

**Architectural and Site Control Commission October 22, 2012  
**Special Site Meeting, 3 & 5 Buck Meadow Drive, Blue Oaks Subdivision and  
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California****

Chairs Hughes called the special site meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at the intersection of Buck Meadow Drive and Redberry immediately adjacent to 3 and 5 Buck Meadow Drive.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Warr  
ASCC absent: None  
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs  
Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Interim Planning Manager Steve Padovan,  
Planning Technician Brown

**Others\* present relative to the proposals for 3 and 5 Buck Meadow Drive:**

Tim Mills, President Blue Oaks Homeowners Associations (HOA)  
Patricia Murray, Vice President Blue Oaks HOA  
Joy Elliott, Secretary Blue Oaks HOA  
Jo Owens, 14 Redberry Ridge  
Nicole Rubin, Blue Oaks resident  
Roland & Anngi Strick, 6 Buck Meadow Drive  
Bob Sieger, 6 Buck Meadow Drive  
Jim Pollock, 3 Blue Oaks Court  
John Toor, 2 Buck Meadow Drive  
Jim & Lynn Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge  
Ginny Kavanaugh, realtor for 3 & 5 Buck Meadow Drive  
David Boyce, Country Almanac  
Jon Silver, 355 Portola Road  
Bud Eisberg, Wyndham Drive resident  
Dick Eckstein, Wyndham Drive resident  
Mike Capalla (interested in purchasing one of the two adjusted lots)  
Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive  
-----

•Others may have been present during the course of the site meeting but did not formally identify themselves for the record.

**Proposed Amendment to Blue Oaks PUD X7D-137, Lot Line Adjustment X6D-214, Lots 23-26, 3 & 5 Buck Meadow Drive, Town of Portola Valley**

Vlastic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report and background materials as a framework for the site meeting. He also reviewed the October 19, 2012 one-lot alternative plan provided by the Blue Oaks HOA. Vlastic clarified that the ASCC was not taking any action on the proposed PUD changes or Lot Line Adjustment (LLA), but only offering comments for consideration by the planning commission during its public hearings on the proposals. Vlastic advised that the planning commission hearings have tentatively been scheduled for November 7, 2012.

Vlastic presented the Blue Oaks PUD provisions including the PUD plan showing the open space elements of the project. He noted that the subject properties were adjacent to Buck Meadow Preserve and the town-owned Redberry Preserve. He then explained the background on the PUD and, particularly, the evaluations made relative to the subject

properties and how the current proposals relate to existing PUD provisions. Vlasic also stressed that the ASCC should comment on both the original two market rate lot plan and the single market rate plan proposed by the Blue Oaks HOA.

In response to a question from **Bud Eisberg**, Vlasic advised that the original plan proposed by the Blue Oaks developer located the proposed BMR parcels on the east side of Los Trancos Road. He clarified that this would have required a general plan amendment for housing in greenway and that there was considerable opposition to such an amendment. It was noted that the project was then revised to show the BMR lots in the current location. Vlasic pointed out that the original project plans did show two market rate lots in the area of 3 and 5 Buck Meadow Drive.

**Jon Silver**, also in response to the question from **Mr. Eisberg**, commented that he was on the town council when the original plan was proposed with the BMR units on the east side of Los Trancos Road. He noted that there was also the position that the units should be integrated with the rest of the project lots and not separated from them. He offered, however, that based on the experience to try and develop the lots, he supported the current changes to meet housing element objectives.

**Tim Mills** reviewed the one lot plan proposal and noted that the HOA was hoping to take actions to help the town make this plan work. He stressed that the HOA wanted to preserve proposed Lot A in open space and limit development on Lot B as described in the one lot option presented to the town at a October 19, 2012 site meeting. He clarified that the HOA was considering actions it could take to help implement the plan. At the same time, he reviewed the issues of HOA concern, including potential tree impacts, and shared a copy of an arborist report commissioned by the HOA to evaluate particularly the Blue Oaks on 3 and 5 Buck Meadow Drive. (A copy of this report dated 10/12/12, prepared by Walter Levison, Consulting Arborist, was provided to the town planner.)

