

Architectural and Site Control Commission
Special Site Meeting, 205 Cervantes Road, Kerwin, and
5 Naranja Way, Maffia* and
Special Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

August 27, 2013

Chair Breen called the special site meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. at 205 Cervantes Road.

*(*Note: The 5 Naranja Way site meeting was convened as a joint meeting of the ASCC and Planning Commission as described herein. **Rescheduling of regular August 26, 2013 ASCC evening meeting.)*

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Ross

ASCC absent: Koch

Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Others* present relative to the 205 Cervantes Road applications:

Terri and Brian Kerwin, applicants

Greg Miller, project designer

Chris Jacobson, project landscape designer

Clark Stoner, project civil engineer

Wayne Erickson, 210 Cervantes Road

Lance and Wanda Ginner, 211, Cervantes Road

Susan Gold, 70 Pineridge Way

Margaret Bennett, 20 Pineridge Way

Elke Walz, 325 Golden Oak Drive

Judith Murphy and Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee

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

Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, 205 Cervantes Road, Kerwin

Vlasic presented the August 27, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story house with partial basement on the subject 1.4-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. Vlasic discussed the recent history relative to proposals for the site, the changes to the property made since a 2011 approval for a different owner, and the current plans. He noted that concerns in the staff report over floor area compliance had been resolved with an 8/23 plan revision and that these changes include a lowering of the proposed height by a "few" inches below what is shown on the plans and modeled by the story poles placed at the site.

Vlasic clarified that the floor area changes ensure that the project would conform to both the 85% and 100% floor area standards for the property. He also discussed the concerns in the staff report relative to the proposed height and west side massing and that this, along with other concerns relative to lighting and project details, should be considered during the site meeting and preliminary project review. Vlasic further advised that after the site and evening ASCC meetings, project consideration should be continued to the September 9, 2013 regular ASCC meeting.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed project plans:

Architectural Plans, Greg Miller Designs, 7/16/13:

Sheet A1, Site Plan and Project Information
Sheet A2, Main Level Floor Plan
Sheet A3, Lower Level (Basement and Garage) Floor Plan
Sheet A4, Front and Rear Elevations (West and East)
Sheet A5, Left and Right Elevations (North and South)
Sheet A6, Floor Area Calculations
Sheet A7, Sections
Sheet A8, Exterior and Landscape Combined Lighting Plan
Sheet A9, Pool House Floor Plan and Elevations

Landscape Plans, Garden Art Group:

Sheet L-0, Site Landscape Design, June 25, 2013
Sheet L-2, Landscape Lighting Plan, July 16, 2013

Civil Plans, CFS Engineering, 7/16/13:

Sheet C-1.0, Plot Plan
Sheet C-1.1, Driveway Plan & Profile
Sheet C-2.0, Grading and Drainage Key Plan
Sheet C-2.1, Grading and Drainage Key Plan
Sheet C-2.2, Enlarged View – Building Site
Sheet EC-1, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet EC-2, Erosion Control Details

Topographic Map, Polaris Surveyors, 7/15/13

Septic System, S.R. Hartsell, R.E.H.S., July 12, 2013

Also considered were the following materials submitted in support of the project applications:

- GreenPoint Rated Checklists for the main house (targeting 161 points) and for the pool house (targeting 91 points).
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 7/16/13.
- Cut sheets for the proposed path, step, house wall and pool lights, received July 18, 2013.
- Exterior Materials Color Board.

Applicants Terri and Brian Kerwin, and project design team members Greg Miller and Chris Jacobson presented the project to the ASCC. They described the current site conditions and, using the story poles set for the site meeting, explained the proposed residence and pool house. They also discussed the landscaping proposals and presented revised landscaping and exterior lighting plans (i.e., Sheets L-0 through L-4, dated 8/27/13) responding to comments in the staff report. They led all present on a tour of the property and offered the following clarifications and comments and plan clarifications in response to questions:

- The plans were developed to cut the house into the site as much as possible, but also to avoid excessive grading that could result in passing the 1,000 cubic yard threshold where more project review, including planning consideration, would be needed.

