

Architectural and Site Control Commission **February 9, 2009**
Special Field Meeting, 17 Redberry Ridge, Demienne, and
1365 Westridge Drive, Hulme, and
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the special field meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. at 17 Redberry Ridge.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Breen, Aalfs, Gelpi, Warr
Absent: None
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Others present relative to the Demienne project:

George Demienne, applicant
Bill Maston, project architect
Jim Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-589, 17 Redberry Ridge, Lot 13 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Demienne

Vlasic presented the February 5, 2009 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for development of a new residence with attached four-car garage on the subject 1.65-acre Blue Oaks subdivision parcel. He emphasized the "preliminary" nature of the review and noted that details were still needed regarding the grading plans and scope of earthwork so that decisions could be made on whether or not the planning commission would need to be involved in the site development permit process. He noted that likely a second "preliminary review" meeting would be needed that would take place after the project architect addresses input from "today's" site meeting and from plan review by the Blue Oaks homeowners association, as well as final conclusions on the scope of the site development permit review, i.e., whether or not there is a need for planning commission involvement.

Vlasic also noted that since preparation of the February 5 staff report he had received input from the most immediate neighbors, Mr. George Salah, Lot 15 and Mr. Jim Gibbons, Lot 12. Vlasic advised that Mr. Salah indicated that while he was generally supportive of the direction the proposal has now taken, he wanted to ensure that the project adhered to all town and Blue Oaks guidelines and requirements. Vlasic noted that Mr. Gibbons, who was present, wanted to ensure the ASCC had a chance to view the story poles and taping set for the site meeting from his property and house. Mr. Gibbons also, again, made this request of the ASCC during the site meeting.

Mr. Maston then presented the project as shown on the following preliminary plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/23/09, received by the town on January 29, 2009, and prepared by William Maston Architect and Associates:

Sheet A0.01, Cover Sheet and Project Data
Sheet A0.02, Floor Area Calculations and Sustainable Building Checklist
Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Brian Kangas Foulk, 8/3/00
Sheet A1.01, Existing Site Plan
Sheet A1.02, Proposed Site Plan
Sheet A1.03, Site/House Locations Comparisons
Sheet A2.01, Basement Floor Plan

Sheet A2.02, Main Level Floor Plan
Sheet A2.04, Roof Plan
Sheet A4.01, Sections
Sheet A5.01, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A5.02, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A6.01, Building Renderings

Mr. Maston discussed the history of the project design development and the differences between work of the previous project designer and his recent architectural efforts. In explaining the project, he referred to statements in a February 9, 2009 memorandum to the ASCC. (Copies of this memorandum were distributed at the evening ASCC meeting.) In reviewing the project, Mr. Maston referred to the story poles and taping set for the site meeting. He also referred to poles set to demonstrate screening that could be accomplished by planting of screen trees and other vegetation. He noted that the "tree" demonstration poles were roughly 16 feet high, but that effective screening could be accomplished with 12-foot high or lower plantings depending on placement.

Mr. Maston described the design for the house, garage and driveway access, guest parking along the Redberry Ridge frontage, lower pool and terrace area, and use of "reverse" retaining walls to control the grading and appearance of improvements when viewed from off-site. It was noted that these "reverse" walls would be exposed into the site and help to minimize the downhill exposure of the lower level of the house. He clarified that the design was patterned after the approach approved for the Borders house, now under construction on Lot 16.

Mr. Maston also clarified that design studies were still underway with respect to exterior materials and finishes. He noted that while the original concepts were more Mediterranean, now, based on comments received from neighbors, the roof materials would likely be a synthetic slate instead of barrel tiles.

Mr. Maston led all present on a tour of the site, reviewing in more detail the site plan, story poles, driveway alignment, etc. Thereafter, ASCC members, at the invitation of Mr. Gibbons, viewed the story poles from various locations within his house. After visiting the Gibbons residence, ASCC members walked along Redberry Ridge to the cul-de-sac bulb to view the story poles from there and also from locations on the Salah property.

At approximately 3:50 p.m., members agreed that they would offer "preliminary" comments on the project at the evening ASCC meeting. Warr did, however, note concern over the formality of some aspects of the design, including the "round" or "turret" bay features and the possible need for broader overhangs to enhance shadows and shading. He worried that the window forms, as aligned on the upper and lower elevations, as well as the "turret" bay features resulted in emphasizing vertical forms while the Blue Oaks guidelines for the "Stonecrest" area called for horizontal forms to be emphasized.