**Joy Elliott** reviewed the specific points the HOA materials and stressed concerns over tree protection, arborist's conclusions, height and access limitations, etc. She noted, in particular, the importance of the protection of the oaks relative to the character of the site and area. She added that it was essential that any new house be limited in height so that the structure did not extend above the tree canopy.

**Jon Silver** also commented on the efforts the town was making to satisfy affordable housing requirements and the need to have a variety of housing types and costs to meet the needs of those living in the town and those providing services to the community, i.e., teachers, firemen, town employees, etc. He noted that when the town was founded that there was a diversity of residents and that he hoped the outcome of this process would result in affordable housing that does not appear possible with the current Blue Oaks BMR lots. He also noted that if a single lot option resulted in the town obtaining the funds needed to implement the affordable housing objectives that would seem reasonable, too. He added that he was impressed with the care the HOA had taken in preparing the single lot alternative.

**Virginia Bacon** commented that she also was impressed with the information provided by the HOA representatives and hoped that a single lot proposal could be found to meet the town's project objectives.

Following presentations and general discussion of alternatives, ASCC members and others present walked along the Redberry Road frontage of the subject sites, across 5 and 3 Buck

Meadow Drive, and then along the Buck Meadow Drive frontage. Consideration was given to matters of building envelope location, tree cover, possible points of access and building setbacks. View lines were considered and relationships to streets and other building sites reviewed. Consideration was also given to open space areas and how these related to the proposed two and one market rate lot alternatives.

ASCC members agreed that they would offer formal comments on the proposal and HOA alternative at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Members thanked the HOA and others present for the information, comments offered, and participation in the site meeting. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

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

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

**October 22, 2012**

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Warr  
Absent: None  
Planning Commission liaison: McIntosh  
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Brown,  
Interim Planning Manager Padovan, Town Manager Pegueros

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

**Continued Review -- Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison**

Vlastic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report on this continued project review. He explained that the ASCC initiated review of the proposal on August 13, 2012 and, based on this review, revised plans were prepared that increased the volume of grading so that planning commission action on the site development permit was now needed. He advised that the planning commission conducted its preliminary review of the site development permit on October 17, 2012 and that the revised plans were now before the ASCC for architectural review approval and for forwarded recommendations to the planning commission on the revised grading plans and site development permit application.

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the 10/18 staff report as to how the revised plans, listed below, satisfy the comments presented at the August 13<sup>th</sup> ASCC meeting and also discussed the planning commission's comments made during the October 17<sup>th</sup> preliminary review.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following revised plan package, unless otherwise noted, dated September 17, 2012 and prepared by Butler Armsden Architects:

Sheet A0.0, Title Sheet & Proposed Site Plan  
Sheet A0.1, Area Calculations  
Sheet A2.1, Basement Proposed Plan  
Sheet A2.2, First Floor Proposed Plan  
Sheet A2.3, Roof Proposed Plan  
Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations (North & East)  
Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations (West & South)  
Sheet A3.3, Proposed Sections (North/South, Pool & Pool Shed)  
Sheet A3.4, Proposed Sections (North & South courtyards)  
  
Sheet L-1.0, Tree Protection and Removal Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape  
Sheet L-1.1, Landscape Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape  
Sheet L-1.2, Planting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape  
Sheet L-1.3, Exterior Lighting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape

Sheet L-2.1, Irrigation Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID  
Sheet L-2.2, Irrigation Legend & Notes, Lutsko Associates Landscape  
Sheet L-2.3, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID  
Sheet L-2.4, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID  
Sheet L-2.5, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID  
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet (Civil Plans), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet C-2, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet C-3, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.  
Sheet SS-1, Preliminary Septic System Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.

