

**Special Field Meeting Portola Valley Town Center, 765 Portola Road, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, Historic School House, 765 Portola Road,
Portola Valley, California**

Chairman Gelpi called the special field meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. at in the parking lot in front of the Town Center Historic School House.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr

ASCC Absent: None

Planning Commission liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

It was noted that the town council had been invited to the special ASCC site meeting and the following council members were present:

ASCC liaison Merk

Davis

Toben

Derwin

(Note: Council member Driscoll also attended, but arrived at the end of the site walk and at the start of the ASCC backstop discussion that took place in the Historic School House meeting room.)

Others present relative to the town center project:

Susi Marzuola, project architect

Larry Strain, project architect

Bill Fee, project landscape architect

Lindsay Bowen, Park & Recreation Committee

Mark Lockareff, Park & Recreation Committee

Sally Anne Reiss, Town Center Outreach Committee

Beth Rabuczewski, Town Center Outreach committee

Jon Silver, 355 Portola Road

Bernie Bayuk, 198 Paloma Road

Mark Greenstein, President Alpine Little League

David Denier, Alpine Little League

Randy (?), Alpine Little League

Domenic Andrighetto, 235 Shawnee Pass

Paul Seipp, 118 Grove Drive

Linda Yates, 170 Mapache Drive

Mary Enright, 171 Mapache Drive

Follow-up Review - Town Center Project, baseball field backstop and site lighting

Vlastic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on this follow-up review. He advised that the primary purpose of the site meeting was to first consider the town center site group

recommended design for the baseball field backstop and, thereafter, the detailed site lighting plan, including the mock-up of the proposed pole mounted light fixture. Vlasic noted that story poles had been installed to model the recommended backstop; and, as requested by the ASCC, the proposed pole mounted light fixture had been installed for site meeting inspection. Vlasic briefly reviewed the design parameters for the proposed backstop and the “minimum design standards” for it, as discussed in the staff report. He also noted the town attorney’s concerns with the backstop design noting it should be the minimum needed for the intended ball field uses. Vlasic displayed three photo boards with views to the backstop story poles from four locations on the town center property adjacent to Portola Road.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC was conducting the site visit relative to the proposed backstop to develop design recommendations that would be forwarded to the town council. He noted that the ASCC would not be acting to approve or deny the proposed design. He also explained that the intended uses for the ball field would be set by the town council, but at this point he understands it would accommodate the “minors” component of Little League baseball (i.e., players between 8 and 12 years old), girls youth softball and the adult softball program in the town.

Larry Strain, Susi Marzuola and Bill Fee discussed the proposed backstop design and how the design responded to the concerns of the town center site group as evaluated at the group’s May 17, 2006 meeting. They reviewed the alternative designs data shared with the group at the 2006 meeting, and the ASTM “Standards Guide for Fences for Ballfields and other Sports Facilities.” Fee explained that the standards call for a backfield height of 16 feet with sideline fencing between 6 and 8 feet high. He clarified that the length of fence sections were based on local judgments relative to field conditions and relationships to adjoining uses. He reviewed the proposed design and how the fence lengths and heights were defined based on relationships to the central pathway, soccer field, bleachers and player benches. He also discussed the proposed backstop top with 20 foot high pole sections. He explained that the cover was to control pop fouls from landing in the creek or on the central pathway. He noted that there was concern over players retrieving balls from the creek section, which would be fenced off.

After an overview presentation of the proposed design, the project architects led all present on a walk of the site to view the backstop story poles from various site locations including along Portola Road and along the driveway to the soccer field and maintenance yard, along the central pathway and within the ball field area. Views were also considered from the proposed building cluster and the area of the proposed children’s play yard, i.e., beyond the left field area of the ball field. Also inspected was the existing ball field and backstop.

During the course of the site walk, Fee described what the story poles modeled in more detail and offered the following additional plan clarifications:

- The existing ball field is being moved and if there is to be a ball field for the uses anticipated, minimum design standards need to be adhered to. There is clearly some judgment needed on some aspects of the design, but the 16 foot and 8 foot minimum heights for the backstop and fencing need to be adhered to. The proposed fencing lengths appear appropriate given the relationship to the other site uses, but it is possible that somewhat shorter lengths could be considered.