- The rear portion of the house maintains a single story profile, and the western side is taller and reflects the changes in land slope and also the desire to have the entry and main floor elevation capture the views to the north. This west side is also less open to views from immediately neighboring residences.
- The project conforms to the town's height limit. Lowering the house through grading would require more cutting and pass the 1,000 cubic yard threshold. It would also result in more site disturbance and the need for more grading to achieve the view objectives.
- The existing pool will be preserved and fitted with a pool cover. All north side fencing, i.e., along Minoca Road, would be removed, but the east side fencing along the parcel boundary common with the Ginner property would be preserved and repaired and likely stained to disappear in the more extensive buffer planting now planned along the east side boundary.
- The lighting plans have been modified to reduce the scope of exterior lighting, but some of the pathway lighting has been preserved for safety for evening use. The plans call for 24-inch box oaks along Cervantes Road, and the grass areas have been minimized and conform to the town's water ordinance standards. Irrigation would be with a drip system and only in place until the plants are established. The grasses will be mainly "Deer Grass," and the lawn would be a dwarf fescue.
- Skylights are only being considered over the main house entry and, in any case, none would be on the east side roof areas.
- The southerly side of the parcel, i.e., the location of the old stable, will not be developed and will be allowed to return to a more native condition. The thistle and other invasive materials, e.g., pampas grass, would be cleaned out. Also, it was noted that the existing acacia and fruitless Mulberry in the Cervantes Road right of way would be removed if the town would issue a permit for such work in the public right of way.
- The pool equipment would be located in the space available under the proposed pool house.
- In response to construction parking concerns, it was noted that the site has ample room on site for parking and two access points from Cervantes Road.

Neighbor comments were requested and the following offered:

Susan Gold expressed concern over light spill from site lighting including from inside the house. She also commented that construction parking needs to be contained on site as the spaces that appear to be available along Cervantes Road for parking are actually part of the public trail system in the area.

Lance and Wanda Ginner were supportive of the project and appreciated the efforts of the applicants to reach out to them relative to the plans and conditions, including proposals for planting, along their common property line.

ASCC members noted that they would offer their specific comments at the evening ASCC meeting. Clark, however, wondered if the opportunity with the applications should be taken to seek change to the solid board fencing along the east side property line. Breen offered that while she found the project generally a good design approach for the site she was

concerned with the proposed height and impact on general views in the area. She noted the potential northerly view impacts to travelers heading north on Cervantes from Peak.

After the site inspection and consideration of plans and site and neighborhood conditions, ASCC members thanked the applicants and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting. Thereafter, ASCC project consideration was continued to the special evening ASCC meeting.

At 4:40 p.m. Breen advised that the special ASCC site meeting would continue at 5 Naranja Way at approximately 5:00 p.m. for preliminary consideration of the Maffia Project.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached office, pool and pool cabana, and Site Development Permit X9H-657, 5 Naranja way, Maffia

At 5:05 p.m., ASCC members Breen, Clark, Hughes, and Ross convened at 5 Naranja Way with Planning Commissioners Von Feldt, Gilbert, McIntosh and Targ (arrived at 5:12 p.m.). The following* were also present for the joint ASCC and Planning Commission preliminary review of the subject project:

- Mike and Vanessa Maffia, applicants
- Richard Beard, project architect
- Jeremy Butler-Pinkham, project architect
- Kate Stickley, project landscape architect
- Ann Wengert, Town Council Liaison
- Judith Murphy and Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee
- Dana Parsons, 167 Mapache
- Linda Yates and Paul Holland, 170 Mapache Drive
- Mary and Patrick Enright, 171 Mapache Drive (Mr. Enright arrived toward the end of the site meeting.)
- Ed and Alison Wells, 15 Naranja Way
- Loverine Taylor, 35 Naranja Way
- Adrienne Roberts, 20 Naranja Way
- Rusty Day, Bev Lipman, Walli Finch, and David Strohm, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

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

Vlasic presented the August 27, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision property. He explained that the project includes a new single story 5,281 sf residence, detached 968 sf garage, swimming pool and 192 sf pool bathroom and storage facilities, and a 629 detached office. He clarified that the detached multi-story residence on the property would be removed, as would the existing stable and swimming pool and that the gated driveway access off of Mapache Drive would be eliminated.

