained that there were relatively small and efficient, much like those used for residences in the town. He added that the plans for location and placement of the equipment had been done in light of potential noise impact considerations. The bathroom locations were also identified as shown on the proposed town center plans.

Eric Eneys, 317 Westridge Drive, shared the concerns expressed by Bayuk and also noted that he was just finding out about the details of the town center plans. He also expressed concern with the approach to architectural design and suggested the buildings should be more like the Sunset Magazine headquarters buildings on Middlefield Road in Menlo Park.

Lindsey Bowan, 195 Portola Road, expressed concern over the safety of the fencing around the open portion of the creek channel near the proposed maintenance yard. He also wondered about the ability to close off the front parking lot or portions of it so that it could

be used, for example, to teach children to ride bikes and for other "kids on wheels" activities. He wondered about the design of the picnic tables and if they would be movable.

Marzuola advised that the tables would be movable, but heavy and not easily transported. She added that the fencing around the creek was to be a deterrent, but if someone really wanted to get to the creek channel, the fencing would not make this" impossible." She clarified that the town would need to make decisions on use of the parking areas for specific activities.

Sally Ann Reiss, 145 Golden Oak Drive wondered about the location of the library information desk and security associated with the access door near the children's story room space. She also wondered about the capacity of the community hall space and the proximity of soccer field fencing to the CH/AR building in terms of safe use of the soccer field.

Strain and Marzuola referred to the library floor plans to show the information desk and noted that the overall design, including location of the access doors was based on significant input and direction from the library staff. They also noted that the CH space would have meeting seating for 210 and could accommodate between 137 and 200 (depending on table size) for a reception type of event. It was noted that even larger groups could be accommodated with expanded outdoor seating on the exterior patios to the west of the CH spaces. With respect to the soccer field fencing, it was noted that the fencing was set back 10 feet from the end of the field striping and that the CH/AR building would be at least 12 feet away from fence, i.e., at least 22 feet away from the field striping.

Yvonne Tryce, 90 Joaquin Road wondered about the lighting proposed outside of the activity rooms.

Marzuola advised that building level lighting plans were still being developed.

Kevin Westbrook, 1255 Westridge Drive, wondered about the effect of vine on the tennis court fencing on player's abilities to see the tennis balls. He also expressed concern with the impact on safety of large oaks in the center of the driveway turnaround, and impacts of having the redwood trees within the fenced children's play yard. He clarified his concern as being the impact on the tree roots. He also wondered about the purpose of the fencing around the maintenance yard.

Strain and Marzuola advised that the oaks in the turnaround should have minimum potential for impacting traffic flow and that the existing children's play yard has been under redwoods without impacting the health of the trees. They stated that the fencing around the maintenance yard was for security and that there would also be one pole light in the maintenance yard on a separate switch for night illumination during emergency needs.

Leah Hamm, 331 Alamos Road, stated that she has been at the previous ASCC town center review meetings and sees the revised plans as a "wonderful job" by the project architects in responding to ASCC and community comments and concerns.

Neal McKinnon, 15 Shoshone Place, stated he was a member of the town's Park and Recreation Committee and that based on review of the following plans he and other committee members have some concerns and comments. In presenting the following, he noted that most would require responses by the town council and not necessarily the ASCC.

- The baseball field fencing should be addressed and resolved in completing action on the plans. The current backstop is inadequate and serious alternatives need to be developed for consideration. The fencing, perhaps, needs to be darker for less visibility and possibly a "temporary" fence should be considered like that planned behind the soccer goals. Such fencing could be raised for temporary protection along the foul lines during games. In any case, the ASCC is asked to look at this matter and hopefully offer a good alternative.
- It is recommended that all three courts be configured for "all sports" play and that this might require a higher fence than the four feet now planned along the eastern side of the courts.

Fee advised that the all sports court surface, now only planned for the western most court, is different from the conventional tennis court surface. He noted that it plays faster and is typically not a surface desired by most players who have been using the existing town courts.

Pierre Fisher, 10 Valley Oak, expressed general support for the site and landscaping plans. He indicated that the tennis courts and all sports court should have the same surface and that should be a surface that is suitable for tennis.

Mark Sutherland, Portola Road, expressed support for the proposed landscape plans, but expressed concern about the addition of new fencing along the Portola Road right of way.

John Lamos, Studio Replica Inc., Petaluma, California, presented samples of an alternative concrete product he manufactures to look like wood siding, and particularly, aged wood. He noted he also can provide wood appearing concrete fence posts. He explained that he had met ASCC member Breen and shared his products and work with her and that she suggested he share it with the full ASCC as well as town center project design team members. He displayed samples that appeared to be old, barn siding and stated they were prepared from molds of actual wood samples of the client's desired wood look. He noted that he could replicate any wood appearance and that his concrete products are finished with a penetrating sealer stain to achieve "any" desired color. He also noted that the material could be made in panels of 35" wide and 165" tall and would be at least 5/8" thick. He added that the material was essentially permanent, is not subject to rot or bug damage and requires little to no maintenance. In response to a question regarding cost, Mr. Lamos advised that it would be based on the project needs and scope. For some perspective, however, he explained that one project that initially intended to use "Hardi-panels," could not get the desired finish and used his product at a cost that was approximately one-third greater than the Hardi-panels.