- A clamshell backstop alternative is possible, but it would need to be high enough for the proposed uses and sideline fencing would still be needed. It is noted, however, that the ball players typically don't like the clamshell alternative.
- The currently proposed "truss system" backstop top with 20 foot high poles, descending to 14 foot high poles, is not needed to conform to the ASTM standards, but was added at the recommendation of the site group to control foul tips. The cable and netting alternative discussed in the staff report, has not been used previously and there is concern with the design in terms of safety as people may climb on to it to retrieve baseballs and soccer balls. In response to a question, Fee advised in further consideration of the cable and net alternative, he did not feel he could recommend such a design due to safety concerns.
- The backstop and sideline fencing would be a 2" chain link material with black coating. It was noted that the coating would be consistent with the environmental objectives of the project.
- There would be temporary foul line poles and out field fencing as noted on the proposed field plan now included in the town center documents. These temporary facilities would be installed during the typically sports seasons.
- The fencing for the proposed tennis courts is to be 10 feet high.
- In response to a question from Paul Seipp, it was noted that the distance from home plate to the Tot lot play yard was approximately 280 feet. Fee advised this was not in the range of the hitters for the Little League and softball league uses anticipated for the field. It was noted, however, that signs would likely be needed to advise that other baseball activities, including hard ball games by older children and/or adults, were not permitted at the ball field.

In response to a question, Susi Marzuola checked the height of the existing netting supported by wood poles at the north end of the soccer field. She advised that the height is 16 feet.

During the course of the site walk, walk participants offered the following comments:

Sally Anne Reiss reviewed a list of the uses she understood were accommodated by the existing ball field. She noted Little League "minors," pitching machine groups and girls softball use the field. She also noted field use by adult softball and the soccer league for very young players, essentially introductory exposure to organized youth soccer.

Linda Yates expressed concern with the size and visual impacts of the modeled backstop and fencing and wondered why the current field and backstop were not considered safe.

(Note, due to the large number of people in attendance, several conversations were ongoing and only a few comments were shared in a more organized manner for all to hear and consider. There were, however, a number of questions relative to the design, minimum standards needed for safety and concerns over the potential visual impacts.)

At approximately 7:05 p.m., it was agreed that ASCC discussion of the backstop would continue inside the historic school house building. All ASCC members and the project architects convened in the school house and several of those who walked the site also joined them. A number of persons, however, left the meeting after the site walk.

Public comments were requested and the following offered: (Note: a few speakers spoke more than once and some comments were presented after initial comments by ASCC members and further clarifying comments by project design team members. For ease of understanding and use of minutes, comments have been grouped by individual not presented as a running list of commentary.)

Jon Silver:

- The proposed backstop story poles were viewed in contrast to the existing baseball backstop and field. It is hard to imagine the existing backstop could “be so small” and the proposed backstop and fencing “so big.”
- While it is understood that something larger than the existing backstop is probably needed, it would be “a shame to clutter the viewscape” across the now open site with the proposed backstop and fencing.
- The existing facilities have served Little League and adult softball for many years and there appears to have been little problem with them. “I’m” not aware of a single claim against the town
- Urge the ASCC and town council to find the appropriate balance between the existing facility and what has been modeled so that the site can preserve its rural setting and that the view impacts are properly limited. The new facilities should respect the low-key nature of the community and its “less urban setting.”

Lindsay Bowan:

- There is a record of a number of injuries at the existing facility from flying balls and thrown bats. “I” joined the park and recreation commission in part to correct the inadequacies with the current field and backstop.
- These are young players and they don’t pay the attention that older athletes do. Extra precautions are needed. Also, the sideline fencing is needed for protection of not only for players and spectators, but also those using the central pathway, e.g., children riding bikes, families with baby carriages, etc.
- The proposed fencing is not much more than what is being planned for the tennis courts.
- Other towns provide fields that Little Leaguers from Portola Valley use. The town should provide similar safe facilities for Little League games in town.
- The clamshell option is not the most desirable because it is easy to climb on and it is low on the players side, making ball retrieval at the backstop difficult. If it is used, it should be on top of a six foot high fence to make climbing difficult and player ball retrieval safe. Further, sideline fencing is needed even with the clamshell.

