

Special Field Meeting, 17 Redberry Ridge, Demienne

Special Afternoon and Evening Field Meetings, 16 Redberry Ridge, Borders

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

Chair Clark called the special field meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. at 17 Redberry Ridge.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Warr

Absent: Gelpi

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Others present relative to the Demienne project:

George Demienne, applicant

Bill Maston, project architect

Denise Gilbert, planning commission member

Leah Zaffaroni, planning commission member (arrived at approximately 4:00 p.m.)

Victor Perlroth, Lot 15 Blue Oaks (arrived at approximately 4:25 p.m.)

Vlasic advised that the Special field meeting for 17 Redberry Ridge had been noticed as a joint meeting with the planning commission because the commission is the approving authority for the proposed site development permit. He clarified that since there was not sufficient planning commission attendance to constitute a quorum, the planning commission portion of the meeting could not take place. Vlasic further clarified that an additional field meeting may be needed to obtain full planning commission preliminary input on the project.

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

Vlasic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this continuation of the *preliminary* project review initiated at the February 9, 2009 ASCC meeting. He explained that at the 2/9 meeting, a number of design comments and suggestions were offered and it was also noted that more detailed grading calculations were needed to determine if the earthwork would exceed the 1,000 cubic yard limit requiring planning commission involvement. Vlasic then briefly reviewed the revised project plans (listed below) and noted that the project architect had concluded that earthwork would exceed the 1,000 cubic yard threshold.

Vlasic also made reference to, and distributed copies of a March 7, 2009 memo to the ASCC from Jim and Lynn Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge, offering comments on the project. Vlasic added that the Blue Oaks Homeowners Association had been invited to participate in the field meeting and had also been advised of the staff report and recommendation that a project model be prepared to facilitate the ASCC review process and neighbor understandings of the revised proposal.

Vlasic further commented that since the staff report had been prepared, he had proceeded to conduct a somewhat more involved review of the project. He discussed the history of project review and Mr. Demienne's willingness to fully consider the concerns of his neighbors and work to achieve a design that, while meeting his needs, was also responsive to site conditions and the Blue Oaks PUD provisions that pertain to the property. Vlasic noted that the revised plans:

- Cut the house into the site and attempt to minimize exposures to the most immediate neighbors. (It was noted that by moving the house down hill, and lowering the roof height, views from Lot 12 across the top of the proposed house were open to Windy Hill, even through this is not the primary view, as defined in the PUD, for Lot 12.)
- Adjust the driveway design to use more fill and eliminate the need for exposed retaining walls on the downhill side of the driveway.
- Make use of very low pitch, hip roof forms, and include a sod roof over the buried garage.
- Make use of retaining walls that are inwardly exposed to further depress the house into the site, keep fill on site and reduce exposure of views from neighboring properties.

Vlasic added that while there has been much progress in the design effort, he felt more work was needed to ensure consistency with the PUD Stonecrest design guidelines and particularly to ensure strong horizontal elements and that the house “hugs” the site to the extent possible within the height limits. He stressed that grading refinements, house detailing, including materials and colors, and landscaping would be important as the design process proceeds and, again, he offered that a model would be an important tool to facilitate the continuing design work and town review process. He noted that the model would also facilitate appreciation of the benefits that could be achieved with landscaping on the subject property and adjoining parcels, allowing neighbors to take steps for privacy and view buffering, as suggested in the PUD.

Vlasic stressed that Lot 13 is one of the most difficult in Blue Oaks for development at this point due to its exposure to neighbors, building envelope constrained by slopes and lack of any significant established screen vegetation, and difficulty to achieve driveway access to feasible garage locations. He thanked Mr. Demienne for his efforts and for allowing Mr. Maston the latitude to pursue the refinements recommended by staff and the ASCC.

