

**Special Field Meeting 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper, and  
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Breen called the special field meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 385 Westridge Drive.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Von Feldt

ASCC Absent: Gelpi, Warr

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Manager Lambert

**Others present relative to the Cooper request:**

Sue and Alan Cooper, applicants

Bob Pleau, project architect

Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect

Adrienne and Bryan Roberts, 357 Westridge Drive

Rusty Day, Chair Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

Bev Lipman, WASC

Walli Finch, WASC

Ruby Seidl, 40 Pine Ridge Way

Ronald and AJ Johnson, 30 Pine Ridge Way

Lynn Rosenstock, 151 Cervantes Road

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new detached accessory structure, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-587, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper**

Vlastic presented the comments in the June 19, 2008 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, detached two-level accessory structure, with a total countable floor area of 3,840 sf, on the subject 3.3 acre Westridge Subdivision property. He discussed the configuration and design of the proposed accessory structure and the policy issues the ASCC would eventually need to address in completing any action on the request. He also discussed the project in terms of the floor area limits for the property, including application of basement floor area exception provisions. He noted that the scope of grading required the subject site development permit.

Vlastic reviewed the specific issues discussed in the staff report and also noted the concerns identified in communications received from Mr. and Mrs. Roberts, including their letter to the ASCC received June 18, 2008. Vlastic then distributed copies of a June 23, 2008 email from Rusty Day setting forth a list of WASC concerns and stating conditional WASC support for the proposal. Also referenced was a June 23, 2008 email from Mr. and Mrs. Roberts to the WASC and ASCC on a recent meeting between them and the Coopers and the issues and tentative agreements reached at this meeting.

Vlastic stressed that this was a preliminary review of the proposal and that at the conclusion of the review, project consideration should be continued to the July 14, 2008 meeting. He noted that this would permit time for full processing of the site development permit and for

the project design team to address any issues that may result from the preliminary review process.

ASCC members considered the staff report, recent communications, and received a presentation from the applicant and project architect on the following proposed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/28/08 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet T-0.1, Title Sheet  
Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, June 2007  
Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design  
Sheet: A-0.1, Site Facilities  
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, revised 6/11/08  
Sheet A-2.0.1, Floor Plans  
Sheet A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Also considered were the project arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated January 8, 2008, cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, and a "Finish Board." It was noted that the town received the cut sheets and finish board on May 22, 2008. It was also clarified that the proposed "surface mounted" light shown on the plans would be located in the ceiling of the identified spaces and not on the "deck" surface. Pleau stated that a cut sheet for the fixture would be provided at the evening ASCC meeting.

Following an overview of the project, the applicant and project design team led all present on an inspection of site conditions. The staking showing the alignment of the proposed accessory driveway and the story poles for the accessory structure were referenced during the inspection. Trees planned for removal and the scope of the grading for the driveway, fire truck turnaround, proposed lower level "hobby room" and pool and pool terrace area were described. Also discussed was the scope of vegetation removal already completed. Mr. Cooper stated this was accomplished to enhance fire safety and respond to fire marshal comments for provisions of "defensible space" on the property.

During the course of the onsite presentation and inspection, the applicant and project design team members offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The size and plans for the basement train "hobby room" were explained in some detail, including the patterns of access to the lower level space for construction of the HO scale model railroad. It was noted that Mr. Cooper would use the proposed driveway for access to the lower level area and workshop, but that there would be no other access, except for yard maintenance and emergencies, e.g., fire trucks. It was clarified, however, that there could be daily use of the proposed driveway. It was stressed that all guest parking would be off of the existing main driveway and the plans for added guest parking in this area were explained.
- The options considered for the project were explained and it was noted that the proposed option ensures that the new accessory structure would be as far away from neighboring properties as possible and, with much of it buried in the site, have as low a profile as possible. It was also noted that the new driveway had been aligned to preserve trees and minimize potential impacts on the Roberts property. It was stressed

that the proposed landscaping and additional planting as may be found necessary would be installed to further address the concerns of the neighbors.

