

Architectural and Site Control Commission **October 26, 2009**
Special Field Meeting, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young,
Special Joint Field Meeting With Planning Commission, Golden Oak Drive
at Peak Lane, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the special field meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. at 210 Golden Oak Drive and noted it was for preliminary consideration of the Young project.

Roll Call:

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

Others present relative to the Young project:*

William and Jennifer Young, applicants
Mark Sutherland, project architect
Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect
Bob Pleau, CJW Architecture
Gavin and Tricia Christensen, 50 Alhambra Court
Warren Poole, 30 Alhambra Court
Ken and Carrie Lavine, 185 Golden Oak Drive
Virginia and Lyle Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive
Ester and Martin Lytton, former residents of Alhambra Court
Jan and Carrie Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive
Syrus Madavi, 220 Golden Oak Drive
Ted Lamb, 190 Bear Gulch Road
Susan Nycum, 35 Granada Court
Bill Kunz, 235 Golden Oak Drive
Huston Cummings, 25 Toro Court
Catherine Hoffman, 225 Golden Oak Drive
Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive
Barbara and Bob Oliver, 15 Holden Court
Galye Collet, 30 Holden Court

•As several people came to and left the site meeting, this list may not include all those actually present over the course of the meeting.

Preliminary Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young

Vlasic presented the October 23, 2009 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for residential redevelopment of the 1.2-acre Alpine Hills Subdivision property. Vlasic advised that there are a number of outstanding issues regarding the project, as explained in the staff report and that engineered site plans have yet to be developed for the project and are needed for processing of the site development permit request. He clarified that the primary purpose of the preliminary review is to provide the opportunity for the ASCC and site neighbors to be fully informed on the project and, at this point, to allow the ASCC the opportunity to react to the proposal and the concerns that have been offered by neighbors in the communications listed in the staff report. It was noted that one additional

communication had been received since the staff report was prepared and this was a letter for concern from Cindy Salisbury, 170 Golden Oak Drive, dated 10/26/09.

Vlastic also explained that there would be no ASCC action at the site meeting or at the evening meeting, but that ASCC members would likely offer comments at the evening meeting. He noted that it may also not be possible for the ASCC to complete all of the needed field review at "today's" meetings given other agenda demands and that likely a second field meeting would be needed.

Mark Sutherland then presented boards with plans data on them and discussed the current proposals as shown on the following plans, unless otherwise noted, dated October 13, 2009 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet (with project data), updated 10/22/09
- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 6/24/08
- Sheet: A-1.01, Near Neighbor Site Plans
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, revised 10/22/09
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-2.2, Lower Level Plan and Roof Plan
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.2, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.3, Pool Level Plans, Elevations and Sections
- Sheet: L-1, Site Preparation Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
- Sheet: L-2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design Associates

It was noted that in support of the plans, the applicant has submitted reports prepared by Ray Morneau, Arborist dated September 15, 2008 and September 26, 2009.

Mr. Sutherland explained the design process that was used to develop the current plans, particularly the changes made to address town staff and neighbor concerns. He referenced the comment and response document he prepared that was included with the staff report materials. He stressed that this effort was continuing and that further design changes would be developed. He made use of the story poles placed at the site to describe the project, as originally designed, and also a project model. He explained that the story poles had not be updated to reflect the most recent design changes. An updated, corrected colors and materials board was also presented.

Mr. Sutherland also provided data to explain how the proposed two-story house fits into the neighborhood. He referenced other nearby two-story houses and compared the subject proposal to them. He stressed that the effort was to make a compact house footprint and maximize setbacks from adjacent property lines.

Neighbors present shared concerns, largely as set forth in the neighbor communications provided with and listed in the staff report and in the 10/26/09 communication received from Cindy Salisbury. Most neighbors expressed worries over the two-story form of the house, the proposed house size and view impacts from adjoining properties. Many neighbors commented that the current design did not fit the character or the neighborhood and that that additional and significant design changes were needed. Concerns were also expressed over the recently completed swimming pool work, including retaining walls, and also the size, scale and location of the proposed guest house, particularly relative to view impacts from the Sweetnam property.

