

**Architectural and Site Control Commission\***  
**Special Field Meeting 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney**  
**and**  
**Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

**June 28, 2010**

The special field meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. at 300 Westridge Drive by Vice Chair Aalfs.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Warr,\*\* Aalfs, Clark, Hughes

ASCC Absent: Breen

Planning Commission: Von Feldt, Zaffaroni\*

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

-----

\*The meeting was noticed as a joint session with the ASCC and planning commission. However, since only two commissioners could attend, there was not the needed quorum to call the planning commission meeting to order. Further, Zaffaroni arrived at approximately 4:20 p.m., and after the ASCC meeting was called to order.

\*\*Warr arrived at approximately 4:10 p.m., shortly after the meeting was called to order.

**Others present relative to the Whitney project\*\*\*:**

Rita and Arthur Whitney, property owners/applicants

Tim Chappelle, project architect, Arcanum Architecture, Inc.

Austin Reilly, Arcanum Architecture, Inc.

Piper Barnett, project landscape architect, Studio Green

Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road

Celia Oakley, 348 Westridge Drive

Sonja Declercq, 317 Westridge Drive

Leslie Doyle, 332 Westridge Drive, (arrived at approximately 4:35 p.m.)

-----

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

**Preliminary Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-616, for new residence, detached accessory structures & related site improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney**

Vlastic presented the June 24, 2010 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story, 5,860 sf residence on the subject vacant 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He explained that, in addition to the residence, the proposal includes a detached 685 sf guest cottage and detached 400 sf home office/study. He also clarified that development would require a total volume of grading, counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance, of 2,190 cubic yards and that the grading has been designed to roughly balance on site so there would be minimal "off-haul" of materials. Vlastic added that the grading volume requires the subject site development permit and the planning commission is the approving authority for any such permit where the earthwork exceeds 1,000 cubic yards and for this reason the special site meeting was noticed as a joint meeting of the ASCC and planning commission.

Vlasic emphasized that the purpose of the preliminary review meeting was for the applicant and project design team to present the proposal to town officials, neighbors and the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC). He stressed that this allows for any design issues to be identified and addressed prior to the time a formal action on the proposal would be considered. As a result, it was noted that after the preliminary review, project consideration should be continued to the July 12<sup>th</sup> regular ASCC meeting. Vlasic noted that after ASCC action on the project, planning commission consideration of the site development permit would be set for a public hearing.

Vlasic advised that while the WASC had been invited to participate in the site meeting, the committee had already acted to issue a conditional project approval as set forth in its June 9, 2010 letter to the applicants. Bev Lipman noted that she was present on behalf of the committee to offer any clarifications as to the approval letter and obtain additional data on status of project design efforts.

The applicants and project architect Tim Chappelle presented plans and materials listed below and made use of the story poles set for the site meeting to explain the proposal. The following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 5/14/10, and prepared by Arcanum Architects were reviewed:

- Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Chappell Surveying Services, 10/3/07, rev. 5/5/10
- Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan and Utility Plan, LTI
- Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan
- Sheet A0.2, First Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)
- Sheet A0.3, Second Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)
- Sheet A0.4, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet A0.5, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet A0.6, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Studio Green (with yard lighting), 5/14/10
- Sheet L2, Planting Plan, Studio Green, 5/14/10
- Arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated January 28, 2008, revised May 11, 2010
- Cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received May 18, 2010
- Proposed materials and colors board, received May 18, 2010

During their initial presentation and during the course of the site meeting, the applicants and project architect offered the following comments and project clarifications:

- As noted in the WASC approval letter, the house location will be shifted to the northwest to ensure preservation of tree #9, a 16-inch coast live oak. It is not certain if the noted 5 feet will be the actual distance of adjustment, but the plans will be modified to preserve the oak. The other factors that must be considered include the location of the detached accessory structures and any shifting of these that may necessary. It is also possible that some reduction in floor area would be considered to accommodate tree protection.
- As noted on the plans, oak #11 is to be removed and would likely be moved to provide screening of views to and from Westridge Drive. It is also possible that an additional oak on site would be transplanted for screening of the views along Westridge Drive. For example, if shifting of the house location and accessory structures might impact tree #19 located west of the planned studio, this tree might be relocated. This has been also discussed with the WASC.

