

**Architectural and Site Control Commission & Board of Adjustment May 9, 2005
Special Joint Field Meeting, 243 Canyon Drive, Asborno Appeal of
ASCC approval of Kosling Application, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

The special field meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. at the Asborno property, 265 Canyon Drive.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Chase, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

ASCC Absent: None

Board of Adjustment: Elkind, McKittrick, McIntosh, Wengert, Zaffaroni

Town Council liaison: Comstock

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Manager Lambert

Others present relative to the Asborno appeal of the Kosling Application:

Dean Asborno, 265 Canyon Drive

Karl and Colleen Kosling, 243 Canyon Drive

Nancy Powell, 237 Canyon Drive

Beth Meyer, 4540 Alpine Road

**Board of Adjustment (Planning Commission) Referral for Comment -- Asborno Appeal of
ASCC approval of Architectural Review Plans for 243 Canyon Drive, Kosling**

Vlastic presented the May 5, 2005 staff report on this referral to the ASCC of the subject appeal. He reviewed the discussion that took place at the May 4 Board of Adjustment public hearing and advised that the Board was seeking ASCC comments on the appeal and issues raised in the appeal documents. He also noted that story poles were now in place to facilitate both ASCC and Board of Adjustment consideration of the appeal and proposed revised project. Vlastic further noted that no action is required of the ASCC but only comments and reactions to the appeal issues that ASCC members believe might be helpful to the Board in concluding action on the appeal.

Vlastic then reviewed the revised Kosling plans explaining background to their development and noting that they fully conform to all of the yard setback and height provisions of the zoning ordinance. He discussed the 85% floor area limitation and the ASCC's approval granting the Koslings the ability to place 94% of the permitted floor area in the main structure.

Dean Asborno conducted a tour of his property and explained his concerns with the Kosling project and the reasons for the appeal. He offered the following comments and clarifications:

- While the proposal may be under all of the numerical limits, it will block views from his property as demonstrated by the story poles. Since the story poles were not in place at the time of the ASCC approval, ASCC members could not have been fully aware of the potential impacts and in a case like this, story poles should be in place for a fair consideration of a project.

- While the development proposed on the Kosling property is similar to that on the Asborn property, the Kosling property is deeper and has more opportunity for steeping down the hillside with a lower rear profile. This approach would permit a better fit into the neighborhood.
- As designed, the project will present considerable mass in terms of views from the Asborn property. The visual presence of the addition and view to a large wall will devalue the Asborn property.
- The oak tree on the Kosling property between the addition area and the Asborn house is essential in terms of privacy and view screening. Concerns exist relative to the potential impacts of construction on this tree. All precautions possible should be implemented to protect the tree from construction impacts.
- The ridgeline of the proposed house addition is now two feet higher than the ridgeline of the existing house. The addition should be no higher than the existing ridgeline, even if it means cutting the house further into the site. At one point the neighbors advised the Koslings that if the proposed ridgeline were lowered at least 19 inches, they would find the project acceptable. The Koslings did not agree to this lowering so this solution is "no longer on the table."
- Additional screen landscaping is needed to reduce the potential view and massing impacts. Everything possible needs to be done to soften the potential view impacts of the addition to the neighboring properties.

Following review of concerns by Mr. Asborn, the other neighbors present shared their similar concerns and also commented on the ASCC review "noticing" provisions. It was noted by staff that ASCC reviews include a courtesy notice of neighbors within 300 feet and this is mailed six days prior to the ASCC meeting. It was also noted that the assessor's rolls are used for the mailing. Nancy Powell stated that the mailing was sent to her former husband. Beth Meyer stated she was away the week before the ASCC meeting on the Kosling application and did not return or find out about it until after the ASCC action had been completed.

Board members commented that perhaps a longer noticing period should be considered.

After review of view conditions from the Asborn property, all persons present visited the Powell property to inspect views from the rear deck area back to the proposed Kosling addition area. Ms. Powell reviewed her concerns over the proposed height, also asking that the addition be no higher than the existing roofline. She discussed her privacy concerns and specifically asked for elimination of the proposed upper level walkway on the north side of the kitchen. She shared a copy of the proposed two-story section and questioned the proposed plate and peak inside ceiling heights. It was noted that the proposed lower level plate height was 8 feet and the upper level plate height was nine feet.