- After the parcel was purchased in March of 2007 a phased program of vegetation removal was initiated, including removal of the old Monterey pines on the property. It was stressed that this was pursued for enhanced fire safety.
- Cleaver described the proposed landscape plan. He discussed the proposal for plantings along the new accessory driveway, in the area of the “cabana” and below the pool terrace. In response to a question, it was noted that the “lawn” area shown west of the pool would actually be meadow grasses and that the only actual lawn would be in the “circular” area east of the proposed cabana.
- It was noted that several smaller oaks in the proposed pool terrace area would be moved to the east side of the site for screening of views to and from the Roberts property. It was also noted that the plans would include three larger valley oaks (i.e., 36” to 48” box size) on the slope below the pool terrace with grasses underneath. The intent being to allow these trees to become specimen “sentinels” helping to set a natural frame for the west side of the property.
- The grading plan has been revised based on comments in the staff report regarding the accuracy of the calculations for grading in the area of the pool terrace. It was noted that the “Earthwork Summary” table still provided for a total of 988 cubic yards of earth movement, but that to account for the correct pool terrace grading volumes, there would be slightly more “off-haul” of cut materials.
- The accessory driveway surface, with two gravel treads, was described. It was noted that the design was modeled after a similar design used at a Mapache Drive property in Westridge. The intent was to make the driveway as invisible as possible.

(Vlasic commented that he had recommended use of a “pervious” grass cell surface that would avoid the need for any gravel, accommodate fire truck access, appear as a grass surface and not have the noise associated with vehicles traveling over gravel. The design team advised they would be considering the use of this alternative surface material.)

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

**Rusty Day** reviewed the issues outlined in his June 23 email and stressed that the main concerns focused on the construction process, length of the process and related traffic, noise and potential for impacts on the safety of use of Westridge Drive. He also expressed concerns over the use of the proposed accessory structure, the driveway to it, and potential for driveway use impacts on the Roberts property. He then commented that any tree removal within the Westridge Subdivision area required prior review and approval by the WASC. He worried that not only pines, but oaks had been removed and sought additional clarification from the applicant on the scope of vegetation clearing.

**Mr. Cooper** apologized for removal of any vegetation without prior approval, but again shared his concern for fire safety. He added that he would do no additional vegetation removal until after ASCC action on the proposed project or without WASC approval.

Vlasic advised that he had expressed his concern to the project architect over the area where vegetation had been removed and that the site development permit plan was to be revised to include the "treated" areas on the plans for landscaping and erosion control.

**Mr. Johnson, 30 Pine Ridge**, stated support for the vegetation clearing and enhanced fire safety.

**Mr. and Mrs. Roberts** reviewed the concerns in their communications to the ASCC and the tentative agreements recently reached with the applicants.

Following review of onsite conditions and receipt of comments, view relationships and the concerns of Mr. and Mrs. Roberts were specifically considered. ASCC members convened at the Roberts house at 357 Westridge and considered potential view issues associated with the proposed accessory driveway and fire truck turnaround area. Members looked back to the project site from the deck area on the northwest side of the Roberts house and acknowledged that likely more landscape screening would be needed to ensure privacy and buffer views between properties.

Following considering of the views to and from the Roberts property, ASCC members walked back to the area of the proposed intersection of the new accessory driveway with the existing driveway adjacent to Westridge Drive. Breen and Von Feldt offered that they would like to see realignment to the proposed driveway that would avoid removal of the multi-trunk golden oak now called for removal. Options for driveway access were considered and alternatives identified. Vlasic cautioned that the "tight" curve radius with the options would limit fire truck access and that any design adjustment would need to be shared with the fire marshal for acceptance.

After the site visit, ASCC members agreed that they would consider the site meeting findings and additional input received during the course of the meeting and, as appropriate, offer additional comments at the evening ASCC meeting.

At the conclusion of the site inspection, Breen thanked the applicants and others present for their participation in the meeting. ASCC members then agreed to continue project consideration at the regular evening meeting.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 5:55 p.m. the special ASCC field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Von Feldt  
Absent: Gelpi, Warr  
Town Council Liaison: Wengert  
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

**Follow-up Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-584 for house additions, detached carport, and detached accessory structure, 135 Crescent Avenue, Aalfs**

Vlastic presented the June 19, 2008 staff report on this follow-up submittal, including the remaining actions on the proposed site development permit. He discussed the May 12, 2008, ASCC conditional project approval and how the following revised plans and materials satisfy the ASCC approval conditions:

