

**Special Joint Field Meeting with Planning Commission
4420 Alpine Road, Roberts Market, George Roberts, and
Regular ASCC Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chairman Gelpi called the special field meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. at 4420 Portola Road, *Roberts Market*. It was noted that this was a joint meeting with the planning commission, as the commission would be the approving authority on the Roberts request for amendment of conditional use permit/planned unit development (PUD) X7D-67.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

ASCC Absent: Warr*

Planning Commission: Elkind, McKitterick, Wengert, Zaffaroni

ASCC Absent: McIntosh

Town Staff: Town Planner Mader, Deputy Town Planner Vlastic,
Planning Manager Lambert

*Vlastic advised that Warr had informed him earlier in the day that he would not be attending the site or evening ASCC meetings as he had potential conflicts of interest with most items on the agenda.

Others present relative to the Roberts Market request:**

George Roberts, applicant

Brian Roberts, applicant

Mike Brown, Sutti Associates, project architect

Bob Allen, 211 Nathhorst Avenue

Kevin Ford, 235 Nathhorst Avenue

Judy Lurie, 8 Ohlone, Portola Valley Ranch

Mr. Dayeh, 3 Portola Road

**There may have been others present during the course of the site visit, but the above listing represents those who identified themselves at the start of the field meeting.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit/Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment X7D-67 & Architectural Review of proposed remodeling and expansion to existing commercial grocery store/market use, 4420 Alpine Road, Roberts of Portola Valley (formerly John's Valley Foods)

Vlastic presented the November 8, 2007 staff report on this request. He explained that the site visit was part of the ASCC's and planning commission's preliminary review of the subject PUD amendment application for remodeling and expansion of the former *John's Valley Foods* market and use. Vlastic reviewed the staff report comments, the recent history with respect to ASCC approval of plans for market remodeling proposed within the limits of the existing PUD, and the following application and background materials provided with the 11/8/07 staff report:

200 ft., and 100 ft. scale vicinity maps

Resolution No. 1975-151, Granting CUP/PUD X7D-67 and setting conditions of market use of the property

November 5, 2007 and September 20, 2007 application letters from Michael Brown, Sutti Associates, on behalf of the applicant

October 9, 2007 letter from neighbors Bob and Karen Allen, 211 Nathhorst Avenue

October 30, 2007 and July 18, 2007, Environmental Noise Assessments, FHA, Inc.

Studio 321 Lighting Design Analysis, Light Intensity Diagram and Proposed Light Fixture Cut Sheets

Project Plans, unless otherwise noted prepared by Sutti Associates:

Sheet A0.1, Project Data Sheet, 9/12/07

Sheet A1.1, Floor Plans and Partial Elevation, 9/11/07

Sheet A1.2, Exterior Elevation, 9/11/07

Sheet A1.3, Sections, 9/11/07

Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan, Roth LaMotte, Landscape Architect, 9/21/07

Sheet L2.0, Planting Plan, Roth LaMotte, Landscape Architect, 9/21/07

Sheet L2.01, Planting Plan, Roth LaMotte, Landscape Architect, 9/21/07

Sheet L2.03, Planting Concepts, Roth LaMotte, Landscape Architect, 9/21/07

Sheet 1, Preliminary Grading Plan, Kier & Wright, Civil Engineers, 9/4/07

Sheet 2, Topographic Survey, Kier & Wright, Civil Engineers, 9/4/07

Site Photometric & Lighting Plan, 9/18/07 (superseded by attached plan dated October 30, 2007)

Background Information:

ASCC minutes May 14, 2007

May 10, 2007 staff report prepared for May 14, 2007 ASCC meeting

October 12, 2007 Town Geologist project review letter

Vlasic also reviewed the comments in the staff report on the planning commission's November 7, 2007 preliminary discussion of the application, including concerns regarding access, circulation, accommodation of bicyclists, and provisions for on-site consumption of food. He clarified that in terms of timing of application consideration, it was likely that the planning commission public hearing would be scheduled for December 5, 2007, and that the ASCC, if possible, should complete its review at its November 26, 2007 meeting. (Note: all ASCC members present advised they would be in attendance at the 11/26 meeting.)

