

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: Zaffaroni
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Prior to consideration of the following application Warr left the meeting room noting that his firm was providing the architectural services on the project.

Continued review, Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-566, 3510 Alpine Road, Hemington

Vlasic presented the February 7, 2007 staff on the continued review of this proposal for construction of a new residence and other improvements on the subject 3.1 acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He discussed the ASCC's 1/22 preliminary review of the proposal and explained how the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 2/5/07 and prepared by CJW Architecture, addressed the comments and issues identified at the time of the preliminary review:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Site Survey, BGT Land Surveying, 9/27/06
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, revised 12/15/06
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Vlasic referenced the 2/6/07 revised submittal letter from project architect Kevin Schwarckopf and noted that the following materials provided with the original application and evaluated in the 1/18 staff report were still part of the project before the ASCC:

Cut sheets, received 12/8/06, for the proposed exterior light fixtures
"Finish Color Board," dated 12/15/06

Vlasic emphasized that the revised plans were intended to address the key design issues discussed at the 1/22 meeting. He noted that the applicant was seeking ASCC acceptance of the key revisions with the understanding the a number of details, including data needed for completion of review and action on the site development permit application, would be pursued after the ASCC found the basic site and architectural design concepts acceptable. Vlasic then presented images of views from Alpine Road to the story poles on the site as

modeled for the original proposal and compared them to images of the story poles adjusted for conformity to the revised plans.

Dorain and Matt Hemington and project architect Kevin Schwarckopf presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They provided the following comments and clarifications:

- The plans have been modified as noted in the 2/6/07 transmittal. In addition to the adjustments to house and garage siting, and elimination of front yard fencing and gates, the plans include a substantial reduction in basement area. The story poles were adjusted to model the revised house location and the adjusted location for the detached garage. The poles, however, do not represent all of the garage changes. Specifically, they do not show the lowering in garage height or changes in roof form.
- In addition to the house and garage changes, the guest/pool house location has been modified to ensure protection of the adjacent trees, i.e., as committed to at the 1/22 meeting.
- A modified image of the proposed garage, viewed from Alpine Road, was presented showing the impact of the addition of screen trees and shrubs on the east side of the structure. It was noted that the "new" tree to be located near the garage would either be a new oak or an oak transplanted from another location on the property, likely one of the existing trees in the area of the proposed swimming pool.
- At this point, consideration is being given to the use of well water for irrigation of site vegetation.
- While the house will not be totally invisible from the street, it will be over 175 feet back from the front property line. The garage will be over 105 feet from the property line. Further, with existing vegetation to be preserved and proposed new planting, in time most of the project would be well screened in terms of views within the Alpine Road corridor. The plans, including the currently proposed revisions, have been developed with respect for town design guidelines, plans and regulations.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the new fence in the area of the "basketball court" would be adjusted to be a four foot high horse fence for conformity to the provisions of the fence ordinance. It was also noted that a gate would likely be included for "retrieval of balls."
- As noted at the last meeting, the garage would have not only stained wood shingle siding, but also stained wood trim to match the wood siding.

Public comments were requested. **Paul Heiple, conservation committee**, reviewed the notes in the committee's project view sheet transmitted to the ASCC. He expressed concern with the proposed use of well water noting that this would restrict water flows to Los Trancos Creek and potentially impact the creek habitat for, in particular, steelhead trout. He also stressed the need to reduce the proposed scope of lawn area, and eliminate the proposed planting of redwood trees. He stated support for removal of the existing palm tree.

In response to a question from Mr. Heiple, Vlasic advised that a revised landscape plan would need to be provided by the applicant addressing the conservation committee concerns as well as other concerns identified in the staff reports on the project. He clarified that this plan would be part of the final site development permit application package and would be referred to the conservation committee for review and comment prior to any action by the ASCC on the site development permit.

ASCC members then discussed the revised plans. Members concurred that the project revisions were appropriate and supported the use of oaks to screen views to the detached garage. Following discussion, Clark moved seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0, approval of the revised plans in terms of physical massing and structural layout, subject to following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The complete site development permit application shall be submitted and processed though final ASCC approval. As part of the site development permit application, a revised landscape plan shall be submitted addressing the concerns identified in the following documents:

- Conservation Committee review sheet
- 1/18/07 and 2/7/07 staff reports
- 1/22/07 ASCC meeting minutes

In particular, the revised landscape plan shall include reduction in scope of planted lawn areas and shall provide for at least two oaks to screen views from Alpine Road to the garage and basketball court area. Details for the proposed trails bridge near the driveway intersection with Alpine Road shall be specified with the final site development permit plans.