After the presentation by Mr. Sutherland and sharing of some neighbor comments, all present walked the site and also considered views from several locations on the Sweetnam property. During this walk, Mr. Madavi and Mr. and Mrs. Sweetnam reviewed the specific comments set forth in their letters to the ASCC.

At approximately 4:15 p.m., Clark thanked the applicant and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting and noted that preliminary review of the project would continue at the regular ASCC evening meeting. He acknowledged that not all of the properties of concerned neighbors had been visited and that a second site meeting may be needed. Further, it was noted that ASCC members would likely share preliminary reactions at the evening ASCC meeting.

Thereafter, it was noted that the special site meeting would continue at the California Water Service property located at the intersection of Peak Lane and Golden Oak Drive as soon as ASCC members could convene at the property.

Joint ASCC and Planning Commission Special Site Meeting -- Preliminary consideration of Architectural Review and Proposed Conditional Use Permit X7D-170, "Monopine" Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

At 4:20 p.m., the special joint meeting of the planning commission and ASCC was called to order at on the California Water Service property located at the intersection of Peak Lane and Golden Oak Drive.

Roll call:

ASCC members present: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes

ASCC members absent: Warr

Planning Commission members present: McKitterick, Gilbert, McIntosh, Zaffaroni

Staff: Vlastic

Others present:

Fred Musser, project architect

Greg Guerrazzi, project engineer

Ali Hafhnegahdar, project representative

Karen and Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive

William Kelly, 10 Peak Lane

Vlastic briefly reviewed the October 23, 2009 staff report on this proposal for installation of a 45-foot tall "monopine" wireless antenna facility at the subject 1.3-acre property owned by California Water Service Company. He explained the project as described in the October 15, 2009 staff report to the planning commission and also reviewed the matters discussed at the October 21, 2009 preliminary review planning commission meeting. It was noted that since one of the critical town review matters would be the aesthetics of the project the applicant needed to provide data on the location of actual examples of "tree" antennas for staff, planning commission and ASCC inspection. Vlastic advised that the ASCC should have an opportunity to inspect these examples prior to completing comments to the planning commission on the use permit proposal.

Mr. Guerrazzi described the proposal and identified the proposed site for the antenna easement and pole location. He noted that the antenna functions on a "line of site basis" and that the proposed site allowed for the best "line of site" function for the three proposed

antenna. Mr. Guerrazzi offered the following comments and clarifications, a number in response to questions:

- Product data were provided for possible “tree” antennas that could be used at the site. It was noted that locations for “real-world” examples would be provided to the town. Photo simulations for the site were reviewed and photo images of existing trees antennas presented for consideration.
- The proposed “monopine” would have a maximum height of 50 feet with the actual antenna pole 45 feet high.
- An option would be a “slimline” monopole at 50 feet high, with a 24-in diameter at the base. This would have the antenna incorporated into the pole and not extending out from it, and the pole could be painted any color determined appropriate. It would likely not support collocation of an additional carrier, but such collocation would be possible with the proposed “monopine.” An example of the optional monopole has been installed just to the east of the where Highway 280 crosses Woodside Road.
- The monopine or monopole could be located outside of the proposed, fenced easement area that would contain the needed equipment, but the area of any such pole would also need to be fenced.
- The proposed fenced enclosure would be with a six-foot high redwood fence. Planting could be added around the fence for screening.
- Construction would take approximately five to six weeks. A backhoe would be used and crane. Access for construction would be the existing gate. A new construction access way is not needed.
- Maintenance would be likely on a one time a month basis. Backup power would be extended as explained at the 10/21 planning commission meeting. A backup generator is being considered. It would likely cycle once per month, and there would be sound control within the proposed enclosure. No specific proposal for a generator has yet to be developed. In any case, T-Mobile has portable generators that can be brought to the site in an emergency to provide backup power.
- At this time, it is projected that at least 50 customers would be served by the proposed facility. Additional customers are anticipated when the service is active in the area. The applicant understands the service plan data that the commission desires and is working on this information.
- Noise evaluations and studies would be completed as determined necessary and desired by the town and adjacent residents. Further, the applicant is will be completing soils and other technical studies in support of the proposal and final design parameters.
- No site lighting is proposed.

