

ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION

March 23, 2015

Special Joint ASCC/Planning Commission Site Meeting, 3 Buck Meadow Drive, Preliminary Architectural Review for New Residence, Green House, Swimming Pool, and Site Development Permit X9H-687

Chair Ross called the special site meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross
ASCC absent: None
Planning Commission: Gilbert, McKitterick, Von Feldt
Planning Commission absent: Hasko, Targ
Town Council Liaison: None
Town Staff: Town Planner Pedro, Assistant Planner Borck

Others present relative to the proposal for 3 Buck Meadow Drive:

Tracy Ross, applicant
Bill Maston, project architect
Leah Bayer, project architect
John Banister, project General Contractor
Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee
Jason and Jessica Pressman, 127 Ash
Kelly Heath, project architect for 127 Ash
John Toor, 2 Buck Meadow Drive

Ms. Borck presented the March 23, 2015 staff report on this preliminary review of the proposed new residence and site improvements. She advised that the project will involve 1,384 cubic yards of grading that counts towards the site development permit and that the Planning Commission is the approving body on the permit. She stated that the proposed development is generally centered within the building envelope and that the project complied with all height, setback, and floor area regulations. Ms. Borck explained that the site is located within the Combination Zone of Blue Oaks and that the proposed design appears to respond to the required provisions of that zone. She emphasized that the proposed basement was being proposed with a patio-style light well and that the zoning ordinance does allow for additional provisions for light, ventilation, and access to a basement if the ASCC finds that the provisions will not be visible from adjoining or nearby properties. She noted that the light well wall would extend approximately 42 inches above grade and that the ASCC should consider the proposed wall in relation to its location and the proposed landscape screening that would soften views to it from Buck Meadow Drive.

Bill Maston, project architect, provided the background to the development of the design concept and explained the layout of the story poles. He advised that the applicant was proposing the use of the Private Open Space Easement (POSE) for construction staging and parking. He explained that using the POSE appeared to be the most viable approach to developing the lot due to the extensive earthwork that would be required and the difficulty in getting the equipment into the site while still protecting the blue oaks that are proposed to be preserved with the project. He then led the commissioners through the site to view the story poles and existing conditions. In response to questions, Mr. Maston stated that:

- The utilities would likely come up the driveway; however, if the POSE were used for staging, the utilities could be drawn through the easement.
- The plan for construction staging within the POSE would involve installing a 30-foot wide temporary rock road up into the open meadow. The meadow would not be graded. After the excavation for foundations is complete, the rock area in the open space easement would be retained for construction parking and material storage.
- The equipment cannot adequately access the site from the front of the property (outside of the POSE) as the approach is not long enough for trucks to come in to unload. Coming in from the

front of the property at the proposed driveway would also not allow enough clearance between equipment and protected trees.

Commissioner Koch questioned whether the POSE could be used for staging. Mr. Maston stated that he believed the Homeowner's Association had approved such use in the past. Commissioner Breen expressed her concern for the number of tree removals required to accomplish the project and asked Mr. Maston to help her understand the reasons for the removals. Mr. Maston further explained the adjustments that had been made to the home's design in order to save existing trees and respond to neighbor's view concerns. He stated that it was a balance of determining the priority of which trees to save and which to remove. He advised that the rear patio needed to be dug down approximately 10 feet and that the trees in that area could not be saved due to the impacts to root systems. He explained that pulling the rear walls closer to the house would not improve this situation because the root systems would still be impacted by the excavation.

In response to a question, Mr. Maston clarified that there would be approximately 2,500 cubic yards of dirt to be off-hauled from the property.

Chair Ross invited public comments, but none were offered.

ASCC members agreed that they would offer comments on the proposal at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Planning Commissioners in attendance held their comments and will submit them via email to Planning staff. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:45 p.m.

(1) CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ross called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House Meeting Room, 765 Portola Road.

