

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Gelpi, Breen, Clark, Warr, Von Feldt
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: Merk
Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Prior to discussion of the following application, Warr temporarily stepped down from his ASCC position, noting that his architectural office was located on the parcel immediately west of 116 Portola Road and that his office was the closest neighboring use to the proposed storage addition.

Architectural Review for storage area Fence additions, Portola Valley Hardware, 116 Portola Road, Paris (CUP X7D-90)

Vlastic presented the October 18, 2007 staff report on this proposal for addition of fencing associated with the desired 212 sf expansion of an outdoor storage area to serve the Portola Valley Hardware Store located in the Jelich commercial center building at the intersections of Portola and Alpine Roads. He explained the request, application compliance with the provisions of use permit X7D-90 and review responsibilities of the ASCC.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the proposed plans (two 8.5 inch by 11 inch sheets) prepared by hardware store owner and applicant Mark Paris and received by the town on September 7 and September 11, 2007.

Mr. Paris was present to discuss his request with ASCC members. He offered the following clarifications:

- While the elevation sheet of the proposed plans shows the wire extension over the six-foot high grape stake fence to be 10 feet high, the height would be controlled by the height of the roof over the storage building immediately to the east of the proposed expanded outdoor storage area. The fence would likely actually be somewhat lower than the adjacent roof.
- There will be a roughly five-foot wide gate in the fence, essentially the same gate condition as currently serves the smaller existing storage area.
- No new paved surfaces would be needed, as the area proposed for storage already has a paved surface.

Public comments were requested. **Carter Warr, 150 Portola Road Site A**, noted that he would have the most direct view to the new fenced storage area from his personal office and fully supported the request as proposed.

Following brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the plans subject to the condition that the improvements be consistent with the proposed plans and clarifications provided by the applicant at the ASCC meeting. The action was taken with the understanding the approval condition would be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Following action on the Paris request, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Architectural Review of proposed fencing and landscaping improvements to existing water tank property, between 122 & 132 Russell Avenue, California Water Service Company (CUP X7D-32)

Vlasic presented the October 18, 2007 staff report on this proposal for fencing and landscaping additions to the existing California Water Service Company facility located on Russell Avenue, just to the northwest of the intersection of Russell Avenue and Santa Maria Avenue. Vlasic reviewed the comments and recommendations set forth in the staff report, including project conformity with use permit X7D-32, and the proposed project plan sheet dated 9/12/07, prepared by Ron Benoit Associates, Landscape Architect. Also reviewed was the plan cut sheet describing the proposed "EuroScape 300, Master Halco" fencing.

Ron Benoit was present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members. He presented a small scale sample of the proposed fencing and offered the following plan clarifications:

- The final fence alignment can be adjusted as suggested in the staff report to avoid a strong, linear form along the parcel frontage. The limiting factors to fence adjustment are, however, the above and belowground level locations of equipment and equipment lines, conduit, piping, etc.
- In addition to the adjustment of the fencing alignment, the proposed landscaping would be modified to have some taller plant materials on the street side of the new fencing.
- In response to a question, it was noted that fence materials were sized and designed for security and to be as transparent and minimal as possible. It was noted that a suggested option for a wood post and frame fence with metal "hog" wire could be considered, but might actually be more visible and less durable. It was stated that the proposed material would have a longer life and require less maintenance.
- In response to a question about the possible removal of existing bottlebrush plantings on the site, it was noted that the plans could be modified to provide for a phased removal of these plantings and replacing them with native materials over time.

- Also, in response to a question, it was stated that the plan for four new redwood trees on the north side of the site could be modified to replace the redwoods with live oaks and that this would be more consistent with the vegetation along the north side of the property. It was noted that the “future” water tank would likely have a height of 25 to 30 feet and that the oaks could achieve sufficient height for screening within the time frame anticipated for the new tank, i.e., 10-15 years.
- In developing the revised site plan with more “push and pull” for the fence alignment, consideration will be given to use of more deer resistant plant materials.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the plans and the clarifications and responses to questions offered by Mr. Benoit. Considerable discussion focused on the fence alignment and materials. ASCC members concurred if the plan were revised to effectively angle the fence in at the front corners of the parcel, e.g., back to the 20-foot front setback line, and other adjustments made at the gate location, again to pull the fence in as far as possible given equipment constraints, the proposed fence material would be acceptable. It was also agreed that the acceptability would be tied to the amount of taller screen planting that could be added on the street side of the fence.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member prior to any site improvements:

1. The plan for fence alignment and landscaping along the realigned fence shall be revised to respond to the concerns and modifications discussed in the staff report and at the ASCC meeting and the general agreements reached at the ASCC meeting.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised to replace the four redwood trees proposed on the north side of the site with live oaks.
3. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for the phased replacement of existing bottlebrush with plant materials from the town’s native plant list and that are consistent with native plant conditions in the general area.
4. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for more deer resistant plant materials on the street side of the new front yard fencing.

Continued Study, Town Council Referral of BEET Committee recommendations regarding Climate Protection and Provisions for Green Building

Vlasic reviewed the October 18, 2007 staff report on this matter as well as the draft minutes of the October 8, 2007 joint meeting the ASCC participated in with the Planning Commission and BEET committee of the town’s climate protection task force. Vlasic advised that, based on the conclusions reached at the 10/8 joint meeting, the ASCC was to receive and discuss the provisions of the LEED H pilot program at its 10/22 meeting. He explained that the purposes of the review were to become generally familiar with the program and the point “rating” system for projects, and to consider, based on the LEED H

program, a possible agenda for the “work session” described in the minutes of the 10/8 meeting.