Bill Maston then proceeded to review the revised proposal as generally discussed in his written communication received by the town on March 5, 2009 and shown on the following plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/4/09, and prepared by Mr. Maston’s architectural firm:

- 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 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

Mr. Maston advised that the design process was continuing and reviewed the revised proposal in terms of the site story poles set for the February 9, 2009 preliminary review meeting. During the course of discussion of the plans, Mr. Maston offered the following plan clarifications:

- The grading plans will be further refined and eventually, when both the applicant and ASCC are satisfied with the concept plans, an engineered grading plan would be prepared.
- Exterior materials are still being evaluated and these will be identified during the next round of ASCC review. The intent is, however, to make use of stone and wood elements as called for in the PUD, and a natural slate roof. All finishes would be selected to conform to PUD guidelines and town policies regarding light reflectivity.
- The revised site plans and elevations have been developed to concentrate the footprint of the house and to cut the house into the site to minimize the exposures to the most immediate neighbors. While it has been suggested that the house step down the hill more, this would increase grading and view exposure, particularly to views from the Salah property.
- Since the revised plans were submitted to the town last week, further design adjustments have been made. Specifically, they now eliminate all gable end roof forms. Now, hip forms are only used. This helps to ensure the house hugs the site and minimizes the apparent height and massing relative to views from off site.
- Consistent with the PUD guidelines, the earlier proposal for a “bridged” driveway access has been changed to a fill solution as recommended by the ASCC.
- The “turret” elements on the plans considered at the last ASCC meeting were eliminated and “fin” walls added to enhance privacy and reduce potential for light spill. Exterior lighting plans are still being developed, but will be presented in conformity with town and Blue Oaks PUD guidelines and regulations.
- In response to a question, it was noted that at this point a variety of wall plate heights are being used. These include 8.5 feet in the lower level, and 8, 9, 10 and 12 feet in the upper floor area.

After Mr. Maston’s presentation, ASCC members offered the following preliminary review comments relative to the revised plans:

- The plan adjustments are “substantial” and moving in the correct direction. Considerable work does, however, remain in terms of plan detailing and refinement to ensure full conformity with PUD provisions, and work needs to continue with staff on this effort. The staff recommendation for preparation and use of a model in this process is appropriate and fully supported.
- In general, the current site plan and use of inward facing retaining walls is good and properly adjusted to the site’s topography, including the exposed “nose” form.
- The design effort would be less difficult if this was the first house in this area. Having established designs in place on the most immediate neighboring parcels makes the design effort very challenging.
- Some of the detailing that particularly needs attention includes:
 - Reduction in the heights and massing of the chimney elements.

- Make the roof top deck disappear into the roof form. Eliminate the more formal railing elements.
 - In general, reconsider the rail elements. Consider a less formal design.
 - The lower level stone and finishes need to be made very dark, and the build-up of dirt enhanced so that the upper level appears as a strong horizontal element.
 - Roof overhangs should be longer and used to further pull the house into the site.
 - Overall, the palette of materials and colors, and how they are used, will be critical in ensuring that the house fits with the site and area and conforms to the PUD guidelines.
 - Consider bringing the rear yard trellis feature back toward the house to help screen views to the lower level. Alternatively, this feature could be made longer and achieve the same objective.
 - Consider adjustments to the main, front entry to reduce the formality, particularly in terms of the design of the proposed entry columns.
 - Final lighting plans need to address control of not only exterior light spill, but also light spill from interior spaces.
- Landscape concept plans will be needed for the next review and should include the planting needed for privacy and buffering of views. The plan, however, should not make use of tall materials between the house and Redberry Ridge, nor should it be a plan for aggressive planting of the site. The plants selected should, again, help “ground” the house and yard improvements into the site, making use of the mounding against the inward facing retaining walls. It should only propose taller materials where necessary for buffering of views to and from Lots 12 and 14.
 - Plant materials should be selected to grow and cascade down over the upper portions of the garages, including use of such materials in the planter along the dining room wall above the lower garage.

Planning commission members Gilbert and Zaffaroni offered the following preliminary input relative to grading proposals:

- Concur with the ASCC comments and reactions re: the site plan and approach to grading. Also concur with ASCC house design comments, particularly the issue of chimney scale.
- There are a number of competing considerations including site constraints and views to neighbors that make the design effort very challenging. In general, the approach to site planning and grading appears appropriate given all of the design constraints.
- Ensure that final plans have properly addressed drainage, particularly with the proposed driveway fill in upper drainage swale area.

Clark asked if anyone wanted to offer additional comments. Mr. Perloth, who had arrived late at the site meeting, commented that he was fully supportive of Mr. Demienne’s plans.

At approximately 4:20 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 16 Redberry Ridge in the Blue Oaks subdivision, as soon as members could convene at the property.