Sally Anne Reiss:

- The backstop issues need to be placed in proper perspective. The main concern is safety for use by children of the community. Protection is needed from balls and bats.
- The use of the field needs to be considered in terms of potential hazards. Children with slow bats hit to right field, adults hit to left field. There is the constant potential for overthrown balls.

- A “decision tree” process needs to be considered in terms of use and potential hazards and safety needs by use.
- The current facility has been on “borrowed time.” It is not adequate in terms of safety or needs for league play.

In response to some public comments and ASCC questions, **Fee** offered the following additional clarifications:

- As pointed out during the site meeting, the minimum ASTM standards call for the backstop to be 16 feet high and the sideline fencing 6 to 8 feet high. The length and added features are based on the experience and best judgment of the professionals involved in the design process in light of the intended use of the fields and site conditions. Safety for participants, spectators and others in the area of the facilities is a critical consideration.
- A major factor in the design process is the awareness of the participants and others of what is going on with the game. For younger players and those present at the games they play, there is more concern with respect to the concept of “eye on the ball and head in the game.” As you move from youth to college to professional sports levels, the expectation is that there will be more player and spectator attention to “eye on the ball and head in the game” and facilities are designed with this in mind.
- Even with the clamshell, there will be the need for an 8 foot tall sideline fence. This is to protect the benches, low bleachers and those at the town center, not paying attention to the ball games. Further, an eight foot high fence is needed for protection of the jumping player from getting his glove hand caught on the top of the fence. Also, the clamshell is not desired by players because ball retrieval at the base of the low backstop is difficult.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the outfield fencing was not required by the ASTM standards.

ASCC members offered the following individual reactions to the proposed backstop plans:

Clark:

- As a baseball player, there is the appreciation of the need for an upgrade from the current facilities, but there needs to be more of a balance between the scale of the existing facilities and what has been modeled at the site. The proposed scope appears excessive given the anticipated uses.
- It is hoped that a less massive design could be identified that would work within the 16 foot and 8 foot ASTM standards. In particular, it is hoped there could be less fencing along the third base line.

Von Feldt:

- Find the current proposal too much for the site.

- Appreciate the need for safety, but very concerned with the view impacts of the extent of proposed chain link fencing. The scope of the current design could be a “magnet” drawing players from out of town.
- The protection of the site’s open space condition is the most important factor. More design effort and understanding is needed to determine at what point, a backstop proposal is “safe enough.”
- With the data currently available and the open space concerns, “I” can’t support the current proposal.
- Would prefer a design that has fencing as low as possible, within the identified standards. Further, the length of fencing sections should be minimized and the sideline fencing should not extend beyond the access gates shown on the proposed plan sections.
- Don’t support outfield fencing.

Warr:

- What is currently proposed is too big for the site. While it is understood that some standards need to guide the design, the final plan should be only to the minimum standards and not beyond them.
- The main concerns with the current design are the proposed 20 foot high roof element and the length of the fence extensions down the base lines.
- A hard look should be taken at the Priory clamshell backstop and its use. It appears to work and the clamshell form is more appropriate given site conditions.
- Adjustments should be considered for the locations of the spectator bleachers and team benches that would allow for shorter backstop and fence sections. Every option should be explored to work within the identified standards, but minimize the scope of backstop and fencing.

Note: After offering the above comments, Warr left the special site meeting, advising he would return at 8:00 p.m. for the regular ASCC meeting.

Breen:

- The proposed backstop and fencing is designed for a "worst case" scenario.
- After all the work on the town center design to open panoramic views, to now propose this kind of fencing scheme is something “I can’t support.” “Had I known early on that the fencing would be much more than what is currently at the site, I would not have supported the present program for the town center. Further I would have recommended moving the baseball program to another location or to Spring Down.”