Vlasic discussed the grading proposals that require planning commission involvement in the site development permit application and also the status of WASC review of the project. Vlasic explained the 8/19/13 plan modifications made to address WASC concerns. Vlasic then reviewed the following communications received by the town and distributed following completion of the August 27th staff report:

- August 23, 2013 letter from the applicants responding to the 8/22/13 letter from Linda Yates and Paul Holland.
- August 27, 2103 email from Ed and Alison Wells advising of no concerns with the project design or visual impacts, but with some concerns over project staging and construction parking.
- August 26, 2013 email from Naranja Way neighbors with a request that there be no construction parking on Naranja Way.
- August 26, 2013 letter from WASC to the applicants stating support for the general approach to house siting, but with remaining reservations relative to the proposed grading and fill on the west side of the site to accommodate the pool and yard spaces.

Vlasic then reviewed the issues in the staff report including the proposed west side fill, lighting and some landscaping matters and noted that the applicant was considering further plan refinements to address staff and WASC comments relative to the proposed grading and west side yard development. Vlasic further advised that after the special joint site meeting and the evening ASCC meeting, project consideration should be continued to the September 9, 2013 regular ASCC meeting.

ASCC and planning commission members considered the August 27, 2013 staff report, data distributed after completion of the staff report, and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated June 17, 2013 and prepared by BAR Architects:

Title Sheet (with house and garage perspective rendering)
 Sheet G0.01, General Information
 Sheet G0.02, GreenPoint Rated Checklist
 Sheet R1.00, Topographic Survey/Tree Survey Map, L. Wade Hammond,

Civil Plans, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., Civil Engineers, 6/6/13:

Sheet C01, Grading & Drainage Plan (with septic data)
 Sheet C-02, Erosion Control Plan

Landscape Plans, Arterra Landscape Architects, 6/17/13:

Sheet L3.0, Planting Plan
 Sheet L5.0, Exterior Lighting Plan

Architectural Plans, Bar Architects, 6/17/13:

Sheet A1.00, Overall Site Plan and Project Information
 Sheet A1.01, Site Plan
 Sheet A2.01, Main House Floor Plan
 Sheet A2.02, Accessory Structure Floor and Roof Plans
 Sheet A2.11, Main House Roof Plan
 Sheet A3.01, Main House Exterior Elevations
 Sheet A3.02, Main House Exterior Elevations
 Sheet A3.03, Accessory Structure Exterior Elevations
 Sheet A3.21, Main House Building Sections
 Sheet A3.22, Main House Building Sections
 Sheet A3.23, Main House Building Sections
 Sheet A3.24, Main House Building Sections
 Sheet A3.25, Accessory Structures Building Sections

Also considered was the August 19, 2013 email from project architect Jeremy Butler-Pinkham, which included the following modified plans:

Landscape Master Plan (grading changes), Arterra Landscape Architects, 8/12/13

Site Section Through Pool, Arterra Landscape Architects, 8/8/13
Site Section Through Lawn, Arterra Landscape Architects, 8/12/13
Sheet L1.0, Tree Protection and Removal, Ned Patchett Arborist, 8/16/13
Landscape Plan, Arterra Landscape Architects, 8/15/13
Sheet A3.0, Garage Study (four foot lowering), BAR Architects, 8/8/13

Vlasic noted that with the revised landscape master plan sheet, the grading volumes were lowered as explained in the staff report.

In addition to the above plans, the following application materials were considered:

- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received June 17, 2013.
- Colors and materials board, BAR Architects, 6/17/13.
- Arborist's report, Ned Patchett, Certified Arborist, June 28, 2013.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 6/14/13.
- Build It Green (BIG) Single Family Checklists, received June 17, 2013.

The applicants and project design team members presented the proposal to the ASCC, planning commissioners and others present for the site meeting. They distributed revised landscape plan sheets further responding to staff and WASC concerns relative to the proposed west side fill and pool proposals. It was noted that the revised approach would move the pool to the west side of the graded area and have stepped terraces, significantly reducing the scope and depth of fill and providing more space between the pool buildings and the main house. It was noted that the modified plan would also help to address concerns with the "drainage swale" feature planned along the boundary common with 170 Mapache Drive.