(2) ROLL CALL

Town Planner Pedro called roll:

Present: ASCC: Breen, Clark, Koch, Harrell, Ross,
Absent: None
Planning Commission Liaison: Denise Gilbert
Town Council Liaison: Maryann Moise Derwin
Town Staff: Public Works Director Howard Young, Town Planner Debbie Pedro, Assistant Planner Carol Borck

(3) ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

(4) OLD BUSINESS

(a) **Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for driveway and bridge over the Ford Field Access Easement, APN: 077-272-010**

Ms. Pedro presented the proposed project and staff recommendations for a driveway and bridge to be constructed within a 30-foot easement on Ford Field in order to access the applicant's property located across Los Trancos Creek in Santa Clara County. The ASCC conducted preliminary review of the proposal on March 9, 2015. Ms. Pedro reviewed the key concerns discussed by the ASCC including:

- Require the removal of the structures when they become obsolete. (Condition #4)
- Mitigate potential safety impacts to park users during construction. Ms. Pedro reported there are no specific items currently stated, but it could include rerouting of the traffic or closure of trails during construction. (Condition #6)
- Install markers at the equestrian trail crossing to warn drivers about the path. Ms. Pedro said there are two paths currently crossing the easement – the C-1 Trail, a paved asphalt path, and the equestrian trail located further back towards the creek. Ms. Pedro said the applicant conferred with staff regarding appropriate markers. A 6" x 6" post approximately 3-1/2' tall is proposed to be placed on either side of the driveway. (Condition #8)
- Consider the option of a gravel driveway that extends to the edge of pavement on Alpine Road. Ms. Pedro said because the code specifically requires that the Planning Commission approve any exception to the requirement of the first 20' of driveway to be paved with asphalt or concrete, staff offered the option of allowing a temporary gravel driveway which would be replaced with asphalt when the vacant lot is developed.

In closing, Ms. Pedro noted that since half of the bridge is in Santa Clara County, the Town cannot issue a building permit until all County permits are obtained by the applicant. She said the ASCC approval is valid for two years, and all building permits must be obtained prior to the expiration of the ASCC approval.

Commissioner Koch asked for the reason of the Town requirement for asphalt paving at the Alpine Road entrance. Ms. Pedro said usually the first 20 feet of a driveway is outside of the property line and in the

road right-of-way, as in this case. She said that when a Public Works project is completed and they need to replace or repair a driveway within a right of way, asphalt is used rather than trying to match a material the property owner may have used. She said the second reason for the code is aesthetic consistency so that as you drive down a road corridor, at least the first 20 feet will be asphalt regardless of what materials the property owners use for the rest of their driveways.

Commissioner Clark asked about the timeline for obtaining and permit from Santa Clara County. Carter Warr, project architect, said they have received a memo from Santa Clara County stating that the County will issue a permit to build the bridge upon receipt of conditional approval from Portola Valley.

Commissioner Clark asked how the removal of the wood fence fronting Portola Road was being approached. Mr. Warr said they will remove only the amount fence necessary to provide for the 12-foot driveway and 2-foot shoulders.

Commissioner Koch asked how access across the bridge will be restricted until the new house is under construction. Mr. Warr said access would likely be restricted by a chain between two posts.

Mr. Warr expressed his appreciation for the Commission's patience and kindness in reviewing their application, especially in light of the confusing and frustrating cross-jurisdictional issues.

Chair Ross asked for public comment.

Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee, asked if the bridge could be shifted to the left to save the oak tree that is located to its right (since the bay tree on the left is proposed for removal). Mr. Warr advised that due to the location of the oak tree within the 30' easement and the necessary alignment of the driveway and bridge, that the tree will need to be removed.

With no further public comments, Chair Ross brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Vice Chair Harrell supported the bridge design. She recommended that they make an effort to eradicate the poison oak.

Commissioner Koch agreed that the bridge design makes sense and she supported the use of gravel at the driveway apron. She added that the proposed trail markers were acceptable and that a barrier would need to be installed at the bridge entrance.

Commissioner Clark offered support for all the conditions in the staff report with the inclusion of a condition to install a traffic barrier to the bridge.