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

At approximately 4:30 p.m., ASCC members Clark, Breen, Aalfs and Warr and planning commissioner liaison Zaffaroni convened at 16 Redberry Ridge for follow-up field consideration of architectural review approval conditions for the subject project. They were joined by deputy town planner Vlasic and the following individuals:

Michael McCabe, project architect
Linda and Jerry Elkind, 14 Hawkview
Pierre Fischer, 10 Valley Oak
Don Niederhaus, 8 Coalmine View
John Thompson, 20 Sandstone
Judy Bryant, 24 Sandstone
Janet Smith, 12 Sandstone
Loren and Erika Walden, 1 Coalmine View

(Note: It is believed this list of attendees is complete, but a number of people arrived and left over the course of the special site meeting and the list may not be complete.)

Vlasic reviewed the March 5, 2009 staff report and advised that the primary purpose of the special site meeting was for the ASCC to complete field review and action on "follow-up" conditions relative to a large size stucco sample of the final stucco coat and the proposed roof tile mix. He noted that these samples are to be generally consistent with the samples presented at the January 9, 2006 meeting and shown on the materials board found acceptable at that time. Vlasic added that the field meeting was also to include an evening session where the "knuckle" version of the E-7 light fixture was to be tested against the stucco to determine if it was acceptable for use on the exposed house walls facing north.

Vlasic then shared the following written communications received by the town since the staff report had been prepared. He noted that all requested that the ASCC ensure the final colors are dark and help ensure the house blends into the site. He noted that they also requested that exterior lighting be controlled to ensure minimum potential for offsite light spill.

Iris Harrell, email dated 3/9/09
Victoria Klein, 6 Longspur, email dated 3/9/09
Ann Chiller, 3 Coalmine View, letter dated 3/5/09
Hilary Giles, email dated 3/9/09

Mr. McCabe reviewed the tentatively approved colors board, i.e., from the 1/9/06 ASCC action, and then compared it to the 4 ft. x 8 ft. stucco test panel prepared for the site meeting. He also reviewed the proposed manufactured roof tile sample placed on the roof for the field test. He noted that the test wall sample was considerably darker and more earthy or "muddy" than the color on the approved concept board. He also noted that the roof tiles were very porous, with a very dark terra cotta rust color with significant black tones. He compared them to the sample on the original colors board noting they were considerably darker.

Mr. McCabe also reviewed the proposed trim color and noted it was considerably darker than the original sample. He stressed that the Borders were very concerned with ensuring that the textures and finishes were as dark as possible to minimize off site visibility.

Mr. McCabe also pointed out the three “Knuckle E7” light fixtures set for the field evaluation and noted that they had been fitted with the maximum rated bulb, i.e., 75 watt, par 30. He advised that one of the fixtures had been set on the stucco test panel so that light spill could be judged. He referred to a copy of the approved lighting plan and noted that only three of the E7 fixtures were to be located on the north facing walls, but that one additional fixture would be located on the northwest facing wall oriented toward Coalmine Ridge and Windy Hill.

Ranch residents present expressed their concern with the visual presence of the house and also that they wanted the wall color to be as dark as possible and that they would prefer a roof material that was not barrel tile. It was noted that barrel tile was approved for use on the house with the condition that the color be field judged by the ASCC for acceptability prior to final approval for application.

After review of site conditions, ASCC members and many of the others present traveled to the Elkind residence, 14 Hawk View, to view the wall colors and roof materials from Portola Valley Ranch. At the Elkind residence, ASCC members were offered the opportunity to view the house and roof and wall materials/colors with binoculars, but agreed that the judgments should be made based on what a normal, “naked eye,” view would be.

After viewing the wall and roof colors from within and on the deck of the Elkind residence, and again hearing concerns of Ranch residents with regard to house visibility, ASCC members tentatively concluded that the test dark, “muddy” stucco color and the very dark roof tiles were acceptable and satisfied the provisions of the field test conditions. Members agreed that they would finalize this decision at the 7:30 p.m. special site meeting after viewing the illuminated E7 light fixtures. Members also agreed that after the conclusion of the afternoon site session, they would drive to other Ranch locations to view the wall and roof color samples.

