

**Architectural and Site Control Commission**  
**Special Site Meeting, 80 Golden Oaks Drive, Liu/Chen and**  
**Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

**June 27, 2011**

Chair Aalfs called the special site meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. at 80 Golden Oak Drive.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Hughes  
Absent: Clark, Warr  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic

Others present relative to the Chen application:

James Chen, applicant  
Roger Kohler, project architect  
Jeff Kuo, project architect  
Sherman Rutherford, 60 Golden Oak Drive  
Pam McKee, 95 Golden Oak Drive

**Architectural Review, proposed residential additions and remodeling, 80 Golden Oak Drive, Liu/Chen**

Vlasic presented the June 23, 2011 staff report on this request for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing mostly single level, 3,251 sf contemporary Ranch style residence on the subject 1.5-acre, Alpine Hills area property. He advised that the project includes demolition of over 2,100 sf of existing floor area and the total floor area with the proposed additions would be 5,013 sf, i.e., a net increase of 1,762 sf. He clarified that the ASCC should gain project information at the site meeting and then continue discussion to the regular evening meeting before any action on the proposals is entertained.

Vlasic explained that the special site meeting was scheduled not only because of the proposed additions, but the extensive remodeling of the architectural style of the house. He clarified that while much of the existing house would be replaced or remodeled, the project does intend to make extensive use of the existing foundation, and that the general scope of development and site use would be similar to existing site improvements. He reviewed the few issues discussed in the staff report, including findings needed to allow 90% of the floor area to be in the single largest building, retaining wall with railing in the 50-foot front yard setback area, lighting and exterior colors and materials comments and suggestions.

Vlasic noted that one matter not specifically discussed in the staff report was "historic" review that would likely be required under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). He commented that it appears the house is over 50 years old, some "on-line" data suggests it was constructed in 1956, and that it may have been designed by a noted architect, i.e., William Wurster. Vlasic advised that before a building permit could be issued, an "historical" review would need to be conducted. He added, however, that he had conducted some preliminary research and that this included finding a listing that was presented as a complete record of houses designed by William Wurster, and that the subject house was not on that list. Vlasic also noted that the house had some unusual architectural elements that suggest a number of changes were made to the original design, including the north side "gallery area," garage/carport, workshop and lower level guest space to be eliminated with this project.

ASCC members consider the staff report, the story poles and staking set to facilitate the site session and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Kohler Associates Architects and dated 5/20/11:

- Sheet TP, General Information
- Sheet A1, Existing Site Plan
- Sheet A1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Impervious Area Calculations
- Sheet A2, Existing Lower Level
- Sheet A3, Existing Upper Level
- Sheet A4, Existing Roof Plan
- Sheet A5, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A6, Existing Sections
- Sheet A7, New Floor Plan
- Sheet A8, New Roof Plan
- Sheet A9, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A10, Building Sections
- Sheet LE1, Exterior Lighting Plan
- Sheet LE2, Lighting Cut Sheet
- Sheet L1, Landscape Plan
- Sheet FA1, Existing Floor Area Work Sheet
- Sheet FA2, Floor Area Work Sheet
- Survey Sheet, L. Wade Hammond, Licensed Land Surveyor, 3/24/11
- Sheet C.1, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, WEC Associates, 5/11/11

Also considered were the following materials and data submitted by the design team in support of the request:

- Exterior (materials) Color Schedule, received May 23, 2011.
- Corrected Sheet TP. (8.5"x11" sheet) with corrected floor area data.
- Arborist Report, S.P. McClenahan Consulting, April 19, 2011.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, dated 5/19/11.
- Cut Sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received May 23, 2011.
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist: Single Family.