Chair Ross asked if the rail fence could be restored until the time a development permit is issued for the property. Mr. Warr said the preferred solution would be a chain between fence posts in alignment with the fence. Alternately, he said a demountable fence could be installed.

Commissioner Breen stated that she supports the project, the proposed conditions of approval, and the installation of the demountable fence.

Chair Ross expressed support for the project and called for a motion.

Commissioner Koch moved to approve the project with the conditions stated in the staff report, and the inclusion of a condition for a demountable fence at Alpine Road that matches the existing fence. Seconded by Vice Chair Harrell, the motion carried 5-0.

(b) Discussion of Options for Proposed Retaining Wall on Alpine Road

Ms. Pedro introduced the project and advised that Mr. Howard Young, Public Works Director, and Mr.

John Wallace, Principal Engineering Geologist of Cotton, Shires & Associates, Inc., were present to review the retaining wall design options of the shoulder widening project on Alpine Road.

Mr. Young described the history and background of the project. He stated it began with a feasibility study for bike lanes that was requested by the Town Council, which was analyzed by the Bicycle Pedestrian Traffic Safety (BPTS) Committee. The committee recommended the widening of the shoulder to create a wider bike lane in approximately 30 areas on Alpine Road and Portola Road. In most areas, the 5-foot-wide shoulders can be accomplished by resurfacing the road, narrowing the lanes, or change the striping. He said, however, there are locations that require additional consideration – including the intersection of Alpine Road and Arastradero Road and in front of the Town Center. Due to lane configurations at those two locations, the 5-foot-wide shoulders could not be easily accommodated. Subsequently, he said, the Town received the SMTA grant funds necessary to complete a widening project on Alpine Road, and began the geological studies with Cotton, Shires & Associates.

Mr. Young then presented the slide show and described existing types of walls in the Town's right of way and the nine options that were laid out in the staff report. Mr. Young explained that the Town Council would like to begin finalizing a design at the April 22 Town Council meeting with the goal of starting construction this summer.

In response to a question regarding the benefits of the wood wall option, Mr. Wallace advised that the wood has a design life of 30 to 50 years, and if it deteriorates or is damaged, it can be easily replaced.

Commissioner Breen asked why the Town was moving forward so quickly with the project if the deadline for using the grant money is 2019. Mr. Young said that there is a desire by the BPTS Committee and the Town Council to enhance the shoulder on Alpine Road, and the Council has directed that the project be completed. Commissioner Breen commented that there are existing options for cyclists including a trail located above the site, and the C-1 trail across the street. Mr. Young advised that the trail above the site is a horse trail and bikes are not allowed, and while the C-1 trail is available for bicyclists, it is for off-road bikes.

Vice Chair Harrell noted her support to provide safety for the many bicyclists.

Commissioner Koch asked if there were any cost-prohibitive reasons for using or avoiding any of the options. Mr. Young said the grant application was developed using the wood lagging option. He said that the original grant application specification of 500 feet of wall has been reduced to approximately 400 feet, and that cost savings can be used to explore some of the other more expensive design options.

Commissioner Clark asked about the existing condition of the sandstone outcropping at the narrowest point. Mr. Wallace advised that the cuts into the hill do not need to be very extensive and the walls can taper to the north and south. He noted that the Arastradero Road intersection has the narrowest shoulder and the weakest rock.

Commissioner Breen asked if Option 2 (grading only) was feasible without putting up a wall. Mr. Wallace said the grading option would involve either reducing the slope angle or pushing the entire cut back in its current form. He said that while it is feasible, it involves taking out all the trees and vegetation and actually pushes the slope back beyond the Town's right of way.

Commissioner Koch asked if there was any material in the hillside that could be integrated into the new wall. Mr. Wallace said it may be a viable option that they are already exploring.

Vice Chair Harrell asked if the small berm in front of an existing wood lagging retaining wall along Portola Road was composed of loose rock and whether the berm material would cause a problem to bicyclists in rainy weather. Mr. Young said it is compacted dirt engineered to stay in place.