After discussion of the health issues associated with the proposed facilities and the town attorney’s opinion that the town is preempted by Federal Communication Commission regulations relative to considering health issues, the neighbors present offered the following concerns during the course of the site meeting:

- California Water Service would be receiving the financial benefits from leasing the site and the neighbors would be carrying the burdens associated with the large antenna. The Water District should be asked to be present at the formal hearing on the CUP request so that district representatives clearly understand the concerns of the neighbors.
- The antenna will likely negatively impact the property values of immediate neighbors and in any real estate transactions, the neighbors would need to disclose the antenna's presence even if disguised as a tree. It would be appreciated if the town attorney could comment on the matter of impacts on property values.
- While the water service company has been a good neighbor to date, this proposal puts added pressure on neighbor relations.
- Additional screen planting around the proposed enclosure and around the property should be required. New trees should be added in anticipation of the loss of pines. Redwood trees should be considered in addition to the redwoods planted by the water district.

ASCC and planning commission members agreed that they wanted to inspect real world examples of the proposed monopine and optional monopole. Some concerns were expressed as to a "fake" tree resulting in more visual presence than a slim line pole. Members also expressed concern over the potential for the site to take on an "industrial" appearance, and Leah Zaffaroni suggested that everyone visit the Priory and inspect the cluster of wireless poles on the hillside adjacent to the monastery building. Other comments were offered as follows:

- Commissioners are looking forward to the written opinion from the town attorney relative to the health issues and scope of FCC preemption. Further, any town attorney input on the matter of whether or not property values can be considered in the CUP review process would be appreciated.
- Currently the existing pines on the property provide significant screening. These trees are not long lived and a plan should be considered for replacement planting to ensure the screening continues.
- The applicant needs to provide long range plans for service to the community as called for in the town's policy statement for wireless facilities. Further, data on evolving technology, as related to less intrusive antenna facilities, should be explained.
- The applicant is reminded that any such CUP would only be issued for a 5-year initial period and the town policies encourage adjustments to the facilities as better, less intrusive technologies are available.

After sharing of the above comments, Chairs McKitterick and Clark thanked the project team and neighbors for their participation in the preliminary review site meeting. It was again noted that the planning commission hearing on the CUP request had yet to be set. Clark advised that the ASCC would further discuss the proposal at the evening meeting and then continue the review to the November 9th regular meeting, with the understanding that commissioners would visit identified "example" antenna sites to help in the development of final comments on the proposal.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:22 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Architectural and Site Control Commission **October 26, 2009**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

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

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Continued Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-604, 133 Stonegate Road, McAdam

Vlastic presented the October 26, 2009 report on the continuing review of the subject project. He noted that ASCC review was initiated on September 14, 2009 and that, while members found the project generally acceptable, a number of comments were offered for consideration by the applicant and project architect.

Vlastic then explained that in response to the September 14th review, Tobin Architects has provided revised plan Sheets L1.0, SP.0, A2.1, and A2.2. He noted how the sheets addressed ASCC comments and that with the revised sheets, the following plans, unless otherwise noted, dated July 14, 2009 and prepared by Tobin Architects PA, are before the ASCC for action:

- Sheet CS, Cover Sheet (with computer model images)
- Sheet C1.0, Grading & Drainage Plan, Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., Engineering, 6/5/09
- Sheet L1.0, Landscape Plan, Thomas Scherer Associates, received 10/23/09
- Sheet A1.0, Architectural Site / Lighting Plan
- Sheet A2.0, (N) Basement Level / Foundation Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Main / Split Level Floor Plan (with exterior lighting details),
received 10/23/09
- Sheet A2.2, Second Level Floor Plan, received 10/23/09
- Sheet A2.3, Roof Plan
- Sheet A4.1, Left and Back Elevations
- Sheet A4.2, Entry and Right Side Elevations
- Sheet A5.1, Sections
- Sheet SP.0, Construction Staging Plan, received 10/23/09

ASCC members considered these plans and Mr. Tobin Dougherty's notes on the revisions presented on an annotated copy of the 9/14/09 meeting minutes. Also considered were the arborist report dated October 14, 2009 and prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company, Inc., the exterior colors and materials board dated July 2009, and the cut sheets for the proposed house light fixtures received July 13, 2009.

