

Architectural and Site Control Commission **February 23, 2009**
Special Field Meeting, 10 La Sandra Way, Krosnick, and
12 Redberry Ridge, Adler/Elliott, and
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the special field meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. at 10 La Sandra Way.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Gelpi, Warr
Absent: Breen
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Others present relative to the Krosnick project:

John Krosnick, applicant
Fred Herring, project designer
Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)
Dennis Davis, project manager for Bill and Tammy Crown, 100 La Sandra Way

Change in Site Meeting Schedule

Prior to the start of the Krosnick field review, Vlastic advised that the site 4:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. site meetings scheduled for follow-up consideration of the Borders project, 16 Redberry Ridge, had been cancelled due to rainy conditions. He explained that these would be rescheduled for the same times on March 9, 2009. He added that the meeting cancellation and rescheduling had been checked with the applicant and Portola Valley Ranch neighbors concerned with the project and that all concurred with and expressed support for the rescheduling.

Preliminary Architectural Review for residential additions and remodeling and Site Development Permit X9H-599, 10 La Sandra Way, Krosnick

Vlastic presented the February 19, 2009 staff report on this preliminary review of plans for significant floor area additions to and remodeling of the existing multi-level residence on the subject 2.7-acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He explained that the existing house has a floor area of 2,926 sf and that the additions total 2,234 sf, most of which would be bedroom area on the west side of the existing house. He clarified that the majority of project work would take place within the established building site, but the architectural character of the house would also be fairly dramatically altered.

Vlastic advised that since the staff report had been prepared, the town had received a February 20, 2009 letter from the WASC indicating several concerns and that the current form of the plans has been "rejected" by the WASC. Vlastic noted that the letter offers specific comments, including understanding of the ASCC preliminary review process, and encourages design changes to mitigate concerns. Bev Lipman advised she was at the meeting to gain additional information and offer any needed clarifications relative to the WASC position.

Vlastic reminded the ASCC that this was a "Preliminary" review and that after gaining information and sharing of comments and reactions, ASCC consideration should be continued to a future meeting. Mr. Krosnick and Mr. Herring advised of their preference for the next review to not take place until at least the March 23, 2009 ASCC meeting date.

ASCC members considered the staff report, WASC concerns and the following proposed plans prepared, unless otherwise noted, by Herring & Worley, Inc., dated November 10, 2008:

Cover/Photo Image of Project Model
Sheet 1, General Site Plan, Project Data
Sheet 1.1, Detail Site Plan
Sheet 2, Garage & Lower Floor Plan
Sheet 3, Main Floor Plan
Sheet 4, Upper Floor Plan
Sheet 5, Exterior Elevations
Sheet 6, Vertical & Horizontal Control Plans
Partial Boundary & Topographic Map, Pat McNulty, Professional Land Surveyor,
November 2008
Schematics 1, Original Plans for Existing House, Michael D. Moyer, February 22, 1973
Sheet C-01, Preliminary Grading, Drainage, & Utility Plan, Clifford Bechtel and
Associates, 2/2/09

Mr. Krosnick and Mr. Herring then conducted an inspection of site conditions and explained the site markings set to demonstrate, particularly, the footprint changes and additions called for on the proposed plans. After walking the area around the house and considering existing conditions and, particularly project relationships to existing trees, the meeting continued inside the house to view the project model and proposed color and materials samples. During the course of the site meeting, the following clarifications were offered:

- Cedar siding, window frame material and roof material samples were provided. It was noted that the roof material, in particular, had been used on several other projects completed by Mr. Herring and that they had minimal light reflection potential. Photo images of other hillside houses designed by Mr. Herring were presented. It was noted that these houses use essentially the same siding, window and roof materials as proposed for the subject project.
- In order to control cooling relative to interior spaces behind the larger window areas on the east facing elevation, consideration is being given to the use of a small water trough along the outside base of the windows.
- The “fin” features (referred to as “flying buttresses” in the letter from the WASC) are intended to support a sun screen that would automatically be extended out over the “fins” when needed to control light and heat. The “screen” would be of cedar slates, likely 1.5” x 1.5” in size. The operation of the screen would be programmed so that it is out when needed to control impacts from the sun. The screen should also help mitigate views to and reflection from the east facing window areas.
- The intent is to protect the site trees and an arborist report will be obtained confirming the ability to protect trees and ensure their long-term health. The plans will, however, be revised to modify the proposed main entry stair and wall system so that tree #20 can, as recommended in the staff report, be saved.
- In response to a question, it was noted that there is no intention to have interior lighting that would “wash” large surfaces and create potential for significant light spill through the east facing windows.