Following an overview of the request, project plans, and other application materials, project representatives conducted a tour of the property explaining the current conditions as well as the proposed building, parking and landscaping expansions. During the course of the site walk, they offered the following comments and clarifications:

- It was noted that the use of Blue Oaks for landscape screening was proposed, as it was assumed they were evergreen. This was discussed, and it was pointed out by Breen that the trees were actually deciduous. It was agreed that an alternative tree would be considered and that the landscape plan would be shared with the conservation committee to obtain committee recommendations.

- The lighting plan and plan evolution were explained. It was noted that the proposed lighting was needed for safety of site use for employees and patrons. It was also noted that some of the lights would be on a motion sensor for security, but that on the rear the motion control sensor would be within the proposed loading dock “clamshell” addition, with light spill limited to within the dock area and not exposed to residences along Nathhorst Avenue.
- It was clarified that there are no plans for the rear parcel other than the proposed employee parking and added landscaping to screen views from the residential parcels along Nathhorst Avenue. It is understood that any future development would be possible only subject to further PUD amendment.
- Delivery activity would be controlled as explained in the application submittal documents. Further, employees arriving at the market generate very little noise and would leave by 8:30 p.m. There have been no employee noise issues at Woodside Roberts Market.
- Two of the pine trees located along the southwest side of the front parcel are shown for removal on the site plan. It appears that at least one of these could be saved. The tree proposed for removal that is closest to the front parcel line may still be removed, but the larger tree just to the rear of this tree can be saved. The site plan will be modified to show at least this second tree as being preserved and only one existing pine being removed.
- The existing circulation pattern was reviewed, and it was noted that the proposed plan continues to make use of the established circulation patterns and that these patterns are consistent with the circulation provisions of the town’s Nathhorst Triangle plan.
- The proposed colors and materials board was reviewed, including the color scheme associated with the proposed building additions along the rear elevation. In response to a question, it was noted that the existing slump-stone building walls would not be painted but power-washed to clean them. It was also noted that the side and rear elevation solid entry doors would be painted to match the color of the slump stone.
- There will be daily trash pick-up, and also the trash compactor will operate several times during the day. Typically, trash pick-up is during the day and not in the early morning hours, but the schedule is not yet established. The trash compactor is to be in a fully enclosed space and the door to the space open to the northeast and not toward the residences along Nathhorst Avenue.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the only new signage would be to replace the copy in the existing John’s Valley Food signs to reflect the new market name.
- In response to a question of provisions for bicyclists, it was noted that many bikers coming to the Woodside Store have very expensive bikes, and they prefer to bring them into the store rather than risk theft by leaving them in an outdoor bike rack. This has been a problem for the Woodside operation.

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Allen and Mr. Ford** shared concerns regarding noise impacts associated with the loading dock use, as well as the proposed new employee parking area. They discussed the history of problems with the previous market operation. They also offered concerns regarding the proposed building additions and need for larger screen plant materials at the time of installation, e.g., 48-inch box size redwood trees instead of the smaller sized called out on the landscape plan. Mr. Allen referenced the comments in his October 9, 2007 letter to the town and, in particular, suggested that the loading dock activities and use of the new employee parking lot on the rear side of the market be limited to the same hours of construction operations that are regulated by the town's noise ordinance.

Lambert advised that she had received a number of communications wondering if the market, when reopened under the new ownership, would include a post office and expressing the hope that outdoor seating areas would be provided.

Planning commissioners and ASCC members offered the following comments:

Wengert:

- Supports the proposal and recognizes that there will likely be the need for some fine-tuning of the operation as it is in place and there is a better appreciation of the details of the use, circulation, access to the Triangle Park, etc. However, it is a use that will clearly serve the local community.
- The applicant needs to be aware of and respond to the concerns of the neighbors.

Elkind:

- Main concern is site circulation including provisions for safe bicycle access and bike circulation on-site. Further, pedestrian flow needs to be considered in terms of safety, as there will likely be considerable vehicle traffic based on the *Roberts of Woodside* model.
- There needs to be clear definition of the on-site circulation pathway system.
- Outdoor seating areas need to be provided, this will be a gathering place.

Zaffaroni:

- Roberts Market will be a "great" addition in terms of service to the local community.
- The new use will result in a significant magnitude of change from the previous market operation and the main concerns focus on circulation and safety, particularly for bicycles and pedestrians.
- There needs to be attention given to potential on-site circulation conflicts, and there also needs to be provision for on-site space for food consumption.