2. The proposed basketball court area fencing shall be modified to be in conformity with the fence ordinance.
3. The proposed painted trim colors shall be modified to conform to the town's 50% maximum light reflectivity value policy limit.
4. The proposed exterior lighting plan shall be modified to address the concerns set forth in the 1/22/07 staff report. In particular, the scope of front porch lighting in the area of study and main house entry shall be reduced for conformity to town exterior lighting guidelines and regulations.
5. A tree protection and construction staging plan shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall incorporate the recommendations of the project arborist relative to tree protection and long-term tree care, as set forth in the January 6, 2007 report prepared by McClenahan Consulting.

Following action on the Hemington application Warr returned to his position on the ASCC.

Prior to consideration of the following application Clark temporarily left his ASCC position, noting that he had previously provided architectural services to the applicant, but was not involved in the current request.

Architectural Review for “Sunroom” house additions and other site improvements, 420 Minoca Road, Kao

Vlasic presented the staff report on this proposal for the addition of a 189 sf sunroom on the subject 1.0 acre Alpine Hills subdivision property. He explained that the project also includes entry gate, fencing and driveway improvements. ASCC members considered the staff report, and the following plans for the sunroom addition and proposed driveway, fencing and gate improvements:

Bay Area Sunrooms, Inc. Sunroom site and elevation plans (two sheets), dated 10/6/06 and received 1/17/07
Sheet S1, Proposed Driveway Plan, Landsystems, 1/8/07
Gate Plan and Gate Elevation, received 1/17/07

Also considered was a product brochure on the proposed “Four Seasons” sunroom, including data sheets on the proposed sunroom glazing, and a sample of the stainless steel material proposed for the new gate and fencing.

Ms. Kao and Mr. Williams, applicants, presented their proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Samples of the proposed wall and roof glazing for the sunroom were presented for ASCC inspection. It was noted that the glass surfaces would have only a 10% light reflectivity and 56% light transmission.
- The site plan for the driveway and fencing work was clarified. It was noted that apparently two versions of the site plan showing different configurations for the guest parking area had been presented. It was noted that the sheet with only one parking bay was the correct design and that no trees would be removed even though one plan suggests that an oak would be removed. It was further clarified that there is no plan for fencing along the west side of the Minoca Road cut bank even though the site plan suggests such fencing. It was stressed that the applicants only desire a fence at the 25-foot setback from the north end of the steep bank to the northern property, basically as suggested in the staff report.
- The stainless steel metal gate material would have a sandblasted surface and the design could be modified with the decorative pattern “cut out” of the stainless steel sheets to achieve the 50% opacity required by current fence regulations. An alternative fencing/gate design with steel posts and horizontal “pipe” elements was also presented for reaction.
- The applicant is agreeable to limiting the pavers to the area “behind” the driveway gate as recommended in the staff report.

Public comments were requested. **William Meffert, 406 Minoca Road**, stated he was the neighbor immediately to the south of the project site. He stated no concerns with the proposed sunroom addition, but worried over drainage conditions associated with recently completed landscaping work on the subject property and also about the accuracy of definition of the property line between his and the Kao/Williams property.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and found the plans for the sunroom addition generally acceptable as presented. Members, however, concurred that the driveway, entry gate and fencing plans needed correction and further clarification before action on them could be considered. Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0, to make the findings to allow for the proposed sunroom addition, exceeding the 85% floor area limit, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A landscape plan shall be provided showing the location of existing and proposed native shrub and tree screening along the south side of the sunroom location. Once approved the landscape plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to "finaling" of the building permit for the sunroom.
2. The completed "sustainability building checklist" shall be included with the building permit application.

In addition to this condition, the ASCC directed that the drainage concerns of the neighbor be referred to the public works director for review, if possible as part of the building permit request associated with the sunroom addition. Vlastic advised that staff would bring the matter to the attention of the public works director.

With regard to the driveway, fencing and gate proposals, ASCC members concurred that the applicant should consider modifications to bring the proposals in line with the provisions of the fence ordinance and that asphalt should be the driveway surface from the road to the driveway gates. Thereafter, review of the fencing, gate and driveway plans was continued to the February 26, 2007 regular ASCC meeting.