- The plans, while similar to the Bariteau project approved by the town in 2008, provides for a design that is more compact and less “spread out” over the site. The current site owners do not want a swimming pool and they are more interested in views into the Portola Valley area than the Bay and San Francisco City views to the north of the site. For this reason, the two-story portions of the site are more directed to the southeast than the northerly views. Further, the site plan places the two-story portions of the house more in the site trees and less in the more exposed locations of the building site.
- The driveway design has been developed to protect the trees along the drive alignment as well as the Dr. Hurd Manzanita. As noted in the staff report, all three of the Manzanita along the driveway would be preserved and efforts are being made to save the one small oak currently shown for removal.
- The applicants’ primary desire is to protect the oak woodland character of the property. For this reason, they are proposing replacing the two cedar trees with oaks and otherwise providing for minimal new site landscaping.
- The auto court area has been cut into the site, as was also proposed with the Bariteau project, to ensure that the parking area and garage doors would have minimum potential for off site visual presence. The wall materials have been selected to integrate the improvements into the site and to be in harmony with the materials to be used on the house and detached structures. The only gates are those associated with the auto court area and internal house courtyard.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the existing “rustic” horse fence along the Westridge frontage would be preserved and repaired as necessary to accommodate the agreed to Westridge trail work.
- The scope of grading has been designed to basically balance cut and fill with the cut from the auto court used to develop the northern and eastern side terrace areas. The balancing minimizes off haul and allows for a more natural appearing transition from the proposed improvements to the existing site contours. The depths of fill for the terrace areas would be in the 2 to 3 foot range with a maximum depth of 4 to 5 feet.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the owners prefer views to the Portola Valley area from the second level master bedrooms and that the Mt. Diablo view was the focus of the entry court framing.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Celia Oakley and Leslie Doyle** both wondered about construction access and staging. It was noted that a detailed construction staging plan would be required prior to issuance of any building permit and that such a plan was also needed to satisfy the conditions of the approval granted by the WASC. Vlasic advised that the ASCC could, and likely would, condition any action on the detailed plan being presented to the full ASCC for approval, in which case the neighbors would receive notice of and be able to comment on the construction staging plan.

**Sonja Declercq** suggested that the applicants might want to consider shifting the house further away from Westridge Drive due to noise associated with vehicles, particularly trucks, “climbing” up the steeper grade of the street.

**Rita Whitney** replied that traffic noise would likely have relatively minimal impact with the house and the outside areas were located so that the house and other structures provided buffering. She also noted that her experience at the site is that it is much quieter than any of the more urban and suburban environments she has experienced.

**George Comstock** pointed out the view corridor to his home at 177 Alamos Road and expressed concern over the potential for privacy and view impacts of the project. He suggested that consideration be given to a “right to left swap” of site plan elements where the two story portions would be on the northwesterly side, with views toward the Bay and Mt. Diablo. He advised that this would reduce the potential for view impacts on his property. He also suggested that consideration be given to lowering the house heights primarily through the use of flat roof forms. He noted that his house has a flat roof with extended overhangs that help to control impacts from the afternoon sun.

**Mr. Chappelle** noted that very low roof forms were proposed and that plate heights were limited to 10.5 feet on the lower level and 7 to 9 feet on the upper level. He also advised that western exposures, where sun impacts would be the greatest, were limited and that the key outdoor areas were purposely placed on the northern and eastern sides of the house for protection from the afternoon sun. Mr. Chappelle pointed out that trees to be preserved on the south and western sides would also assist in shading the south and west sides of the house.

After consideration of Mr. Comstock’s concerns, it was agreed that at the conclusion of the on site session, ASCC members would go to the Comstock property to consider views and the concerns of the neighbor.

Prior to traveling to the Comstock property, Warr asked if any ASCC member or planning commissioner present wanted to offer comments on the project. ASCC members concurred that they would reserve comments for the evening meeting.

Von Feldt advised that she generally supported the project and that the proposed grading, of primary concern to the planning commission, appeared appropriate given site conditions and the proposed site plan. She offered that she supported removal of the cedar trees and suggested consideration be given to more use of California Oak grasses which are present on the site. Lastly, she strongly recommended that additional efforts be made to enhance the green-building elements of the project to be more in line with the BIG targets soon to be required by the town.

Mr. Chappelle noted that final project plans would include more BIG green rated elements and that the details for the green building elements would be worked out as building permit plans are being developed.