After visiting the Powell property, all present proceeded to the rear yard area on the Kosling property. At that point, discussion took place between the Koslings and their neighbors as to the history of sharing "future" building plans. Opinions differed as to what information the Koslings actually provided to the neighbors.

Mr. Kosling also responded to the neighbor's comments and requests as follows:

- After the ASCC January approval, the plans were modified to the current design to address neighbors concerns. Further, the story poles requested by neighbors were installed. They were initially placed incorrectly, but eventually properly located.
- The addition design, including roof forms, setbacks from side and rear yards, and recent adjustments were all developed to accommodate the desire to work with the neighborhood. The proposed house is very similar to the sizes of the houses located on the two neighboring parcels and the proposed additions are relatively modest.
- Lowering the addition height by two feet will cause some more significant impacts to the architectural design and could result in less desirable roof forms, but this will be discussed with the project architect. Also, the desire is not to do additional grading in the rear yard area or to cut the lower level further into the site.
- The oak tree of concern to Mr. Asborno is of great importance to the project and every effort will be made to protect it. An arborist has already been involved and will continue to guide development of detailed plans to ensure the best foundation design for tree protection.

Board members asked for ASCC reactions.

Breen and Schilling acknowledged that prior to completing action on the request, they asked the Koslings about interaction with their neighbors. They both noted that from the discussions with the applicants, they concluded that the plans had been shared with neighbors and the neighbors supported the plans. They both stated these discussions and the fact that most neighbors were not present at the January meeting influenced their action on the project.

Chase noted that the ASCC does not always require story poles to be installed prior to acting on a request and that story poles are an optional element under the provisions of the zoning ordinance. She commented that in many cases, based on experience and knowledge, ASCC members can judge potential project impacts without the need for story poles. She also commented that the proposed design has jogs in the walls, pulls away from the property lines and has sloped roof forms facing most of the neighbors. These original design elements, as well as the changes made since the January approval, including the lowering of the patio cover, hiping of the rear roof and elimination of the upper elevation window, further enhance how the house fits the area. She did offer, however, that some additional lowering of the proposed roof ridge and screen landscaping should be considered.

Warr noted it was a difficult neighborhood to design in, given the close relationships between houses and the varied topography. He appreciated the story poles now in place and advised they help reinforce his original position that the general approach to the addition design is appropriate and to be supported. He also provided the following observations:

- The project relationship to the neighbors could be improved with lowering of the proposed ridge height by at least one foot. This could be accomplished by a change in plate height and/or grading the addition further into the site.
- Additional screen planting is needed to provide for privacy and soften views. The main view issues are relative to the Asborn property and the rear yard area on the Powell property.
- It is possible that elimination of the proposed walkway on the north side would help improve privacy relationships.

He concluded that where the addition is on the site "makes sense" and that this is the most appropriate location for the addition. He commented that some further adjustments would, however, improve relationships and noted that the items offered above were viewed as a list of possible changes and that not all of them would necessarily be needed.

Breen and Schilling agreed with many of the comments offered by Warr and Chase, and specifically encouraged lowering of the proposed roof ridge and additional screen planting.

Gelpi concurred with the comments offered by other ASCC members. He noted he was not present at the time of the original project approval, but after visiting the site concurred that the planned addition location is appropriate and proper in terms of general neighborhood conditions. He stated his preference for leaving the rear part of the property open. He also concurred with the recommendations for lowering of the proposed roof ridge and additional screen planting.

Chairman McIntosh and other Board members thanked the all the neighbors present and the ASCC for their comments. He recommended that the neighbors continue to work together to resolve the remaining issues and inform the Board of the status of this effort at the May 18 planning commission meeting. Individual Board members also offered the following comments:

Wengert stated she generally supported the comments offered by Warr and hoped the neighbors could find a mutually agreeable solution to the concerns expressed at the site meeting.

Elkind noted the project would have view impacts and that lowering of the roof ridge and additional screen planting, in particular, were needed.

Zaffaroni advised that the ASCC was the design review committee and that typically she prefers deferring subjective design considerations to the ASCC. She also stated her hope that the neighbors would find a way to resolve the concerns between themselves. She added, however, that her biggest concern was the short noticing period and offered that the town should probably review this.

McKettrick concurred with the comments of the ASCC members and noted that the general approach to the design of the addition appeared appropriate given site and area conditions. He added that the design and size of the house were similar to the improvements on the

neighboring properties, and that the Koslings were not seeking anything out of character with the neighborhood.