- The extent of this fencing compromises the project. The town center is not just a playing field, it is an experience of the Western Hills and the "magic of a place." This is not La Entrada, not Burgess, This is "our" place. All you have to do is look and listen on the site to know that what has been presented is a "less bad" design and we need to have a plan that results in a positive design legacy for Portola Valley.
- Communications have been made with Tim Molak, headmaster of the Woodside Priory and Ron Benoit, the Priory landscape architect regarding the "clamshell" backstop design, which they selected for a school field that is immediately adjacent to their soccer field and parking lot. After discussion with Ron Benoit, this approach to fencing could be supported. Obviously safety was a major concern for the school. At present, they are also considering a clamshell design for their back ball field; which, "I believe," is a high school level hardball field. "I also like the organic form of the clamshell design, which I think lends itself better to the site than the hard geometric lines of the canopy scaffolding."
- Share concerns about safety. "I've" played at the town center for thirty plus years and until an anecdote shared today, never have been aware of an injury due to a resident being hit by a ball. Realizing that someone could be hurt, "I'm" willing to look at the expanded fencing plan of a clamshell with a dark coating and perhaps some temporary baseline netting, which could be installed and removed during individual games.
- Do not support any outfield fencing.

Gelpi:

- The proposed design is very "institutional," will be highly visible and will attract older kids to come and play. It will attract players and "pick-up" games that are not appropriate for the facility or consistent with the field design.
- While it is recognized that some standards need to guide the design, more design effort is needed so that any final backstop and fencing is as "informal" as possible. The current design does not seem "informal."
- The proposed design appears "a bit over the top" and concur with Warr that a backstop design no higher than 16 feet without the roof is preferred. The clamshell option also needs additional consideration.

In response to ASCC comments, design team members advised that some design options were possible, but there would still be the need for some sideline fencing to protect the central pathway and soccer field.

Vlasic wondered if the ASCC should work with the design team to explore options so that, if possible a specific design recommendation could be forwarded to the town council. This was discussed with council liaison Merk. Merk asked the project architects how soon the council needed to make a final decision on the backstop design prior to the bid packages being distributed to potential contractors. Strain advised that the bid packages for the field work would not go out until the near the end of the current calendar year.

After discussion and input from council liaison Merk, it was agreed that the ASCC review comments would be forwarded to the town council with the understanding that the ASCC would be willing to work with the project design team to identify a preferred design if this was the request of the council. This approach was taken because it was understood that the council would need to authorize any additional work by the design team needed to pursue options with the ASCC.

Adjournment of special site meeting

At approximately 8:00 p.m. the special site meeting was adjourned. Gelpi advised that the regular ASCC meeting would begin after a short break.

Chairman Gelpi called the regular evening ASCC meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Continued Discussion, Follow-up Review - Town Center Project, baseball field backstop and site lighting

Vlastic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on this matter and briefly noted that backstop discussion was, for the most part, completed by the ASCC a few minutes earlier in the evening. Gelpi asked if anyone wanted to offer additional comments on the backstop issue, but no one expressed an interest to do so.

Thereafter, town center project architects Susi Marzuola and Larry Strain presented the current version of the site lighting plan, i.e., Sheet E1.0, dated 2/17/07. They noted that the plan identified all of the locations for the proposed light fixtures as well as the switching zones for the proposed lights. Vlastic referred to cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures provided with the April 6 staff report.

The design team advised that specific time frames for the lights to be on by zone had not yet been identified, but that the timing systems permitted easy adjustment for lighting times as eventually determined appropriate by the town. It was also noted that there would be some entry sign lighting, but that specific plans and fixtures for such lighting had yet to be detailed.

After brief discussion of the lighting plan, ASCC members and the project design team left the meeting room to inspect the "mock-up" of the proposed pole mounted light fixture installed at the site as requested by ASCC members. Marzuola noted that the "mock-up" fixture had been modified to include a defusing lens and a "warmer" light bulb. ASCC members concluded that while the light intensity seemed acceptable, they would prefer the fixture be modified to include a "skirt" or shield to block views to the light source. Marzuola stated she was exploring the option to so modify the proposed fixture, but that an alternative fixture may need to be identified.

After viewing the "mock-up" of the pole light, ASCC members returned to the meeting room. Public comments were then requested, but none were offered.