Following action on the Kao application Clark returned to his position on the ASCC.

Follow-up Review -- proposed residential development of Westridge parcel and Site Development Permit X9H-547, 100 La Sandra Way, Crown

Vlastic presented the February 7, 2007 staff report on the subject follow-up review. He explained the background associated with the original 1/9/06 ASCC action on the project and discussed how the following revised plans and materials, unless otherwise noted prepared by Chase Diengott Architects, address the approval conditions:

- Page 1, Construction Schedule, R.J. Daily Construction Co., 1/9/07
- Sheet L-10, Construction Staging and Tree Protection plans, received 1/31/07
- Sheet A4.1, Vineyard House Main Level Electrical/Reflected Ceiling Plan, 1/24/07
- Sheet A4.2, Vineyard House Lower Level Electrical/Reflected Ceiling Plan, 1/24/07

Sheet A4.3, Garage/Exercise Electrical/Reflected Ceiling Plans, 1/24/07
Sheet L-6.0, Planting Plan and Legend, Jenn Carroll Wilson Landscape, 1/24/07
Sheet L7.0, Landscape Lighting Plan and Schedule, Jenn Carroll Wilson Landscape,
1/24/07
Cut sheets for step, Vineyard House sconce and Garage sconce
January 29, 2007 transmittal letter with access easement data

Vlasic also had available for reference, copies of the 2006 approved plans and materials.

Laura Chase project architect and Bob Dailey, project contractor presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC. Chase provided a "clear" photo image of the proposed sconce, wall mounted light fixture. The following comments and clarifications were also offered:

- In response to a question, Mr. Dailey advised that his firm had done considerable construction at the site previously and, for the most part, was able to contain construction staging and parking on site. He noted, however, that at times the La Sandra cul-de-sac was temporarily used for delivery of materials and storage, but that care was taken to avoid problems for neighbors. He added that he expected a similar situation with the new project.
- Also in response to a question it was noted that the proposed construction schedule could be modified to move the driveway "lighting mock-up" for ASCC review from "August-September" to mid June 2008.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the submittal and several comments were offered relative to the proposed landscape materials, protection from deer impacts and ideal time for planting of native shrubs. It was agreed, however, that overall the revised plans and proposed project schedule were acceptable as submitted. Chase commented that she would share the landscaping concerns and issues with the project landscape architect and pursue minor adjustments as determined appropriate.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to building permit issuance:

1. The project schedule shall be modified to move the ASCC mock-up lighting test from August-September to mid June 2008.
2. At the time of the pre-construction meeting, staff should in particular, define the details for any construction use of the La Sandra cul-de-sac. Any such use should only be on a temporary basis for unusual conditions and the cul-de-sac should not routinely be used for construction staging, parking, etc.

The above action was taken with the understanding that the other approval conditions, i.e., those that are not the direct responsibility of the ASCC, would be addressed to the satisfaction of the appropriate staff member prior to issuance of any building permit.

Architectural Review for addition to Main Winery Building, 19501 Skyline Boulevard, Fogarty Winery

Vlasic presented the February 7, 2007 staff report on this request for approval of plans for a 590 sf garage addition to the winemaker's residence that is part of the main winery building at the Fogarty Winery located at the western boundary of the town along Skyline Boulevard. He reviewed the history associated with the project, as presented in the staff report, and previous decisions made relative to project conformity with the Winery conditional use permit X7D-87, also explained in the staff report. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following garage addition plans dated 1/16/07 prepared by Northpointe Development:

Vicinity Map
Sheet A1, Site Plan
Sheet A3, Floor Plan
Sheet A4, Elevation

Also considered were color images provided by the applicant of the proposed garage addition site with a note stating that all exterior materials and finishes would match existing conditions. In addition, Vlasic distributed copies of a 2/9/07 letter from Bruce and Hildegard Jackson, 19765 Skyline Boulevard, stating their understanding of the project and raising no concerns with it.

Dr. Thomas Fogarty and Larry Van Horne, project manager, presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following clarifications:

- They concurred with the staff assessment that some additional back-up space and associated grading would be needed for appropriate garage vehicle ingress and egress.
- The garage doors would be finished to match the wood siding.
- Erosion control planting would be installed at the end of the construction project.

Public comments were request, but none were offered.