Also considered were the following materials provided by the project design team to further clarify the project and the revisions:

- Set of six color renderings modeling how the project is intended to fit onto the site.
- September 25, 2012 letter from the project architect explaining the plan revisions and containing data clarifying the proposals, particularly grading, floor area, tree impacts and protection, planting, irrigation, lighting, etc.

It was noted that these are in addition to the project materials included with or referenced in the 8/9/12 staff report prepared for the 8/13 ASCC meeting.

Glenda Flaim, project architect, and Mr. Lutsko presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They advised that the plans had been reviewed and approved by the site neighbors and that the concerns of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) had been considered and addressed with the revised plans and supporting materials. They also offered the following comments and clarifications:

- In response to a question, it was noted that the planting proposed along the entry drive adjacent to the Mapache Drive frontage was to enhance the meadow/grassland condition and not create an entry garden.
- In response to the suggestion in the 10/18/12 staff report relative to some modification to the proposed rear yard walls, Mr. Lutsko clarified that the walls were moved downhill to help eliminate the need for other walls higher on the site and that the design not only accomplished this, but also allowed for the neighbor to the south to have stair access to the planned garden area. He explained that the neighbors desire this access as the vegetable garden and orchard area is to be shared by them.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed number of pool lights was reduced from four to three and that the number of lights in the trellis areas could also be reduced.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and submittal, appreciated the plan changes and found them acceptable and also found the site development permit acceptable. Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the architectural review application subject to planning commission approval of the site development permit. In addition, the following conditions were set on the architectural

approval to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A detailed materials and colors board shall be provided consistent with the comments in the September 25, 2012 letter from the project architect and the color renderings provided to model the project.
2. A comprehensive construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The construction staging plan shall include a detailed timeline with milestones to ensure the arborist's tree protection measures are fully implemented, particularly relative to the 60" and 24" oaks to ensure that they are protected from construction impacts, remain in good condition during the life of the project, and are treated as necessary to ensure long-term tree health.
3. The lighting plan shall be revised to reduce lighting at the east and south side trellis and overhang areas and to ensure that all exterior lighting, including switching controls, is consistent with town standards and guidelines.
4. The landscape plan shall be clarified to ensure that the Mapache Drive entry area planting is accomplished to preserve and enhance the meadow condition and not result in an entry "garden."

**Proposed Amendment to Blue Oaks PUD X7D-137, Lot Line Adjustment X6D-214, Lots 23-26, 3 & 5 Buck Meadow Drive, Town of Portola Valley**

Vlasic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report on the subject proposals. He noted that the ASCC had initiated review at its October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and then continued the review at the afternoon site meeting as summarized above in the site meeting minutes. He reminded the ASCC members that they did not have to take any formal action on the proposal, but only forward comments to the planning commission for consideration when formally acting on the proposed PUD amendments and lot line adjustment.

Town Manager Nick Pegueros and Town Council member Jeff Aalfs were present on behalf of the town to offer input on the proposals. Mr. Pegueros noted that the town was working with the Blue Oaks HOA on their proposals for a one-lot option and that it would be important for the ASCC to conclude comments on the proposals for planning commission consideration at the November 7, 2012 scheduled public hearing on the applications.

Public comments were requested. **Bud Eisberg, Wyndham Drive**, spoke to oppose the process of shifting the Blue Oaks BMR burden from the 2.47 acres in the subdivision to a 1.67-acre parcel on Portola Road. No other public comments were offered.

ASCC members considered the staff report, discussed the proposals and site meeting findings, and concluded that either the original town proposal or the alternative Blue Oaks HOA proposal would be acceptable relative to density, open space and other established PUD criteria. Members concurred that the blue oak trees on the site should be protected to the extent possible, but that some would need to be removed to accommodate any site development and this would be the case with the current PUD allowances for the four affordable housing lots. It was agreed that some of the oaks were likely more important than others and that with any development proposal there should be a detailed inventory of

the oaks and their condition, and that the trees found to be exceptional protected from construction.