Chair Ross invited public comments.

Mr. Warr asked Mr. Young and Mr. Wallace to see a section diagram for Option 2. Mr. Wallace noted that if the angle is steepened, the slope will have more instability than currently exists. He clarified that Option 2 recommends pushing the entire slope back and lowering the angle.

Joyce Shefren, Trails Committee, advised that the upper trail is an equestrian trail and asked if Option 2 would affect the equestrians heading toward Golden Oak Drive. Mr. Young said that a wall would not affect the equestrian trail, but if the slope was cut back under Option 2, that there would be no place to put the trail because they would run out of right-of-way.

Vice Mayor Derwin said that the Town council was advised that the intersection is unsafe for bicyclists and needed to be corrected. The project was vetted through the BPTS and the Town Council. The grant process was very competitive, and she is very pleased that the Town was awarded a grant for this project.

There being no further comments from the public, Chair Ross asked the Commission for comments that would be forwarded to the Town Council.

Vice Chair Harrell stated that the wood wall and the shotcrete wall are not aesthetically acceptable choices. She offered support for the steel I-beam and concrete lagging walls. She noted that the retaining wall with rock facing (Photograph F) looked too urban. She said the CMU wall with stacked rock facing looked more natural. She said if the wall needed to be high, then the crib wall with plantings would be a better choice than wood.

Commissioner Clark expressed support for the steel I-beams with wood infill design. He supported limiting the wall to 4 feet high and placing an earthen berm in front of it. He stated he did not support a rock or concrete wall solution.

Commissioner Breen stated that she was not aware of any traffic studies, evidence of injuries, or police reports identifying a problem at this intersection. She agreed that there is a consistency to the steel I-beams with wood infill in town. She stated that she did not support seeing a wood and metal wall at this location where the existing stone outcroppings are a beautiful, natural feature. She expressed concern that this project could set a precedent for future walls. She wondered if the lanes could instead be narrowed and the slope cut back rather than installing a retaining wall.

Commissioner Koch said that although she does recognize the potential danger of the narrow shoulder, she is also concerned about this becoming a precedent for the future of Alpine Road and Portola Road. She said she notices the steel I-beam and wood lagging wall at Windy Hill because it is an unnatural element and prefers something more organic such as native boulders and not a formal wall. She said the CMU wall is acceptable but it would be difficult to achieve the vintage look. She stated she did not support a crib wall design.

Vice Chair Harrell stated she would prefer a stone wall that was made to look vintage. She said a wood wall is visually demanding, and the proposed wall should not draw attention to itself.

Chair Ross said he was aware of the bike lane study and aware of the distinction between a shoulder and a bike lane. He said there are no official bike lanes in Portola Valley, and the shoulders are used by bicyclists who do not feel safe riding on the road. He agrees that the intersection is a pinch point that should be corrected. He said he would like to see a variegated wall surface with outcroppings of competent rock with interrupted sections of retaining wall for the pockets of incompetent material. He said that while it may make for a more complicated project, it would make for a nicer entryway to Portola Valley from Arastradero than a monolithic wall. He said that if an unbroken wall design is required, then steel beams with lagging might be the best solution and could be done in a way that respects the existing sandstone formation.

Chair Ross said if it were possible to modify Option #2, removing as little material as possible and

minimizing the use of any retaining wall, and reducing the 420 lineal feet down to six different sections that add up to 110 feet, it would be a beautiful solution.

Mr. Wallace said that the exposure of the sandstone can be maximized by cleaning it off with high pressure air. However, he noted that it is a 200-foot stretch that will be very difficult to break up, but that further exploration can be carried out.

Commissioner Koch suggested that the design utilize the natural outcroppings to break up the retaining wall. Chair Ross agreed, as long as the work remains within the Town right-of-way, that visually breaking up the wall so that it is not in a straight line would be preferable. He suggested that a two-phase approach may need to be employed, where first, removal of the existing materials with some exploration for competent sandstone outcroppings would occur, and then the design of the wall could then be finalized based on the locations of that competent rock.