Vlasic advised that information from Mr. Lamos would be provided with the record of the ASCC meeting to the town council as well as the project architects so that it could be considered as an alternative as part of the budget process. It was noted, however, that the redwood siding remained the first choice if the final budget for the project could support it.

After receiving the presentations and clarifications from the design team as well as public input, ASCC members offered the following comments and reactions:

Schilling:

- Appreciate the efforts made by the design team in developing the most recent revised plans and "really like" the gable ends expressed on the east facing elevations.
- Support the landscaping plans and applied concept that "less is more." The proposed design is an extension of what is already there.
- The final plans should include a "public" mailbox with easy access.
- Alternative designs need to be developed for the backstop fencing.
- It is difficult to judge the current lighting plan. A complete plan with all code required building lighting as well as the bollard lighting planned in the plaza area is needed. Also, a mock up of the pole and bollard lighting should be installed for night testing and evaluation by the ASCC. This would help in appreciating the number of lights needed, and particularly, the appropriateness of the height of the planned mounted pole lights.

Warr:

- The presentation and clarifications offered at the meeting were excellent.
- The building design refinements are good and, in general, the designs for all of the building are supported. The following are, however, noted for additional study and consideration:
 - 1) The CH hall entry seems too narrow. It should be expanded and in such a way that the outdoor spaces on the west side of the CH are better defined.
 - 2) Still wonder about the appropriateness of the use of the sunscreens on the north facing elevations of the CH and town hall buildings. On these elevations, the screens are not needed for sun control and seem to add unnecessary expense for both installation and long-term maintenance.
- The landscaping proposals are good and the strategy for the landscape zones is, in particular, supported. The town should look forward to having "nametags" for the plants and zone areas, with some discussion of them, and the "micro-climates" they are suited to (e.g., sun v. shade, moist v. dry, acceptable adjacent to building, etc.). This is in line with the desire for demonstration gardens and plantings at the town center and such an approach would be very beneficial to the ASCC in its application review process. There could be "real world" examples that the ASCC would direct applicants to of the types of landscape solutions that would be appropriate for their projects.
- Don't support the fence proposed along Portola Road. It is not an appropriate solution along the road right of way. If the fence must be included in the project, it should be as close to the trail as possible.
- Support a vertical wood fence on the solid wall at the maintenance yard. This should match the vertical siding now proposed for use on the buildings.

- The central pathway should not be surfaced with concrete. It should have the character of a country lane, with a "soft" gravel shoulder. The "edge" should be like the asphalt drive adjacent to Spring Down Farm. Perhaps an asphalt surface with gravel shoulders should be considered. A more formal concrete surface is not appropriate for the site.
- Support the location and general concepts for the site furniture. The materials should be heavy and rural in character and not easily moved.
- There needs to be more design attention to the "patio" area in front of the existing school house meeting room. This is an important gathering spot before, during and after meetings. There should be space, seats, etc., for people to meet and interact.
- There is no need for pole lights at the driveway entry points and a mock up of the pole lighting is particularly needed for ASCC nighttime consideration. Agree with Schillings comments on lighting.
- It is suggested that the baseball field include some permanent and some temporary fencing along the foul lines to achieve the safety for baseball use desired by the Park and Recreation Committee. The backstop area could be permanent with temporary fencing extensions offset from the backstop for passage from the team beach areas to the field. Taller poles could be in place with netting installed and lifted when needed for the games.
- See no problem with having the fenced children's play yard extend into the redwood grove. This should not impact the "power" or "spirit" of the grove and will allow children to also experience the grove in a special way.

Breen:

- The landscape design firm of Lutsko Associates has developed a plan that is "perfect for the site" and fully in line with town design guidelines. "I've seen a lot of the work by the landscape firm and it is incredible." The proposed plan will result in a "rural and appropriate character for the town center site."
- The overall layout plan is excellent and the proposed lawn and meadow areas appropriate for the needs at the town center. Further, the architectural character of the retaining walls at the town plaza is appropriate and supported.
- It is hoped that a creek channel can be extended through the site at some point, but the problems of including it with the current project are understood.
- There should be some pedestrian access to the western redwood grove. Perhaps this can be handled by simply less planting in places to provide for some meandering access to experience the "spirit" and "power" of the grove.
- The native meadow should be extended to the southwest along the left field side of the baseball field. The "rougher" grasses could even slow balls from the baseball field.