Dr. Chen, Roger Kohler and Jeff Kuo presented the proposal to the ASCC. They reviewed the project plans, explained existing and proposed site conditions and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The existing residence has been vacant for several years and Dr. Chen and his family have owned it since approximately 2005. The house has water damage that occurred with the previous owners and some resulting mould issues. The applicant has secured the property while plans for the current project were being developed.
- \* The existing house and foundation have been evaluated by the project structural engineer. He has concluded that much of the foundation is sound and can be used with the proposed project. This has allowed for pursuit of the project as currently proposed.
- The comments in the staff report regarding color changes and need for material samples will be addressed as project plans are further developed. In particular, a darker color will be considered for the lower portion of the south facing elevation and the intent is to have

a clay tile mix of colors that would be darker than suggested in the roof materials photo on the colors board.

- The front yard retaining wall with railing will be modified to conform to the requirements for such features in the front yard setback area.
- Improvements will be implemented to improve sight distance for vehicles exiting the site to Golden Oaks Drive.

During the course of the site visit, both existing exterior and interior house conditions were considered and proposals for tree removal were clarified. A number of design features were noted in the house that suggested modifications made over time that were inconsistent with the original house architecture. Considerable discussion also focused on the condition of the redwood trees along the parcel's Golden Oak Drive frontage and the need for more detailed landscape plans. All present walked along Golden Oak Drive to consider the existing tree conditions and the views to the story poles, particularly those set to model the proposed entry area.

The neighbors in attendance indicated general support for the proposal, but encouraged the use of a darker color palette, particularly for the roof tiles and the lower, south side house walls and the replacement retaining wall. They also encouraged minimal exterior lighting.

Following review of site conditions and the plans, ASCC members offered the following comments for consideration by the applicant and project design team prior to the continued discussion of the project at the regular evening ASCC meeting:

- Remove some or all of the redwoods along the site frontage and replace these with one or two oaks for screening of views to the replacement retaining wall and new house entry. The new oaks should be planted further uphill, closer to the features to be screened, so that the screening will be more effective in a shorter time and so that the lower meadow area would be returned to a more open, oak-grassland condition.
- The new south side replacement retaining wall should be faced with stone to match the other site retaining walls and not finished in a painted stucco.

Hughes expressed some concern over making the findings to permit 90% of the floor area to be in the single largest structure. In particular, he offered that if the existing foundation could not be used then he might favor a different design with the house moved somewhat further to the north and into the slope. He added that the additional floor area over the 85% limit might also be placed in a detached building on the northerly site of the property.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, Chair Aalfs thanked the applicant, design team members, and neighbors for participation in the review and advised that project discussion would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The special site meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes

Absent: Warr

Planning Commission liaison: Gilbert

Town Council Liaison: Richards

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered on items **not** on the agenda. *(Some more general comments were, however, offered at the start of the meeting when it was announced the applicant had requested review of the "Howe" gate proposal be continued to the July 11, 2011 regular ASCC meeting. The comments are presented below under the "Howe" agenda item.)*

**Architectural Review for new driveway entry gate and fencing, 4 Grove Court, Howe**

Chair Aalfs advised that the applicant has requested that consideration of this application be continued to the July 11, 2011 meeting and that staff supports this request. He added, however, that if anyone wanted to comment on the proposal, they could do so.

Peter Simpson, representing the owners of 3 Grove Court, discussed the background associated with both 3 and 4 Grove Court. He expressed dismay with the scope of clearing and fencing that the owners of 4 Grove Court are pursuing and the proposed entry gate. He offered that the gate location and design does not properly reflect the existence of the access easement that benefits 3 Grove Court and also does not respect long-standing easement use in place when the Arnold family owned 4 Grove Court. Photos were presented to define the history of easement use, scope of planting that had been in place previously and, also, history of neighbor interaction during the early period of development in the area. It was suggested that this planting was in keeping with the historic condition of the property and the more native condition appropriate for the area and the town. He stressed that he and his family did not support the fencing that has been installed along the property lines or the new gate proposal.