Mr. Young advised that he will use the Commission's feedback and determine what is feasible, what logistics and funding will be required, and how the preferred option would affect the construction schedule. Regarding the project setting a precedent, he advised that the BPTS identified this one location, and there are no other wall widening projects under consideration.

Commissioner Breen asked Mr. Young if a wall was planned for Portola Road in front of Town Center. Mr. Young advised that there would be no wall. Commissioner Breen stated that it is important for the ASCC to review any proposed improvements within the scenic corridors. Mr. Young said that he understands that improvements within the scenic corridors should be limited and in keeping with the rural nature of Portola Valley.

Ms. Pedro asked the Commission to recommend the top three options for Town Council consideration, including the additional options they discussed.

Based on the ASCC discussion, Chair Ross summarized the three recommended options, in no particular order of preference: 1) a stone retaining wall that is broken up by natural, competent sandstone outcroppings left in place, that would stagger in height and depth where feasible; 2) a rock clad retaining wall, either CMU or concrete; 3) a wood lagging retaining wall with steel I-beams.

Mr. Young confirmed that he will forward the Commission's feedback back to the Town Council.

(5) NEW BUSINESS

(a) Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a New Residence, Greenhouse, and Swimming Pool, 3 Buck Meadow Drive, Ross/Tamasi Residence, File #s: 52-2014 and X9H-687.

Chair Ross thanked the applicants for the tour conducted earlier today. He explained that this project will also require Planning Commission approval due to the amount of excavation involved in the project.

Assistant Planner Carol Borck presented the staff report and noted that the primary concern raised during today's field meeting was the number of trees proposed to be removed. She said the ASCC should consider any adjustments that may be possible in the patio areas or along the landscape walls that may provide an opportunity to preserve more trees. Ms. Borck said another key issue raised during the field meeting was the proposed use of the private open space easement ("POSE") for construction staging. Ms. Borck provided the Commission with a copy of the Easement Agreement. She noted that the purpose of the conservation easement is to prevent adverse impacts on the land, including grading, vegetation removal, and erosion, recognizing that such land is essentially unimproved and if retained in its natural state has substantial scenic value. Ms. Borck said it appears the easement agreement would not allow for construction staging activity but does allow for the Town Council to authorize exceptions to the easement requirements.

She read an email from Planning Commissioner Alex Von Feldt saying that she strongly encouraged the project team to see what more they can do to mitigate tree loss. In addition, she commented that while she appreciates the proposal to create the construction driveway away from the oak trees, the area proposed is probably the best quality grassland on the site and restoration of grassland and meadow is very difficult and takes years of careful monitoring. She encouraged the applicant to explore other options that do not cover such high quality grassland.

Commissioner Clark asked staff to confirm that POSE is not an option for construction staging. Ms. Pedro confirmed this statement. Vice Chair Harrell asked if they could use the area if they were putting in private utilities. Ms. Pedro said they could, but not for construction staging. Chair Ross asked if they could build a permanent private driveway in a POSE. Ms. Pedro said yes but the purpose is to allow for access to those properties in the Blue Oaks subdivision where the entire lot is surrounded by POSE and the only way to access the building site is through the open space easement.

Vice Chair Harrell asked if the Town Council had ever been approached for an exception to use the POSE for the purpose of trying to reduce potential adverse impact on trees during construction. Ms. Pedro advised that she was not aware of any such requests.

Bill Maston, project architect, said they had weighed whether the mitigation of putting in a temporary road was more beneficial than the time expended for restoration of the meadow. He said the Town Council does have the ability to make exceptions. He advised that he will conduct additional research on the construction staging and access for the project.

Regarding the parcel's history, Mr. Maston said that the original subdivision approval for this property was for four homes in a cluster. He said that the lots were merged to create two parcels and new building envelopes were drawn to reduce the footprint on the site. These modifications resulted in fewer trees being at risk as they were now outside of the building envelope. He advised that he has worked to create a design that balances the trees they want to protect and those that cannot be preserved due to necessary grading. He stated that the emphasis has always been to save the trees that the neighbors thought were the most important.