The design team made use of story poles and staking to explain the proposed site plan and building features and driveway alignment. They reviewed the project plans and colors and materials board and provided photo examples of the work of the project architects and landscape architects to explain the proposed architectural character and approach to use of landscape walls, particularly the planned low, i.e., roughly two feet high, stone walls between the west side terrace levels. During the site presentation and walk, design team members offered the following clarifications and responses to questions:

- The proposed house has been kept to a single story and placed so as to ensure views over the house and lowered garage building from the house on 170 Mapache Drive. Further, the size of the space between the house and garage has been increased to address concerns expressed for the long building "edge" along north side of the property. With the most recent site plan studies, the pool house and equipment structures would be lowered and moved to the west side of the pool terrace area, further mitigating the issue with the longer north side "edge."
- Images of houses designed by the project architects for the property in the Santa Lucia Preserve area of Carmel Valley were presented. It was noted that the single story house maintains a low profile on the site and that the low stone walls help to adjust landscaping and outdoor use areas so that they harmonize with site conditions.
- It was noted that no basement is planned and that the house has been sited between the north side slopes leading up to the Holland/Yates house and the drainage course and associated wet area along the drainage course. It was pointed out that additional calculations were in process relative to the storm water volumes and that final drainage plans, including size of corrugated pipe and west side detention area, needed to be

developed to the satisfaction of the town's public works director. It was clarified that these plans would need to be finalized and the data used in development of the final plans for west side grading of the desired pool area and terraces.

- Reference was made to the sun exposure data provided with the revised plan handouts provided at the meeting. It was noted that this data was used in developing the site plan and pool location, as well as plans for both passive and active solar applications.
- In response to a question, it was noted that no skylights are planned, but the clerestory elements proposed on the garage and the great room area of the main house were noted.
- It was noted that the 8/16 arborist plan noted the trees now specifically to be removed and to be preserved. In response to a question, it was clarified that the two large north side pine trees (T64 & T65) were planned to stay for now as they provide key screening between properties. It was acknowledged that the trees were not in the best of condition and as a result of this, and in response to town and fire district policies encouraging the removal of such trees, the proposal for pine tree preservation could be revisited and perhaps at least one might be removed and replacement screen planting added with the new landscape plan.

Following review of the project plans and site conditions, the site meeting continued to the south side of the Holland/Yates property to consider the concerns offered in the August 22, 2013 letter from the neighbors. **Mr. Holland** reviewed the concerns and emphasized the following issues:

- The proposed house is still aligned along the northerly setback and only 10 feet east of the northerly setback line. It is aligned parallel to the side setback line and perpendicular to it like the other houses in this are of Westridge. The house should be moved further away from the setback line and closer to the southerly hillside of the property to mitigate potential noise and privacy impacts. There needs to be more space between houses than is provided for on the plans.
- While the approach to house architecture appears acceptable, the applicant and project design team have been informed of "our" concerns over house siting and have not elected to make the more significant changes that are needed to ensure privacy and openness as encouraged by both Westridge provisions and town guidelines.
- The comments regarding the consideration of pine tree removal are contrary to promises made by the applicant to protect the trees for privacy. "We" feel misled by his comments and that there has been no effort to respond to the concerns shared with the applicant early on in the process of plan discussion.
- There is a significant potential for light spill from the clerestory elements and the new driveway access that will impact his property. Mitigations should be required.

Mr. Maffia took exception to comments offered by Mr. Holland and reviewed the comments in his August 23, 2013 letter responding to the comments in the August 22, 2103 letter from the neighbors.

Ms. Yates wondered about the adequacy of the tree evaluations and how the town would complete a review of the arborist's conclusions. She also stressed that when she and Mr.

Holland developed their property they were required by the town to provide mature screen landscaping relative to protecting views of an uphill neighbor and that they should not be not put in a position to take defensive action to protect views being jeopardized by the planned project. She also noted that they moved key larger trees on their site that were potentially impacted by their project and that the applicant should consider and be required to move site oaks for replacement screening, particularly if he is permitted to take out the large north side pines.