After sharing of these comments, ASCC members, Vlastic, the project architects and Mr. Whitney joined Mr. Comstock, and his wife Anne Hillman, at their residence at 177 Alamos Road. ASCC members considered the view corridors to the Whitney property from both outside and within the Comstock residence. They considered options for dealing with the view relationships of concern to Mr. Comstock. It was also noted that one large oak providing significant screening at this time was not on the subject site, but on the property at 120 Ash Lane. It was clarified that this tree was to be preserved based on the plans recently approved for residential redevelopment of the Ash Lane property.

After visiting the Comstock property, 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 later in the day at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 5:05 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

**Architectural and Site Control Commission** **June 28, 2010**  
**Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room. It was noted that the special meeting start time of 7:00 p.m. had been set to accommodate the first agenda item of an informational meeting with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC).

**Roll Call:**

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

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Informational Meeting with representatives of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)**

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the June 24, 2010 staff report as background to the informal discussion. He noted that periodically, the ASCC and WASC have meet to discuss design issues of mutual interest and concern and that, typically, the discussion enhances communication and results in improved consideration of applications requiring both ASCC and WASC review and approval. He noted the agreement for early, preliminary review site meetings and the efforts that town has made to ensure that the WASC is informed and has the opportunity to participate in such sessions.

The following WASC members were present to participate in the informal meeting with the ASCC:

Rusty Day, Chair, Pinon Drive  
Bev Lipman, Secretary, Favonio Road  
Walli Finch, Westridge Drive  
George Andreini, Mapache Drive  
David Strohm, Mapache Drive

**Mr. Day** thanked staff and the ASCC members for providing space on the agenda for the informal meeting. He noted that times were changing and that as the ASCC has seen, projects are typically more complicated as people buy parcels and want to replenish the housing stock, and that expectations of applicants relative to uses for their properties is significant due to the high cost of property in town. He also stressed that neighbor concerns with the scope of new projects is a significant factor in considering applications. Mr. Day also offered the following perspectives:

- The WASC and ASCC are two independent bodies that typically work in parallel and that the responsibilities and scope of WASC review are different and broader than those of the ASCC. It was also stressed that the latitude of WASC consideration is broader due to its broader responsibilities and it can act in ways that the ASCC can't due to the

ASCC's more public role. He clarified that the WASC authority can be "tighter" or "looser" than the town's depending on the specific issue being considered.

- The WASC authority and scope of project review is set in the CC&Rs for Westridge and in the Blue Book setting the framework for the community and WASC. He noted that Westridge and the CC&Rs have been in place since 1947 and precedes town incorporation by almost 20 years.
- Some Westridge area applicants don't appear to fully appreciate the independent roles and responsibilities of the WASC and seem to conclude if a design is acceptable to the town then that is the most important consideration. That position appears to be that the concerns of Westridge should be considered more as an afterthought. George Andreini commented that in some cases he has been asked to look at a project after the ASCC has acted on it.
- Since the WASC has no staff, it is critical that town staff inform all Westridge area applicants that Westridge project review is essential and that the applicant needs to make early contact with the WASC when projects are first being considered.
- In response to a question, it was noted that on some applications all five WASC members would participate in the review and for some only two or three members would participate. The CC&Rs, however, only require two persons to participate in a review.
- Westridge is seeing more pressure to "max out" the use of properties and, therefore, pressure to reduce open space and vistas.
- Westridge has desired to have a decision made on the acceptability of a project prior to the time of even the preliminary site meeting so that the committee's position can be included in the staff report. It was noted that often an applicant would expend considerable time and energy in a project before communicating with the WASC and this leads to frustration and can result in the WASC review process starting off on a negative note. It was stressed that early involvement was essential for the process to be as positive as possible.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the Westridge committee promoted its role through annual meetings, interaction with realtors and also periodic mailings.

Warr stated appreciation for Mr. Day's concerns and agreed that there was a need for improved coordination of the ASCC and WASC processes. He advised that the preliminary review site meetings were intended to do this. He noted that the intent was for both the WASC and ASCC to use the site meeting for data gathering and that from that meeting final positions on the acceptability of the project could be developed.

Breen commented that she finds significant benefit from input from the WASC and appreciates the information that has been shared during preliminary project reviews.

Vlasic advised that staff does specifically advise Westridge area applicants of the need for early involvement with the WASC and specifically will either provide a copy of the Blue Book to them or direct them to the committee to get a copy. He cited a recent example of someone interested in a parcel on Bolivar Lane and staff's strong encouragement that the concepts for use of the property be shared with the WASC as soon as possible. He added that shortly after the staff recommendation, a site meeting was held with ASCC and WASC

for early discussion of concepts. Vlasic also commented that he was unaware of any project in the Westridge area that had come to the ASCC without the WASC first being notified of it. It stated that when staff reports are prepared for such projects, if a letter from the WASC is not available, Leslie Lambert, Carol Borck or some other town staff member will make contact with the WASC to check on the committee's review status.