McKitterick:

- Shares others concerns over circulation and need for outside use spaces. The town needs to look ahead and anticipate improvements needed to the pathway system and, in particular, circulation between the market and the triangle park.

- Outdoor spaces for food consumption need to be provided around the market.
- Bike riders will come to the market, and bike racks and other accommodations for their safe access to the use need to be provided.

Breen:

- There is a need for a “gathering” location in town and the market will serve this function. This needs to be recognized and provided for in the site plan with outdoor spaces for setting, gathering and food consumption.
- An alternative to the Blue Oaks for landscape screening is needed. This can be worked out with a final landscape plan.
- People are already looking to the market use as a gathering place for local school children.
- The colors board is fine, and the lighting plan appears acceptable. The proposed landscape mound also appears to be an appropriate response to the need for more landscape height sooner, rather than simply waiting for plant growth.

Clark and Von Feldt both advised that they would share comments and reactions at the evening ASCC meeting.

Gelpi advised that he shared a number of the comments offered by planning commission members, but that, in addition, he was concerned with the massing of the proposed building additions and encouraged the design team to consider options to reducing the potential visual impacts.

Following the site inspection and sharing of the above clarifications and comments, ASCC members concurred that ASCC project review should continue at the regular evening meeting. Thereafter, ASCC chair Gelpi and planning commission chair Wengert thanked all present for their participation in the site meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:25 p.m. the special joint ASCC and planning commission field meeting was adjourned.

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt
Absent: Warr
Town Council Liaison: Merk
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit/Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment X7D-67 & Architectural Review of proposed remodeling and expansion to existing commercial grocery store/market use, 4420 Alpine Road, Roberts of Portola Valley (formerly John's Valley Foods)

Vlastic presented the November 8, 2007 staff report on this proposal and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a listing of application plans and supporting materials.) Vlastic advised that this was a preliminary review and following discussion, ASCC members should continue project consideration to the November 26, 2007 regular ASCC meeting.

George Roberts, Brian Roberts and project architect Mike Brown were present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications largely in response to issues discussed during the afternoon site meeting:

- The plans will be modified to address the landscaping issues discussed at the site meeting, including replacement of the Blue Oaks and preservation of pine trees.
- It is hoped that a number of the plan adjustments could be handled as conditions to the PD action so that work on the new parking area could proceed as soon as possible while the weather is still accommodating. It is hoped that while this work proceeds, any plan adjustments could be developed and implemented prior to opening of the market.
- The plans for the back of the building include preserving part of the old roof eave, but this presents problems, particularly if there is a desire to grow vines over the wall as has been done at the Woodside Store. The old eave presents a "block" and maintenance issue regarding use of vines. An option could be considered that would eliminate the old eave, use a solid board for the break between the lower existing wall and new upper wall, and then plant vines to grow, eventually over the entire rear elevation. (Some discussion followed on the type of vines that could be used, and it was agreed that this could be reviewed further with the town's conservation committee as to an appropriate selection.)

- The plans call out the use of plywood for the new upper fascia, but the fascia material will actually be “Hardi-board” as this is a longer-lived material with less maintenance issues.
- In response to a question regarding “green” market practices, it was noted that the market does not use plastic bags, except for some biodegradable bags in the produce section. It was also noted that local suppliers of fresh products are used when available and that the market attempts to anticipate the desires of local clients in terms of products and nature of, for example, “green” operation, and respond positively to such desires.
- It was clarified that one oak would likely be lost along the north side of the building and that other trees have been added to the landscape plan to compensate for this loss. Also, in response to further discussion, it was agreed to consider preserving all the existing south side pine trees, at least for the time being.
- In response to a question about preserving some of the existing orchard trees in the area of the planned parking lot, it was pointed out that the trees were not in good condition and past their productive life. It was also noted that the planting strips were planned to accommodate drainage and that water would be allowed to flow to them with the intent of much of the runoff allowed to percolate on-site. Also, in response to a question regarding use of permeable asphalt, it was noted that some experience with this material indicates it clogs within a 5-10 year period.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following discussion, ASCC members expressed general support for the proposal and project plans, including the proposed colors and materials boards, general approach to landscaping, and lighting. It was noted that some items discussed at the site meeting needed follow-up by the applicant prior to the 11/26 ASCC meeting, and that some of these could likely be added as PD amendment conditions to be fulfilled prior to opening of the market, e.g., modification of the landscape plan. The following additional comments were offered:

- Any plans for changes to the use signs will need to be described to the satisfaction of the ASCC.
- Options need to be presented for dealing with the massing issue of concern relative to the rear elevation additions. If the vine proposal is to be considered, more information needs to be provided on it as to plant materials and adjustments to the plans for the rear elevation.
- Some consideration should be given to either preservation of some of the existing orchard trees in the new parking area planting strip or to the planting of new orchard trees to preserve the orchard character of the rear parcel.
- The proposed berm planting in terms of the size of the redwood trees seems appropriate as presented. The trees will grow fast and larger trees don’t seem necessary.

- Consideration might be given to adding an outdoor seating, food consumption area in the rear orchard.
- Consideration might be given to fewer new trees along the Alpine Road frontage to allow for a more open view to and from the market, pathway, parking area, etc.
- A “loose” parking area surface material for the rear parking lot would likely not be appropriate as it would add to the potential for noise impacts from moving vehicles over the gravel surface.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the November 26, 2007 regular ASCC meeting, with the understanding that additional clarifications on the items discussed above and at the site meeting would be provided for ASCC consideration at that time.

Proposed Modifications to approved plans -- Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-571, 15 Holden Court, Banman

Vlasic presented the November 8, 2007 staff report on this request. He reviewed the ASCC’s previous actions on the project including the May 14, 2007 conditional approval, June 11, 2007 “follow-up” review and approval, and approval of minor project refinements on June 25, 2007. He then reviewed the current request for further plan revisions, largely to reduce the scope and site impacts associated with the approved rear yard pool and terrace improvements.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the new plan sheet dated 10/11/07, prepared by Timeline Design, showing the currently proposed revisions and comparing them to the “approved” plans. Also considered were the 10/11/07 transmittal letter from the project designer on the proposed plan revisions, including product data sheets on the proposed pool pump with sound level information, and a November 12, 2007 email from neighbor Sally Ann Reiss, regarding views from her property to the lower pool wall.

Mathew Harrington, project designer and contractor, described the proposed revised plans and offered the following clarifications:

- The adjusted plans substantially reduce the scope of rear yard grading and vegetation removal. The existing plant materials between the pool site and the Reiss property will be preserved, and views from that property will not change in terms of the scope of screening provided by existing vegetation. The project plans and data were reviewed to explain the scope of vegetation protection afforded by the proposed plan changes.
- The pool equipment will be in an enclosure under the new wood deck and with this enclosure and the low sound levels of the pool equipment, there should be little potential for noise spill from the equipment.
- In response to a question regarding the outdoor stone fire place shown on the plans, it was noted that it was not yet agreed that this would be built and a final plan would be developed for the fireplace if it were to be pursued. The current thinking regarding the fireplace is that it would have a maximum height of six feet.

Public comments were requested. Council liaison **Merk** wondered about the size of the catch basin “trough” below the pool and potential for pool water spilling into the lower manzanita plants and impacting the health of the plants.

Harrington advised that the trough would have a minimum width of 2.5 feet and that potential spill was considered and accommodated for with the trough width.

Following discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Breen, and passed 4-0, approval of the plan revisions subject to the following condition:

If the stone fireplace element is to be pursued, a detailed plan for the feature shall be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and planning staff prior to issuance of any building permit for fireplace construction.

Architectural Review for new residence and detached accessory structure, 163 Brookside Drive, Deaser

Vlasic presented the November 8, 2007 staff report on this revised proposal for a new residential project that was originally approved by the ASCC on July 24, 2006. He reviewed the background on the previous proposal and explained how the current project differed from it. He noted that because of the background on the relatively recent 2006 review, a site meeting had not been set as part of ASCC consideration of the current proposal, but that depending on discussion, ASCC members could conclude a site meeting was in order to fully consider the modified request. He also referenced a November 12, 2007 email from site neighbor Scott Devereaux, who was not able to attend the meeting, raising concerns with the project and asking that project review be continued so that he could obtain and comment on the new plans.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the email from Mr. Devereaux and the following plans, unless otherwise noted dated October 5, 2007 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Boundary and Topography Map, Pat McNulty, Professional Land Surveyor, April 2005
- Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan & Flood Plain Data
- Sheet: A-0.2, Grading, Staging Site Plan & Tree Protection Plan, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, Exterior Lighting Plan
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.2, Guest House Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design