Following the site inspection, ASCC members agreed that preliminary review of the project should continue at the regular evening meeting. Chair Clark then thanked the applicant, project architect and Mr. Gibbons for participation in the site meeting. It was noted that the special ASCC field meeting would continue at 1365 Westridge Drive as soon as members could convene at the property.

Continued Review -- Architectural Review for detached second unit, swimming pool and other site improvements & Site Development Permit X9H-596, 1365 Westridge Drive, Hulme

At approximately 4:08 p.m., all ASCC members convened at 1365 Westridge Drive for continued consideration of the Hulme project. They were joined by deputy town planner Vlastic and the following individuals:

Andrew Hulme, applicant
Phil Hyland, project designer
Carol Scheetz, project landscape designer
Chip McIntosh, planning commission liaison (leaving at approximately 4:30 p.m.)
Laurie and Bryan Barber, 51 Stonegate Road
Mia Banks, 45 Stonegate Road
Jenny Vaughan, 41 Stonegate Road

Vlastic briefly presented the February 5, 2009 staff report on the subject follow-up review. He noted that since the January 26, 2009 ASCC meeting, the applicant and project design team had considered ASCC comments and neighbor input and made a number of tentative design changes that would be presented at the site meeting. He clarified that no new plans had yet to be formally submitted, but an arborist report had been provided that has been considered in development of alternative plans. It was noted that based on the site meeting, ASCC members would offer additional input so that the applicant could proceed to finalize proposed plans for action by the ASCC at a future meeting, perhaps as early as February 23.

Mr. Hulme, Mr. Hyland and Ms. Scheetz reviewed site conditions and presented plan revisions largely consistent with the tentative design adjustments listed in the 2/5 staff report. It was noted that the original story poles were in place and that taping had been installed to demonstrate the reduction in height and roof mass that would occur with the planned design changes. It was also noted that taping had been installed along the property lines to demonstrate the screening impacts of proposed landscaping. The applicant advised that other design issues discussed in the original staff report would be resolved with plan revisions after agreement is reached relative to the design and siting of the guest unit and pool.

Mr. Hyland advised that if permission were granted to remove tree #6, that the proposed pool and guest unit could be moved further to the northwest on the site and away from the rear property line common with 51 Stonegate Road. He stated that the footprint marked in blue at the site represented a six foot shift to the northwest away from tree #4, the 14" live oak, and an approximately 2 foot shift to the southwest. It was noted that with removal of tree #6, a tree of questionable condition in the view of the project arborist, additional separation from tree #4 and the rear property line would be possible.

Mr. Hyland advised that the above design changes were discussed with site neighbors during a February 4, 2009 meeting. Ms. Barber, noted that she was not clear that the information presented at the 2/4 meeting was consistent with the current description of possible plan changes and she expressed frustration over not having clarity as to revised plans or story poles modeling what was actually now proposed. She also noted that if the new structure were of a similar height and location as the existing stable building, she would be less concerned. (Note: reference was also made to a note received by the town from

Ms. Barber just prior to the site meeting, with a “January 9” date, offering her perspectives on the February 4, 2009 meeting with Mr. Hulme and his design team.)

After review of onsite property conditions, ASCC members and others present considered views from the Barber property, 51 Stonegate Road. This included review of views from within the Barber residence. The proposed changes to the design, with lower heights and reduced roof mass were evaluated, but it was acknowledged that the story pole modeling did not accurately reflect the now proposed movements away from the rear property line.

After visiting the Barber property, views were considered from the Banks property, 45 Stonegate Road. View relationships from the front, i.e., southeast side of the residence, and from the southwestern end were considered. It was noted that some existing, non-native vegetation provided screening and that moving the guest house toward the northwest, i.e., toward tree #6 on the Hulme property, would likely make the structure more visible from the Banks residence. At the same time, it was also noted that the story poles of greatest concern relative to this view relationship actually modeled the original roof form and height and that the proposed revisions would be considerably lower, with less roof mass.

Following consideration of views from the Barber and Banks properties, ASCC members returned to the project site on the Hulme property. They were joined there by Jenny Vaughan. She stated she was representing her mother, Clarice, and that the proposed siting of the guest house was screened by existing vegetation in terms of views from the neighboring property. Mr. Hulme noted that he had visited with Clarice Vaughan and experienced views from within her residence. He added that the pool location had been selected to minimize potential for light and sound impacts not only on the Vaughan property, but also relative to the other neighboring houses.