- Share Schilling and Warr concerns and comments on the lighting plans. Also concerned with the pole with two lights shown in the center planting island in the proposed driveway turnaround bulb.
- Support the proposed vine covered tennis court fencing. The oak near the eastern most court should be trimmed as recommended by the arborist, but the trimming should lighten the load on the tree without significantly impacting its form.
- "Love" and support the proposed recycled redwood siding.
- Only support minimum fencing for the baseball field and would prefer there be no fencing along the third base line due to the potential visual impacts. Also, don't like the "temporary outfield fencing" and would prefer "rough" meadow grasses as discussed above to slow or stop balls in the area beyond the regulation outfield.
- The eastern redwood grove should not be split by fencing as is now proposed with the fencing placed for the play yard. The fencing should be moved out of the redwood grove. Alternatively, if the desire is to have some play area around redwood trees, e.g., for "hide and seek," perhaps such a separate play area, without fencing should be considered at the western redwood grove, i.e., in the area of the current play yard. The western grove is far removed from vehicle traffic and fencing should not be needed for protection children playing around the trees.
- Appreciate the comments from the architects about the revised building architecture and the fact that additional design efforts will be pursued relative to the eastern elevation of the CH/AR building. The results of this work will be important in terms of reaching a final comfort level with the design. At the same time, with the comments by the architects, the general approach to the design is supported as presented on the 1/23 revised plans.
- Possibly consider bringing some orchard trees into the site and, perhaps some additional screen planting to soften views to the CH/AR building from the area of the soccer field.

Gelpi:

- Thanked the design team for the thorough and clear presentation on the revised proposals and indicated general support for the revised architectural plans, assuming the completion of the continued design efforts explained by the project architects. At the same time, the east elevation does appear to "work" now, especially with the proposed redwood siding.
- Concur with Warr's comments regarding the entry to the school house meeting room, the CH entry area and site lighting and, in particular, don't see the need for pole lighting at the driveway entry points.
- With respect to the CH/AR building, the final plans need to clearly demonstrate there has been adequate attention paid to storage, janitorial needs as well as kitchen facilities. Also, somewhat concerned with the exterior building support posts and any hazard they present in terms of people bumping into them.

- Concur with Warr that the central pathway needs to be made more rural in character.
- Concerned with the adequacy of the width and space of the walkway proposed on the north side of the library. The tree wells with trees, and library extensions seem to restrict space for pedestrian passage.
- Wonder if you will see some of the proposed landscape plantings from within the buildings, especially from within the library? *(In response, the landscape architect said the landscaping would be visible.)*
- Wonder if there will be gaps in the soccer fencing for retrieval of balls kicked over the fence? *(In response, the architects reviewed the fence designs and explained that gaps could be added, but that getting over fence or through it for retrieval of balls was clearly possible.)*
- Wonder about the need for and appearance of the chipseal paving proposed south of the backstop by the access gates to the maintenance yard? *(In response, the architects said it was needed for access to the maintenance yard, and the material was selected because it was less formal and would blend with the "DG" surface to be located between the maintenance yard and the baseball field.)*
- Prefer the storefront window option, but understand the architects' recommendations on the proposed windows.
- With the final plans, a comprehensive signage plan needs to be provided that will address town center needs for "way finding."
- The play yard fencing within the redwood grove appears awkward and should receive more study. Perhaps a test can be made of this to better appreciate the potential impacts on the character of the grove and see if fencing outside of the grove would work.

Chase:

- Appreciate the presentation and plan revision efforts by the project design team as well as the public comments presented during the ASCC project review process.
- Appreciate the design efforts made to respond to the broader community concerns over the architecture proposed for the buildings. At the same time, cannot "personally" support the gable roof forms that have been developed for the eastern end of the library and CH/AR buildings. These adjustments take away the "drama and interest" from the architecture. The adjustments represent a "lost opportunity." This is a personal feeling that will be shared with the town council when the council next considers the plans.
- Concur with Warr and others that the central pathway should have more of a country lane character through the site. Asphalt might be a good choice as, over time, it "grays out" and has a rural appearance.
- Support the landscape plan and general approach to landscaping. Also support suggestion by Breen to consider extending more orchard trees into the site.

- Concur with other ASCC members regarding the proposed lighting and need for mock up tests.

After offering the above comments, it was agreed the ASCC in general supported the January 23, 2006 revised plans. It was noted that the plans should be forwarded to the town council with this understanding and that the foregoing individual comments should also be forwarded to the council for consideration in completing its next action on the project.

After completing the above review, ASCC members inspected the proposed "hardscape" materials samples. It was noted that if members had any comments on them, they would forward the comments to the landscape design team members.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 5-0 approval of the December 5, 2005 special town center meeting minutes with the following correction:

On Page 6., in the second bullet item from the top of the page, correct the spelling of "seam."

Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 4-0 (Gelpi) approval of the January 9, 2006 field and evening meeting minutes with the following corrections:

On page 13, show that Warr temporarily left the ASCC meeting room during discussion of the application for Westridge Properties LLC.

On page 7, in the fourth sentence in the comments by Kirke Comstock, correct the spelling of "gopher."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

T. Vlasic