After sharing tentative ASCC reactions, the afternoon special Borders field review was concluded. ASCC members agreed they would return to 14 Hawk View at 7:30 p.m. to conclude the field meeting actions relative to wall and roof color and the E7 light fixture test. Clark thanked all present for their participation in the afternoon site meeting and invited all back to the 7:30 p.m. continued session on the Borders field test conditions. In particular, Mr. and Mrs. Elkind were thanked for opening their home for ASCC use in judging compliance with the approval conditions.

Adjournment of Special Afternoon Field Meeting

At approximately 5:25 p.m. the special afternoon field meeting was adjourned.

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

At 7:30 p.m., ASCC members Clark, Breen, Aalfs and Warr convened at 14 Hawk View for completion of follow-up field testing and action relative to architectural review approval conditions for the subject project. They were joined by deputy town planner Vlasic and at least the following individuals:

Michael McCabe, project architect
Linda and Jerry Elkind, 14 Hawkview

Majda Jones, 8 Longspur
Hilary Giles, Valley Oak
Loren and Erika Walden, 1 Coalmine View

Clark noted that the primary purpose of the session was to complete field action relative to wall stucco color and finish, roof tile color and the proposed use of the E7 wall mounted fixture. The findings from the afternoon meeting were reviewed (see above minutes) and tentative ASCC conclusions discussed.

Mr. Elkind and other Ranch residents discussed the roof materials and wondered why they could not be changed to a material like the darker asphalt shingles approved for use at the Ranch. Mr. Elkind noted that after the afternoon session, he went to other Ranch locations and determined that in some light situations, the proposed barrel tile did have a sheen and would be more visible than what might be expected from simply viewing them directly as was the case with the afternoon test.

Majda Jones spoke in favor of a darker roof tile, but noted pressure the Ranch is getting for use of lighter, "cooler" roof colors that help to make a house more energy efficient. It was noted that the same pressures were being experienced in other areas of town.

Hilary Giles supported darker colors overall and expressed concern over the light spill from the E7 fixture. Loren and Erika Walden shared their concerns and noted that the colors should be as dark as possible and that there was excessive light spill from the E7 fixture.

After considering the comments from Ranch residents and viewing the three illuminated E7 fixtures, ASCC members concluded the proposed stucco texture and color and roof materials were acceptable but that the E7 fixture was not. Aalfs then moved the following, seconded by Warr and passed 4-0:

1. The stucco sample and roof materials are accepted as displayed at the ASCC meeting, satisfying the condition for field testing and approval.
2. The use of the E7 fixture is not approved. Either an alternative wall mounted fixture needs to be specified or a step light fixture used that would be mounted very low, e.g., 18 inches from the terrace surface, with only enough light spill on the terrace surface to satisfy building code requirements.

It was understood that options for addressing the remaining lighting matter would need to be presented to the ASCC for acceptance.

Adjournment of Special Evening Field Meeting

At approximately 8:10 p.m. the special evening field meeting was adjourned. It was noted that the Regular ASCC meeting would take place as soon as ASCC members could convene at the Historic School House at the town center. Clark again thanked Mr. and Mrs. Elkind for allowing the ASCC to make use of their house for the special afternoon and evening reviews.

Architectural and Site Control Commission
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

March 9, 2009

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 8:20 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Gelpi, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Toben

Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Reporting of Action at Special Afternoon and Evening Field Meetings, 16 Redberry Ridge, Borders

Clark advised that the ASCC had concluded action on the Borders matter at the special evening meeting relative to the field-testing for conformity with follow-up architectural review approval conditions. (Refer to above special field meeting minutes,)

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

Vlastic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this matter. He explained that the project designer has advised that the plan revisions process has not been finished and the applicant has requested that the matter be continued to the March 23, 2009 regular ASCC meeting. Vlastic added that staff concurs with the continuance request.

Public input was requested, but none was offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the March 23, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following Ramies matter, Warr temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room. He advised that his architectural firm was providing services to Mr. Ramies.

Continued 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 March 5, 2009 staff report on this matter. He explained that on February 9, 2009, the ASCC considered this sign request and took action to permit a 30-day temporary placement of the proposed sign, i.e., until the March 9, 2009 ASCC meeting and also acted to recommend that the town council direct staff and the planning commission to consider amendments to the sign ordinance, as explained in the staff report.