After considering design options and input from neighbors, ASCC members offered the following comments and directions for plan revisions and refinements:

- The design adjustments that are being considered are going in the right direction. Further, removal of tree #6 is acceptable. While this will permit additional movement of the guest unit toward the northwest, this will need to be done with care to ensure the exposure is not increased in any significant manner relative to views from the Banks property. In essence, the additional changes to siting of the structure should not be large, but made with specific consideration for reasonable balancing of view protection. For example, any additional movement of the guest house to the southwest would result in more exposure to views from with the attached guest unit on the Barber property. The final design adjustments need to be sensitive to such potential for changes in view relationships.
- Existing tree cover surrounding the parcel is fairly successful in screening of key views. The proposed additional landscaping, if carefully planned, should address any remaining screening issues. In particular, the design team was encouraged to focus new planting in the area of the landscape gaps along the rear and northeast side property lines.
- As the plans are adjusted, additional attention should be paid to reducing the roof mass and height, if possible. For example, the gable form over the northwest side entry might be modified to further reduce roof mass. It was noted, however, that with accurate modeling of the revised roof form, this gable feature might not be a visual issue.

- As siting adjustments are made for the guest house, consideration should be given to moving the pool improvements somewhat further away from the large, 55" oak, along the northwest property line, i.e., tree #1 in the arborist report.
- Final selection of materials and colors should be fully consistent with the town's design guidelines and policies relative to light reflectivity.
- All of the issues, including fencing, trash enclosure, clarification of the design of the outdoor kitchen area, exterior lighting, etc., discussed in the original staff report and at the 1/26 ASCC meeting need to be resolved with the revised plans.

ASCC members also acknowledged that while the above design changes should address concerns that have been expressed over the project, it was not practically possible or reasonable to eliminate all views to the planned guest house from neighboring parcels. It was noted, however, that the final design should result in a building that is clearly accessory and subservient to the main house.

After sharing of the above comments, it was agreed that review of the matter would be continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting, but only for receipt of additional public comments, if any. It was noted that neither the applicant or neighbors needed to attend the evening meeting and that following request for and receipt of any public comments, project consideration would be continued to the March 9, regular ASCC meeting. This date was agreed to because of the upcoming conflicts with school Holidays and the time that would be needed to revise plans, reset the story poles, share the revised project with neighbors, and hopefully work out any remaining concerns with them.

In response to a question, ASCC members concurred that they did not feel at this point an additional site meeting would be necessary.

Chair Clark then thanked the applicant, design team and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:10 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Architectural and Site Control Commission **February 9, 2009**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 8:01 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Breen, Aalfs, Gelpi, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: Wengert
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Continued Review -- Architectural Review for detached second unit, swimming pool and other site improvements & Site Development Permit X9H-596, 1365 Westridge Drive, Hulme

Vlastic advised that at the end of the site meeting on the project, which was concluded earlier in the day (refer to above site meeting minutes), it was agreed that additional design work was needed and that, therefore, project consideration should be continued to the March 9, 2009 meeting. Thereafter, public comments were requested, but none were offered and project review was continued to the March 9, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr temporarily removed himself from the ASCC meeting room, noting his firm was providing the architectural services for the project.

Review for conformity with provisions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-99 – Proposed service station sign, Portola Valley Fuel, 115 Portola Road, Ramies

Vlastic presented the February 5, 2009 staff report on this request to permit installation of a service station identification and fuel pricing sign similar to one installed last year at the subject site, without benefit of ASCC review and approval, as required by the conditions of CUP X7D-99, or planning staff review. He explained that the proposed sign, except for a color adjustment, is similar to the sign currently displayed in the service bay area of the service station, and that the request is more specifically explained in the January 29, 2009 statement from Mark Sutherland, project architect, CJW Architecture.