**Architectural Plans, by Field Architecture, dated 6/10/08**

Cover Sheet (with project rendering)  
Sheet A1.0, Site Plan  
Sheet A1.1, Landscape Plan  
Sheet A1.2, Lighting Plan  
Sheet A1.3, Tree Removal Plan  
Sheet A2.0, Lower Floor Plan  
Sheet A2.1, Upper Floor Plan  
Sheet A2.2, Roof Plan  
Sheet A3.0, Elevations

**Civil Plans, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc, revised 6/10/08**

Sheet C-1, Title Sheet  
Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan  
Sheet C-3, Details  
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan  
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details

**May 29, 2008 arborist report, Berrie D. Coate Associates**

Project architect Stan Field presented the revised plans to the ASCC. He clarified that the metal cable railing proposed for the parking pad and carport would be of galvanized steel. He also commented that railing height would be 42" as shown on the architectural plans and not 48" as noted on the engineering plans.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members concurred that the plan revisions addressed the approval conditions and also concurred with the comments offered in the staff report with respect to remaining items that needed to be addressed prior to actual issuance of the site development permit or any building permit.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 3-0, approval of the site development permit and follow-up submittal, as clarified at the ASCC meeting and subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final detailed landscape plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and shall be consistent with the concepts shown on the revised landscape plan. The plan shall also identify the areas that will be used for construction access to the lower area of the parcel and make provisions for landscape repair of these areas at the end of the construction process.
2. The revised grading plan shall be re-circulated for review by the public works director, town geologist and fire marshal and any additional requirements from this re-circulation shall be complied with. (Staff and the applicant are, however, encouraged to work with the Fire Marshal to seek relief, at least partially, from the 12-foot driveway width requirement with the intent being saving of tree #5, i.e., an 8" coast live oak at the edge of the existing loop driveway.)
3. A comprehensive and detailed construction staging and tree protection plan, incorporating the recommendations of the project arborist plan, shall be provided and refined with the project contractor at the preconstruction meeting prior to release of the building permit. Once approved, this plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

The above action was taken with the understanding that the ASCC was not, after the fact, granting approval for the existing parking pad feature. It was further understood, however, that the permit process initiated by the previous owner for the pad would be completed by the current property owner, at least to the point of ensuring the structural integrity of the pad and supporting walls and that this would be completed to the satisfaction of planning staff.

#### **Follow-up Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-586 for house additions including new garage extension, 145 Golden Oak Drive, Reiss**

Vlasic presented the June 19, 2008 staff report on this follow-up submittal and the remaining actions needed on the site development permit. He reviewed the April 28, 2008 ASCC conditional project approval and the following revised plans and materials prepared to address the ASCC approval conditions and remaining site development permit requirements:

**Civil Engineering Plans, Alcon Engineering, 6/16/08:**

Sheet 1, Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan  
Sheet 2, Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan

**Landscape Plans:**

Landscape Plan Final, Lands of Reiss, June 16, 2008  
Landscape Plan Construction Phase, June 16, 2008

**Architectural Plans, Nii Architects, Inc., 3/21/08:**

Sheet 1, Site/Roof Plan  
Sheet 2, Main Floor Plan  
Sheet 3, Reflected Ceiling Plan, Main Floor, revised 5/9/08  
Sheet 4, Garage and Habitable (Lower Level)  
Sheet 5, Exterior Elevations Main Residence (Upper Level)  
Sheet 6, Exterior Elevations Garage/Activity Room (Lower Level)

Updated "Materials Board," received 6/16/08

Mr. and Mrs. Reiss presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- With respect to exterior colors, several options have been considered, but it is felt that the current, existing color scheme as presented on the revised "materials board" provides the best scheme for blending with site stone and native grasses. The only variation is that the "soffit" extension, currently painted white, would be left in a natural wood finish, as it would be an extension of the wood ceilings inside the house.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the plans for installation of native grasses would be with seeds or hydro-seeding. In response to a suggestion for use of native grass plugs, found more successful, the applicants stated that this would be considered as they would be installing the landscaping.
- In response to a question regarding the terrace walls proposed for the existing driveway area, it was noted that they would each be approximately 1.5 feet in height and were preferred to a grading only solution as they helped to minimize erosion potential and also integrated better with the planned new entry pathway system.
- A project arborist has been retained. He has inspected the site and considered the site plan. He is in the process of offering specific recommendations for tree protection and preservation.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

In response to a question from Mr. Reiss, Vlastic advised the "site development permit committee" was the group of permit reviewers as listed in the site development ordinance. He clarified that it did not meet as a body and that compliance with conditions of the individual reviewers would typically be a staff function and that there are no meeting requirements associated with the "committee."

