

**Architectural and Site Control Commission**  
**Joint Special Field Meeting with Planning Commission**  
**121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbernd**  
**and**  
**Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

**April 26, 2010**

The joint Planning Commission and ASCC special field meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. at 121 Ash Lane by Chairs Gilbert and Warr.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Breen, Clark  
(At approximately 4:48 pm Clark had to leave due to a personal commitment.)  
ASCC Absent: Hughes  
Planning Commission: Gilbert, McIntosh, Von Feldt, Zaffaroni  
Planning Commission Absent: McKitterick  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

**Others present relative to the Vidalakis/Elsbernd project\*:**

Nicole Vidalakis, property owner/applicant  
Matt Elsbernd, property owner/applicant (arrived at approximately 5:20 p.m.)  
Bob Swatt, project architect, Swatt/Miers Architects  
Miya Muraki, project architect, Swatt/Miers Architects  
Valerie Remitz, project landscape architect  
Rich Tincher, project contractor  
Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)  
Sue Langdon, 137 Ash Lane  
Rita and Arthur Whitney, 300 Westridge Drive  
Boren Brant, 133 Ash Lane  
-----

•Note: Others may have been present during the course of the special site meeting and may not have been identified for the record.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached garage/guest unit, detached cabana, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-614, 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbernd**

Vlasic presented the April 21, 2010 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, multi-level, 5,755 sf contemporary, flat roofed residence with detached 1,093 sf garage/guest unit on the subject 3.7 acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He noted that the planning commission was involved with the preliminary review because the scope of grading exceeded 1,000 cubic yards, in this case 4,000 cubic yards of earth movement are proposed.

Vlasic discussed the proposal and the preliminary issues noted in the staff report including height, proposed removal of three oaks to accommodate a drainage swale, width of the driveway, scope of lawn area and associated grading, fencing, lighting and proposed materials and finishes. He clarified that no basement was proposed and that the project did conform to town floor area standards as well as setbacks and most other basic zoning standards.

Ms. Vidalakis, Bob Swatt, and Valerie Remitz presented their proposal as described on the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/10/10, and prepared by Swatt/Miers Architects:

Sheet DR1, Title Sheet  
Sheet DR2, Site Plan  
Sheet DR3, Ground Floor Plan  
Sheet DR4, Second Floor Plan  
Sheet DR5, Third Floor Plan  
Sheet DR6, Roof Plan  
Sheet DR7, Elevations  
Sheet DR8, Elevations  
Sheet DR9, Exterior & Landscape Lighting Plan  
Sheet DR10, Exterior & Landscape Lighting Plan  
Sheet DR11, Lighting Cut Sheets  
Sheet DR12, Build-It-Green Green-Building Checklist

Sheet L-1, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 2/24/10  
Sheet L-2, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 2/24/10  
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07  
Sheet SU2, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07  
Sheet C-1, "Preliminary" Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/2/10  
Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Overall Site), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/2/10  
Sheet C-3, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Area of Detail), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/2/10  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control & Construction Operations Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/2/10

Site arborist's report prepared by Econo Tree Service, Inc., dated 3/11/2010

Exterior colors board, received on March 10, 2010

Project booklet, received 3/10/10, including color photomontage before and after images showing effects of landscape screening, the proposed driveway gate and other project features

Plan verifying the location and specific heights of the story poles prepared by the project architect, dated 3/25/10

The applicant and design team members presented the plans inside of the existing house and led special meeting attendees on a tour of the site to consider existing and proposed conditions, including views to the story poles from both on and off-site locations. Also, a project model was presented to further describe the proposal. During the review of plans and site inspection, the project team offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Swatt/Miers Architects has done other contemporary design houses in the area including the Kohavi house on Golden Oak Drive. Other examples of the firm's work were presented to demonstrate how the proposed design and palette of materials and finishes would be integrated with the site and area. The colors board was reviewed, as were proposed house elevations with proposed materials and finishes referenced by elevation area. It was noted that the concrete walls would have no color added and that the intent with the palette was to make use of "100% natural" materials. Samples of the window and door frame materials were presented and it was noted that the metal would have a "champagne silver" color with a matte finish. It was noted that this surface was selected

because it helped make the window frames “disappear” further ensuring the combination of materials did not cause highlighting visual attention to the building.