Public comments were requested. **Loverine Taylor, 35 Naranja**, stated that as a Westridge resident, she was not completely certain of the WASC review process, responsibilities and timeframes.

After discussion, Vlasic suggested that while the town would continue to stress the need for early WASC involvement, it would be very helpful for the committee to prepare a "handout" sheet that could be placed in the parcel file with a cover letter briefly explaining the role of the WASC and outline the committees review process and preferred timeline. He noted this could also be available as one of the standard handouts at town hall and distributed to all persons interested in doing projects in the Westridge area.

Mr. Day agreed that his committee would prepare the suggested handout, and again stressed the need for the town to take the lead in informing applicants of the independent role of the WASC.

After the discussion Mr. Day again thanked the town for the opportunity for the WASC to meet with the ASCC, and Warr thanked Mr. Day and other Westridge committee members for their comments and input.

**Follow-up review -- request for approval of redwood tree removal, 330 and 340 Golden Hills Drive, Oak Hills Subdivision, Klope (Tri State Capital)**

Vlasic presented the June 24, 2010 staff report on the subject follow-up review. He explained that the redwood tree removal project was conditionally approved by the ASCC at a special March 12, 2010 site meeting. He noted that the approval permitted the removal of 257 redwood trees but with understandings that additional redwoods could be removed off of, but along the property boundary, if a neighbor agreed to the removal or, where the trees are in the public right of way, an encroachment permit would be issued by the public works director to allow tree removal. Vlasic explained that in line with these understandings, the project was refined to address neighbor concerns and to include some additional tree removal as explained in the staff report and the June 4, 2010 letter from the applicant.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the June 4, 2010 letter from Thomas Klope Associates on behalf of the applicant, including the May 19, 2010 *Raptor Nest Survey* prepared by Bryan M. Mori, Biological Consulting Services, and the following revised and updated project plans, also prepared by Thomas Klope Associates, dated 6/2/10:

- Sheet LL-1, Tree Removal Plan
- Sheet LL-2, Landscape Screening Plan
- Sheet LL-3, Lawn Removal Plan
- Sheet LL-4, Revised Entry Gate Plan
- Sheet LL-5, Exterior Lighting Plan

Mr. Klope presented his follow-up submittal and discussed the comments in his June 4<sup>th</sup> letter to the town. He noted, in response to comments in the staff report, that a final fence plan would be developed and that the applicant is agreeable to limiting the height of the



proposed new gate to no more than six feet. He also noted that a final selection for the house color had yet to be made, but when selected would be presented to the ASCC for review and approval. He also noted that work would proceed as soon as a bond or other surety could be posted with the town as required by one of the original approval conditions.

Mr. Klope also commented that while the landscape plan has been refined with input from ASCC member Breen, additional refinement would take place after tree removal to ensure the plan provides the key screening between properties.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. It was, however, noted for the record that the Oak Hills homeowners association has approved the revised plans and that the conservation committee had also found them acceptable as noted in the staff report.

In response to a question, Mr. Klope stated that the landscaping was to be completed by the fall and that the revised landscape plan would be submitted for ASCC consideration as soon as the trees are removed and final plan adjustments completed.

Following brief discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the follow-up submittal with the understanding that work would not proceed until the required bond or surety was posted and subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC as soon as possible after tree removal:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised in light of the conditions after tree removal has taken place and, once approved by the ASCC, the landscape plan shall be implemented within the 2010 fall planting season to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. The final fence plan shall be presented to the ASCC for review and approval and shall be provided with the revised landscape plan.
3. The new entry gate plan shall be revised so that the maximum gate height does not exceed six feet.
4. The final house paint color shall be specified and the time frame for house painting identified.
5. The trees shown for removal in the public right of way shall only be removed if the public works director issues an encroachment permit for their removal.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room explaining that he could not participate in application review as his firm was providing architectural service for the Bach-Sausville project.*

---

**Architectural Review for house additions and detached garage/accessory structure with studio, 150 Fawn Lane, Bach-Sausville**

Vlasic presented the June 24, 2010 staff report on this proposal for house additions and construction of a detached two-story, accessory structure, with lower level garage and upper level studio, on the subject 1.0-acre Fawn Lane parcel. He explained that the proposed house additions total 744 sf and would increase the house area to 2,263 sf. He added that the proposed 988 sf two-story structure contains a 494 sf garage and 494 sf upper level

studio that would be connected to the expanded main house by a wood deck and bridge system. Vlasic also noted that essentially no grading is needed for the project and the total floor area in the main house would only be 54% of the allowed site floor area.