Christine Arnold stated that she was raised on 4 Grove Court and that there was never a need in the past for fencing or an entry gate. She stated opposition to the perimeter fencing and stressed there was a more appropriate manner in which to achieve the objectives of the Howe's relative to control of the property. She clarified that the Simpson's access easements rights needed to be respected and that what was being proposed was not consistent with the intent or provisions of the easement.

Jim Simpson spoke to specifically oppose the gate plan. He argued that the current design would force him out of the defined easement area for access to his property and that the proposal also does not take into account how the Simpsons or their visitors would get through the automatic gate to the easement or the Simpson property. He stressed that the

easement has been used daily and there appears to be no accommodation to the Simpsons for continued ease of use of the easement.

David Cincotta, attorney for the Simpson family, expressed disappointment with the continuance and the inconvenience it presents to the neighbors with concerns over the proposal. He advised that the easement has been in place since 1948 and that the current plans appear to ignore the easement provisions and/or established patterns of daily easement use. He added that if a gate were allowed, his clients and the fire department would need to have codes, rights, etc., for gate operation and access.

Jon Silver Portola Road, noted that he grew up in the neighborhood and that there were never any needs for fencing or gates. He noted that the plans appear to be incomplete as to what is happening on the Howe property and that, for example, planting of redwoods under oaks will jeopardize the oaks. He stressed the need for a comprehensive plan for the site. He argued that the access easement rights were being violated with the current fencing project and the proposed gate system and that the plan conflicts with the easement needed to be resolved before the ASCC took any action on the gate plans. Mr. Silver also noted that he had sent an email to staff and the ASCC earlier in the day, but after the normal work day, and wanted that email distributed to the ASCC and formally made part of the record on this project.

Following receipt of comments, project consideration was continued to the July 11, 2011 ASCC meeting.

#### **Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for residential additions and new detached garage, 121 Santa Maria Avenue, Orchard**

Vlasic presented the June 23, 2011 staff report on this follow-up review. He discussed the conditions of the May 23, 2011 ASCC conditional project approval and how the following plans and materials prepared by Jeff Rigler and, unless otherwise noted, revised through June 10, 2011, address ASCC conditions:

- Sheet A-2, (N) Site Plan (AMIS) and Landscape Lighting
- Sheet A-4, (N) First Floor Plan and (N) Second Floor Plan and Electrical Plan
- Sheet A-5, (E) Foundation and (N) Foundation Plan
- Sheet A-11, (N) Elevations
- Sheet A-17, (N) New Garage Plan and Views
- Colors and materials board, with light fixture cut sheet, received June 20, 2011 (Note: relative to the proposed light fixtures, the original application submittal included the full set of fixture cut sheets and these were provided with the June 23, 2011 ASCC report.)

ASCC members considered the plans and materials and attached memo from Mr. Rigler received June 13, 2011 discussing the follow-up submittal and, particularly, matter of proposed garage roof form. Also considered was a June 27, 2011 email from conservation committee member Marge DeStaebler regarding the condition of the 36-inch oak tree located to the west of the proposed garage site.

Mr. Orchard and Jeff Rigler presented the follow-up materials to the ASCC and offered the following clarifications:

- Three supplemental sheets were provided to clarify plans as follows:

**Garage doors.** A photo was presented showing the new garage doors to be stained a “walnut” finish. The view included stone facing on the walls similar to the proposed design.

**Repair and adding stone veneer to existing driveway pillars.** Photo images were presented showing how the pillars would be refaced with cobblestone veneer and with a stone cap to cover the top exposed with the removal of the existing light fixtures.