While members found the plan submittal generally acceptable as presented and both Breen and Clark concluded use of the existing color scheme, as clarified by the applicant, was acceptable in this case, Von Feldt expressed concern over deviation from town color light reflectivity value (LRV) policy limits. She noted that for most applications including the extent of house change proposed with this project, the ASCC has required conformity to the LRV policy limits. This matter was discussed at some length.

Vlasic advised that the LRV limits were set to ensure that projects were harmonious with their settings and that color contrasts were minimized so that less visual attention would be called to a structure. He explained that the limits were enacted as policy and not ordinance to permit the ASCC some flexibility in dealing with specific situations. He suggested that the ASCC could require field-testing of the proposed color scheme to ensure it achieved the objectives of blending into the site. He added that if the conclusion of the field-testing was that the current color scheme was appropriate in this respect, and a darker color would result in more contrast, the ASCC could conclude that the proposed color scheme would be consistent with the intent of the policy. At the same time, if a darker siding color was found necessary based on the field test, this could then be pursued with additional field testing of alternative colors.

Following discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 to approve the site development permit and follow-up submittal as clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

1. Prior to application of the final stucco siding coat, the proposed siding color shall be applied to a section of the house for field inspection and approval by a designated ASCC member to determine if the color will be in harmony, i.e., blend in, with the natural stone and vegetation of the site. If, based on this testing, a darker stucco color is found necessary to achieve policy objectives, the darker color shall be specified to the satisfaction of the designated ASCC member.
2. A final construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and shall incorporate the recommendations of the project arborist for protection of significant trees adjacent to the construction area that are shown on the plans for preservation. The plan shall be consistent with the phased landscape plans presented with the revised submittal. Once approved, the construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. All requirements of site development committee reviews shall be complied with to the satisfaction of the individual reviewer.

**Follow-up Architectural Review for new residence, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-579, 215 Golden Hills Drive, Debroeck & Heinen**

Vlasic presented the June 19, 2008 staff on the subject follow-up review. He advised that on January 28, 2008 the ASCC granted conditional approval of the project and that the following revised plans and materials were provided to satisfy the ASCC approval conditions:



Sheet A-6, North and East Elevations, Stoecker and Northway Architects Inc., May 30, 2008

Sheet A-7, South and West Elevations, Stoecker and Northway Architects Inc., May 30, 2008

Sheet L-3.1, Landscape Planting Plan, Willie Lang, Landscape Architect, 4/8/08

Sheet L-3.2, Landscape Details, Willie Lang, Landscape Architect, 4/8/08

Sheet C2.OSW, Site Retaining Walls, Erosion and Tree Protection Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 5/30/08

Sheet C3.OSW, Site Retaining Walls Detail Sheet, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 4/30/08

June 4, 2008 letter from the project architect, explaining how the plans specifically address each of the approval conditions.

Metal roof and stone wainscot samples, as discussed in the June 4, 2008 letter from the project architect.

Vlasic explained that subsequent to the filing of the above plans, the project architect provided 8.5" x 11" page size revisions to plan Sheet L3.1 and Sheet C2.OSW. He noted that these revised sheets reflect changes in the location of the proposed pool equipment from the slope north of the pool to a location on the slope to the southwest of the pool. He clarified that Sheet L3.1 shows the new location, and Sheet C2.OSW reflects the reduction in scope of construction area and fencing that results from the change in pool equipment location.

Clare Malone Prichard, project architect, and Willie Lang, project landscape architect presented the revised plans to the ASCC. The offered the following comments and clarifications:

- In response to a question regarding the differences in the "green" color for the window frames and roof, it was noted that when the materials are separated from one another, as they will be at the site, the differences in color are not readily apparent. It was also noted that the colors and shadows on the site would further minimize any apparent color differences.
- The applicant is agreeable and concurs with Von Feldt's recommendation, as described in the staff report, to replace the proposed Pennisetum (fountain grass) with *Nasella pulchra* (purple needlegrass).