- The issues discussed in the staff report were reviewed. It was noted that the highest part of the house would be no more than 28 feet over grade assuming that the grade/contour lines were extended through the existing garage. It was agreed that additional contour data would be provided to demonstrate height compliance.
- The plans for the new drainage swale could be modified to preserve the three trees discussed in the staff report. The applicant is willing to adjust the project plans to save the trees and eliminate the grading associated with the swale.
- The new house has been sited in roughly the center of the parcel and setbacks are well over the minimum ordinance requirements.
- The existing driveway access will be preserved and it is a positive way to access the site. If the driveway does not need to be wider than 12 feet to meet fire department standards, it will be reduced to that width from the currently proposed 16 feet.
- The lighting has been selected for minimum impact, but to also provide for safe use of the site. The house lights are mostly recessed soffit fixtures and the spacing is considered minimal.
- The proposed planting is intended to augment what is presently on the site. The planting has also been directed to follow the new fencing line that is within the building envelope. The photo images were references to show how the planting would screen views from off site to the proposed house. It was noted that the “courtyard” area would be adjusted to conform to the town’s new water conservation ordinance and that alternatives to the irrigated lawn would need to be considered. It was explained that the lawn/courtyard area was designed as a secure place for the owner’s children.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the olive orchard was viewed as an agricultural use and was located to have visual presence from within the property but be screened from off site views by existing vegetation to be preserved.
- Plant materials have been selected to screen views, but also protect long distance views of the uphill neighbors. The trees on the uphill side would have maximum heights of 25 to 30 feet. In response to a question, it was noted that a total of 14 new trees were now proposed.
- In response to a comment from Bev Lipman that the WASC does not permit fences over six feet high, it was noted that the proposed design for the seven-foot tall “deer and security” fence would be modified to conform to the Westridge standard.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the majority of grading would be the excavation for the courtyard. It was clarified that the location and adjusted contours would not be visible from off site and was to, again, provide for a secure outdoor area for the applicants’ children. It was clarified that as currently planned, the grading would include off-haul of 1,475 cubic yards of earth.

Also during the course of the site walk, Ash Lane neighbors Langdon and Brant raised concern over impacts associated with construction staging and, particularly, construction

parking and large delivery truck access on Ash Lane. Rich Tincher, project contractor, noted that he was a town resident and very sensitive to neighbor impacts from construction operations. He offered that a temporary construction access from Alamos Road might be considered if it did not adversely impact existing screen vegetation. He did acknowledge that Ash would not be a good location for construction parking or general staging operations and that it was fortunate that the site was large. He added that due to the large size the property could likely accommodate most construction work on site, but noted that some largely delivery equipment, e.g., cement trucks, would have to access the site. He stated that details of the construction operation would be developed in a final staging plan taking into account the concerns of neighbors over impacts on Ash Lane.

Due to the lateness of the site meeting, ASCC members agreed they would offer comments on the proposal at the regular evening ASCC meeting, as did planning commissioner Von Feldt, noting she would be at the evening meeting as the commission liaison to the ASCC. Commissioners Gilbert, McIntosh, and Zaffaroni then each commented, but shared the following basic concerns:

- The planting plan appears to be “over landscaped.” More effort should be made to select the views to be screened and to leave more open grassland around the property. Also, consideration should be given to “pulling” the new screen planting further into the site.
- The scope of grading for the almost 4,000 sf, level “courtyard” area was questioned. It was noted that it had a more artificial character and did not appear to be adjusted to the natural contours of the site. Members also worried over the large amount of off-haul of soil to accommodate courtyard construction.
- The plans should be adjusted as agreed to by the applicant to save the three oak trees and eliminate the grading with the proposed drainage swale.

Bev Lipman, WASC, was asked if she wanted to make any specific comments on behalf of the Westridge homeowners association. She advised that the WASC would be convening to formulate comments and that there would be input on at least the matters of fencing, lawn area and exterior lighting; but, that comments on other matters would likely also be provided.