**Site plan.** The plan shows how the proposed garage siting might be adjusted to save the 36-inch oak.

- Two arborists have reviewed the condition of the 36-inch oak and concurred that it likely does not have a long life, noting its current condition and the fact that other oaks in the immediate area have succumbed to SOD.
- Considerable effort has been made to enhance the chances for survival of the oaks on the property. However, the history of poor tree care prior to the current ownership and site tree problems in general, don't suggest a long life for the existing oaks, particularly those adjacent to the proposed garage.
- In response to a question about the west side neighbors' reactions to the current plans, it was noted that the house on the property is a rental and that several different occupants have resided on the property over the past several years.
- Also, in response to a question, it was noted that the cobble stone would be used on the garage and not “valued engineered” out. It was stressed that the cobble stone veneer was important to changing the design to the desired cottage style.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the submittal and there were some differences of opinion regarding saving of the 36-inch oak. Breen noted that she had inspected the tree and site conditions and concluded the tree should be removed now and replaced with appropriate new trees and landscaping along the west side of the property. She concluded the oak and one smaller tree near it were not in good condition and, long-term, better screening would be achieved with new plantings.

Clark and Hughes indicated that consideration should be given to rotating the garage to save the tree, but agreed that additional landscaping was needed also. Aalfs did not favor garage rotation. Eventually, it was agreed that the applicant's arborist should provide a formal, written assessment of the 36-inch oak with recommendations for either tree removal or the steps to be taken to provide for tree protection and preservation if possible. If, it is concluded that the tree does need to be removed then appropriate tree replacement should be required.

Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the follow-up submittal 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 formal, written professional arborist's report on the condition of the 36-inch oak shall be provided with recommendations for either tree removal or the steps to be taken to

provide for tree protection and preservation if possible. If it is concluded that the tree does need to be removed then appropriate tree replacement shall be required. This condition shall be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

2. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided for the area between the proposed new garage and the westerly property line. This plan shall include the replacement trees for the 36-inch oak if removal of this tree is determined necessary pursuant to the provisions of condition 1 above. This condition shall be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
3. The colors and materials board received June 20, 2011 is approved. Any deviation from this board, particularly relative to use of the stone veneer siding, shall be subject to review and approval by the ASCC.
4. Final project design details relative to floor plans shall be subject to planning staff review for compliance with the floor area understandings presented on the revised plan sheets as evaluated in the June 23, 2011 staff report.
5. A vegetation and construction staging plan shall be provided and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. Final lighting plan details shall be clarified to the satisfaction of planning staff to resolve the issues identified in the June 23, 2011 staff report.
7. The Build It Green checklist and calculations shall be revised for consistency with the final plans that are determined by staff to be consistent with the floor area limits for the property. Conformance with the final checklist shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff.

### **Architectural Review, Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, 80 Golden Oak Drive, Liu/Chen**

Vlasic presented the June 23, 2011 staff report on this request for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing mostly single level, 3,251 sf residence on the subject 1.5-acre, Alpine Hills area property. He discussed the events of the afternoon special site meeting on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Dr. James Chen and Roger Kohler were present to discuss the proposals further with ASCC members. In response to site meeting comments and comments in the staff report, the following clarifications were offered in addition to those provided at the site meeting:

- The front yard retaining wall with 42-inch railing will likely be modified by moving the railing back from the top of the wall so that the wall and railing are not continuous. Further, the wall will be modified to have stone face to match the other site stone retaining walls.
- A darker color mix will be selected for the proposed clay roof tiles and samples provided to the town.

- The foundation review by the structural engineer has again been reviewed and it appears that his conclusions support using portions of the existing foundation for this project.

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Sherman Rutherford, 60 Golden Oak Drive,** requested clarification of the project scope. He noted that the public notice identified this as a new house, but the staff report stated it was an addition and remodeling. Vlasic commented that the application is for additions and remodeling and not a new project and that the notice was not consistent with the actual application. Mr. Rutherford also requested and received clarifications regarding exterior lighting on the south side of the house. He did not take any specific issue with the plans, but encouraged the ASCC to minimize the scope of exterior lighting particularly on the more exposed south side of the house.

ASCC members discussed the project and site meeting findings. Hughes continued to have some concerns over the findings to permit 90% of the floor area in the main house, particularly if it was determined that the entire foundation had to be removed. At the same time, he noted that if the foundation is sound, he supports the proposal as planned.