McIntosh encouraged the Koslings to consider the changes, particularly lowering of the proposed roof ridge height, suggested at the meeting.

After discussion, the public hearing of the Board was continued to the May 18 planning commission meeting.

Chase advised that the ASCC did not intend to discuss the matter further at the evening ASCC meeting. She clarified, however, that since the matter was noticed, anyone wanting to comment on it at the evening meeting would be given the opportunity to do so.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the site meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: Merk
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Architectural Review -- Proposed Residential redevelopment of Westridge parcel and Site Development Permit X9H-536, 118 Solana Road, Avery

Vlastic presented the May 5, 2005 staff report on this request. He noted that ASCC project review had been initiated on April 25, 2005 and then continued to the May 9 meeting with specific comments on data needs and suggestions for project modifications. Vlastic explained that in response, the applicant corrected the placement of story poles at the site and submitted the following revised plans and materials, unless otherwise noted dated 5/4/05 and prepared by Taylor Lombardo Architects:

Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet, Project Index
Sheet A2.1, Basement Plan
Sheet A2.2, First Floor Plan
Sheet A2.3, Second Floor Plan
Sheet A2.5, Pool Pavilion Plans & Elevations
Sheet A2.4, Roof Plan
Sheet A3.1, Building Elevations
Sheet A3.2, Building Elevations
Sheet L-1, Landscape Site Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc.
Sheet L-2, Planting Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc.
Sheet L-3, Impervious Surface Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc.
Sheet LP-1, Lighting Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc.

Sheet 1, Preliminary Grading Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 5/2/05
Sheet 2, (Grading Plan) Notes and Details, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 5/2/05
"Exterior Colors and Materials " and colored renderings for the south and north elevations. These materials will be presented at the ASCC meeting

Vlastic advised that the project architect also submitted a May 4, 2005 letter explaining the project adjustments. He then referred to the April 27, 2005 letter from Anthony and Joan Lazzara, 1080 Westridge Drive stating view impact issues with respect to the proposed new second story and photos submitted by the neighbors to demonstrate their concerns. Also

referenced was the April 29, 2005 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Avery responding to the concerns with a panorama photograph of the views from the terrace area on the Lazzara property. Vlastic advised that both sets of photographs show the story poles and taping installed to demonstrate the potential view impacts. After review of the photographs, it was noted that both sets were taken prior to the most recent correction to the placement of the story poles.

Mr. and Mrs. Avery, project architect Tom Taylor and landscape Architect Tom Klope were present to discuss the revised proposal. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Samples of the revised palette of proposed exterior materials and finishes were presented.
- It was noted that the plans were developed to minimize the second story areas and that the roof form and height over the living and dining room areas was desired to achieve a special character for these spaces. It was pointed out that all of the proposals are well within the height limits for the property.
- The pool house includes a 10 foot plate height to accommodate the placement of the eight foot high trellis under the eave. It is a very low profile design.
- The chimneys conform to the desired architecture and the number is reflective of the indoor and outdoor use patterns of the applicants.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Jim Ashford, son-in-law of Mr. and Mrs. Lazzara, 1080 Westridge Drive, reviewed the comments in the 4/27 letter and stressed that the view impacts, as demonstrated by the story poles would be significant. He asked for elimination of the proposed second story or for it to be shifted to the west end of the proposed house.

Janice Toben, daughter-in-law of Mr. and Mrs. Lazzara, 1080 Westridge Drive, spoke on behalf of the Lazzaras and stressed her opposition to the view impacts of the proposal. She noted that the design would impact views from both the interior areas of the Lazzara house and key outdoor areas. She encouraged ASCC members to view the conditions from the Lazzara property.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and the remaining issues. Most members noted they had inspected the revised placement of story poles and that they were able to consider views from the Lazzara property. Based on this information, ASCC members concluded that additional design work was needed to reduce the height of the proposed second story and, overall reduce the potential for impacts to views from the Lazzara property.

After review of the various aspects of the proposal, ASCC members concluded that the proposed site plan was "excellent" and that most of the revisions made since the April 25 meeting fully addressed the specific issues they were intended to resolve. Further, after review of the pool house height and chimney matters, ASCC members generally concluded the designs would be acceptable as proposed if the main house height issues are resolved.

At the conclusion of the discussion, ASCC members concurred that the only remaining issue was the height issues associated with the main house. The project architect was directed to lower the heights to reduce view impacts. It was specifically stated that the two-story portion might be graded into the site to achieve a lower height and that a reduction of plate heights should also be considered. The architect was also encouraged to consider design options that would allow lowering of the ridge height over the living and dining room areas.