Vlasic noted that after the February 9 ASCC action, the sign was temporarily installed at Portola Valley Fuel, the town council concurred with the ASCC's recommendation relative to consideration of an amendment to the sign ordinance, and the planning commission conducted a discussion of concepts for the possible sign ordinance amendment. He noted that planning staff is continuing to work with the town attorney on the possible amendments to the sign ordinance and, as a result, recommended that the ASCC take the following actions at this time:

1. Grant permission for additional temporary placement of the sign, this time to the April 27, 2009 ASCC meeting, to allow time for the ordinance work to be completed, at least through planning commission public hearing and action.
2. Offer any comments or reactions ASCC members may have after initial viewing of the temporary sign that would assist staff in the ordinance work or the applicant in terms of possible design parameters and sign design adjustments.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Mr. Ron Ramies was also present and advised he had no additional comments to offer beyond those in the staff report.

ASCC members concurred with the comments in the staff report. Gelpi then moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0, to permit the temporary sign placement to remain until April 27, 2009.

Following discussion of the Ramies matter, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

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

Vlasic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this matter and also reviewed the events and findings of the afternoon special site meeting. (See above site meeting minutes for a discussion of the comments and findings from the site meeting and a complete list of current project plans and materials.) Vlasic stressed that this is still a preliminary review of the proposal and that after review and input, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

George Demienne and Mr. Maston were present to further discuss their project with ASCC members. Mr. Maston thanked the ASCC for the input provided at the afternoon special site meeting and advised that he would be developing additional plan adjustments and also building a project model.

Public comments were requested. **Lynn Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge**, reviewed the comments in the March 7, 2009 letter from she and her husband to the ASCC. She thanked Mr. Demienne for his redesign efforts, but also agreed that more work was needed to ensure plan conformity with the Blue Oaks design guidelines. She commented on the need to simplify project design elements and to fully address the concerns identified by the ASCC at the February 9, 2009 preliminary review meeting.

Jim Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge, also reviewed the comments in his March 7, 2009 letter to the ASCC. He supported the idea of a model, but also hoped sections could be provided that would help him better understand view relationships and heights. He noted that such data would be important as he considers options for screen landscaping on his property. He expressed particular concern with the view from his living room area.

George Salah, 18 Redberry Ridge, advised that while he was there to “support” Mr. Demienne in his efforts, and was encouraged by the design progress that has been made, he also wanted to stress that the final plans needed to be consistent with the Blue Oaks PUD design standards and guidelines. He recognized the difficulty of the site and the challenges Mr. Demienne and Mr. Maston face as they work to complete the design process, and he “looked forward” to having Mr. Demienne as his neighbor.

ASCC members then offered the following comments in addition to those presented at the special afternoon site meeting:

- Overall, the design adjustments that have been made enhance how the project fits the site and area. More work is needed with regard to the details discussed at the site meeting.
- Longer roof overhangs need to be used to not only pull the house more into the site, but to also pull the hip roof element together.
- The extension of the “wing walls” should help in terms of privacy and view protection. The model and section lines should be prepared, however, to ensure that the wall extensions will do what they are planned to do. Further, sections and the model will enhance understandings as to the most appropriate landscaping proposals.
- The stone base and color scheme need to be used to achieve objectives of pulling the house into the site and achieving the strong horizontal forms called for in the PUD. The lower, garage side elevation needs to be very dark and stone used to emphasize how this elevation is “grounded” into the site. Overall, it appears that more stone should be used to ground the house into the site, but the model should help better appreciate massing, shadows, etc., and how much stone would actually be needed.
- The house design refinements need to be considered in combination with the lighting and landscaping issues discussed at the site meeting. A holistic approach needs to be taken in finalizing design details.
- The east side window areas need to be looked at closely and adjustments made to ensure the final design is consistent with the horizontal emphasis called for in the PUD.

Following discussion, public input, sharing of additional ASCC comments, and checking with the applicant and Mr. Maston as to timing, project consideration was continued to the April 13, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

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

Vlasic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this matter and explained that on February 23, 2009 the ASCC initiated review of the applications and then continued review to the March 9, 2009 meeting to permit time for the design team to respond to the comments

and reactions offered at the 2/23 meeting. Vlasic noted that the project architects have advised that this effort is still in process and have asked that project consideration be continued to the March 23, 2009 ASCC meeting. Vlasic added that staff concurs with the continuance request.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the March 23, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Review for conformity with provision of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30, proposed installation meditative walking labyrinth, 302 Portola Road, The Priory School