Mr. McAdam and Mr. Dougherty were present to discuss the revised plans with ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- While the plans have been developed to achieve a total of 189 points on the BIG checklist, the desire is to actually achieve an LEED platinum rating. This will be pursued as the building plans are developed.
- They identified the specific trees as numbered in the arborist report and advised that a site plan would be annotated to identify the trees as tagged at the site.
- The changes to the landscape plan were explained, particularly as related to increased screen planting on the north side of the proposed house.
- No deer fencing or any other fencing changes are proposed at this time. Some may, however, be developed with neighbors and these would then be included with the building permit submittal. There is no desire to fence for deer protection and, if necessary, the plant palette would be adjusted to make use of plants that are, to the extent possible, deer resistant.
- A final, detailed construction staging plan will be developed to the satisfaction of the town, when a project contractor is engaged. The one parking space proposed on the street on the preliminary construction staging plan is to accommodate the occasional visitor, e.g., an inspector, the project architect, etc., who might come to the site for a short period during any construction day.
- Drawings for the rear yard shed and trellis were prepared, but left at the architect's office. The shed would, for the most part, be open with a flat roof. The shed and trellis would have would have heights ranging from 9 to 12 feet.
- Control of solar gain on west side windows would be with relative long and deep overhangs. Shade would also be used as needed and planting would be installed to help control solar penetration. The upstairs bedroom windows would also be recessed and protected by the existing tree canopies.
- There are no plans for yard lighting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and concurred that the project, as modified and clarified was acceptable. ASCC members also concurred that based on data gathered at the 9/14 site meeting and the evaluations in the staff report, they could make the findings to allow for the proposed concentration of floor area. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of two designated ASCC members prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The planting plans shall be revised and/or clarified to address deer resistance concerns and to include more robust, shade tolerant plantings on the north side of the site.
2. Any proposals for fencing shall be fully clarified.
3. Details for the rear yard shed and BBQ trellis shall be provided.

4. A site plan shall be provided identifying all of the trees discussed in the arborist report.
5. A final construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided.
6. Final data for the finishes for all metal surfaces shall be provided and the plans for roof mounted solar panels and finish of the flat roof clarified.
7. The site development committee conditions in the following reports shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the reviewer:

Public Works Director, August 28, 2009
Town Geologist, July 29, 2009
Fire Marshal, July 27, 2009
Conservation Committee, July 28, 2009

In addition, all of the requirements of the health department shall be complied with to the satisfaction of the health officer.

8. The building plans shall clarify whether the project intends to achieve the BIG points proposed or if LEED certification is to be pursued. At the conclusion of the project, the applicant shall provide a report identifying what sustainable elements have actually been incorporated into the completed project. These requirements shall be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Architectural Review of proposal for detached accessory structure, "Studio," 155 Canyon Drive, Jasinskyj

Vlasic presented the October 23, 2009 staff report on this proposal for ASCC approval of plans for enlarging an "existing" 192 sf storage shed into a 390 sf "studio." Vlasic explained that, for the most part, the enlargement has been completed as described in the staff report. He noted that the work was completed without benefit of needed building permits and conflicted with town setback and floor area limits, also as explained in the staff report.

Vlasic discussed project adjustments that would be needed to meet setback and floor area provisions and then specifically reviewed the following proposed plans and materials received September 15, 2009:

Enclosed Plans (four sheets)

Site Plan
Floor Plan
Front and Left Elevations
Rear and Right Elevations

Attached Materials

Cut sheet for proposed Sea Gull Lighting wall mounted "dark sky" outdoor lantern
Color Board (The attached copy lists the proposed finishes with light reflectivity value data. These finishes are discussed below and a color copy of the board will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting.)

Mr. Jasinskyj presented his proposal to the ASCC. He acknowledged the problems noted in the staff report and expressed his willingness to make the recommended changes to the “studio” for compliance with town standards.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and the issues identified in the staff report. Members concurred that they were uncomfortable with the approach that was taken by the applicant, but concluded that with adjustments the “studio” design and location would be acceptable. Members further concurred that the adjustments should include reducing the bathroom space to be as small as possible so that it could not be easily expanded to accommodate additional plumbing facilities.