Vlasic reviewed the few concerns noted in the staff report and advised that they focus on tree protection, lighting, construction staging and access, and fire/emergency access. He clarified that the project architect was to present a revised lighting plan at the meeting and that the fire marshal had provided a preliminary comment, generally supporting the project plans as presented.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project materials and plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by CJW Architecture and dated 5/19/10:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet  
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 12/15/09  
Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan  
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan (with site lighting)  
Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging  
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans  
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans  
Sheet: A-2.4, Roof Plan  
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet: A-3.2, Model Views  
*Build It Green checklist*, received May 26, 2010  
Materials and colors board dated 5/21/10  
Arborist Report by McClanahan Consulting, LLC, June 12, 2010

It was also noted that story poles had been installed at the site to model the proposed improvements to facilitate ASCC consideration and neighbor understanding of the project.

Mark Sausville, applicant, and Mark Sutherland, project architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC. Mr. Sutherland presented the following supplemental plans and materials:

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan (with site lighting), revised June 24, 2010  
Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging, revised June 14, 2010 to include the recommendations of the project arborist  
Cut Sheets for the light fixtures shown on Sheet: A-1.1, dated 6/28/10 and including product data for the path lights, pendant and wall mounted lights, and recessed tasks lights

In response to a question, Mr. Sutherland clarified that all existing exterior lighting would be eliminated with the project, including all existing spotlights. The following additional clarifications were provided:

- The master bedroom siting may be adjusted as needed to ensure preservation of the 13-inch oak just of the north of the addition area.
- In terms of construction staging, the plan has been developed in light of the owner's intention to deliver the materials to the site himself. He appreciates the difficulty of the driveway access and wants to ensure that the site conditions, including tree cover, are adequately protected from construction impacts.

- In response to a question, it was noted that some of the eucalyptus trees in the area are not on the subject site and, therefore, the applicant is not in a position to remove them. It was also clarified that some of the pines and eucalyptus trees on site, but not near the construction area, might be considered for removal at some point, but current budget constraints do not allow for this to be pursued at this time.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Hughes, to make the necessary accessory structure policy findings as evaluated in the staff report and to approve the project as clarified by the applicant and project architect at the ASCC meeting, including the revised lighting and construction staging plans. The motion was passed 4-0 subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final, detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. The plans shall have been formally reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal.

---

*Following consideration of the Bach-Sausville application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

**Preliminary Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-616, for new residence, detached accessory structures & related site improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney**

Vlasic presented the June 24, 2010 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story, 5,860 sf residence on the subject vacant 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He then reviewed the events of the special afternoon site meeting on the proposal. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Rita and Arthur Whitney, applicants, and design team members Tim Chappelle, Austin Reilly, and Piper Barnett were present to discuss the project further with ASCC members. Mr. Chappelle noted that following the site meeting, they received and considered a June 28, 2010 memo from Mr. George Comstock to the ASCC with suggested design changes and a photo image of the view from his home to the proposed building site, with story pole modeling. Mr. Chappelle presented a copy of the photo image with sketching on it to better demonstrate the views.

**Mr. George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road**, was present and provided copies of his June 28, 2010 memo with photo image to staff and ASCC members. He noted appreciation for the efforts of the applicants and design team, but also recommended consideration of project changes as outlined in the memo and presented during the course of the afternoon site meeting. In particular, he recommended consideration be given to a "left/right" swap of the program for the structures, lower heights and use of flat roofs.

Mr. Chappelle offered that the current design meets the view desires of the applicants and also includes a program that minimizes the massing and scale of the building elements. He noted that the buildings “tier” in terms of the view corridor open to the Comstock residence and that with some addition of evergreen shrub and tree planting the views would be buffered. He also noted that the roof forms for the lower, north side portion of the house, particularly screen views to the upper window areas. He also stressed that the proposed house does not have a profile open to the sky, but is within a tree-covered backdrop.