ASCC members also discussed the matter of driveway access. Warr noted that if the Blue Oaks HOA option for only one developable lot was pursued, access would be better from Redberry Ridge as it would require less grading and tree impacts. If the two-lot option was pursued as proposed on the town's original plan, then access to Lot A should be from Redberry Ridge and Lot B from Buck Meadow Drive. Warr also suggested that if the HOA could not acquire both parcels, i.e., so as to control Lot B development standards as the HOA prefers, then the building site on Lot B would likely be more appropriate higher on the site, i.e., within 40 feet of the boundary line common with Lot 22 and not the 80 shown on the HOA preferred one market rate lot plan.

The ASCC concluded that the final option or options would depend on final purchase agreements and assurance that the purchase(s) would meet the town's objectives for achieving housing element affordable housing objectives.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC comments would be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration during the public hearings on the proposed PUD amendments and lot line adjustment.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr temporarily stepped down from his ASCC position and left the meeting room. He advised that he could not participate in the review as he had provided architectural services to the owners of 20 Granada Court.*

---

### **Proposed Lot Line Adjustment X6D-213, 20 and 30 Granada Court, Nebrig-Hall**

Vlasic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report on this application for adjustment of the common property line between the two subject Alpine Hills properties. He noted that the planning commission is the approving authority for the application and that the ASCC should forward comments to the planning commission for consideration during the public hearing on the proposal tentatively scheduled for the November 7, 2012 commission meeting.

The ASCC considered the 10/18/12 staff report, the October 11, 2012 report to the planning commission, and the lot line adjustment proposal as shown on plan Sheet SU1, Lot Line Adjustment, revised 8/29/12, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc. Also considered was the information from the 10/17/12 planning commission meeting summarized in the 10/18/12 staff report.

Applicant Katherine Hall reviewed the background to the lot line adjustment as presented in the staff report and by fellow applicant Mr. Bob Nebrig at the 10/17 planning commission meeting. She noted that the previous owner had constructed a shed on 30 Granada Court over the property boundary that, in part, led to the confusion over the location of the lot line and that the proposed adjustment, acceptable to both neighbors, corrects the history of boundary confusion and helps to ensure that the area in question is part of 30 Granada Court, as this area is directly related to uses on that property.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project and concurred that the lot line adjustment matter was appropriate as proposed. Members also concurred with the planning commission comments about the possible need to consider adjustments to the site development ordinance to ensure that more extensive clearing of vegetation for fuel/fire management is appropriately reviewed by the town. In addition, ASCC members expressed some concern over the recent planting of redwood trees on the lower slopes of 20 Granada Court and encouraged that the owner reconsider the scope of tree planting in this area. It was acknowledged, however, that the fuel management clearing and tree planting matters were not issues directly related to the lot line adjustment application.

Vlasic advised that the planning commission would be informed of the ASCC comments.

---

*Following consideration of the above application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

### **Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-642, house additions, remodeling and guest house, 55 Stonegate Road, Hughes**

Vlasic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report on these requests for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing single level, 2,698 sf traditional Ranch style residence, with attached garage, located on the subject 1.0-acre, Stonegate Road property. He advised that the project includes conversion of the existing attached garage to living area, addition of a new attached 541 sf garage and a total floor area of 4,575 sf in the main house including the attached garage. He also noted that a detached 750 sf guest house is proposed, as are landscape improvements and elimination of the existing double access driveway connecting to Stonegate Road.