Breen wondered about the seven-foot high side yard fencing discussed in the staff report. She suggested that it be modified to be no higher than the current ordinance limit of six feet. Other ASCC members did not feel this was necessary as a condition of any action on the project.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0 acceptance of the project in terms of conformity with the town’s accessory structure policy statement subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff, i.e., in this situation the town planner shall act as the ASCC representative in reviewing the final project plans:

1. The floor plans and building form shall be modified as recommended in the staff report for conformity with the town zoning ordinance setback and floor area limitations. Further, this shall include making the bathroom as small as possible as discussed at the ASCC meeting.
2. Prior to issuance of the building permit, a deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney stating that the studio shall not be modified or used in such a manner to be in conflict with town zoning regulations and polices relative to accessory structures.
3. The applicant shall consider the town’s sustainable building checklists and determine what elements can be incorporated into the project and pursue these to the extent possible to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit X7D-170, “Monopine” Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

Vlasic presented the October 23, 2009 staff report on this project and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission on the proposal. (Refer to above site meeting minutes.) He noted that the ASCC would be continuing the review to the November 9 meeting to allow time for local examples of the proposed “monopine” and option “slimline” monopole to be identified for inspection.

Fred Musser, project architect, and Greg Guerrazzi, project engineer, were present to discuss the proposal further with ASCC members. They again referenced the slim line pole at Woodside Road and Highway 280. They also clarified the enclosure security fence could

be painted or left to weather. It was noted that the proposed 45-50 foot tall antenna was considerably shorter than a number of the existing site trees that are 70 to 80 feet tall.

In response to a question, the project representatives noted that the tree design could be customized relative to branches, form, etc. They also again noted that it would be easier to collocate antennas with a tree solution than with a slim line pole.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the aesthetics of the proposal and had differing opinions on the acceptability of a “fake” tree vs. the slim pole. It was noted this would depend on the final siting, relationship to nearby trees, and actual design of the tree. Warr commented that he had yet to see an antenna “tree” that he felt looked acceptable.

ASCC members acknowledged that the water tank site was likely a good one for the cell facility and that improved cell service was needed in town.

After discussion, project review was continued to the November 9th ASCC meeting with the understanding that the applicant’s representatives would identify local tree and pole examples for ASCC inspection prior to the 11/9 session.

Prior to consideration of the following project, Warr temporarily left the ASCC meeting room. He noted that he could not participate in the discussion as his firm was providing the architectural services for the Young project.

Preliminary Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young

Vlasic presented the October 23, 2009 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.2-acre Alpine Hills Subdivision property. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project (see above site meeting minutes which include a complete listing of the proposed plans). He explained that since this a preliminary review, ASCC members should take additional input, offer preliminary reactions to the proposal and then continue review to a specific future ASCC meeting.

ASCC members first reflected on the site meeting and noted that it would be beneficial if the story poles were corrected to reflect the most recent design changes. Clark commented that he saw three “zones” relative to decision-making. First, the two-story house with basement, second the guest house, and third the pool and retaining walls. He wondered if the ASCC should consider and react to these “zones” individually.

Breen offered that she could not support the current design due to the scale and mass of the two-story house, and the view impacts. She tentatively concluded that a two-story design was not right for the site. She also stated that she had significant concerns with the appropriateness of the existing swimming pool and retaining walls. She concluded she could not support them in their current form. She stated concern with the overall size of the project, including the guest house.

Aalfs and Hughes indicated that while they shared many of Breen's concerns, they thought a scaled back two-story might still be possible. They noted, however, that they still wanted to consider view issues from locations they could not visit at the afternoon site meeting.

Mr. Young and Mark Sutherland were present to further discuss their plans with the ASCC. It was noted they were still considering design changes to address the identified concerns and, in particular, would be adjusting the designs for the pool area. They added they were very interested to receiving ASCC direction as to how they should proceed in considering design changes.

Public comments were requested and the following were offered:

Planning commission liaison McIntosh shared his concerns that the ASCC fully consider the project in terms of conformity to the town's design guidelines and particularly two-story houses on ridgeline.

Carrie Lavine, 185 Golden Oak, reviewed the concerns in her 10/21/09 letter to the town. She encouraged a fundamental reconsideration of the proposal to better fit with the neighborhood and town guidelines.

Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive, reviewed the concerns in her 9/22/09 and 10/22/09 letters to the town. She also read into the record the comments in the 10/26/09 letter from Susan Nycum, 35 Granada Court, and presented a statement in opposition to the current project design signed by a large number of neighbors in the Alpine Hills area.

Jan Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive reviewed the concerns in his 9/24/09 letter to the town. He stressed that the current design overpowers the site and neighbors. His concerns extend to the guest house and potential view impacts and over site disturbance. He shared concerns stated in other communications regarding the potential precedents that would be set if this project were approved as currently proposed.

Ann Kearney, 120 Golden Oak Drive, expressed concern with the large size of the house and proposed basement. She concluded it was not consistent with the established neighborhood character.

Syrus Madavi, 220 Golden Oak Drive, reviewed the comments in his 9/30/09 letter to the town and worried about the loss of privacy and view impacts.

Gavin Christensen, 50 Alhambra Court, reviewed the issues in his 9/30/09 letter to the town and worried over the scope of the project, the pool area improvements, and vegetation impacts. He commented that the current plan revisions were a good start, but that more work was needed.

Carrie Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive shared the concerns expressed by her husband Jan and also stressed the impacts the project would have in terms of loss of open space and natural beauty of the area.

Barbara White, 110 Golden Oak Drive, shared concerns of others over the large size of the project and the potential visual impacts as indicated by the story poles. She concluded that more efforts were needed to preserve the visual character of the area and the scope of the proposal needed to be reduced.

Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive, echoed the concerns of many of the other speakers. She particularly noted the visual impacts associated with the two-story form and the guest house, particularly when viewed from the Sweetnam property. She also commented that the pool area improvements had significant impacts on views from both the Madavi and Sweetman property. She encouraged a significant scaling back of the project and redesign of the overall proposal. She stated her opinion that a one-story design was appropriate given the site and area conditions.

William Young, applicant, stated that the design effort had been to pull the house program as far into the site as possible, but that he would be willing to consider a one-story solution and perhaps a more contemporary, flat roof design. He also noted that the existing fencing and driveway gates would be eliminated from the project. He worried about fair treatment and noted that there had been tree removal on the Madavi property without needed permits and that had impacts on view protection privacy. He also commented that the Sweetman garage had been converted to living space without permits.

Mark Sutherland, project architect, offered that more work would be done on the project design and that options would be considered that include changes to the partial two-story part of the house. He stressed, however, that he still felt a two-story design was consistent with the neighborhood, again citing other two-story houses in the area.

ASCC members then discussed the project at some length and agreed that major changes needed to be considered. Members shared concerns over the scale and massing of the two story form, but only Breen concluded, based on the data currently available, that a two-story design seemed inappropriate. Others were willing to still consider a partial two-story, but agreed that significant scaling back of scope was needed to address potential visual impacts. Members also agreed that serious consideration should be given to analysis of a one-story alternative. It was also suggested that consideration be given to cutting the house further into the site.

With respect to pool and guest house area, members also concurred that further adjustments were needed to address the site and view impacts of concern to neighbors and discussed in the staff report.

Following discussion with the applicant, it was agreed that concepts for potential redesign would be presented at the November 9th ASCC meeting. It was agreed the ASCC would then offer guidance on how to proceed. Members also concurred that they wanted to visit the Madavi property and the parcels across Golden Oak Drive at a special afternoon site meeting on November 9, but that they would consider views from Alhambra Court individually.

Following sharing of comments and discussion with the applicant and project architect, project review was continued to a November 9, 2009 site meeting with the understanding that the concepts for possible project revisions would be considered at the regular evening 11/9 meeting.

Following consideration of the Young project, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Approval of Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 5-0, approval of the September 14, 2009, regular evening meeting minutes as drafted.

Hughes moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0-1 (Warr), approval of the September 22, 2009, special field meeting minutes as drafted.

Breen commented that she was concerned with the follow-through on the conditions set forth in the September 22nd minutes relative to the Lefteroff project (i.e., X9H-494, 5922 Alpine Road) and had checked site conditions. She noted that tree protection measures had not been implemented as expected and that there was still no indication that any SOD protection efforts had been implemented.

ASCC members directed that a report on the status of the Lefteroff project be provided at the November 9, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

T. Vlastic