Vlasic then briefly reviewed the provisions of the LEED H pilot program and also discussed the local rating programs underway in Santa Cruz and Rohnert Park. He clarified that it was not expected that ASCC members would fully digest all of the materials associated with these programs provided with the 10/18 staff report, but that the main thing would be to consider their provisions in general and how the program information might influence the framework for the work sessions agreed to at the 10/8 joint meeting.

Vlasic advised that, in addition to the data provided with the 10/18 staff report on the Santa Cruz green building system, he had discussed the program with John Ancic, Deputy Building Official for the City of Santa Cruz and learned the following:

- The residential rating program is based on the Alameda County Waste Management model that is, like the Rohnert Park program, also based on the Build it Green system. The non-residential portion of the Santa Cruz system is based on LEED 2.1.
- The program was voluntary for one year and there was essentially no tracking of actual implementation. The only requirement was completion of the checklist, but nothing beyond that. There were 260 residential applications and 7 non-residential.
- Since the program became mandatory at the start of 2007, 135 permits have been processed totaling 84 remodels/additions and 161 dwelling units. Dwelling units were mostly multi-unit projects, thus the reason for “combined” permits and not one permit per unit.
- Since the mandatory program has been in place there has been no negative reaction. The point total for a permit is set low and can be easily achieved. In fact, a relatively high percentage of applications actually seek the “green building” award, or highest “tier” of the program.
- The key point components of the program are:
 - Exceeding Title 24 energy provisions
 - Title 24 lighting compliance
 - Plumbing points, e.g., insulation of pipes,

Other “point” elements are actually more “supportive” of the more significant items.

- The city is actually pursuing adjustments to the Title 24 provisions to, essentially require exceeding the base by at least 15%. This needs to be accomplished through the planning ordinances and “point system,” as a city cannot in its building ordinances set a standard higher than Title 24.
- There has been no negative reaction in the City to the mandated point system rating program. It is noted, however, that the point total is set low so that it can be readily captured for the building permit. It is still viewed as an education and outreach program with a “big carrot” and “little stick.”

- Cost for staff support of the green program has been added to the building permit fees.
 - For each permit, an audit is done at the end of the construction process to ensure that what was planned has actually been implemented. Each permit drawing set has an index as to the “green” items on the plans and these are checked for completion at the end of the permit construction process. For example, if an energy star appliance has been committed to, it is noted on the index and the index shows the plan page where it is called for. Then the permit signoff includes an audit line in the index for compliance/implementation. This is done with the applicant/contractor prior to permit signoff and, the applicant is burdened with audit compliance and checking. The fee covers staff time.
10. In Santa Cruz, the view is that it is clear the state is moving toward a mandatory program and it is important that City help its residents prepare for this. Many communities in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties are pursuing programs similar to the Santa Cruz city model and the city is helping them with their efforts. City staff and decision makers feel program consistency between local jurisdictions is important.

ASCC members discussed the materials and the approach for next steps set forth in the minutes of the October 8, 2007 joint study session. Members appreciated the efforts and program developed for use in rating residential projects in Santa Cruz and expressed concerns with the requirements of the LEED H program. Members agreed that any program developed for the town should be kept as simple and clear as possible and, as suggested at the 10/8 joint session, the program might include some mandatory items that would ensure an easily achieved minimum level of “green building” for all new projects. It was specifically suggested that even some very small projects would want “in” to the system and that provisions should be made to also provide an opportunity for “recognition” of smaller projects.

After discussion of the materials and possible work program framework, ASCC members stated their preference for the “work session(s)” and work program to be conducted as follows:

- The work session(s) should be set as meetings with only a maximum of two ASCC or planning commissioners attending. This approach would avoid the need for formal meeting organization. The results of the work session(s) should then be forwarded to the full ASCC and planning commission for consideration and development of final recommendations to the town council. The BEET committee members and their work to date on “sustainability” would be an important resource at the work session(s), as would staff support.
- Clark and Warr agreed to participate in the work session(s) on behalf of the ASCC.
- Considering that the town council has set a target date of July 1, 2008 for having measures in place to implement the “processes” portions of the BEET committee recommendations, it was projected that the ASCC and planning commission should attempt to finalize recommendations to the council by the end of March 2008. (Merk clarified that the council had identified 7/1/08 as a “target” and not mandated date.)

- If the recommendations are to be completed by the end of the March 2008, it is anticipated that the “small group” working sessions should, if possible be completed by the end of this calendar year. It appears that two sessions would be needed, *one* to gain general familiarity with the possible rating system approaches, and the *second* to work out the possible concepts for a program to be pursued for the town. It was recommended that the first session take place in November and the second, if possible, in December. It was noted that there would still be time for the second or a follow-on session in January if needed, due to scheduling problems, before tentative recommendations would be ready to send to the full ASCC and planning commission.
- The planning commission and ASCC could consider the “small group” recommendations in late January, February and March, and then, by the end of March, complete recommendations to be forwarded to the town council. This would allow three months for the council to consider the recommendations prior to the 7/1/08 “target” date.
- The two “small group” sessions should be set for a late afternoon time, preferably no longer than about three hours each. The preference would be for either 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. meeting time periods. It was acknowledged that efforts would be needed to find acceptable meeting times avoiding Holiday period conflicts, but both Clark and Warr advised that they would be available in the time period before the Thanksgiving Week and after that week up until mid December.

Vlasic advised that the planning commission would be advised of the ASCC comments and suggestions at the November 7 commission meeting and that, thereafter, specific dates would be set for the first two work sessions; hopefully one in November and one in December.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0-1 (Gelpi), approval of the September 24, 2007 minutes as drafted.

Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 5-0, approval of the October 8, 2007 special meeting minutes as drafted. It was noted that these minutes would also be shared with the Planning Commission for acceptance.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

T. Vlasic