Vlasic then reviewed the following neighbor communications received since preparation of the staff report:

- October 22, 2012 email from Laurie Emerson Barber, 51 Stonegate Road
- October 19, 2012 email from Laurie Emerson Barber, 51 Stonegate Road
- October 21, 2012 email from Louise Emerson, 51 Stonegate Road
- Undated letter from Laurie Emerson Barber and Bryan Barber
- October 19, 2012 letter from Jenny and Richard Vaughan, 41 Stonegate Road

It was noted that the letters and emails raise issues with the proposals and request that a site meeting be held by the ASCC to consider and receive additional input on neighbor concerns.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by PPV Associates and dated 8/15/12:

- Sheet T1, Project Data & Notes
- Boundary & Topographic Map, Pat McNulty, Professional Land Surveyor, June 2012

Civil Engineering Plans, Precision Engineering and Construction:

- Sheet C-0, Title Sheet
- Sheet C-1, Notes Sheet
- Sheet C-2, Grading Plan
- Sheet C-3, Utility Plan



Sheet C-4, Erosion Control Plan  
Sheet C-5, Detail Sheet

Site, House and Guest House Design Plans:

Sheet A0, Site Plan, Existing Floor Plan & Notes, rev. 10/10/12  
Sheet A1.0, Floor Plan & Notes  
Sheet A1.1, Floor Plan and Notes, rev. 10/10/12  
Sheet A2.0, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A2.2, Accessory Structure Elevations, rev. 10/10/12

Landscape Plans – John Dalrymple, Landscape Architecture, 8/14/12:

Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan  
Sheet L-2, Diagrammatic Lighting Plan

Color/Material Board, 8/15/12

Light fixture cut sheets for the proposed exterior wall mounted step and pathway lights  
GreenPoint Rated Single Family Checklist, which targets 89 BIG points

It was noted that in addition to the above listed plans and materials, story poles were in place at the site to model the proposed house additions and guest house.

Erik Hughes and project architect Ray Viotti presented the plans to the ASCC. They advised that they had met with the neighbors raising concerns and also other neighbors, and several supported the project as proposed. They appreciated the concerns noted, but also advised that the guest house plans were adjusted to address some of the concerns and the majority of the additions, including the guest house, were single story and placed in areas adjacent to the northwest side access drive and parking area and garage on 51 Stonegate Road.

Mr. Hughes noted that while he understood the desire for a site meeting, he was concerned that it would further delay the project review process. In response to a question, he noted that the guest house plate height was 8 feet.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Richard Vaughan, 41 Stonegate Road**, reviewed the concerns presented in his 10/19 letter to the town. He emphasized issues relative to height and massing, proximity to the property line. In particular, he expressed concern over the scope of improvements proposed to parallel the parcel boundary and the feeling of a wall being created along the northwest side boundary.

**Jenny Vaughan, 41 Stonegate Road**, also reviewed the concerns in her 10/19 letter to the town and stressed the need for an ASCC site meeting.

**Laurie and Bryan Barber, 51 Stonegate Road**, reviewed the concerns in their communications to the town and also requested a site meeting so that the concerns could be fully appreciated.

**Fred (?), Westridge Drive**, offered a few comments of concern over the project and advised that he was interested in attending any ASCC site meeting.

**Bob McLean, co-owner of the project property**, stressed the need for the guest house to accommodate a 92-year old mother-in-law and that access had to be level for safety. He

advised that the site proposed for the second unit avoided drainage issues relative to the neighbor on the south side and minimized potential for off site visual impacts.

In response to neighbor concerns, Mr. Hughes asked if the project process could move ahead faster if the second unit was removed from consideration at this time. Following brief discussion, it was agreed that for a site meeting, the project should be maintained as currently proposed.

ASCC members discussed the project and were generally supportive of it as proposed, but agreed that a site meeting as requested by the neighbors would be appropriate. In response to concerns of Mr. Hughes, members advised that they believed at the conclusion of the site meeting they would be prepared to complete action on the entire project. As a result, it was agreed that the site meeting would be set for 4:00 p.m. on November 12, 2012, with the intent that final ASCC action would be considered at the regular evening 11/12/12 ASCC meeting.

During discussion, the following ASCC comments were also offered.

- Clark commented that while he viewed the project as well developed, a slight adjustment to the siting of the guest house, mainly to offset it so that the footprint didn't fall on the line the proposed garage might be considered to address neighbor concerns.
- Keeping all improvements to one story and elimination of the large existing, double-access driveway are appropriate design responses as is the proposed materials and colors board.
- The general approach to landscaping and tree preservation appears appropriate. Over time, there should be a phased removal of the older pines, but other screen planting should be in place. Vegetation screening should be responsive to neighbor concerns.