Vlasic advised that the town's conservation committee would be looking at and commenting on the conditions of the existing trees. He also concurred with the comments from Ms. Yates about the efforts she and Mr. Holland made to address concerns of the uphill neighbor and that the subject application should be held to the same standards.

After the visit to 170 Mapache Drive, the field meeting returned to the applicant's property and additional neighbor comments were requested and the following offered:

Mary and Patrick Enright expressed concerns with the adequacy of the drainage plans and wondered about the status of town plan review and basic requirements of the town. She noted that likely the most significant potential for down stream drainage impacts would be on the "Somerset" property at 177 Mapache Drive and not her property at 171 Mapache Drive.

Vlasic advised that the property owner's plans were under review by the consulting engineer to the town's public works director and that such review and plan acceptance with any revisions would need to be completed prior to a planning commission hearing on the site development permit. He also noted that under town and state standards a property owner was bound to receive water from an uphill property based on the historic pattern of drainage and ensure that any water discharged off of the site did not change in any material manner as a result of site development.

Planning commissioners present suggested that the final drainage plans should be "creative" and try to reduce the downstream runoff if at all possible. It was also suggested that consideration be given to slowing the flow of water and that there be increased opportunity for storm water to return to the ground on the site. It was noted that this likely would also limit moving the house further to the south toward the existing rock lined drainage feature.

Ed Wells provided a letter to the planning commission and ASCC dated August 27, 2013 supporting the proposal and encouraging an "expedited" town approval of the project.

Loverine Taylor emphasized the concerns over construction staging and Naranja Way parking provided in the August 26, 2013 transmittal from the Naranja Way neighbors.

Rusty Day reviewed the comments in the 8/26/13 WASC letter and noted that it appears the revised plans provided at the site meeting may, upon further evaluation, satisfy the remaining key committee concerns. He discussed the efforts made by the applicant to address WASC concerns and appreciated the applicant's interaction with the committee. He supported the efforts to remove pines and redwoods and encouraged an effort between the applicant, uphill and downhill neighbors, and the town to deal with drainage issues in the area. Day stressed that once the proposed grading plan changes were fully evaluated by the WASC, with adequate side markings of proposed grading elevations and boundaries, the WASC would complete project review and evaluation.

Planning commissioners present offered the following comments in addition to the above comments on the matters of drainage and the drainage course across the property.

McIntosh was generally supportive of the project, but wondered if the proposed pool could be moved closer to the house to further reduce the west side fill area and allow for more options for the ultimate drainage solutions.

Gilbert noted the need to take more time to appreciate the revised grading plans. She also supported consideration of taking out the large pines now and installing replacement screen planting now that will last longer than and be a better long-term landscape solution than depending on the older pines.

Von Feldt expressed concern over the drainage “channel” that appears to be planned along the northerly parcel boundary and the scope of tree removal planned, particularly, with the new driveway extension. She also noted the need to take time to better understand the revised grading plans presented at the site meeting.

Targ stressed the concern over the need for a “creative” plan to resolve drainage issues and shared the comments of other commissioners for the need to better understand the revised grading plans.

Vlasic advised that any other comments from planning commissioners would be appreciated and could be forwarded to planning staff either directly to him, Karen Kristiansson or Carol Borck. ASCC members concurred that they would offer preliminary comments on the project during the continued review at the special evening ASCC meeting.

Thereafter, Breen and Von Feldt thanked all present for the participation in the field meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Chair Breen called the special meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Ross

Absent: Koch

Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh

Town Council Liaison: Richards

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner, Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-658, 205 Cervantes Road, Kerwin

Vlasic presented the August 27, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story house with partial basement on the subject 1.4-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. He reviewed the events of the special afternoon site meeting on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) Vlasic advised that the ASCC appeared generally support of the project design approach, but with reservations relative to project height as expressed on the west side elevation. He also reviewed some of the concerns noted in the staff report and noted that additional time would be needed for staff review of the revised lighting and landscape plans shared at the afternoon site meeting.