After discussion of the proposed fixtures and lighting zones, ASCC members found the plan generally acceptable but requested the following plan revisions or adjustments:

1. The proposed pole light should be modified to include a “skirt” or shield to screen views to the light source, otherwise the light intensity appears acceptable as modeled.
2. An alternative for the proposed seat wall mounted G4 fixture needs to be identified that ensures light will be directed down and not out. The locations for the currently proposed G4 fixture would result in an unacceptable amount of light spill toward Portola Road views.
3. More switching zones are needed in the area of the building cluster. The zone areas need to ensure that if only a few people are at town hall later in the evening, only the lights actually needed to accommodate their safety are illuminated. The specific concern is that not all lights in the cluster area be on to accommodate just a few staff or meeting participants.

The project architects advised that they would consider the ASCC comments and provide a revised plan for later review by ASCC members.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-548, for new residence, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Corman

Vlasic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on the subject follow-up review and site development permit. He referenced the September 11, 2006 ASCC conditional approval of the request and discussed the following plans and materials submitted to address the ASCC conditions of approval and satisfy site development permit requirements:

Architectural Plans, Stoecker and Northway Architects Incorporated, 2/14/07

Sheet A1.0, Title Sheet
Sheet A1.1a, Site Plan
Sheet A1.1, Site Plan First Floor
Sheet A2.1, First Floor Plan
Sheet A2.2, Basement Plan
Sheet A2.3, Roof Plan
Sheet A2.4, Reflected Ceiling Plan
Sheet A2.5, Basement Reflected Ceiling Plan
Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A3.3, Building Sections
Sheet A3.4, Building Sections
Sheet A3.5, Building Sections

Grading and Drainage Plans, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 2/14/07

Sheet C1, Grading, Drainage and Utility Plan
Sheet C2, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet C3, Plan Details

Landscape Plans, Ron Benoit Associates, 12/21/06

Sheet L1, Planting Plan
Sheet L2, Irrigation Plan
Sheet L3, Irrigation Plan
Sheet L4, Planting Details

Sheet SW-1, Septic System Plan, Steve Brooks Environmental Health Specialist,
3/17/07 (separate sheet that supersedes the 1/31/07 Sheet in the overall plan
package)

Vlasic also noted that since the staff report was prepared comments had been received from the conservation committee, raising certain issues relative to the proposed landscaping plan, and from the town geologist recommending conditional approval of the site development permit.

Tedd Corman, applicant, Jim Stoecker and Bob Stoecker, project architects and Ron Benoit, project landscape architect presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Benoit presented an April 6, 2007 letter setting forth the procedures for site placement of plant materials to satisfy approval condition 2a.
- The plans have been revised to satisfy the requirements of the health department, but final health department approval has not yet been received.
- A photo of the proposed exposed aggregate driveway material was presented. It was noted that the photo was of the "Kabcenell" driveway located in town and that the material was not reflective. It was suggested that an ASCC member inspect this driveway to see its characteristics and appreciate that the material does address the issues in ASCC approval condition 4.
- The final construction staging plan will include a tree protection plan that incorporates the recommendations of the project arborist.

Public comments were requested. **Mary and Robert Jack, 938 Westridge Drive**, presented a photo of the existing Buckeye trees located in the proposed fill area to the north of the proposed driveway. They commented that the approved plans allow for removal of the trees, but that the trees are important for screening and they would prefer their preservation. Mr. Jack also raised concern over making a decision on the driveway material from only a photo.

Bob Stoecker advised that the Buckeyes could not be saved due to the grading required for the driveway. He explained that the driveway in this area was at the maximum allowable 20% grade and that the alignment could not be shifted without creating greater site impacts in terms of grading and tree removal. In response to a question, he agreed to the addition of coast live oak in the area where the Buckeyes were to be removed to help provide for long term view screening.

Todd Untrect, 197 Meadowood Drive, expressed concern over the size and location of the plantings proposed along the property line common with his parcel. He sought assurance that the locations and sizes of plants would achieve the intended screening desired.