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Thereafter, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt, and passed 3-0, approval of the follow-up submittal, with the revisions shown on the 8.5" x 11" plan sheets received after the June 4, 2008 submittal subject to the following condition to be completed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

The landscape plan shall be revised replacing the proposed *Pennisetum* (fountain grass) with *Nasella pulchra* (purple needlegrass).

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new detached accessory structure, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-587, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper**

Vlasic presented the June 19, 2008 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, detached two-level accessory structure on the subject 3.3 acre Westridge 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 proposed plans and materials as well as communications received at the site meeting.)

Mr. Cooper thanked ASCC members, neighbors, and WASC members for participating in the site meeting. Project architect Bob Pleau then provided light fixture cut sheets for the proposed wall mounted and surface mounted (i.e., for outdoor ceiling locations) "Hubbardton Forge" lights. He stressed that the "key" green element of the project was preservation of the existing house and not demolishing it to construct a new, bigger house. Mr. Pleau also stressed that there would be no lighting associated with the new accessory driveway.

Bob Cleaver project architect advised that he had discussed the landscape screening concerns of Mr. and Mrs. Roberts with them and also considered the ASCC comments regarding driveway alignment offered at the site meeting. He noted that the Roberts would be leaving town near the end of the week of June 30, and recommended that a working session be conducted with them and an ASCC member to define plan revisions to provide for mutually desirable landscape screening.

In response to Mr. Cleaver's suggestion, the Roberts, who were in attendance, and ASCC member Breen agreed to a meeting on Monday June 30. Mr. Pleau advised that he would circulate an email to everyone as to the best time for the meeting.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

**Rusty Day, WASC Chair**, reviewed the comments in his June 23, 2008 email communication to the ASCC and emphasized the "first" concern with respect to the proposed excavation and off-hauling of earth. He discussed the need for careful traffic management for safety, including the prohibiting large trucks from parking or staging on or along Westridge Drive.

**Mr. and Mrs. Roberts** referenced the comments in their recent communications to the town, including the June 23, 2008 email regarding their meeting with the Coopers, and stated they looked forward to the June 30 session to discuss possible landscape screening additions.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary review comments:

**Clark:**

- The accessory access driveway and its potential view impacts on the neighbors are of concern. Additional landscape screening appears needed and perhaps the grading should "cant" the driveway into the site so the surface would be less visible from the east side.

- The proposed pool location is good, as it is well removed from adjoining parcels and, particularly, the Roberts property.
- Pool area improvements will open views to the site from properties across the canyon. These neighbors, however, were present at the site meeting and expressed no concerns with the proposals.
- The plans at the driveway access to the lower level of the new structure appear to conflict with the existing septic system leach lines and this potential conflict needs to be evaluated and, as necessary, resolved.
- The size and scale of the proposed structure is of some concern.
- Very detailed construction staging plans will need to be developed and carefully implemented.

**Von Feldt:**

- The fire management clearing on the site appears excessive. If this is really what is expected by the fire marshal, the guidelines for the fire management need to be discussed with her and hopefully modified to be less aggressive. There should be more islands of vegetation protected and less “clear cutting” of areas.
- The landscape plan appears generally appropriate and the additions discussed at the site meeting, including the three valley oaks (36” to 48” box size), on the south side of the pool terrace, and additional shrubs will enhance the plan. Further, the applicant’s comments about changing the “lawn” proposed below the west side of the pool to native grasses is appreciated and appropriate.
- There is a need for additional screen planting associated with the accessory access driveway, particularly at the junction point of the proposed alignment with the maintenance way that is visible in the field. This will be important to protect the views from the Roberts house. “Berming” should, however, not be used to achieve screening. Also, it is hoped that the driveway alignment and intersection with the existing driveway can be adjusted to save the golden oak cluster, as discussed at the site meeting.
- The construction fencing requested by the Roberts in their 6/23/08 email is supported.
- There should be further study of the need for the retaining wall at the fire truck turnaround area. It would be preferred if this area could be improved without the wall, but with only grading and screen plantings.
- Based on the information gained at the site meeting, the design and location of the proposed accessory structure appear generally acceptable.
- Appreciate applicant’s willingness to remove the “existing” pillar and tree lights. The proposed new lighting appears somewhat more extensive than needed. Further, with

regard to the proposed “surface mounted” outdoor ceiling lights, it would be preferable if these were recessed can lights, fully directing light down to task areas.