Also considered were a colors and materials board dated October 5, 2007, the cut sheets for the proposed exterior Arroyo Craftsman house, and TEKA Illumination yard light fixtures. Vlasic clarified that while Sheet:A-3.2 of the plans include a “Guest House” title, this is not a

guest house but a cabana; because, as explained in the staff report, guest houses are not permitted in the subject parcels zoning district.

Mr. Deaser and project architect Kevin Schwarckopf presented the proposed plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Roof tile and stone siding samples were offered to respond to the architectural style and neighborhood compatibility issues raised in the staff report. In addition, photo images were provided to better explain the proposed architectural style and, particularly, character of the desired stone and roof tile materials. It was noted that the style is viewed as a "Carmel Ranch Scheme" and not "Mediterranean."
- Apologize for the mislabeling of the cabana. It is not designed or intended for guest house use and the applicant is fully agreeable to a deed restriction with regard to ensuring the cabana will only be used as permitted under town zoning restrictions and policies for accessory structures. The current proposal includes no plans for cooking facilities and there is no intention to ever rent the space.
- The exterior lighting plan is essentially the same as presented with the approved 2006 project.
- A clarified driveway plan, dated 11/12/07 was presented to address the impervious surface area issues described in the staff report.
- There are a number of other plaster sided houses on Brookside Drive, and the proposed style is desired by the new parcel owners. It was explained that the style is intended to be more rustic and not formal.
- The cabana and its orientation is to serve the owner's desire for a personal, private office space and be less a cabana than such an office space. Orientation to the creek is for privacy for the office use. The bath is external and orientated to the pool to serve the pool use and avoid the need for the owners children to run from the pool though the house to a bathroom.
- In response to concerns regarding the cabana deck extending into the flood plain, it was noted that the plans would be revised to cantilever the deck across the flood plain limit line, thereby avoiding placing foundations for any improvements within the mapped flood plain.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the pool site is one of the few places on the property that has appropriate sun penetration. The applicant considers it a "great" location for a pool, and the proposed pool is very small.
- A copy of the current plans will be made available by the applicant directly to Mr. Devereaux.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Barbara Gaal, 165 Brookside Drive, shared the concerns of Mr. Devereaux and supported his request for a continuance to allow time for Mr. Devereaux to receive and review the plans for the new proposal. She also expressed concerns with the proposed cabana, its potential for guest house use and orientation of the accessory structure to the creek corridor. Other concerns were offered with respect to the new pool proposal, its possible impact on trees, and potential for spill of pool chemicals into the creek. She offered an additional reaction as to the impact of the overall design on the rural, rustic character of the neighborhood.

Richard Merk, speaking as a neighbor at 171 Brookside Drive, offered the following comments:

- It is unfortunate that the guest house label has been used for the existing accessory structure and also noted on the new plans for the cabana. The existing structure was not an “existing” guest house.
- The proposed architectural character and use of stone is out of character for this part of the Brookside Drive neighborhood. The house just constructed at 167 Brookside Drive originally was to have some stone siding, but this was removed from the plans for cost savings. The project is aesthetically better for it and fits better into the site and neighborhood.
- This is a very dark, tree covered property and a pool does not seem appropriate in terms of sun access, tree debris, etc.
- The proposed construction parking seems inappropriate, as it would block the Madden property, and permission would need to be granted by the neighbor for the construction parking that is proposed.
- Some plan changes should be considered. If the garage were reoriented toward the street, it is possible that there would be the need for less driveway paving. Also, the cabana should be oriented to the pool and not the creek, and the proposed cabana bath should be attached to the main house to avoid the potential for cabana guest house use.
- There should be enhanced plan provisions for tree protection.

ASCC members discussed the project and the concerns of neighbors. It was agreed that a site meeting was needed and the meeting was set for 4:00 p.m. on November 26, 2007. This action was taken with the understanding that if the site meeting findings and clarifications offered at that time by the project applicant and design team were found appropriate, action on the request could be concluded at the end of the site review.