Mr. Maston presented the site plan and proposal with 3D renderings.

In response to a question, Mr. Maston stated that pavers were proposed in the autocourt. Ms. Pedro advised that the Blue Oaks PUD requires that all driveways be constructed with asphalt surfaces. However, other surface materials may be used subject to prior ASCC review and approval when the materials blend with the adjoining terrain and vegetation or when the coloring agents can be added to effectively achieve such blending.

Commissioner Clark stated that it appears that the only way to avoid putting the staging in the POSE is to sacrifice the front oak tree that is encircled by the driveway and the lower parking pad. He asked how the ASCC could help the applicant determine where to locate the construction staging.

Commissioner Koch expressed concern with the number of significant trees in good condition that were proposed for removal at the back patio area. She asked what options had been explored regarding protecting these trees. Mr. Maston advised that the proposed patio is 10 feet below grade, and it is not possible to protect the root systems of those trees. He stated that the original design located the entire outdoor patio system on the pool side, toward the street, but the neighbors did not support that proposal. He said the design is a balance between uses, privacy, and noise between neighbors.

Commissioner Koch said the arborist report does not indicate that many of the trees are unhealthy. She asked if they had considered relocating the greenhouse and vegetable garden to avoid removing the clusters of trees in that area. Mr. Maston said they had to prioritize which trees were most important to save and decided to eliminate the small trees that were bundled close together in favor of preserving the largest, most mature trees. Commissioner Koch said she supports saving the three trees in front and

understands the screening factor with neighbors, but is disappointed to see the removal of the 25 blue oaks on this property.

Leah Bayer, project architect, advised that the proposed greenhouse breaks up the height of the retaining wall, where the majority of the tree clusters are, and if that were moved closer to the home there would be a massive wall close to the house.

In response to a question, Mr. Maston advised that the roof tiles will be a modulation of 70/20/10 and that he will provide a mockup upon request.

Vice Chair Harrell asked how they decided to propose 31 new blue oak trees. Mr. Maston said it was recommended that they plant more than what might be needed, knowing that they will be culled out with age. Vice Chair Harrell asked if they had given further consideration to the utilities location. Mr. Maston said that if staging activities were permitted in the POSE, that the utilities would also be installed there. If the POSE is not used, the utilities would be installed in the driveway.

Chair Ross asked if there was any consideration given to reducing the program footprint to further protect existing trees. Mr. Maston advised that the previous project architect had designed a two-story solution, but was unable to comply with the single-story height limits. Additionally, the proposed grading with the previous design scheme required more tree removal. He advised that the current plan has received the support of the Blue Oaks HOA. He noted that because a significant amount of floor area is located within the basement, the actual footprint of the ground floor is much less than 5,620 square feet proposed with the project.

Chair Ross invited comments and questions from the public.

John Toor, 2 Buck Meadow Drive, offered support for the project and stated that he and the other homeowners are pleased to see the revised plan. He said the extension of the chimney on the southeast wall of the kitchen, the largest expanse of the house, is directly visible to him and Buck Meadow Drive. Mr. Toor encouraged the project team to provide any measures that would reduce the visual impact of this feature. Mr. Maston advised that the feature was not a functioning chimney, but a recessed area of the kitchen range serving as an exhaust vent. He confirmed that the faux chimney feature could be reduced in height.

Commissioner Koch asked Mr. Toor if it was the height of the chimney or the size of the wall that created the most visual impact for him. Mr. Toor stated it was a combination of both. Commissioner Koch offered that the faux chimney does break up the wall dimension, but at the same time, it is an entirely stucco surface.

Tracy Ross, applicant, advised that she had met with three general contractors to discuss the means for construction staging and access. She noted that the general contractor selected for this project expressed much concern in minimizing potential tree damage. She explained that with the size of the equipment required for the grading work and the need to stabilize the home's excavation area, it became apparent that access from the proposed driveway entrance and up through the trees slated for preservation was not going to be feasible.