**Breen:**

- This is a big project, but a good solution for the applicants’ desired a railroad use.
- While the project direction appears generally acceptable, there is concern over the future uses of the large accessory space. Not yet certain that the normal deed restriction is sufficient to ensure uses will be consistent with town policies and regulations.
- While there is a need for more landscape screening relative to the views from the Roberts property, there needs to be a balance to minimize the potential impacts on the oak grassland condition.
- The landscaping and repair of the area disturbed for fire clearing raises concerns over irrigation and water usage. It is hoped that once the natives are established any irrigation system, installed to get plants started, can be disconnected.
- As noted by Von Feldt, the applicant’s willingness to reduce the scope of the proposed “lawn” area is appreciated and appropriate.
- Share concerns of Von Feldt that lighting, particularly in the pool area, is more extensive than needed.
- Worry that invasive materials will occupy the area disturbed for fire management. This should be considered are part of the final restoration and erosion control landscape plan.

Breen then noted that in some of the application materials there was a suggestion that a clay tennis court may also be part of the plans for the site. The applicant advised that the tennis court was no longer being considered.

Mr. Cooper stressed that as to the area disturbed by the fire management efforts, he fully intended to repair it with erosion control treatments including native grasses.

Following discussion, it was agreed that, in anticipation of the plan revisions to address preliminary review comments, particularly landscape plan changes, a second site meeting would be appropriate. Thereafter, project review was continued to a site meeting to take place on the afternoon of July 14, 2008, tentatively set at 4:00 p.m.

**Architectural Review for House Additions and exterior remodeling, 8 Sandstone, Portola Valley Ranch, Gordon**

Vlasic presented the June 19, 2008 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 270 sf of floor area to the existing single-story, flat roof, 2,620 sf residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. He noted that the addition is a master bedroom “bump out” on the south side of the house, largely within an existing deck area. He also referenced the June 18, 2008 approval letter from the Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee. ASCC members

considered the staff report and the following project plans revised through 6/15/05 and prepared by Harrell Remodeling, Inc.:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 2, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet 3, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet 4, Existing/Proposed Side Elevations - A
- Sheet 5, Existing/Proposed Back Elevations - B
- Sheet 6, Existing/Proposed Side Elevation - C
- Sheet A5.04, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Portola Valley Ranch light fixture detail, for the one (1) new proposed light at the addition doors that open to the existing deck.

Mr. and Mrs. Gordon and project designer Linder Jones were present to discuss the project with ASCC members, but advised they had no additional comments to those presented in the staff report.

Following brief discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the project as proposed subject to the following condition to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

Construction access/staging and vegetation protection plans shall be provided to and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

### **Schedule/Attendance at July and August "Summer" ASCC meetings**

It was noted that the August 11 ASCC meeting would be cancelled. With respect to the July 14 and 28 meeting dates, and the August 25 meeting, for the three members present, only Von Feldt identified a possible conflict with the July 28 date.

Vlasic advised Gelpi and Warr would be contacted to check on their summer schedules to determine if there were any potential meeting quorum problems.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 3-0, approval of the June 9, 2008 meeting minutes with the following typographical correction; on page three, in the listing of plant materials at the top of the page, change "Luma apiculota" to Luma apiculata."

Von Feldt noted that in the 6/9/08 minutes of the Evans follow-up review, the minutes correctly show that the ASCC directed that live oaks should not be used in the area of the Blue Oak forest and that alternative, more compatible plant materials should be selected. She advised that after the meeting she, serving as the designated ASCC member, discussed this comment with the project landscape architect and that he noted live oaks exist in the area and felt the additional planting of live oaks was, thus appropriate. Von Feldt advised she concurred with his recommendation regarding the use of live oaks because others were already present. Other ASCC members concurred. She also advised that she felt the Laurus

'Saratoga' was appropriate for use, given her discussion with the project landscape architect and other ASCC members concurred with her comments.

Vlasic advised that these above clarifications would be noted in the minutes. He also advised that Von Feldt, as the designated reviewer of the landscape plan condition could reach the decisions, as described above, and that it was also appropriate to share them with the full ASCC.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

T. Vlasic