ASCC members then shared the following preliminary reactions on the plans:

Clark:

- A alternative form is needed to the proposed “S” shaped roof tile that would be more compatible with the neighborhood setting. Otherwise the proposed colors and use of stone appear appropriate.

- The cabana should infringe less on the creek side, otherwise, the design, with attached bath and subject to a deed restriction, appears acceptable.

Von Feldt:

- Biggest concern is the deck extension into the creek corridor and potential flood plan conflicts.
- The scope of sod lawn should be limited to the area near the house and native grasses should be used closer to the creek bank.
- The cabana should only have an outside shower as provided for with the 2006 approval.
- The architectural style should be reconsidered in terms of the tile, stone, etc., so there would be better neighborhood compatibility.

Breen:

- The site meeting will be helpful in terms of understanding the potential impact of the proposed pool on trees, excavation, etc.
- The proposed architectural style seems a departure from the character of the neighborhood, and this needs to be considered at the site meeting in light of actual neighborhood conditions.
- The cabana as currently designed “feels” like a guest house. It needs to be more integrated to the pool use with the doors opening to the pool. Light from the structure should not spill into the creek corridor.

Gelpi:

- The site meeting will be important in reaching judgments on the appropriateness of the plan changes, particularly the pool, cabana, and architectural style. The overall site plan and garage orientation appear appropriate and generally consistent with the 2006 approvals.
- Larger size samples of the proposed exterior materials should be provided for the site meeting. Also, the site for the pool and cabana need to be clearly marked for site meeting evaluation.

Following discussion, project review was continued to a site meeting at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, November 26, 2007.

Variance Request X7E-131, Swimming Pool Replacement, 333 Willowbrook Drive, Prado

Vlasic presented the November 8, 2007 staff report on this request and reviewed the background of the August 27, 2007 ASCC architectural approval for project site house additions and the October 3, 2007 planning commission preliminary review of the swimming pool replacement variance request. Vlasic advised that at the time of the previous ASCC review, the members noted the variance request appeared appropriate in concept, but specific plans for pool replacement were not then available. He also commented that the planning commission’s preliminary review seemed supportive of the

variance request and that the commission agreed that processing of the variance application should proceed. Vlasic advised that at this time the ASCC was being asked to formally comment on the variance request and respond to the plan clarifications described in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the October 13, 2007 application statement from Latker Design Solutions and the following proposed plans:

Sheet 1, Landscape Conceptual Plans, Latker Design Solutions, 10/16/04
Exterior Elevations, Elsbeth Newfeld, AIA

Mr. Prado and Mr. Latker presented the revised materials to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The proposed fence extension beyond the new pool area fencing is a “secondary” fence that was intended as a second line of defense in controlling horses on site. Based on the concerns in the staff report and fence requirements of the zoning ordinance, the proposed secondary fencing will be removed from the plans. Dense vegetation will be used to achieve the added horse control and eliminate any potential for conflicts with the 25-foot front yard setback requirement for fencing, i.e., beyond pool fencing.
- In response to a question, it was noted that only one pool light is planned and that this would be shown on the building permit plans.
- A detailed landscape plan for the front yard area will be provided eventually for ASCC consideration and approval as called for in the 8/27/07 conditional approval. It is likely that this plan will be provided to the ASCC immediately after commission consideration of the variance matter, now scheduled for the December 5 planning commission meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC member briefly discussed the proposal and supported the variance request, subject to the fence changes as clarified by the applicant and with the provision that a condition of the variance be that a front yard landscaping plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to release of any building permits for the pool reconstruction. ASCC members also encouraged the plan to include plantings on both sides of the new pool fence.

Update -- Town Council Referral of BEET Committee recommendations regarding Climate Protection and Provisions for Green Building

Vlasic presented the data in the November 8, 2007 staff report on this matter and advised that the planning commission, at its 11/7 meeting, concurred with the ASCC recommendations on timing and process. Clark commented that he could participate in the first work session most any afternoon between 12/5 and 12/14. Vlasic advised that he hoped to have the first meeting date confirmed within the next week

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0, approval of the October 22, 2007 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

T. Vlastic