It was agreed that these comments and the other neighbor issues would be considered at the 11/12-site meeting and project review was then continued to that meeting.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr temporarily stepped down from his ASCC position and left the meeting room. He advised that he could not participate in the review as he is providing architectural services to neighbors of 35 Golden Oak Drive.*

---

### **Architectural Review for house additions, 35 Golden Oak Drive, Pedersen**

Vlasic presented the October 18, 2012 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for the addition of 467 sf of living area to an existing 2,617 sf, contemporary design residence with attached garage on the subject 1.2-acre Alpine Hills property. He explained that the plans propose a relatively small master bedroom and bath addition on the existing level building pad that extends to the west of the existing residence. He noted that virtually no grading is needed other than for foundation work, no significant vegetation would be impacted by the project and that the addition would fully match the architecture, including finishes and materials of the existing flat roof, contemporary design house.

Vlasic also commented that the project fully conforms to all zoning standards including yard setbacks, floor area and height limits and that no special findings are needed by the ASCC relative to the proposal.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials received, unless otherwise noted, September 10, 2012 and prepared by Elin R. Pedersen:

- Cover Page Sheet
- Sheet A.1, Site Plan and Property Information
- Sheet A.2, Floor Plan
- Sheet A.3, Roof Plan (trellis extension details)
- Sheet A.4, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A.5, Lighting Plan
- Sheet A.6, Landscaping and Drainage
- Sheet B.1 & B.2, BIG Checklist and Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist
- Materials and colors sheet, 9/7/12 stating that all proposed materials and finishes will match existing conditions including siding, roofing, windows and trim.

Ms. Pedersen presented her proposal to the ASCC. In response to a question, she noted that structural engineering review of existing conditions appears to support the application of the desired southwest side sun control shade using existing roof beams. Also, it was noted that the manually switched light at the crawl space was only for safety of access as may be needed in an emergency situation.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the project as presented.

---

*Following consideration of the above application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

### **Review of Conservation Committee Guidelines on Redwoods**

Steve Padovan presented his October 22, 2012 staff report on this matter and requested comments from ASCC members on the guidelines developed by the conservation committee for planting and removal of redwood trees. He clarified that ASCC comments would be forwarded to the town council for consideration when the council discusses the guidelines, now tentatively scheduled for a November council meeting. Padovan also reviewed the comments on the guidelines presented by planning commissioners at the October 17<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting. He noted that the guidelines address both planting and removal of redwood trees.

Public comments were requested. **Loverine Taylor, Westridge**, expressed concern over the guidelines and how they were developed. She took exception to comments limiting the location of appropriate habitat for redwoods and offered that there are a number of locations in town where conditions do support redwoods, including areas in Westridge and Arrowhead Meadows. She offered that the guidelines appear to take control of redwoods "to the extreme."

ASCC members discussed the guidelines and offered the following comments:

- Consider some editing to make the “guidelines” actually be consistent with other town guidelines in the town’s design guidelines document. Further, they should be clear as to provisions guiding tree planting and tree removal. There should be more focus on provisions for tree removal.
- The guidelines should include provisions on how to use redwoods. They should not be used to create a “fence” condition like the redwood tree planting on Alpine Road near the intersection with Paso del Arroyo. Also, for example, they should not be planted in an oak forest, as they would “hurt” the oaks.
- Redwoods grow rapidly and become a strong landscape feature. Care needs to be exercised in their use and the “guidelines” should help people carefully think about the use of redwoods and long-term consequences of their planting.

Padovan thanked ASCC members for their input and noted that the comments would be considered in preparing the guidelines for town council action.

### **Minutes**

Breen moved, seconded by Koch, and passed 4-0-1 (Warr) approval of the October 8, 2012 meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

T. Vlastic