Vlasic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this request for approval of site improvement plans for the installation of a “meditative walking labyrinth” to be located on an existing level, hillside “bench” just to the north of the Priory school chapel. He clarified that the chapel is located near the center of the school campus and that the proposed labyrinth would extend over an area of roughly 2,400 sf. Vlasic advised that pursuant to the provisions of the CUP for the Priory, all applications for site improvements are subject to ASCC review and approval for conformity to the approved School master plan.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans dated February 10, 2009 prepared by Waterman and Sun:

- Sheet S1, Partial Site Plan
- Sheet L1, Landscape Design
- Sheet L2, Layout Plan and Rustic Split Fence Design

Father Martin and Bob Waterman presented their proposal to the ASCC. In response to a question, Mr. Waterman advised that this was to be a classic “Celtic” labyrinth and that it did not have an “exit” point. He further clarified that no lighting is planned with the facility. Father Martin advised that the labyrinth would be available to the general community for meditative use.

In response to a comment, Mr. Waterman stated he would adjust the planting plan to replace the *Cornus Stolonifera* with a native material that is more deer resistant.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the condition that prior to making of improvements, provisions for handling any storm runoff from the labyrinth area shall be defined to the satisfaction of the public works director.

Prior to consideration of the following matter, Gelpi temporarily left his ASCC position. He advised he is a neighbor in the Wyndham Drive neighborhood.

Architectural Review for residential additions, 230 Wyndham Drive, Bailey/Masada

Vlasic presented the March 5, 2009 staff report on this project that proposes to add an attached 580 sf garage and a small amount of new living area, roughly 141 sf, to an existing 2,304 sf single-story residence located on the subject .26-acre Wyndham Drive parcel. He advised that the proposed improvements would concentrate roughly 87% of the permitted

floor area in the main house, i.e., the only building on the property, and that this is only possible subject to special ASCC findings as evaluated in the staff report. Borck then reviewed the sustainability aspects of the project and, particularly, the plans for recycling of materials from the to be demolished carport structure.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans received January 29, 2009, prepared by Bryan Architects and Associates.

Sheet A.1, Site Plan, Building Data
Sheet A.2, Site (Floor) Floor Plan (with exterior lighting notes)
Sheet A.3, Exterior (East, West, North & South) Elevations
Sheet A.4, Exterior (Garage & Entry) Elevations

Also considered were the cut sheets for proposed light fixtures "A" (Kichler Lighting "Down Accent") and "B" (Five Rivers wall sconce).

Vlasic advised that since the staff report was prepared, the town had received one additional letter in support of the project. He distributed copies of this March 6, 2009 letter from Mike and Yvonne Deggleman, 100 Wyndham Drive.

Mr. Bailey and project architect Buzz Bryan presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and plan clarifications:

- The applicant has considered the comments in the staff report and is willing to consider repainting the house to conform to the town's policies relative to color reflectivity. It is hoped, however, that this could be a phased effort with the new construction painted first and the remainder of the house painted at a later date.
- The proposed light fixtures would only direct light down.
- There will be no "up" lighting in the planned skylights. The skylights would have a bronze tint and be flat.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and found it generally acceptable. Members also concurred with the evaluation in the staff report regarding the proposed concentration of 87% of the floor area in the main house.

Warr wondered about the existing loop driveway on the east side of the property and whether this should be modified with the project. Vlasic advised that this was not raised as an issue because of the limited amount of work proposed on this side of the site, particularly yard work, and the cost that would be incurred. Warr agreed that there was likely not a basis for pursuing this driveway area with this project, but he felt the color changes were needed for conformity with town policies given the scope of work planned for the house.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0, approval of the 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. A final exterior color scheme conforming to town policies for color light reflectivity values shall be provided.
2. A landscaping plan for repair of disturbed areas shall be provided.
3. A final lighting plan for all exterior lights (existing to be preserved and proposed) shall be provided and shall conform to town lighting policies and regulations.
4. The site plan shall be adjusted to address the driveway design issue discussed in the staff report to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. A final construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Following action on the Bailey/Masada matter, Gelpi returned to his ASCC position.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0-1 (Breen), approval of the February 23, 2009 special field meeting minutes as drafted.

Gelpi moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 3-0-2 (Breen, Warr), approval of the February 23, 2009 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

T. Vlastic