Benoit and ASCC members discussed the plantings and agreed that in general they would achieve the screening objectives relative to the Untrect property. Concern, however, focused on the use of *Myrica Californica* under the Blue Oaks. Reference was made to the comments in the report from the conservation committee on this matter. It was suggested that the *Myrica Californica* be replaced with Toyon or Coffeeberry.

Benoit explained his experience with the use of *Myrica Californica* and commented that it would be established with drip irrigation and once established irrigation would not be needed. He stressed that his experience demonstrates that the plant would be appropriate in the Blue Oak environment without any impact on the oaks.

Council Liaison Merk and planning commission liaison Elkind also shared concerns with the use of *Myrica Californica* under the Blue Oaks.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the concerns of the conservation committee would need to be resolved with plan adjustments or clarifications to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. It was stressed that Mr. Benoit would need to work with a representative of the conservation committee to develop an acceptable response.

As to the driveway material, Warr commented that he had experience with it and found it fully appropriate. It was agreed, however, that a field check of the "Kabcenell" driveway, as offered by the project architect, should be made by a designated ASCC member to ensure acceptability for use of the material on the subject project.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up plan submittal and site development permit request subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit or the site development permit:

1. The requirements set forth in the following reports shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the site development permit committee member:

Public Works Director memorandum of February 23, 2007

Fire Marshal memorandum of March 27, 2007

Town Geologist memorandum of April 9, 2007

In addition, the project shall conform to all requirements of the health officer.

2. The concerns of the conservation committee as set forth in the committees review comments for "120 Golden Hills" shall be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated member of the ASCC.
3. The landscaping plan shall be revised to incorporate the planting process and schedule set forth in the April 6, 2007 letter from Ron Benoit. The final schedule, however, shall also provide for early installation of the key screen plants along the property boundary

with the intent that the materials are established and providing some screening at the time of house occupancy. Further, the landscape plan shall be revised to include additional planting of a *Quercus Agrifolia* in the fill slope below the driveway to mitigate for loss of the Buckeye trees. The landscape plan revisions shall be to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

4. The "Kabcenell" driveway shall be field checked by a designated ASCC member to verify that the material satisfies the provisions for low reflectivity potential as called for in original approval condition 4. (Breen volunteered to serve as the designated ASCC member on this item.)
5. A final, detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be presented with the building permit application to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member. The plan shall include the recommendations of the project arborist. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Follow-up Review, Site Development Permit X9H-568 -- Architectural Review for detached guest house accessory structure, 300 Alamos Road, Christensen

Vlasic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on this follow-up review and site development permit. He referenced the conditions of the November 20, 2006 ASCC project approval and noted that the following plans, unless otherwise noted prepared by the Douglass Company and received February 9, 2007, were submitted to primarily address the site development permit requirements of the approval conditions:

- Sheet A-1, Project Data, 11/7/06
- Sheet A-2, Site Plan/Landscape Screening Plan, 11/7/06
- Sheet A-3, Floor Plans, 11/7/06
- Sheet A-4, Exterior Elevations, 11/7/06
- Sheet C-01, Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan and Notes & Details, Clifford Bechtel And Associates, 1/23/07, revised 3/30/07
- Survey, 300 Alamos Road, L. Wade Hammond, 12/8/06

Vlasic advised that the other ASCC conditions would be addressed with a future submittal that would likely be presented with the project building permit plans.

Jim Christensen, applicant and Mr. Douglass, project designer and contractor, presented the plans to the ASCC. They stressed that they wanted assurance that the grading plans were acceptable prior to proceeding to address the other ASCC approval conditions. It was noted that Sheet C-01 had been revised to address health department comments regarding the septic system, but that a final sign-off letter had yet to be received from the health officer.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the grading plans and agreed they were generally acceptable as presented. Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Von Feldt and

passed 5-0, approval of the site development permit request subject to the following conditions:

1. The requirements set forth in the following reports shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the site development permit committee member:

Public Works Director memorandum of March 16, 2007
Fire Marshal memorandum of March 28, 2007
Town Geologist memorandum of March 28, 2007

In addition, the project shall conform to all requirements of the health officer. Any recommendations of the conservation committee shall be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff.