After discussion, project review was continued to the May 23 meeting with direction that this review would take place at a 4:00 p.m. site meeting. It was noted that if the recommended height reductions are achieved with plan revisions, the ASCC would be prepared to complete action on the project at the conclusion of the site meeting.

Board of Adjustment Referral for comment -- Asborno Appeal of ASCC approval of Architectural Review Plans for 243 Canyon Drive, Kosling

It was noted that the ASCC had completed review of and comment on this referral item at the afternoon site meeting with the Board of Adjustment (see above site meeting minutes). Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for new residence, 445 Golden Oak Drive, Migdal

Vlasic presented the May 5, 2005 report on the subject follow-up submittal. He advised that on July 26, 2004, the ASCC conditionally approved plans for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.3 acre Alpine Hills property and that the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/31/05 have been submitted to address the approval conditions:

- Sheet A0.1, Title Sheet
- Grading and Drainage Plan, AC&H Civil Engineering, 12-2004
- Landscape Plan, Winterbotham Partnership, 3/11/05
- Sheet A2.1, First Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Second Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.3, Basement Floor Plan
- Sheet A3.1, Ceiling and Roof Plans and Calcs
- Sheet A4.1, Framing Sections
- Sheet A5.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.2, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet D1, Door Details (with photos of proposed architectural detailing)
- Sheet D2, Window Details
- Sheet D3, Roof Details
- Sheet D4, Exterior Details

April 18, 2005 letter from the applicant explaining the proposed site plan changes and other aspects of the submittal including tree removal proposals.

Arborist report dated September 27, 2004, prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company

Vlasic advised that a tree protection and erosion control plan was developed and approved by town staff and is being implemented as demolition of the "existing" house on the site is currently in process.

Vlasic also explained that the required site development permit had only recently been filed and that staff review of the proposed grading was still underway. He requested that the ASCC comment on the revised plans and new scope of grading and provide directions, as appropriate, regarding the proposal, and then continue plan review to the May 23 regular meeting.

Mark Migdal and project designer Anthony Ho presented the follow-up submittal. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The proposed grading plan will be revised to address the concerns raised in the staff report. The scope and height of the proposed retaining walls will be reduced as will the extent of the proposed level outdoor areas.
- The plans, including need for tree removal have been discussed with project neighbors and they appear supportive of the proposal. It is believed that the visual impacts of the proposed level areas will, in any case, be minimal.
- House demolition is now underway, it is hoped that the ASCC can complete the current review process as soon as possible so that work on the new house can proceed.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed terrace areas would likely be planted with lawn and some ornamental plantings.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Michael Friedman, 435 Golden Oak Drive, indicated his support for the overall project, but expressed concern with the current grading and retaining wall plans. He noted he was not entirely clear as to the scope of grading and tree impacts and would like to have a better understanding of the plans. He also expressed concern over the stability of the banks above the local creek "ravine" and any lighting associated with the proposed retaining walls. He reminded the applicant that the original plans approved by the ASCC called for vines to be planted to grow on portions of the north facing exterior walls of the house.

Graciela De Pierris, 435 Golden Oak Drive, also expressed concern with the project changes and clarity of the revised plans. She was concerned with the fact that the demolition process had started with some apparently significant new plan issues unresolved.

William Bigas, 20 Minoca Road stated his support for the project and his wish that project construction could proceed as soon as possible. He also noted that many of the oaks in the area are very old and in decline. He supported removal of the trees at risk and replacement with young, healthy trees that, in time, would provide the needed screening.

Richard Merk council liaison and liaison to the conservation committee commented that the plan data regarding tree impacts needs to be clarified on the plans referred to the

conservation committee. It was noted that more data is needed with respect to the grading proposals and their impacts on the existing trees that are to be preserved.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and agreed that the grading plans needed to be considerably scaled back. They advised that the plans should be more consistent with the conceptual site plans originally approved for the project and that tree impacts needed to be clearly articulated. The following comments were also offered:

- A much more organic approach to the grading scheme is needed. Any retaining walls should be considerably lower than what is suggested by the current plans.
- A much greater effort is needed to ensure tree preservation than is suggested by the current grading design. The current plans call for very deep wells around some trees. This approach seems to jeopardize the potential for long-term tree health.
- The grading and landscaping plans need to be fully coordinated.
- A complete exterior lighting plan is needed as called for in the staff report.
- The proposed front yard screen planting needs to be more extensive. The proposed 15 gallon size Madrone trees are not adequate to accomplish the necessary screening of views.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the May 23 meeting with the understanding that the project plans would be revised to address the comments articulated at the ASCC meeting and in the May 5 staff report.