After sharing of the above comments and reactions, planning commission and ASCC members thanked the applicant and others present for their participation in the site meeting. It was also noted that ASCC consideration of the request would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 5:40 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Breen, Clark  
Absent: Hughes  
Town Council Liaison: Derwin  
Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached garage/guest unit, detached cabana, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-614, 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbernd**

Vlasic presented the April 21, 2010 staff report on this project and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) Vlasic stressed that this was a preliminary review of the proposal and that after offering of comments, project consideration should be continued to at least the May 10<sup>th</sup> regular ASCC meeting for formal consideration of the architectural review request. He also advised that after ASCC action on this application, the site development permit would be forwarded to the planning commission for public hearing and that a time for this hearing had yet to be identified.

Nicole Vidalakis and Matt Elsbernd, property owners/applicants, Bob Swatt and Miya Muraki, project architects, and Valerie Remitz, project landscape architect, were present to offer additional comments and/or respond to questions in addition to those considered at the afternoon site meeting.

Mr. Swatt noted that based on questions raised at the site meeting he wanted to clarify the proposed grading calculations. He offered that total cut would be 3,200 cubic yards, fill 1,750 cubic yards, and off-haul 1,475 cubic yards. He clarified that the cut would be reduced somewhat with elimination of the drainage swale

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Thereafter, Warr asked if planning commission liaison Von Feldt would present her preliminary review comments prior to ASCC members providing comments.

**Von Feldt** stated she shared the concerns expressed by other planning commissioners at the site meeting relative to scope of new screen vegetation and elimination of the swale to save the three oaks. She also questioned the large lawn area and noted the need to conform to the provisions of the town's water conservation ordinance. With respect to the proposed courtyard grading, she noted that 4,000 cubic yards was a large grading project. She stated that, typically, large volumes of grading are to cut a house into the site and/or correct problems with past grading operations. She advised that she had difficulty

concluding that this scope of grading for the courtyard help to achieve a project that was “subservient” to the natural site conditions and contours as called for in the general plan. She offered that adjustments be considered to reduce the scope of grading and that the grading plan be more responsive to native site conditions.

ASCC members then offered comments. Members concurred that, overall, the house siting and design of buildings, including materials and finishes, including the proposed materials for the flat roof and window frames, were appropriate. Members also concurred that the scope of glazing with large roof extensions was acceptable. The following were, however, specific concerns that ASCC members agreed needed to be addressed with project refinements.

- The plans should be revised and/or clarified to address the driveway, height and drainage swale matters as evaluated in the staff report and responded to by the applicant at the site meeting.
- The planting plans need to be addressed to reduce the scope of planting and preserve more of the open grassland around the site. The scope of planting along the proposed fence should be reduced. The landscape comments offered by planning commissioners were supported.
- The scope of exterior lighting needs to be reconsidered and reduced. Particularly, the soffit lights that can be viewed from below from off-site locations need to be reduced in number. Further, less driveway lighting should be considered and the plans should take into account light spill from with the large glazed spaces. It was also noted that at the upper floor areas, outdoor lighting should be reduced or eliminated where not necessary for compliance with building code access standards.
- Given the scope and size of the project, it was suggested that a higher number of Build It Green GreenPoint rated points should be targeted. It was suggested that the number be closer to the green building standards the town is now considering adopting.
- The project design team should review the provisions of town building code Chapter 7A, implementing state fire code provisions. This Chapter may impact some of the proposed exterior wood materials.
- The various site plans are at different scales. This should be corrected, as it makes plan comparison difficult.
- The courtyard plans need to be reconsidered. The scope of grading should be reduced and the planting/lawn brought into conformity with the town’s water conservation ordinance. Further, a more organic approach to development of the outdoor space should be pursued that is responsive to site conditions. The modifications should also reflect the fact that the adjacent line of conifers is not a native condition and that the trees are not long lived. The design of the courtyard should not be directed by the line of existing trees, but be more in keeping with the natural contours and native vegetation of the site and area. Further, the plans should fully clarify the retaining walls and any associated railings that may be needed for development of the final courtyard area.
- Consideration should be given to removal of the new pines recently installed along Westridge Drive. These will grow rather rapidly to block views from the property and they are not needed for screening of views to the project site.