Applicants Terri and Brian Kerwin and project designer Greg Miller were present to further discuss the project plans with ASCC members. Based on the staff report and site meeting discussion, they offered the following plan clarifications and responses:

- Consideration will be given to the height concerns noted at the site meeting and in their staff report. The focus will be on the plate heights and adjustments made for floor area compliance. In response to a question, it was noted that further cutting into the site would require significantly greater earth movement and this approach is not one the applicants wish to pursue for the site. It was also acknowledged that preserving the existing driveway with some portions over 15% grade would require some brushed concrete surfaces to meet the standards of the fire marshal.
- The scope of lighting will be further reduced to address concerns over pathway and decorative yard lighting, and a revised plan will be developed.
- Relative to construction staging and parking, it was noted that the current loop dirt way from the existing asphalt drive and parking area north and back to Cervantes Road would be preserved through the site, but essentially hidden in the landscaping. It could then be used for construction parking as well as emergency access when needed.

- In response to a question, it was noted that the old “Jetson” mailbox was to be replaced with a standard design box.
- The landscape plan will be updated to address comments offered at the site meeting and any that may be offered at the evening meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary reactions to the project plans:

Ross:

- Generally supports project. House siting and overall site plan appear appropriate. House design appears to need some refinements, but necessarily opposed to plans as presented.
- Concerned with the fairly massive appearance of the right side of the front elevation of the house when viewed from Cervantes Road. The darker palette of finishes, and cantilever over the face of the garage appear to accentuate the massing. Further, the front porch features, including the columns, appear to add to the apparent mass and scale.
- The pool house cantilever appears awkward.
- Avoiding the use of skylights is a good approach.

Hughes:

- Concurs that the general project approach is good and the uphill, east side elevation is well developed and works with site and neighbor conditions.
- The west side elevation of the house is “way up there,” and consideration needs to be given to lowering the height and reducing the apparent mass. Consideration should be given to plate height and roof pitch adjustments to achieve some lowering and massing reductions.
- Not concerned with the cantilever over garage, as this will not be seen from below due to the curve of the land above Cervantes Road. Also, pool house cantilever not a concern.
- Reductions in the scale and massing of the entry porch and features should be considered.
- Further lighting changes are needed. The backyard path lighting should be eliminated, and it appears that one half of the proposed front yard lighting could be eliminated. Appreciate concern to identify edges of driveway, but every proposed exterior light should be reconsidered in light of a real need and not simply a convenience or decorative purpose.
- The exterior color palette should be reconsidered with the objective of more contrast and a less overall dark scheme. The combination of height and dark color appear to make the house stand out from the site.

Clark:

- Main concerns are orientation of garage and garage doors toward Cervantes, mass of the western elevation as commented on by others, formality of the pathway and stairs from the garage to the front porch, and the height of the main finish floor.
- Suggest cutting the house one foot further into the site to reduce height and apparent mass.
- Consider replacing the east side fence with a more transparent design with landscape screening. Consider this with the neighbors.
- Echo the lighting concerns of others.
- Appreciate the efforts to restore the old stable area to a more native condition.

Breen:

- Main concern is the west side height and massing. Need to have less “community impact” when considering the views to the north as you travel down Cervantes from Peak. Lower height and a lighter color palette should be considered. Perhaps grading more into the site to “hunker down” a bit. The house roof color should be lighter and help the any distant views to the roof blend into the sky.
- The landscape plan should be reconsidered in light of the following comments:
 - The proposed front yard planting appears linear and more “clumping” of materials should be considered.
 - The proposed deer grass will become fairly tall and some lower is needed for the proposed “meadow” areas.
 - Reconsider the proposed Fremontedendron as the deer “go after it.”
- Share lighting concerns of others. Should reduce lighting by at least one half.

ASCC members concurred that the most significant concerns centered on the height on the west side and also the proposed darker color palette. Lesser but important concerns were with the lighting and landscaping issues.

Following discussion, project consideration was continued to the regular September 9, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached office, pool and pool cabana, and Site Development Permit X9H-657, 5 Naranja way, Maffia

Vlasic presented the August 27, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision property. He reviewed the events of the special afternoon joint site meeting with the planning commission on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials and discuss revised plans shared at the site meeting.) Vlasic advised that the ASCC members did not make comments on the proposal during the site meeting and advised that they would do so at the evening meeting.