Breen, Clark and Aalfs supported the proposed concentration of floor area, finding it superior to a plan that would require more grading and site disturbance and placement of a new, detached building in areas beyond the established building site. Clark commented that if, however, the entire foundation were to be replaced, he might support lowering the project 2 to 3 feet further into the site, but recognized this would mean more grading, particularly for accessing a lower garage elevation.

Following discussion, Breen moved the following actions, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0:

1. To make the findings in support of concentrating 90% of the floor area in the main house as evaluated in the June 23, 2011 staff report and at the ASCC meeting.
2. To approve the project as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:
  - a. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided that includes provisions for removal of the redwood trees and other non-native and invasive plant materials along the Golden Oak Drive frontage. The plan shall also include provisions for removal of invasive materials on the entire property, including star thistle north of the building site. The landscape plan shall be directed at restoring the oak grassland conditions along the frontage below the building site and shall include two large size box oaks located just south of the replacement retaining wall below the access pathway.
  - b. The replacement retaining wall with railing proposed below, i.e., south of the new entry to the house, shall be faced with a stone material consistent with the character of the stone used on the other site retaining walls to remain with this project. Further, the wall and railing design shall be revised to conform to town setback standards for such features in the required front yard setback area and details for the railing design shall be clarified.
  - c. Final exterior materials and color samples shall be provided. In particular, the roof tile mix shall be darker than shown on the proposed color board received May 23,

2011. In addition, the lower portion of the south elevation, generally below the identified "datum board" line, shall be in a darker color as recommended in the June 23, 2011 staff report.

- d. The plans shall be clarified as to grading and vegetation removal that is proposed to improve sight distance at the driveway intersection with Golden Oak Drive.
- e. The lighting plans shall be modified to place south side terrace and deck area lights close to the surface of the deck rather than using higher wall mounted lights for required illumination in these areas. The intent is to specifically limit potential for light spill along the southern side of the property. Similarly, the lighting along the pathway below the south side replacement retaining wall shall be located in the wall and shall be with a low mounted step light fixture that directs light to the pathway surface and not out from the wall. The lighting plans shall include identification of switching patterns.
- f. The historic record of the house and its architecture shall be provided to the satisfaction of town planning staff.

**Architectural Review for guest house/accessory structure, swimming pool, and dining pavilion, and related yard improvements and site Development Permit X9H-627, 8 Applewood Lane, King**

Vlasic presented the June 23, 2011 staff report on this proposal for architectural review and site development permit approval of plans for significant accessory use improvements in the rear yard area of the subject 1.3-acre, residentially developed Applewood Lane subdivision property. He clarified that the project calls for 150 cubic yards of grading to accommodate development of a new swimming pool with spa, 613 sf pool house, 420 sf guest room with exercise space and 192 sf dining pavilion. He also noted that the ASCC is the approving authority for both the site development permit for the proposed grading and the architectural review application for the proposed site improvements and building designs.

Vlasic reviewed the parcel and subdivision history and the issues associated with the plans as evaluated in the staff report. He noted that, in particular, adjustments are needed relative to the storage facilities proposed in the side yard area and the lighting plans. He also discussed the findings the ASCC needed to make relative to the size and design of the proposed accessory use pool house as attached to the proposed guest suite/exercise room.

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated May 27, 2011 and prepared by Samuel Sinnott & Company, Inc., Architecture & Construction:

- Sheet A0.1, Site/Roof Plan, Project Data
- Sheet A1.0, Site/Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.0, Elevations
- Sheet A3.0, 3D Views
- Sheet E1.0, Lighting Plan
- Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, William Johnson, A.P.L.D., 5/26/11

- Sheet C-1. Topographic Survey Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 1/17/11
- Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading & Drainage plan, MacLeod and Associates, 5/24/11

Also considered were the following:

- Proposed exterior colors and materials board, received June 20, 2011.
- Cut sheets for the proposed accessory building and yard light fixtures received May 27, 2011.
- 5/27/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist.
- Build It Green project checklist, received 5/27/11, targeting a minimum of 49 BIG points.