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plans shall be revised to state that the garage doors shall be finished to match the stained wood siding on the existing and proposed building walls.
2. The plans shall be revised to include provisions for erosion control planting.
3. The plans shall be revised as required to clearly describe the adjustments necessary for appropriate driveway vehicle ingress and egress for the new garage spaces.

Architectural Review for house additions, 361 Grove Drive, Fabian

Vlasic presented the February 7, 2007 staff report on this proposal for approval of a second story addition to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.0 acre site. He explained that the proposal includes a new horse fence and driveway entry gate. He also noted, the plans would concentrate almost 90% of the permitted floor area in the main house and this can occur only if the ASCC can make the findings required by Section 18.48.020 of the zoning ordinance, as evaluated in the staff report. Vlasic then reviewed the following project plans and materials unless otherwise noted dated 12/22/06 and prepared by Hugh F. Kennedy, Architect:

Sheet A0-1, Plot Plan, General Notes and Index
Sheet C1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/16/06
Sheet A2-1, Floor Plans Option B, Relocate Master Bedroom Suite
Sheet A2.2, Roof Plan
Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevation & Section
Sheet A3.2, Elevations of the Addition
Colors and materials sheet received 12/22/06

Also reviewed were a 12/22/06 letter from the project architect describing the proposal, and the cut sheet for the proposed "Cooper Lighting" exterior wall mounted light fixture.

Vlasic noted that three communications from project site neighbors had been received relative to the proposal. He referenced two letters expressing concerns, one dated 2/7/07 from Mr. David Maahs, D.D.S., 360 Grove Drive and the other dated 2/9/07 from Larry Tesler and Colleen Barton, 351 Grove Drive. The third communication was identified as a 2/9/07 email from Beth Bianchi, Grove Court, expressing support for the proposal.

Vlasic then displayed photo images showing conditions in the area as well as view relationships relative to the project site and 351 and 360 Grove Drive. He noted, and referenced in the images, that the story poles and ridgeline taping had been installed at the site to enhance appreciation of potential changes that would result from project construction.

Mr. and Mrs. Fabian and project architect Hugh Kennedy presented the proposal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The site and area conditions were carefully evaluated to determine the best approach for an addition that would be meet the needs for the family with four children and minimize potential for impacts on the site or views to an from neighboring residences. The proposed second story design maintains a low profile, minimizes potential for any new site impacts and is as far removed from neighboring houses as possible.
- New windows have been located to ensure privacy for the site occupants and neighbors. The design process included considering views from the roof of the existing house to neighboring residences.
- The roof forms were selected to ensure the addition area would not "stand out" in terms of views to the site. Further, continuing the existing darker color scheme will ensure harmony with the existing tree and other vegetative colors of the site.

- Solar system professionals were consulted regarding the possible application of photovoltaic panels on the property. The conclusion is that the site is too shady for installation of an efficient photovoltaic system.
- Based on current ordinance requirements for fence and gate designs and locations, the proposed fencing and gate plans are being reconsidered. Due to driveway layout, location of large redwood trees and creek setback limitations, more thought will need to be given to the fencing and gate proposals.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Richard Merk, Town Council liaison wondered about the oleanders in the public right of way and the need for removal to clear any obstructions to public trail use.

Vlasic advised that there was still room to pass within the public right of way in the area of the oleanders, but that the public trail appears to actually be on the other, i.e., south, side of the Grove Drive extension to the Corte Madera Creek crossing.

Dr. Maahs, 360 Grove Drive, stated that he supported preservation of the oleanders for screening of views, but also was supportive of the proposed second story addition.

Larry Tesler and Colleen Barton, 351 Grove Drive, reviewed the comments in their 2/9/07 letter to the ASCC and emphasized their wish for an ASCC site visit to their property to consider view relationships prior to completing action on the proposal.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and found the approach for the house addition generally appropriate for the site and area conditions and also concluded that the findings needed to permit the proposed concentration of floor area could be made. In addition, members concurred that the existing/proposed color scheme was appropriate. Some discussion focused on the new entry area design and potential for light spill; and, after review of several issues and in view of the concerns of the neighbors agreed that a site meeting should be conducted prior to the completion of any action on the proposal. The site meeting was scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, February 26, 2007.

Larry Tesler and Colleen Barton were asked if access to their property could be made available for the 2/26 site meeting and they advised that someone would be present to allow ASCC access so that their view impact concerns could be fully appreciated.