Mike and Vanessa Maffia, applicants, Richard Beard and Jeremy Butler-Pinkham, project architects, and Kate Sticklely, project landscape architect, were present to discuss their proposals further with ASCC members. Mr. Maffia reiterated the design approach to maintain a low profile and nestle the one story house into the site. He noted that due to the site disturbance for original development, including drainage work, it is a difficult property to work with. He added that he hopes to restore most of the slopes and also the meadow areas and remove much of the non-native plantings.

The project design team presented a PowerPoint presentation of the revised plans and example images shared at the site meeting and further discussed the evolving design concepts for the west side stepped terraces and pool facilities. It was noted that based on further evaluations and site meeting comments there would be further study of bringing the pool closer to the house and reducing the scope of west side fill. It was clarified that this would also be dependent on the final plans for needed drainage modifications.

In response to a question relative to the DG path shown on the site plan, it was noted that the path was to access not only the lower pool area but the proposed south side office. It was also clarified that the driveway and auto court would have a chip seal surface and that

any driveway slopes over 15% would be surface with a material satisfactory to the fire marsh, likely a brushed concrete.

In response to comments relative to fireplace smoke and chimneys, the applicant clarified that the fireplaces would be gas units and, therefore, there would be no smoke, and chimney heights would be minimal and/or the need for chimneys eliminated.

Public comments were requested. **David Strohm and Bev Lipman**, in response to a question from Chair Breen advised that they had no additional **WASC comments** to those offered by Mr. Day at the afternoon site meeting.

Patrick Enright, 171 Mapache Drive, reviewed the drainage concerns he and his wife shared at the afternoon site meeting.

Vlasic advised that drainage and impervious surface plans were still in process of review by town staff and that these would need to be found acceptable by staff prior to the public hearing on the site development permit by the planning commission. He noted that neighbors would receive notice of the public hearing and would have the opportunity to review final grading and drainage plans prior to the hearing and comment on them at the public hearing. He added that at least the final concepts for drainage found acceptable to staff would also need to be identified prior to ASCC action on the architectural review application.

Paul Holland, 170 Mapache Drive, referenced the concerns in his August 22, 2013 letter to the ASCC and also the comments offered at the site meeting. He asked if a project contractor had been identified and Mr. Maffia noted that a final decision on a contractor had not yet been made. Mr. Holland then requested that the applicant be required to construct a full scale site model of the garage, like he was required to do, so that appropriate screen landscape conditions could be determined and that such landscaping should be the burden of the applicant and not an impacted neighbor.

Linda Yates, 170 Mapache Drive, expressed concerns over visual impacts, lighting and noise, and proximity of the proposed house to the northerly property line. The driveway alignment and elevations relative to car light penetration was discussed relative to her concerns.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary project comments:

Hughes:

- Appreciate the design approach for the project and generally supportive of it. It appears, though, that significant additional drainage analysis is necessary.
- Moving the pool and cabana will help relative to the "linear" issues discussed at the site meeting. However, the pool could be closer to the house, and the overall plan for the fill on the west side needs to be more developed and sufficient data provided so it can be clearly understood.
- Consideration should be given to changing the roof over the lanai to a softer form to further help in breaking up the linear mass.
- The clerestory dormer windows increase potential for interior light spill. Interior lighting in the dormer areas needs to be controlled.
- The overall scope of proposed exterior site lighting needs to be significantly reduced to be consistent with town standards and guidelines. Of particular concern is the lighting proposed along the driveway.

- The large north side pine likely should be removed and there needs to be better solutions for screening along the north site. Consideration needs to be given to the possible relocation of some of the oaks now planned to be removed.
- The design for the “gully” drainage solution along the north property line needs to be reconsidered and perhaps the drainage directed more toward Naranja Way.
- Consider saving more trees along the proposed driveway and Naranja Way side of the site. Move the better oaks if they are in conflict with the driveway and office plans.
- Consider removal of the chimney at the office to avoid potential visual presence of the chimney element.