- A detailed construction staging plan is needed and should address the concerns of neighbors shared at the site meeting. The one large pine could be removed to allow for construction access from Alamos Road and, after construction, replaced with appropriate native materials.

After the above comments were shared with the applicant and design team, project review was continued to the May 10, 2010 regular ASCC meeting.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following two matters, Warr temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room. He noted that his firm was providing the architectural services for the Young project and that the firm was also the architect for the Letteroff project on lands bordering those of the Fogarty Winery.*

---

### **Follow-up review – Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young**

Vlasic presented the April 21, 2010 staff report on this follow-up review for compliance with conditions of ASCC approvals granted on December 14, 2009 and January 11, 2010. He noted that a number of the 12/14/09 conditions were addressed with the January 11, 2010 ASCC action, but that others, as outlined in the staff report, needed ASCC attention at this time. Vlasic then reviewed the project building permit plans as evaluated in the April 16, 2010 memorandum from him to planning technician Carol Borck.

Vlasic noted that since the April 21<sup>st</sup> staff report had been prepared, project architect Mark Sutherland provided a general “Construction/ASCC Review Schedule” dated 4/21/10 and that this schedule would serve as a framework for a more detailed construction schedule that would be developed between staff and the project contractor prior to release of the building permit. He clarified that this more detailed schedule was essential to ensure that there was positive communication between the contractor and staff and to avoid any misunderstandings that could lead to a possible stop work notice.

William Young and project architect Mark Sutherland presented the building permit plans and the following data, in addition to the 4/21/10 schedule, to address the matters listed in the April 21<sup>st</sup> staff report:

- April 23, 2010 letter from project landscape architect Bob Cleaver stating that the civil engineers utility plan would not conflict with effective implementation of the approved landscape plans.
- April 21, 2010 Section clarifying the lighting proposed in the clerestory area. It was further clarified that the fixtures in the clerestory area would be Eureka #3211B and a cut sheet for the fixture was provided to ASCC members.
- Revised Sheets engineering plan Sheets C-2 and C-3, both dated 4/20/10, were presented. It was noted that C-2 shows utility extensions outside of, i.e., avoiding conflict with, areas approved for key landscape improvements. It was also clarified that Sheet C-3 now clearly states the lower, northeast side retaining wall would be no higher than four feet maximum as provided for in the January 12, 2010 letter from project geotechnical consultant John Stillman of Murray Engineers.

- The planned construction fence will have a dark green colored fabric.

Sutherland stressed that the construction schedule would be detailed during the course of the normal preconstruction meetings with town staff.

Public comments were requested. **Jan Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive**, requested clarification regarding the Murray Engineers report on the height of the lower retaining wall. He offered that comments were not clear as to the scope of possible wall lowering.

Vlasic noted that he had checked with the town geologist and town public works director and both had confirmed that the wall could be modified to be a maximum height of 4 feet, confirming the note that was added to the revised grading plan. Breen also stated she had discussed the matter with the town geologist and Murray Engineers representative John Stillman and had also confirmed the four-foot maximum clarification. She noted that, with this clarification and the other data presented at the meeting, she found the building permit plans acceptable subject to a detailed construction and inspection schedule being presented to the satisfaction of town staff prior to issuance of the building permit.

Other ASCC members concurred with the comments offered by Breen. Thereafter, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 to approve the follow-up submittal, as clarified at the ASCC meeting, subject to the condition that a detailed project construction schedule be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to release of any building permits. It was noted that this schedule should provide for the key milestones where ASCC and planning staff inspections will be needed as called for in the record of the 12/14/09 and 1/11/10 ASCC actions.