Vlastic advised that in support of the sign statement, Mr. Sutherland provided color images of the existing and proposed sign, with the planned color change and desired placement within the landscape island on the Portola Road side of the service station fueling bays. These images were distributed for ASCC review. Vlastic also explained that according to information provided by Mr. Sutherland, the proposed size and height dimensions, and mounting location for the two-faced sign would be as follows:

- 6 feet high by 6 feet wide, total area per side of 36 sf
- Maximum mounting height above ground to top of sign 6 feet 10 inches
- Sign would be positioned in the center of the front landscape island, and perpendicular to Portola Road as shown on the proposed photo images

Vlasic then provided a February 9, 2009 memorandum from town attorney Sandy Sloan, clarifying state and town provisions for service station signage and discussed the options for ASCC action as set forth in the February 5 staff report. He advised that at this point, it is not possible for the ASCC to grant an approval that would permit a permanent sign installation, and that it was staff recommendation that option b. set forth in the staff report be considered as follows:

- b. Act to support the sign as proposed, with any design modifications and recommend that the town council consider making adjustments to the sign portion of the zoning ordinance to permit larger signs under specific circumstances, essentially recognizing state signage requirements for gas station fuel products.

Vlasic noted that based on the history of sign reduction at the service station property, including removal of the former Uicol orange, pole mounted, ball sign, the amount of signage even with the proposed sign was considerably less than at conventional service stations in the area including, for example, the Shell station in Ladera. He also reviewed the history of site cleanup and maintenance and the current volume of comments posted on the Portola Valley forum relative to the “service” that Mr. Ramies’ station provides to town residents and their support for the proposed sign.

Vlasic clarified that based on his review of the matter with the town attorney, while the ASCC could not grant a permanent approval of the proposed sign until there was an amendment to the zoning ordinance, it might consider allowing a temporary installation, i.e., for a period of 30 days, with appropriate encroachment permit for the desired right of way placement. He explained that since the sign exists, the temporary installation would permit the ASCC the opportunity to focus on the proposed design elements, such as color, need for permanent wood frame, mounting orientation, how much additional space beyond that required for price information might be permitted for the name of the business, etc. He commented that this review could proceed while the town council and planning commission consider any changes to the sign ordinance.

Mr. Ron Ramies and Mark Sutherland were present and offered the following clarifications with regard to the proposed sign.

- Mr. Ramies apologized for the ‘unauthorized,’ “cowboy,” placement of the sign last year and appreciated the efforts the town was making to find a way for his use of the proposed sign. He noted the pressure an independent service station owner faces in obtaining and dispensing fuel vs. the opportunities that are available to the stations owned and supported by the large oil companies. He stressed his desires to meet the services needs of the residents of the community and concluded that in his opinion the sign was in the best interest of this objective. He added that the sign had received positive response from most of his clients, who appreciated the information and his business’ service to the town.
- Sutherland reviewed the state fuel signage requirements and noted that the current sign just satisfies the requirements, but also includes some additional area for the name of

the business. He clarified that there are two businesses on the property that the sign calls attention to.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the request and the general reaction was supportive of the proposed sign design, but with the understanding that color adjustments, some form of wood frame, reflecting a permanent installation and a more rural character for the sign, would be needed. It was also agreed that a temporary, 30-day installation would be appropriate, as it would allow for final ASCC recommendations to be developed for any permanent sign installation and also provide a basis for final recommendations for any changes to the sign ordinance for such service station signage.

There was some discussion as to whether or not the final sign should have three or two colors. No decision was made on this, but Mr. Sutherland offered that the proposed three colors were consistent with the general color scheme used for the gas pumps in the fueling bay. ASCC members agreed to consider the color question, during the temporary sign installation period.

Following discussion, ASCC members agreed to forward a recommendation to the town council encouraging amendment of the sign ordinance relative only to service station signs, i.e., specifically to consider the state requirements for fuel signage. It was further agreed that Mr. Ramies should be granted a 30-day encroachment permit for temporary placement of the existing sign, as discussed above, with the understanding that this would permit the ASCC to consider the sign and need for final design adjustments before any permanent installation would be allowed, i.e., assuming the sign ordinance is amended to allow for a permanent placement. Thereafter, review of the request was continued to the March 9, 2009 ASCC meeting.

Following consideration of the above application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-589, 17 Redberry Ridge, Lot 13 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Demienne

Vlasic presented the February 5, 2009 staff report on this preliminary project review. He discussed the afternoon site meeting and noted that ASCC members had agreed to offer their preliminary review comments at the regular evening meeting. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Vlasic again stressed the preliminary nature of the review, need for clarification of grading volume and the need to set a second "preliminary" review site meeting, likely on March 9, with the planning commission. He added that this would also permit the opportunity for at least preliminary input from the Blue Oaks homeowners association.