ASCC members also offered the following comments for applicant consideration in preparing for the site meeting:

- The fence and gate proposals should be revised to conform to the fence ordinance standards and, in particular, addresses the fencing issues discussed in the staff report.
- A revised landscape plan should be developed that provides for eventually phasing out of the oleanders. The plan should include additional evergreen native shrubs and trees along the south side of the property to provide for the screening now accomplished by the oleanders.

- There is no building code requirement for the proposed second floor exterior deck light and consideration should be given to eliminating the light from the plans to further reduce potential for light spill toward neighbors.
- For appropriate site review on February 26, the proposed window areas exposed to view from the neighboring parcels should be “modeled” within the story poles placed to demonstrate the scope of the new second story.

In addition to the above comments Warr suggested that some additional design considerations be given to the “large” two-story wall exposed on the proposed south elevation. He noted that setback averaging is available to deal with the 50 foot front setback restriction and this “averaging” would allow some additional floor area extension on the south side of the lower floor. He suggested that this would break up the mass of the two-story form and might even allow for the continuation of a mid-level roof extension along the base of the upper floor wall, emphasizing the Ranch profile of the lower floor and reducing the apparent scope of the addition. He concluded that with such a design effort he could support even more floor area in the project. He added, however, that these comments should be viewed as a suggestion and not necessarily essential to his support of the request.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the February 26, 4:00 p.m. site meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following application Warr left the meeting room noting that his firm had recently provided architectural services to the Priory on the school’s master plan conditional use permit amendment project.

Review for compliance with conditions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30 – proposed plans for renovation and additions to library building, 302 Portola Road, The Woodside Priory School

Vlasic presented the February 7, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 1,270 sf to the library/media center building within the Priory campus. He noted that the project also includes circulation and exterior lighting improvements and that all of the proposals must be reviewed by the ASCC for conformity with the Priory’s master plan CUP documents. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by MK Think Architects and dated 1/12/06:

- Sheet: A0.00, Cover & Overall Project Information
- Sheet: A0.01, Site Plan
- Sheet: A1.00,, Existing & Demo Ground Floor Plan
- Sheet A1.01, Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.01, Existing and Proposed Elevations
- Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, BKF Engineers
- Sheet L1, Hardscape & Lighting Plan, Ron Benoit Associates
- Sheet L2, Hardscape & Lighting Plan, Ron Benoit Associates
- Cut sheets for the proposed pathway pole light fixture and the light to be placed in the existing fountain adjacent to the west end of library building

Exterior Materials Board received 1/12/07

Vlasic advised that based on the evaluation in the staff report, all aspects of the current proposal, except for the proposed fountain "up" lighting appear to fully conform to the approved CUP mater plan. He recommended elimination of the proposed "uplights" or an alternative approach to fountain lighting that would conform to the provisions of the use permit. He also recommended that the proposed "cut-off" to control light spill from the proposed pole lights be defined to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Al Zappelli, Woodside Priory, Matt Pietras, MKThink Architects, and Ron Benoit, project landscape architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC. Mr. Benoit advised that the existing fountain was donated to the school and is to be a focal feature of the existing plaza that would now be at the top of the new circulation staircase. He explained that it is currently lighted by a 500-watt spotlight attached to the library building that would be eliminated with the proposed plans. Mr. Benoit provided considerable data on the proposed fountain lights.

After discussion, ASCC members concluded that all aspects of the proposal were consistent with the provisions of the use permit except for the proposed fountain area "uplights." The applicant was encouraged to consider other options for the lighting that would be consistent with the use permit documents and fundamental town guidelines for exterior lighting. Members also noted that with the new staircase pole lights and recessed lights at the remodeled and added to library/media center building there would be considerable illumination of the fountain plaza and the fountain.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0, to find the plans in conformity with the approved use permit master plan documents subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the plans shall be revised to the satisfaction of planning staff to eliminate the proposed "uplights" around the plaza fountain.
2. Once the four pole lights are installed, and prior to "finaling" of the permits for the library/media center additions, an evening site inspection shall be conducted by the ASCC to ensure the pole light "cut-offs" direct light into the new staircase and the plaza area and minimize potential for light spill beyond these areas. Adjustments to the "cut-offs" shall be made as determined necessary by the ASCC.

Approval of Minutes

Von Feldt moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the January 22, 2007 regular meeting minutes with the following typographical corrections:

Page 9. In the third bullet item change "eliminate" to "eliminated."

Page 12. At the start of the fifth bullet item change "I" to "In."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

T. Vlastic