### **Continued consideration, Proposed Amendments to Conditional Use Permit X7D-87, 19501 Skyline Boulevard, Thomas Fogarty Winery**

Vlasic presented the April 21, 2010 staff report on the subject proposed conditional use permit amendment. He noted that the matter was on the ASCC agenda for follow-up to the March 27, 2010 Winery site meeting attended by ASCC members Breen and Hughes. He then made a PowerPoint presentation showing photo images taken during the March 27<sup>th</sup> site meeting. During the presentation he also referenced the following materials describing the conditional use permit amendment proposal, the key issue associated with it and, particularly, the concerns of the most immediate neighbors to the winery, Hildegard and Bruce Jackson:

April 15, 2010 staff report to the planning commission with attachments  
March 25, 2010 staff report prepared for March 27<sup>th</sup> site visit, with attachments

Vlasic also recommended that ASCC members determine if any physical site modifications, e.g., additional screen planting, parking controls, lighting adjustments, etc., should be considered by the planning commission as it conducts its hearings on the CUP amendment proposal.

After the staff presentation, Breen commented that during her attendance at the March 27<sup>th</sup> site visit, she did not experience any noise or light spill issues, particularly during the time spent at the Jackson property. She noted that traffic along Skyline Boulevard was quite audible and masked noise from winery activities. She also noted that the site visit did not extend to 11:00 p.m. and that it would be appropriate to experience a larger, late evening

event to fully appreciate the situation and concerns of the neighbors. She also noted that most of the visual issues could readily be addressed with shrub planting on the Jackson property.

Public comments were requested and Mr. and Mrs. Jackson reviewed the concerns expressed in their various communications to the town. Mrs. Jackson presented a photo image highlighting elements in the area that reflected the relationships between her property and the Winery property. Mr. and Mrs. Jackson also offered the following comments:

- Skyline traffic is part of the circumstances, but it does decrease over the evening and, as a result, it is considerably quieter later, around 9:00 p.m., and that is when the winery noise becomes particularly apparent.
- When the Hill House northerly windows are open during a reception, there is more noise spill. If there is a heat issue in the Hill House, perhaps the skylights could be shaded or air conditioning used to avoid the need to open the windows for cooling. The sound was characterized as “buzzing like bees.”
- The impact is on the use of the entire Jackson property.
- Activities in the lawn area can be bothersome. Over the April 24<sup>th</sup> weekend at one point children, perhaps teenagers, were playing and their voices could be readily heard.
- As to light, an issue not previously discussed, is the clear, Holiday type lights on the fence around the pond. These were originally only used during the Holidays, but now seem to be on much of the time when an evening event is taking place. These seem excessive and inconsistent with town lighting policies.
- In response to a question, the neighbors noted they did not hear activities in the pavilion area and the main concern was the noise associated with the receptions within and around the Hill House and lawn area.

**Mark Sutherland, Groveland Street**, wondered about the relationship of the Winery and Jackson properties to the boundary of the town. It was clarified that the boundary was Skyline Boulevard and that both properties were within the town.

ASCC members concurred that the majority of the CUP amendment issues were under the authority of the planning commission. Members also agreed they had little to offer as to concerns over the physical site conditions or need for physical adjustments. It was, however, further agreed that it would be helpful if the site and neighbor concerns could be checked during a larger, later evening event.

Breen commented that she felt that the pond lights were inappropriate, and that perhaps some additional landscaping might be considered to screen views to vehicle movement and lights along the driveway. She, however, did not feel strongly about this. She clarified that during the March 27<sup>th</sup> visit, a test was made with one of the Winery employees driving his diesel engine truck around the loop drive and that there was some sound heard from the truck, but that light spill was minimal and the lights did not penetrate into the living spaces on the Jackson property.

Tommy Fogarty, applicant, commented that the pond lights were installed for security around the pond. It was suggested that an alternative be considered, such as path lights, if security lighting was needed.

Dr. Fogarty advised that the Winery was agreeable to town officials visiting at any time, including during the later evening events to appreciate potential impacts. He noted, however, that the only caution would be to avoid any disruption to a wedding ceremony. Winery representatives agreed to make the schedule of upcoming evening events available to the town so that any planning commissioner or ASCC member could visit as desired.