2. The location of the proposed drainage outfalls shall be reviewed by a professional arborist and as necessary relocated to ensure that water is directed away from the oaks and not concentrated around the drip lines of the trees. This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.

The above action was taken with the understanding that all other conditions of the November 20, 2006 architectural approval would be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit.

Continued Architectural Review of plans for garage addition, 312 Golden Hills Drive, Edwards

Vlasic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on this project. He explained that project review was initiated on March 12, 2007 and then continued mainly to allow time to resolve a building height issue. Vlasic then reviewed the following revised project plans, received on April 4, 2007 and prepared by ADL Design, and explained how they address the issues discussed at the March 12 meeting:

Sheet A-1, Site Plan, 2/10/07
Sheet A-2, Elevations, 4/1/07
Sheet A-3, Floor Plan & Elevations, Electrical and Mechanical, 4/1/07
Sheet A-4, Roof Plan, 4/1/07

Tony Lauras, project designer, presented the revised plans to the ASCC and also submitted a March 22, 2007 "Arborist On Site" report prepared by Horticultural Consulting, Inc. discussing the one valley oak tree to be removed and the needed trimming of one limb of and oak tree that would be preserved. He also advised that he and the applicant were agreeable to the conditions recommended in the staff report.

In response to a question, Mr. Lauras explained that height conformity was achieved with lowering of the proposed roof pitch and that the "golf simulator" would still function with this change.

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

1. A final arborist report shall be provided relative to the measures to be taken to protect the 16" and 18" oaks to be preserved adjacent to the addition area. The tree protection measures shall be implemented with a tree protection and construction staging plan.
2. The proposed exterior color scheme shall be modified to conform to the provisions of the town's policies relative to light reflectivity values.
3. The one new proposed light fixture location, i.e., on the rear door to the garage, shall be shown on the building permit plans. Further, an alternative light fixture shall be selected that has more shielding and that directs light down.

Architectural Review for landscaping and minor grading, 11 Buck Meadow Drive, Lot 27 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Klein

Vlasic presented the April 6, 2007 staff report on this request for approval of proposed minor landscape improvements to be made on the east side of the existing residential improvements on the subject Blue Oaks subdivision property. He explained that the improvements include a new tile patio with stucco retaining wall within the building envelope and minor grading, gravel surfaces, dry stack boulder landscape walls and native plantings just to the east of the building envelope line. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 3/8/07 and prepared by Ransohoff, Blanchfield, Jones, Inc.:

Sheet L2, Master Plan & Planting Plan
Sheet L3, Planting Plan

Applicant Danielle Guttman and project architect Paula Blanchfield presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- A final approval letter has been received from the Blue Oaks Homeowners Association. A copy of the letter dated April 4, 2007 was provided to the ASCC.
- No new exterior lighting is proposed.
- As explained in the staff report, the intent is to place the dry stack boulder features as randomly as possible in the area outside of the building envelope so that they do not have a strong linear appearance. They will be set to randomly to follow the terrain and appear more like they were naturally placed on the site.
- In response to questions regarding the proposed plant list, it was noted that some plants on the list are not consistent with the approved list for the Blue Oaks project but are also not shown for actual planting. One plant proposed for use, however, was noted as being inconsistent with the Blue Oaks PUD list and Blanchfield concurred it should be eliminated from the plans.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

Thereafter, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the proposed improvements subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any permits for the project:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to eliminate the following plantings from the list and plan:

Black Knight Butterfly Bush
Pink Delight Butterfly Bush
Fleabane

2. The placement of the dry stack boulder features shall be as randomly as possible in the area outside of the building envelope so that they do not have a strong linear appearance. They shall be set to randomly follow the terrain and appear more like they were naturally placed and not "manufactured."

Other Comments

Vlasic advised that two previously approved projects would be presented to the ASCC for additional review at the next ASCC meeting. He noted one was for the Andrighetto project at 235 Shawnee Pass and the other was the Enright project at 171 Mapache Drive. He clarified that both requests were for some adjustments to the height conditions placed by the ASCC on the projects.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Warr and passed 5-0 approval of the March 12, 2007 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

T. Vlasic