Vlasic noted that story poles have been installed at the site to model the proposed detached accessory structures and a plan Sheet (A1.1—Site Stakes) dated 6/17/11 was provided to clarify pole locations and heights.

Mr. and Mrs. King and project architect Bill Sinnott presented the proposed plan to the ASCC. The following clarifications were offered, largely in response to comments in the staff report and questions:

- A June 27, 2011 statement identifying plan changes was provided with revised sheets A0.1, A1.0, A2.0, A3.0 and E1.0. It was noted that the revised plans reduce the scope of exterior lighting, modify plans to remove the need for guardrails in two locations, replace a bench with a planter, add a walkway on both sides of the dining pavilion and extend pool and equipment storage under the dining pavilion. It was clarified that the storage area would be less than 7.6 feet in ceiling height and designed and finished only for equipment and storage uses.
- A cut sheet for the proposed “SAVI” infinity pool light was presented. It was clarified that the external pool trough lighting would not be colored and was only intended for safety and not decoration. It was noted that each LED light would be 14 watts.
- The proposed wall mounted light fixture has a solid top even though the cut sheet suggests it is an “up and down” fixture. It was also noted that no “up-lighting” is proposed.
- The plans will include solar panels on the top of the pool house and the pool cover color will be specified with the building permit submittal.
- The proposed side yard storage facilities would replace similar existing facilities. If the proposed improvements with roof can’t be constructed in the side yard, as commented on in the staff report, then an option might be to simply not make any changes to the existing storage facilities.
- The proposal includes the elimination of over 2,300 sf of irrigated lawn surface.
- The plans have been shared with the neighbors to the northeast and they have indicated support for the plans.
- A cut sheet for the proposed pendant light to be used in the dining pavilion still needs to be identified.

- Due to the complexity of the plans and current time schedule for town project review, including building permit processing, construction will likely not start until the 2012 building season.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the plans and expressed some concern in fully appreciating the scope of design changes presented at the meeting. After discussion, however, members concluded they were comfortable with proceeding to consider and act on the plans.

Concerns were, however, expressed over the proposed storage improvements and the lighting plans, particularly as associated with the infinity swimming pool trough. Changes were also discussed relative to the landscape plan and the need for some additional tree planting to accommodate for the loss of the large walnut tree.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the project subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit or the actual start of site grading:

1. The exterior lighting plan shall be further revised to address concerns noted in the staff report relative to the pool lighting to ensure that lighting is not for decorative purposes and otherwise consistent with town lighting policies and standards. The plan shall include cut sheets for all proposed fixtures, as well as complete information on switching patterns.
2. The landscape plan shall be modified to extend tree planting into the “trampoline” area shown on the site plan.
3. The side yard storage area shall be redesigned to conform to town standards for structures and fences in side yard setback areas.
4. The following site development permit committee comments shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the specific committee member:
  - June 3, 2011 report from the public works director
  - June 13, 2011 report from the town geologist
  - June 7, 2011 report from the Fire MarshalAny project comments from the conservation committee shall be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney to ensure current and future property owners are made aware that the use of the pool house/guest suite/exercise room structure must conform to town second unit and accessory structure polices and zoning regulations.
6. The pool cover color shall be specified.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Clark moved, seconded by Breen, and passed 3-0-1 approval of the June 13, 2011 meeting minutes with the following corrections:

Page 1. In the bold banner heading for the Pidwell project, add “major” in front of “remodeling” to emphasize the actual scope of the project.

Page 2. Correct the spelling of Lisa Moulton in the paragraph in the middle of the page where the Pidwell design team members are listed.

Page 3. In condition “e.” at the bottom of the page, change “that that project” to “that the project.”

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

T. Vlasic