Mr. Chappelle and other design team members noted that they would continue to consider the concerns of Mr. Comstock, but that they believed that additional screen landscaping would resolve the issues and support the basic design as currently planned.

Mr. Comstock noted item 7 in his memo asking that any action include the requirement that this owner and any subsequent owner be required to provide and maintain evergreen trees for screening of views from his property.

Additional public comments were requested. **Planning Commission liaison Zaffaroni** advised that based on her attendance at the afternoon site meeting she concluded that the proposed grading would have minimal visual impact and that the grading was reasonable.

ASCC members then individually offered the following preliminary comments on the project for design team consideration:

**Clark:**

- Generally supports project, scale and efforts to break-up massing and protect trees and site conditions.
- Would support transplanting of tree #19 at studio and using this tree for screening to permit shifting of the house to protect tree #9.
- Requested and received clarification re: landscape material “NAS PUL” as being purple needle grass.
- Consider additional landscaping to buffer view corridor to and from the Comstock residence, particularly in light of the fact that one key screen tree is on the neighboring property at 121 Ash Lane.

**Breen:**

- Could not attend site meeting and, therefore, did not benefit from it. Did drive by the site and viewed story poles from Westridge Drive. Some concern of view up from Westridge to proposed two-story form. The story poles suggest that the view could be very imposing.
- Worries over the loss of the cedars relative to view impacts.
- Appreciate the efforts being made to save tree #9, as this is important in helping to screen the view from Westridge.
- Efforts should be directed at adjusting the house size and location, rather than planting to hide the proposed improvements.
- Generally supports architecture and site design, but appreciates that some efforts are needed to address potential view impacts.

**Aalfs:**

- The design is a good response to site conditions. Generally supportive of design and materials and colors.
- The two key issues that need to be addressed are the view from the Comstock residence and adjusting the plans for tree preservation as reviewed at the site meeting.

- Much can be done with the addition of a “couple” of trees and appreciates the applicant’s intent to stagger the tree relocation and new planting to result in a more natural appearance.
- Consideration might be given to reduce the height with adjustments to the roof pitch and heights of plates, but what is proposed is not excessive.

**Hughes:**

- Generally supportive of project, including site plan and materials and color palette.
- Concerned with views from Westridge Drive to two-story area. Screen planting will be important relative to this view.
- Concern with the screening needed to protect the view from the Comstock property. Particular attention should be paid to the view to the upper story bath and master bedroom window. Careful selection and placement of screen trees will be important in terms of both the Westridge and Comstock view corridors.
- The proposed roof should blend well with the tree backdrop.
- Supports the relocation of trees on site to enhance screening where it is really needed.

**Warr:**

- Generally supportive of the project design.
- Supports the efforts being made to save tree #9. Tree #19 is less important and if shifting the program means that this tree could be moved and used for screening elsewhere, that would be appropriate.
- Main concern is the view impacts from Westridge Drive. It is suggested that a darker finish be used for the upper level to help reduce its visual presence and make it blend more with the darker shades of the tree cover backdrop. Suggests use of a darker wood for the upper level siding rather than plaster.
- The lighting plans need to be modified to reduce the scope of lighting. In a number of cases there are multiple lights near doors, including step, trellis and wall fixtures. The scope of lighting needs to be adjusted to be consistent with town lighting policies and to also ensure that lighting is for specific needs.
- Supports the removal of the cedar trees. Prefers the architectural solution noted above relative to the views from Westridge Drive, rather than extensive new screen planting.
- The grading plan above the auto court retaining wall needs to be adjusted to essentially “carve the retaining wall in more.” Further, the plan needs to be modified to ensure the protection of the tree manzanita along the driveway.

Following discussion and sharing of comments, Warr again thanked the applicants and design team members for their efforts, particularly with the provisions made for the afternoon site meeting. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the July 12, 2010 regular ASCC meeting. It was understood that this would allow time for the applicants to respond to the comments provided by neighbors and ASCC members and to also modify the story poles as necessary to model design adjustments.

**Approval of Minutes**

Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the June 14, 2010 meeting minutes as drafted. Clark commented that the complicated review of the issues associated with the Chung/Lacerte driveway and parking issues were accurately presented in the minutes.

### **Summer Holiday Schedules**

Only Aalfs and Clark noted that at this time they knew of dates when they could not attend regular ASCC meetings due to summer holiday conflicts. Aalfs noted he would be away on July 26<sup>th</sup> and Clark advised he would be away on August 9<sup>th</sup>.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

T. Vlastic