- In response to a question, it was noted that there are no skylights proposed. It was also noted that no new yard lighting is planned at this time and that all planned house lighting would be within soffit areas and directed down.
- At this point, no significant landscape improvements are planned. The main objectives are to preserve existing site conditions, including tree cover, and to only install native grasses and shrubs where needed for erosion control.

Public comments were offered. **Bev Lipman** referred to the concerns in the February 20, 2009 WASC letter. She noted that she was gathering additional information for the committee and was particularly interested in receiving clarifications regarding the “fin” elements and proposed cedar slate shade system.

Dennis Davis, representing Bill and Tammy Crown, 100 La Sandra Way, provided a February 23, 2009 written list of concerns of his clients. He noted, however, based on clarifications offered at the site meeting he has tentatively concluded that design and planned adjustments should address most all of the listed concerns.

After consideration of site conditions and receiving design clarifications from the applicant and Mr. Herring and in light of WASC and neighbor input, ASCC members offered a the following comments and reactions to guide further plan development:

- While the proposed massing will, for the most part, stay within the existing house footprint and massing envelop, the success of the project will be based not only on how it fits on the site and within the neighborhood, but also the livability of the house for its occupants. The final design details will be the critical factors in making the project “work.” A critical detail is how the “edges” of the planned work impact adjacent trees and other vegetation. It is essential that the design and construction effort be done with care to ensure tree protection and long-term tree health. The design and construction need to be completed in light of comprehensive input from a qualified arborist.
- The proposed materials and finishes appear generally appropriate as planned. A larger sample of the roof material will, however, be needed so that final judgments can be made relative to reflectivity and off-site visibility, particularly from uphill properties.
- The entryway adjustments to preserve tree #20 need to be completed as recommended in the staff report. Further, the retaining wall work, including wall finishes, railings, etc., need to be fully described. Also, care needs to be exercised to ensure that the proposed driveway widening does not adversely impact the southeast side tree cover.
- Consideration needs to be given to added detailing along the southwest elevation, to help break-up the apparent two-story mass. Some additional horizontal treatments would appear appropriate.
- The detailing for the sun shade system over the “fin” elements needs to be fully explained. The design could cause added massing and enhance concerns over potential visual impacts. Overall, there needs to be a better understanding of how the shapes and elements work together to fit the site and area conditions. Alternative approaches to shading and sun control need to be considered that would allow for elimination of the proposed “fin” shading system of particular concern to the WASC. Possibly, the upper curved roof form needs to be extended over portions of the east side

to “pull” the house more into the site, shade the upper east side living spaces and terrace, and eliminate the need for the “fin” features.

- The large, east facing window areas are of particular concern, both in terms of potential view impacts and also livability of the house. They appear to require unique technical responses to control solar light and heat impacts, but these responses appear to have some inconsistencies. For example, the cooling “water trough” could create some reflection issues. The design needs to be explained in detail. Further, the curved metal roof over the lower east side study area could create heat gain and reflection impacting the livability of the upper terrace and interior living spaces. This issue needs to be considered in terms of appropriate design response now and not after the remodeling is completed and the design found to create such problems.
- Due to site conditions and driveway limitations, a comprehensive construction staging plan will eventually be needed to ensure minimum potential for site and area impacts.

While members appreciated the importance of views from within the house, they did concur that the potential off-site view impacts of the window areas were of particular concern to them. At the same time, members also concurred that the more “organic” approach of the design was generally appropriate, but with the important refinements that would be needed to address ASCC comments and concerns.

At approximately 3:30 p.m., members agreed that they would offer further “preliminary” comments on the project at the evening ASCC meeting. Chair Clark then thanked the applicant, project designer and others for participation in the site meeting. It was noted that the special ASCC field meeting would continue at 12 Redberry Ridge in the Blue Oaks subdivision, as soon as members could convene at the property.