Architectural Review for Minor House Addition, 4 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 35), Blue Oaks Subdivision, Benhayon

Vlasic presented the May 5, 2005 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 64 sf of new floor area on the upper level of the exiting two-story house on the subject 1.98 acre Blue Oaks property. He advised that the Blue Oaks PUD requires all building permits for additions to be reviewed and approved by the ASCC and then reviewed the following "Benhayon Residence" plans dated 4/14/05 submitted for ASCC consideration:

- Proposed Second Floor Plan
- Proposed First Floor Plan
- Front Elevation
- Right Side Elevation
- Site Plan

Vlasic advised that all new construction would fully match existing improvements, including all exterior materials and finishes, i.e., as explained in the staff report.

Steven Benhayon presented his proposal to the ASCC. He clarified that the actual floor area of the existing house is 4,920 sf and provided data from the house building permit plans to support the clarification. He noted that this number is 198 sf less than stated in the staff

report. He also clarified that the design of the addition has been adjusted to minimize potential for impacts on the tree adjacent to the house entry.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the condition that the existing oak at the house entry be protected from construction impacts to the satisfaction of planning staff. In taking the action, it was acknowledged that one tree limb may require some trimming and this would be permitted as long as the work was done under the direction of the project arborist.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling, 415 Golden Oak Drive, Weber

Vlasic presented the May 5, 2005 staff report on this proposal for addition to and remodeling of an existing Modern style residence on the subject 1.9 acre Alpine Hills property. He explained that the project proposes new construction of a garage and second story bedroom and bathroom off of the northern corner of the existing structure as well as interior remodeling and some grading and landscaping. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Kent Harvey:

- DWG# 1, Topographical Plan, prepared by Lee Engineers, Inc., 11/15/04
- DWG# 2, Existing Floor Plan, 3/28/05
- DWG# 3, Proposed Floor Plan, 3/28/05
- DWG# 4, Elevations Front and Rear, 3/28/05
- DWG# 5, Elevations Sides, 3/28/05
- DWG #6, Landscape Plan, 3/28/05

Also considered were the proposed exterior colors palette received April 11, 2005 and the 4/6/05 cut-sheet for the proposed Kichler Lighting #9672AZ exterior light fixture.

Steve Weber and project representative Vincent Armando presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Based on staff recommendations, story poles were installed to demonstrate the height of the proposed second story addition. The addition will be slightly visible from along the front side of the property, but has been located to be as unobtrusive as possible from surrounding properties. Existing nearby tree cover will help limit visibility to the addition.
- The lower, "basement," area of the house has a total floor area of 449 sf. This means that this added to house will be 114 sf over the 85% floor area limit. As pointed out in the staff report, the approach to placement of floor area is desired due to constraints imposed by slope, geology and tree cover.
- The plans call for grading along the west parcel boundary to widen the driveway. As currently designed, a fir tree would need to be removed. The final driveway plan will reduce the scope of grading and extent of proposed retaining wall. The plan now is to specifically save the fir tree.

- The proposed exterior colors will be modified to conform to the town's policy limits on reflectivity.
- Every effort will be made to protect the oaks in the area proposed for grading and retaining wall work associated with the garage and driveway extension.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Most ASCC members indicated they had an opportunity to visit the site and view the story poles placed for the proposed second story addition. Schilling advised he was able to view the poles from the uphill property (i.e., to the west) and discuss the plan with the uphill neighbor. He added that she did have some concern over what she would see, and wondered about window areas.

Mr. Weber advised that there would be no upper level windows facing the uphill neighbor, and added that this approach was taken to ensure privacy.