Clark:

- Shares comments regarding the need for more drainage analysis and refined drainage solutions.
- Encourages consideration of moving the proposed development further away from the northerly property line at least a few additional feet.
- The pines should be removed and new landscaping or relocated trees installed for screening early on in project work.
- Supports general approach to site development and property restoration, but appreciates that more study of west fill and pool/cabana plans is needed, as is work on the drainage plans.
- The single story architectural design approach including materials and finishes and narrow building widths is appropriate.
- Chimneys should be kept as low as possible.
- Scope of lighting needs to be reconsidered.

Ross:

- Overall finds the project design appropriate, but it does need more work on the issues identified by other ASCC members, particularly drainage and efforts to address the concerns of the north side neighbors. Over the project at this point it “8.5 out of 10.”
- Main concerns focus on the proximity of outdoor spaces along the northerly property line. The lanai design needs to be reconsidered to enhance privacy between neighbors, perhaps adding a solid wall to the north side.
- The pool should be moved closer to the house for enhanced supervision of children using the pool.
- Overall supports house and garage orientation and the lack of skylights. The outdoor space between the house and garage will not be highly used and should not impact privacy.
- Consideration should be given to some additional lowering in garage height, perhaps an additional two feet.
- The pines should be removed and perhaps the valley oaks moved to the north site. These trees, however, are not necessarily a great screen and some additional shrub planting should be provided to screen views from above. But the new plantings do not need to have great height and should be lower to preserve more distant views from the northerly property.
- Moving the pool uphill should also help in enhancing privacy between properties.
- Shares lighting concerns expressed by others. In particular, the scope of interior lighting relative to the clerestory elements needs to be clarified and controlled to avoid potential for significant evening light spill.
- The office would have a low impact on the site and the pathway to the office appears appropriate.
- The choice of materials and finishes as well as architectural character are appropriate.

Breen:

- Shares comments offered by others, particularly Ross.
- Support the basic design, and it is “almost there.”
- The final landscape plan will be critical to a successful project.
- Considering keeping pines for now, but install replacement material as soon as possible and, hopefully, this fall. Recognizes, however, that it is difficult to grow materials under the pines.
- In any case, new screen planting should be installed immediately after rough grading before the project is complete.
- Not certain moving the valley oaks will achieve much in terms of screening. Perhaps better to bring in new specimen tree with better screening characteristics.
- The architecture and siting are good as is the materials and finishes palette. There is still room to lower the garage height, and the pool should be moved closer to the house.
- Would like to see more effort to “restore” the drainage channel, but the main thing is to get the drainage right for the site and area.
- The scope of lighting needs to be significantly reduced.
- More work is needed relative to the drainage plan along the northerly boundary. The current “swale” plan would result in a very artificial condition.

Members then discussed the neighbors’ request for a full scale mock up of the proposed garage. It was noted that the existing stable provides a good mock up, as do the story poles. These can be used relative to decisions on needed landscaping, and members concurred that at, this time, they would not require the requested full size mock up.

Following preliminary discussion and sharing of comments, project consideration was continued to the regular September 9, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for residential additions and remodeling and new horse-keeping facilities, and Site Development Permit X9H-659, 1155 Westridge Drive, Eckstein-Blum

Vlasic referenced the August 27, 2013 staff report on this proposal for residential additions and remodeling and new horse keeping facilities. He advised that while the project was noticed for consideration at the August 27th ASCC meeting, project review needs to be continued to the September 9, 2013 regular meeting. He explained that this was due to the need for story poles to be installed and the fact that the project architect would be out of town at the time of the 8/27 meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the regular September 9, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Commission and Staff Reports

Vlasic reviewed the tentative agenda for the September 9, 2013 regular ASCC meeting, commenting that story poles should be in place for the project at 1155 Westridge Drive. He added that at least one other new project would likely be on the agenda in addition to the projects continued from the August 27th meeting.

Hughes asked if the ASCC would be considering the use of food trucks and the Farmer’s Market at the town center, i.e., as the town council is now reviewing. Vlasic advised that the town council has assumed responsibility for how the town center would be used and has only referred use proposals to the ASCC for comment if they involved significant, and more

permanent, physical changes to the Center's facilities, e.g., like the installation of the FM emergency broadcast antenna.

Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Hughes, and passed 4-0 approval of the August 12, 2013 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

T. Vlastic