Joint Planning Commission and ASCC Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-598, 12 Redberry Ridge (Lot 18 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Elliott/Adler

At approximately 3:45 p.m., ASCC members Clark, Aalfs, Gelpi and Warr and planning commissioners McIntosh, Gilbert and Von Feldt convened at 12 Redberry Ridge for *Preliminary* consideration of the Elliott/Adler project applications. They were joined by deputy town planner Vlasic and the following individuals:

Joy Elliott and Robin Adler, applicants
Carl Hesse, project architect
Tom Carrubba, project architect
Miki Honda, project architect
Stefan Thuilot, project landscape architect
Alan Dixon, project landscape architect
Kevin Kielty, project arborist
Bruce Owen, 14 Redberry Ridge

Vlasic presented the comments in the February 19, 2009 staff report on this proposal for new residential development of the subject Blue Oaks subdivision property. He reviewed the Blue Oaks PUD provisions for the project and also briefly discussed the site development permit provisions and need for planning commission consideration of the proposed grading plans.

Vlasic stressed that this was a preliminary review of the project and that after consideration of site conditions and other matters, ASCC members and planning commissioners should offer comments and reactions to help the applicant and design team develop plan revisions as may be necessary. He added that project review should then be continued to the March 9, 2009 ASCC meeting. He clarified that the date for further planning commission consideration of the site development permit will be set after the ASCC completes action on the architectural review application.

The project design team then presented the proposal making reference to the following proposed project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/20/09 and prepared by Square Three Design Studios, LLP, Architecture:

- Sheet A1.01, Proposed Site Plan, Project Data/Tabulations
- Sheet A1.02, Proposed Partial Site Plan
- Sheet A1.03, Proposed Partial Site/Main Level Floor Plan
- Sheet C-0, Topographic Survey Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 9/12/08
- Sheet C-1, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 1/19/09
- Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan with Erosion & Sedimentation Control Measures, MacLeod and Associates, 1/19/09
- Sheet A2.01, Proposed First Floor Plan – Area A and Joy’s Studio
- Sheet A2.02, Proposed First Floor Plan – Area B and Second Floor Loft
- Sheet A2.03, Proposed First Floor Plan – Area C
- Sheet A2.04, Proposed Basement Plan
- Sheet A2.05, Proposed Roof Plan
- Sheet A3.01, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A3.02, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A3.03, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A3.04, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.01, Proposed Building Sections
- Sheet A5.02, Proposed Building Sections
- Sheet A5.03, Proposed Building Sections
- Sheet L1.0, Conceptual (Landscape) Layout Plan, Thuilot Associates, Landscape Architecture, 1/19/09
- Sheet L2.0, Landscape Sections, Thuilot Associates, Landscape Architecture, 1/19/09
- Sheet L3.0, Planting List/Zones, Thuilot Associates, Landscape Architecture, 1/19/09

Exterior color board dated 1/20/09
Cut sheet for the proposed “Hinkley Lighting” wall mounted light fixture
January 29, 2009 arborists report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services.

Also used to explain the project were story poles and taping set to facilitate the site meeting. These were used during the course of the meeting to evaluate appropriateness of the proposed siting of the house and other improvements.

After a brief overview, Mr. Kielty arborist specifically discussed his review of the tree impact concerns outlined in the February 15, 2009 email to the ASCC from Josetta and Bruce Owen 14 Redberry Ridge. Mr. Kielty explained that while some tree limbing would likely be needed to accommodate parking, he concluded that tree health would not be adversely impacted by the proposed improvements.

During the course of the site walk, design team members described the plans and offered the following clarifications:

- The story poles were set to model the ends of the roof extension and, therefore, in many cases, actual wall alignment is three feet “in” from the story pole.
- The house and other improvements have been cut into the site and placed so as to minimize potential view impacts from adjoining houses and neighbors’ primary outside use areas. Further, the location of proposed plant materials has been selected to enhance screening and privacy. It was also noted that only minimal extension of improvements is planned in the slope/drainage-restricted area on the south side of the building envelope (BE).
- Design adjustments are being considered to address the Owen concerns with regard to visibility of the detached “studio.”
- In response to a question, it was noted that currently, the plans propose approximately 2,400 cubic yards of cut to be hauled away from the property. It was also noted that this would require at least 240 one-way truck trips, with each trip removing up to 10 cubic yards of earth from the site.
- While rear yard plans are still being refined, it is likely that some of the retaining walls would be of corten steel, with a “rusted” exposed surface. The rear yard landscape plan was also explained and it was noted that no more than 1,000 sf of irrigated lawn area is proposed, i.e., in line with the PUD restrictions on lawn area.