Mr. Demienne and Bill Maston, project architect, were present to further discuss their plans with ASCC members. Mr. Maston provided copies of a February 9, 2009 memorandum from him to the ASCC containing an overview of the project design considerations. He discussed these in more detail and noted the following, some in response to information gathered at the site meeting.

- Grading plans will be evaluated and it is highly likely that the 1,000 cubic yard threshold will be exceeded. This is particularly the case if the driveway grading makes more use of fill, rather than simply a retaining wall design, as discussed and encouraged at the site meeting.
- The current design has been to concentrate the house footprint and not to extend it more downhill. It is felt that this approach has less potential for off site view impacts. It is understood that a number of details still need to be worked out, but the current approach that includes moving the house away from the street and cutting it more into the site, including the sod roof buried garage, is far more sensitive relative to off site relationships than was the case with the earlier design rejected by the Blue Oaks homeowners association.
- It is understood that the current plans need to be refined with respect to the handrail and entry pathway gate so that these features are located within the building envelope.
- The proposed parking on the property, but parallel to the street, while unusual should help reduce the scope of grading and site disturbance and offers additional opportunities for enhancing view relationships between properties.
- The comments offered in the field regarding roof overhangs and the “turret” features will be considered as plan refinements are developed.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed roof terrace is much smaller than a design originally planned and that with the current design, the access stairs were placed so as to minimize offsite view exposure to them.
- In response to a question relative to “green” building elements, it was noted that details for such elements were still being worked out. It was also explained that the house size is to meet the needs of the family, but that the scope was reduced from original designs, after more consideration was given to actual planned use of spaces.
- As noted at the site meeting, considerable work needs to be done with respect to architectural detailing, including materials, colors, forms, etc. Further, detailed landscape and exterior lighting plans are still needed and in process. The detailed landscape plans would also address items such as pool equipment location, retaining wall materials, entry pathway, etc.

Public comments were requested. **Jim Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge**, stated that the owners of Lot 14 (George Salah) and Lot 17 (Jo and Bruce Owen), asked him to share their mutual perspective on the proposed plans for Lot 13. He stressed that while all three lot owners, himself included, respect Mr. Demienne’s efforts and his rights to build on the property, they want to ensure there is a clear understanding of how the plans meet all of the design requirements for Blue Oaks and specifically the Stonecrest Zone. He noted particular concern with respect to the apparent “vertical” elements of the design, as these are exaggerated when viewed from the lower elevations of the neighboring building sites.

ASCC members stated appreciation for the information presented at the site meeting and at the evening meeting and then offered the following preliminary comments and reactions to the proposed plans:

- In general the planned site design, including driveway location and access, buried garage with sod roof and approach to development of the lower pool and terrace area appear reasonable. Further, the approach to location of guest parking spaces appears reasonable given the site constraints. This general overview was tempered by concerns over a number of project details and need for more clarity on them. At the same time, it was understood that due to the location and elevation of the building envelope any improvements on the property would be highly visible from the surrounding parcels.
- The approach to driveway design with more fill and less retaining walls is encouraged and should be explored further.
- The architectural detailing needs to be simpler and less formal and flow more with the site forms. In particular, the roof forms need to be simpler in terms of their architectural expression. While the house does have strong horizontal elements and lines, a number of details appear to emphasize vertical features. These include the “turret” bay elements, window forms, and lack of extending overhangs to pull the house more into the site as called for in the Stonecrest guidelines. The roof forms in particular need to be reconsidered so that they work better with site contours.
- The plans need to be clarified so that there can be a better understanding of the forms of particularly the downhill elevation. It may be necessary for the design to be modified so that this elevation in particular, appears less continuous and expressed more as a set of connected shapes that include shadows and shading to reduce apparent size and massing. More use of stone might also help to achieve the appropriate, Stonecrest expression.
- In addition to the above, final selections of materials and colors will be essential to making the house fit into the site contours and minimize visual presence relative to views from neighboring properties.
- Sections should be provided from the building sites on the adjacent properties to better appreciate view relationships and effectiveness of screening that might be provided by, for example, solid deck rails, landscaping and the “reserve” retaining walls.
- Efforts should be made to find a design solution for the buried garage that would avoid the need for any safety railing. Consider landscape options.
- In general, more design effort is needed to make the building feel “lower” and its horizontal elements emphasized over vertical forms. Also, landscaping closer to the building will likely be more effective than taller screening at a distance in helping the house blend with its site.
- Final elevation details need to work to minimize views to two levels of night lighting, particularly along the rear, downhill elevation.