After discussion, ASCC members concurred that the above comments should be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration, as appropriate, during the CUP hearing process. Members also concurred that if anyone could visit the Winery during a later event they would share their impressions with staff so that they could also be provided to the planning commission.

---

*Following consideration of the Fogarty Winery matter, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

### **Architectural Review for proposed swimming pool pavilion, 16 Buck Meadow Drive, Lot 33, Blue Oaks Subdivision, Lopez**

Vlasic presented the April 21, 2010 staff report on this request for approval of pool pavilion plans related yard improvements on this 2.76-acre, Blue Oaks subdivision property. He reviewed the background relative to the proposal and noted that the proposal was actually a refinement of swimming pool plans approved by the ASCC in 2008. Vlasic clarified that the swimming pool was now under construction in conformity with the 2008 plan approval.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated March 31, 2010, prepared by Warnecke Rosekrans, Inc.:

- Sheet L. 1, Site Plan
- Sheet L. 2, Pool Pavilion
- Sheet L. 3, Planting Plan

Also considered were cut sheets for the proposed path, pendant and sconce light fixtures received April 2, 2010 and the "Pool Pavilion Materials Sheet" noting that the proposed improvements will match the finishes and materials, including terracotta tile roofing, used on the main house.

John Lopez was present to discuss his plans with the ASCC. He clarified that he concurred with the staff report concerns relative to landscaping, particularly the use of the Thuja occidentalis 'emerald green' along the west side of the pool. He noted that he would be seeking plan modifications from his landscape architect.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Aalfs moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the proposed plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit for the pool pavilion:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to address the concerns set forth in the staff report to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member, and this would include referral to the conservation committee for review and recommendations relative to appropriate plan selection.
2. The plans shall be modified to clarify that all lighting associated with the pool pavilion shall be manually switched.
3. Prior to construction of the pavilion, the applicant shall provide data demonstrating the accurate location of the POSE boundary on the south side of the pavilion. The intent is to ensure that the pavilion and related yard improvements are all within the recorded building envelope for the site.
4. The proposed fireplace shall be gas fired and of a design consistent with the provisions of the Blue Oak Planned Unit Development Statement.

### **“Draft” proposed modifications to Story Pole Policy Statement**

ASCC members considered the April 26, 2010 revised policy statement and concurred it was acceptable with one addition. Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs, and passed 4-0, approval of the revised statement with a new fourth bullet under “additional” guidelines on page 2 stating:

- If, during the course of project review, a design change is made or required by the ASCC that changes the planned heights, the story poles shall be modified if required by the ASCC. If the story poles are required to be modified, they shall be in place in the modified condition at least 10 days prior to final ASCC action.

Clark asked about the need to also consider the matter of ASCC noticing procedures to respond to recent concerns expressed by some neighbors to projects considered by the ASCC for the last year. Vlastic advised that this matter would be placed on a future agenda for specific consideration.

Vlastic also advised that with the ASCC action on the story pole policy statement, the proposed revisions would be forwarded to the town council for concurrence and then placed in the Design Guidelines booklet.

### **Proposed New Native Plant List for Portola Valley Design Guidelines**

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the April 21, 2010 staff report on the conservation committee revisions to the town’s native plant list. He clarified that it is intended that the revised list be added to the town’s design guidelines once it is approved by the town council. Vlastic recommended that the ASCC review the list and offer any comments or suggestions for consideration by the conservation committee before the list is presented to the town council for final approval. He noted that one suggestion the ASCC might consider is that the plant list be modified to provide some guidance in terms of deer resistance.

Breen and planning commission liaison Von Feldt expressed some surprise to see the revised list being presented as a recent recommendation from the conservation committee. They noted that the work was actually a few years old and that further refinements were

likely needed to reflect changes to water conservation requirements and other considerations.

After brief discussion, ASCC members concurred that Breen and Von Feldt should interact with the conservation committee to further develop and refine the native plant list before it is finally presented as a revision to the list in the town's design guidelines.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Aalfs moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0-1 (Warr), approval of the April 12, 2010 meeting minutes with correction of the "roll call" list on page one to only show that Warr was absent from the meeting.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

T. Vlastic