There being no further comments from the public, Chair Ross asked the Commission for comments.

Vice Chair Harrell offered support for the project siting and minimizing visual impacts off-site. She expressed concern for the survival of the three oak trees to be preserved in the front yard during construction activities and earthwork. She stated that she supported the use of the POSE for construction staging in order to ensure the preservation of the front oak trees. She offered that two lights at the front entry are acceptable for aesthetic reasons. She supported the installation of native shrubs within the open space easement to screen the patio light well wall.

Commissioner Breen stated that the proposed house did not fit the site with respect to the loss of the 25 significant blue oak trees. She said the loss of these trees is significant and changes the character of the property which is one of the significant blue oak properties within the Blue Oaks subdivision. She questioned whether there is another design solution that would preserve many more of these oaks.

Commissioner Clark offered support for the scale and massing of the proposed project. He said he would prefer a darker palette of browns for the tile roof that will blend into the site more naturally than a red/orange selection. He agreed with the reduction in exterior lighting mentioned in the staff report. Concerning the proposed landscaping plan, he stated that he does not support any shrub planting within the POSE for screening the patio light well wall. He suggested lowering the faux chimney element and proposing a material for it other than stucco. He also expressed support for the proposed driveway and parking locations. Commissioner Clark stated that tree located between the lower parking pad and the autocourt could be difficult to protect during driveway construction, even if the POSE were used for staging. He offered that if the POSE were approved for staging that a detailed analysis of how it will be used and restored would be needed.

Commissioner Koch supported the design of the home, while also suggesting that any possible modifications to the rear patio be considered if additional oak trees could be preserved. She expressed concern for potential view impacts for the 2 and 4 Buck Meadow properties, and requested that the faux chimney be reduced in height or the massing of the wall be broken up. She supported reducing the proposed exterior lighting within the patio light well wall and the other locations around the home identified in the staff report. Commissioner Koch expressed support for minimal planting, particularly in front of the light well wall.

Chair Ross offered general support for the project. He understands the loss of oak trees is unavoidable with the development of the property and that a reduction in house size would not necessarily preserve a significant number of additional trees. He stated that he also recognizes that removing the rear patio and moving that wall closer to the house would be undesirable. He stated that the use of the POSE grassland area to access the site may provide the lowest risk to the trees identified for preservation, and that the temporary access must be well thought out. Chair Ross stated that screen plantings were not needed in front of the basement light well. He stated that the roof tiles should be in tan or brown hues with less red and yellow. He offered that it ornamental lighting at the house entry seemed appropriate. He supported the other areas of lighting reduction identified in the staff report. He expressed appreciation for the limited areas of fenestration and suggested that there be a material change along the faux chimney wall.

(6) COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS:

(a) Solar Path Lights at Schoolhouse

The Commission suggested that new down-shielded path lights be installed as part of the landscape replanting plan in front of the Historic Schoolhouse.

(b) Replacement Radar Trailer

Ms. Pedro advised the Commission that a new, smaller radar trailer will be purchased to replace the existing one.

(c) 315 Grove

Commissioner Koch advised that she reviewed and approved a proposed siding material and color change for this project.

(d) 220 Golden Hills

Commissioner Clark advised that he had approved proposed obscured glass for an entry light fixture at

this property.

(e) 5 Naranja

Chair Ross informed the Commission that Linda Yates, 170 Mapache, has continued concerns with the project at 5 Naranja Way. He stated that Ms. Yates reported that as trucks enter the site, their lights sweep across her master bedroom. Ms. Pedro advised that staff is responding to her concerns, and the neighbor has installed a temporary screen over the construction fence at the driveway entrance to shield the headlights.

(7) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 9, 2015.

Harrell moved to approve the March 9, 2015, minutes as submitted. Seconded by Ross, the motion passed 4-0, with Koch abstaining.

(8) ADJOURNMENT 10:11 p.m.