Following sharing of the above preliminary comments and reactions, project review was continued to the March 9, 2009 regular ASCC meeting. Vlasic noted that this would likely be scheduled as a second site meeting with the planning commission.

Architectural Review for house and deck additions, 35 Hillbrook Drive, Jennings

Vlasic presented the February 5, 2009 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 454 sf to the existing 3,381 sf, two-story house on the subject 1.0-acre Hillbrook Drive panhandle property. He explained that the project includes expansion of an existing deck off the first floor of the house and that essentially no grading is needed to make the proposed improvements and there would be only minor impacts to existing grass slopes and ornamental plantings. Vlasic discussed the few issues identified in the staff report, particularly colors for the proposed "loft" roof area and house siding, need for lighting clarifications and the need for a construction staging and vegetation plan to be provided with the project building permit.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 1/22/09, prepared by the Hayes Group:

- Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A0.3, Site Plan/Floor Area Calculations
- Sheet A1.1, Existing & Demolition Plans
- Sheet A2.1, Proposed First Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Proposed Loft Plan
- Sheet A3.1, Existing North & South Elevations
- Sheet A3.2, Existing East & West Elevations
- Sheet A3.3, Proposed North & South Elevations
- Sheet A3.4, Proposed East & West Elevations
- Sheet A3.5, Proposed Sections & Details

Also considered were the cut sheet for the proposed exterior house light fixture received 1/22/09, the proposed "Finish Board" dated 1/21/09, and several color images of the existing residence, received 1/22/09.

Borck then presented her February 2, 2009 report on the "sustainable building" checklist prepared for the project. She advised that based on the checklist, the applicant was considering additional "green" elements for incorporation into the final project plans.

Ken Hayes project architect presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following design comments and clarifications:

- The owners are not present as they had a trip scheduled and were surprised with the speed with which the plans have moved through the design review process.
- The design changes are to make the house more livable and energy efficient. Currently there is significant heat gain on the southwestern elevation and the main room of the lower level is difficult to use due to this gain. The proposed window replacements and sunscreen are intended to help solve this problem.
- The design adds an informal eating area on the main level and also enhances the usefulness of the expanded deck area off of the great room. The loft addition makes this internal space more practical as to the new stairs to the upper area.
- The design changes and additions follow the modern, barn-like character of the existing residence. The exterior has been recently painted and the intent is to finish the proposed improvement to match existing conditions.

- The only new exterior light would be the one recessed fixture to be added at the new deck access door serving the addition proposed at the northwest end of the house.
- The proposed mineral roofing for the loft area was selected due to the low slope, where metal roofing would not be appropriate. The color was selected to blend with the color of the existing metal roof, but it is acknowledged that the sample on the finish board appears light in comparison to the existing/proposed metal roof surfaces.

Public comments were requested. **Jackie Kubicka, 51 Hillbrook Drive**, expressed concern over the proposed loft roofing and its light color. She noted that her views are above and over the site, but that a strong contrast between the color of the metal and mineral roofing would be disruptive to the views from her property.

ASCC members considered the project and concluded it was well designed and generally appropriate as proposed. Members, however, concurred with the concerns in the staff report and presented by the neighbor regarding the mineral roof color. Members also concurred that given the scope of the project, the house siding color should be darker and consistent with the town's light reflectivity value (LRV) policies relative to siding color, which limit LRV to a maximum of 40%.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the proposed plans as presented 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. Final colors for house finishes shall be specified and shall be consistent with town policies relative to maximum LRV.
2. The final color for the mineral loft roofing shall be specified and shall be demonstrated to be as close to the color of the existing metal roofing as feasible.
3. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Breen stated that she also hoped the existing roof mounted antenna would be removed with the project. She noted that it appears to be dysfunctional and it does not add to the aesthetics of the site. Warr noted that it might be possible to use metal roofing matching the existing metal roofing on the loft area if an "ice guard" installation is applied and suggested that consideration be given to this option.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 5-0, approval of the January 26, 2009 meeting minutes with the correction to the spelling of "Clarice Vaughan" under "public comments" on page 3.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

T. Vlasic