ASCC members and planning commissioners considered the project plans and materials and site and area conditions. They discussed the concerns of Mr. Owen with him and viewed the proposed improvements, as modeled by the story poles and taping, from locations on the Owen property. Also considered were views from Redberry Ridge relationships to existing improvements on Lot 19 to the south.

Following consideration of the plans and site and area conditions and issues, both planning commissioners and ASCC members offered comments and reactions to the proposed applications. The following comments were offered by the planning commission with respect to the proposed grading plans:

- In general the project appears appropriate as planned. Adjustments, however, should be considered as may be necessary to ensure protection of the trees of concern to Mr. and Mrs. Owen, and additional tree and shrub planting should be considered to further screen views.
- The adjustment needs to be made as noted in the staff report regarding removing the garden area walls below the studio that extend beyond the BE limit line.
- More effort needs to be made to keep “cut” materials on site. Consideration should be given to either reducing the scope of cut, perhaps a smaller basement area, and/or placing more dirt on site as fill. At the same time, any additional fill placement should not dramatically impact the native manzanita and other native materials on the western slopes of the BE. A balance would be needed to retain more fill on site and preserve the general character of the existing native materials.
- Some of the proposed plantings are considered invasive in the town and others appear to need more water than would be appropriate for the site and this could impact other plant materials that don’t require such watering. The landscape plan needs to be

clarified to eliminate any such materials and ensure it fully conforms to the plantings listed in the PUD for use in Blue Oaks.

- The placement of new trees needs to provide for privacy and screening, but should also ensure that distant views from Lot 19 are not adversely impacted as trees grow to maturity.

The following comments were then offered by ASCC members:

- Overall, the proposed siting of improvements and architectural treatments appear appropriate for the site and properly related to adjoining improvements. Further, the proposed materials and finishes appear appropriate.
- There is some concern with the placement of the improvements at the north end of the site. The garage and parking areas appear “tight” at this end, and consideration should be given to pulling improvements further away from the property line and trees of concern to the neighbors.
- Consideration should be given to lowering the heights of the roof forms over the garage so that the overall profile of the house is more harmonious with site contours. This would also help reduce potential for visual impacts relative to views from Lot 17 (Owen).

ASCC members also concurred with the comments of planning commissioners with regard to reducing the scope of grading off-haul and also suggested that consideration be given to a smaller basement area. Warr noted that his concern over height in the area of the garage might be relieved when he has a chance to study the project model, which could not be reviewed at the site meeting due to rainy conditions.

ASCC members agreed that they would offer further “preliminary” comments on the project at the evening ASCC meeting. Vlasic asked that if planning commissioners had any additional comments after the meeting they could forward them to him by email.

At the conclusion of the field review all present thanked the applicant and project design team for the site meeting and information gained at it. Thereafter, “preliminary” ASCC project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment and Evening Meeting Attendance

At approximately 4:50 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned. Warr advised that he was not able to attend the evening ASCC meeting.

Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 8:05 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Gelpi
Absent: Breen, Warr
Town Council Liaison: Toben
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Review, Remaining Conditions-- Architectural Review for new residence, 16 Redberry Ridge (Lot 16 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Borders

Clark advised that consideration of this follow-up matter would be continued to field sessions on March 9, 2009. He explained that the scheduled reviews, as outlined in the February 19, 2009 staff report, had to be cancelled due to the rainy weather.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter, project follow-up review was continued to March 9, 2009, to start at the project site at 4:30 p.m.