ASCC members expressed some concern over the clarity of the proposed plans. After discussion of exterior lighting and other issues, Members concluded that due to slope, geology and tree cover; they could make the findings to permit the proposed concentration of floor area. Thereafter, Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final engineered grading plan shall be provided that clearly shows the proposed improvements, including retaining wall details, associated with the proposed garage and driveway improvements. The retaining wall materials shall be clearly specified.
2. An alternative light fixture shall be specified that shall include a covered top.
3. The exterior colors palette shall be revised to conform to the color reflectivity policy limits of the town to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
4. The existing "globe" lights on the top of the two entry gate columns shall be removed and no new lights shall be installed at the columns.
5. The existing house mounted spot lights shall be removed with completion of this project.
6. An arborist report shall be provided to ensure that adequate precautions are taken to protect trees from construction impacts. The recommendations of the arborist shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the planning staff.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling, 381 Portola Road, Cheng

Vlasic presented the May 5, 2005 staff report on this proposal for substantial remodeling of and additions to the existing residence on the subject .34 acre Brookside Orchard parcel. He reviewed the history of parcel use and previous plans approved by the ASCC in 2001 for

development of a new house on the property. Vlastic advised that as with the 2001 plans, the current project would concentrate all of the permitted floor area in the only structure on the property and for this to occur, the ASCC must make special findings as evaluated in the staff report. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials received May 4, 2005, prepared by F.R. Strathdee & Associates, Architecture and Planning:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 2, Main Level Floor Plan
- Sheet 3, Basement Floor Plan
- Sheet 4, Roof Plan
- Sheet 5, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet 6, Exterior Elevations, Roof Plan and Site Section
- Sheet 7, House Sections
- Colors and materials board
- Light fixture cut sheet for the proposed step lights, received 2/17/05

Mr. and Cheng and Fred Strathdee were present to discuss their plans with ASCC members. They advised that the plans would be adjusted to address the color and lighting issues raised in the staff report. It was also noted that the current plans were developed to address setback and daylight plane height limit issues identified by staff during review of an earlier set of proposed plans.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Tracie Law (?), 117 Brookside Drive, stated she recently moved to the neighborhood and was very concerned about the safety of driving from Brookside Drive on to Portola Road from the intersection immediately east of the Cheng property. She wondered if some trimming of vegetation, a safety mirror or other actions might be implemented to improve sight distance. She also stated concern with the potential impacts of house addition construction activities further impacting safety with the use of the intersection.

Dan Cornew, 182 Brookside Drive also raised concern with safe use of the intersection with Brookside Drive and Portola Road and the need for a carefully developed construction staging plan. He stated some concern with the size of the proposed roof area, visual impact on neighbors and need for additional screen planting along the southern property line common with 199 Brookside Drive.

Louise Ringo, 199 Brookside Drive, shared concerns with the scale of the proposed remodeled house, and compatibility of the size and design with other houses in the neighborhood.

Rosalie Cornew, 182 Brookside Drive, shared the traffic safety concerns expressed by others and also commented that the proposal seemed out of scale with other houses in the neighborhood. She also noted that when Mr. Nash owned the subject property, it was believed he buried gas cans and other potentially explosive containers on the site and that there have been incidents of "explosions" on the property.

Richard Merk, Brookside Drive, thanked the Chengs for developing a plan with less site and area impacts than the plan proposed in 2001. He did, however, share concerns over construction impacts on safety of use of Brookside Drive, and stressed there should be no construction parking along the private street and that the construction activities should avoid any conflicts with potential for emergency vehicle access in the neighborhood. He also expressed some concern with the size of the remodeled house, and suggested some reduction in the scope of proposed exterior lighting.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and agreed that a comprehensive construction staging plan was essential to address the comments of the neighbors. It was noted however, that some of the sight distance issues would likely need to be discussed with the traffic committee and the town's public works director.

ASCC members also agreed that revisions to the lighting plans were needed and plans for some additional screen planting along the southern parcel boundary should be developed and implemented.

Warr commented that while he found the project to generally be a well-designed proposal, he was concerned with the scope of the roof area and its mass and visual impact. He recommended a lower roof pitch and that other adjustments be considered to reduce the size and height of the roof area. He stressed that the existing house has more of a "cottage" character and the recommended roof adjustments were needed to retain this character. He also expressed some concern with the design of the enclosed stone faced support area under the north elevation covered porch.

All other ASCC members concurred with Warr's comments. After discussion, it was agreed that project review should be continued to the May 23 meeting to permit the project architect the opportunity to revise the plans to address, in particular, the roof massing concerns. Mr. Strathdee advised that he would have revised plans prepared in time for consideration at the May 23 ASCC meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Schilling moved, seconded by Warr and passed 5-0 approval of the April 25, 2005 meeting minutes with the following correction:

In the last line on page 6, correct the spelling "Schilling."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

T. Vlastic