Grading for Los Trancos Creek Fish Ladder improvements—Site Development Permit X9H-597, 7 Arastradero Road, Stanford University

Vlasic presented the February 19, 2009 staff report on this request for approval of approximately 140 cubic yards of grading, including 47 yards of cut and 93 yards of fill, within the town's boundary for modification of an existing fish ladder facility located on Los Trancos Creek. He advised that the work within the town boundary is a small part of a larger project, as explained in the staff report, that is subject to conditional use permit provisions regulated by Santa Clara County.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Wood Rodger and are dated 5/8/08:

Cover Sheet, Location and Vicinity Map
Sheet G-2, List of Drawings
Sheet G-3, Abbreviations and Legend
Sheet G-5, Site and Grading Plan
Sheet G-7, Riparian Revegetation Plan, Olberding Environmental

Stanford University project representatives Karla Smith and Tom Zuckerman presented the proposal and submitted a full set of project plans for town files. It was noted that the plans clarified the scope of tree removal, which is consistent with the understandings for tree removal discussed in the staff report.

Mr. Zuckerman explained the purpose of the project as being replacement and enhancement of the existing steelhead trout fish ladder facility. It was further noted that there would be improvement to the "feed" of water to Felt Lake and, relative to lands in the Town, a stabilized creek bank.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 3-0 approval of the project subject to the following conditions, as listed in the staff report, to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to the issuance of the site development permit:

1. The project shall adhere to all of the conditions of Santa Clara County architectural and site approval as set on August 14, 2008.
2. The requirements of the town geologist as set forth in his February 2, 2009 report shall be adhered to. (These shall also be forwarded to Santa Clara County for incorporation into its approval documents as appropriate.)
3. Prior to the start of project work, final construction staging, vegetation protection and erosion control plans shall be provided to the satisfaction of the public works director.
4. Prior to the start of project work, the plans shall be clarified as to the exact extent of tree removal. Replacement vegetation shall be provided as determined necessary to the satisfaction of the conservation committee.
5. The proposed riparian re-vegetation plan for the work area in the town shall be modified as may be determined appropriate by the conservation committee.

Architectural Review for carport conversion, 6 Franciscan Ridge, Portola Valley Ranch, Novesky

Vlasic presented the February 19, 2009 staff report on this proposal for enclosure of the existing flat roof, detached carport located on the subject parcel on the southeast side of the Franciscan Ridge cul-de-sac bulb in Portola Valley Ranch. He explained that the proposed enclosure would be accomplished with the installation of two new garage doors with a dividing post and that the opening on the north side elevation would be replaced with a new window and siding to match the existing vertical grooved plywood siding. He added that the garage door would also have vertical grooved plywood to match the siding and that all improvements would be finished to match existing conditions, as detailed in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the two-sheet application plans, one showing the proposed front elevation and the other showing the proposed north side improvements, received on January 12, 2009. Also considered were color photo images provided by the applicant of the existing carport and the January 9, 2009 project approval letter from the Portola Valley Ranch design committee.

Mr. Novesky presented his proposal to the ASCC and clarified that an automatic garage door opener is part of the plans.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Aalfs, and passed 3-0 approval of the project as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. An automatic garage door opening system shall be provided for on the building permit plans.
2. A plan to protect existing landscaping from construction impacts shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Preliminary Architectural Review for residential additions and remodeling and Site Development Permit X9H-599, 10 La Sandra Way, Krosnick

Vlasic briefly reviewed the February 19, 2009 staff report on this project and the events of the afternoon site meeting. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans.) He noted that the ASCC agreed to provide additional *preliminary* comments as needed at the evening meeting and then continue project review to the March 23, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Mr. Krosnick and designer Fred Herring were present to discuss the project further with ASCC members. Mr. Herring formally submitted photo images of similar projects he has completed, primarily to enhance understanding of the proposed design, materials, finishes, etc.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members then offered the following comments in addition to, or further emphasizing, those expressed at the afternoon site meeting:

- The southwest elevation needs to be reconsidered to break-up the two-story mass and plan adjustments need to be made to save tree #20. In redesigning the entry pathway to save the tree, consideration should be given to using two lower retaining walls instead of one tall wall.
- The scope of glazing on the east side needs to be reduced. Consideration should be given to, for example, having shorter windows that don't lose the view from within, but "bring the bottom of the windows up" so that, overall there is less window area.
- The proposed "cooling water-trough" needs to be explained, particularly in terms of water conservation.
- The "fin" and shade features need to be explained in detail. If they result in excessive massing or calling of undue attention to the structure, then, perhaps, to gain shading, the upper curved roof form should be extended to the east and the fins eliminated.
- Detailed plans for tree protection and construction staging will be needed, and the input of a certified arborist is essential.
- Lighting details need to be explained, including plans for internal illumination.
- The final landscape plan should include identification of efforts that would be needed to eliminate thistle on the property.

- Final plans need to detail the driveway and parking area retaining walls in terms of proximity to trees, tree root protection, and also proposed railing design.

In addition to the above comments, members concurred that in general the “organic” design approach was appropriate and, overall, they were supportive of the basic design. Following discussion, project review was continued to the March 23, 2009 ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-598, 12 Redberry Ridge (Lot 18 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Elliott/Adler

Vlasic briefly reviewed the February 19, 2009 staff report on this project and the events of the afternoon site meeting. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) He noted that the ASCC agreed to provide additional *preliminary* comments as needed at the evening meeting, consider the project model then continue project review to the March 9, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Joy Elliott, Robin Adler, and project architects Tom Carrubba and Carl Hesse were present to discuss the plans with ASCC members. The project landscape architects were also present. The design team displayed and discussed the project model and samples of the proposed exterior materials, including paving materials, and offered the following comments and clarifications in addition to those presented at the site meeting.

- The project was scheduled for formal consideration at the February 23, 2009 Blue Oaks Homeowners Association meeting, but this did not occur due to lack of a quorum.
- The house, as sited on the plans, is actually two feet further away from the Owen property than what was modeled by story poles and taping at the site. This adjustment was made after the story poles were installed and was, in part, a response to the concerns of the neighbors.
- Some of the hardscape surfaces would be in permeable materials. Most of the driveway and parking area surfaces would be in “Natural Pave XL” resin, like the central path at the town center.
- In response to a question regarding the sustainable elements of the design, it was noted that a number of items are being considered including:
 - A “cool” roof
 - Clerestory windows for natural light
 - 2”x6” walls for “thicker” insulation
 - Rainwater collection system
 - Durable materials
 - Consideration of a Photovoltaic solar system. At a minimum, the house would be prepared for ease of future installation of such a system.
- Comments have been received from the owners of Lot 19 (Swisher), regarding the “playhouse” feature and lighting associated with it. These are being considered as plan refinement proceeds.
- In response to concerns over the size of the proposed basement, it was noted that the plans previously approved for the site had a larger basement and that given the scope of

work needed to cut the house into the site, the additional effort to capture the basement area was minimal.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Mr. Hesse wondered about town regulations and policies regarding basements. He noted for the projects he has done in town, he often receives concerns from staff and the ASCC about the size of any proposed basement. He noted that the designs are always developed within town regulations, but that concern appears to remain over the basement plans.

Vlasic stressed that the key issue is to ensure applicants have carefully considered their needs and use of spaces and that they are not adding spaces that will use resources and require long-term consumption of energy simply because the space is permitted by ordinance. He added, that larger basements require more grading and off-haul of materials impacting streets and the overall scope and length of the construction operation.

ASCC members then offered the comments listed below, adding to, or emphasizing those provided at the afternoon site meeting. Members also agreed that, overall, they were supportive of the general design approach.

- The scope of proposed grading and, particularly, off-haul of materials, is of concern. Efforts should be made to reduce the scope of grading and materials for off-haul. Further, if the basement is to proceed in its current size, information should be provided demonstrating how its energy consumption can be controlled or off-set.
- Consideration should be given to adjusting the roofline of the studio and roof pitch over the garage to reduce the apparent height relative to views from the Owen property and the height/building flow issues discussed at the site meeting.
- The Lot 19 neighbor should be informed of the two-foot shift of the house/"playroom" to the south.
- Additional efforts should be made to reduce the scope of the work under the oaks at the northern end of the property.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the March 9, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Gelpi moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 3-0, approval of the February 9, 2009 meeting minutes as drafted.

Meeting Attendance and Adjournment

Warr advised that he would be unable to attend the regular March 23, 2009 ASCC meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

T. Vlasic