

**Special Field Meeting 240 Golden Oak Drive, Lamm; and
18 Redberry Ridge, Creative Ventures; and,
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

ASCC Chair Chase called the special field meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. at 240 Golden Oak Drive.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Schilling, Gelpi, Warr

ASCC Absent: None

Planning Commission liaison: McIntosh*

Planning Commission absent: Zaffaroni

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

*Arrived near the conclusion of the Lamm site meeting.

Others present relative to the Lamm project:

Walter Leclerc, 250 Golden Oak Drive

Jeanne Kunz, 235 Golden Oak Drive

Barbara Poole, 30 Alhambra Court

Owner of 225 Golden Oak Drive

Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive

Architectural Review for residential redevelopment, 240 Golden Oak Drive, Lamm

Vlastic presented the December 7, 2006 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.33 acre Alpine Hills property. He explained that the plans call for removal of the existing single story house and construction of a two-story, 4,447 sf, more contemporary design residence, with low pitch, hip and gable roof forms and an attached two-car garage.

ASCC members considered the December 7, 2006 staff report and the following project plans and data, unless otherwise noted, dated 11/1/06 and prepared by Chambers + Chambers:

Sheet A0, Project Data

Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, Mar. 2006

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan

Sheet A2.1, First Floor Plan

Sheet A2.2, Second Floor Plan

Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations

Sheet L-1, Preliminary Landscape Plan, Bradanini & Associates, 11/8/06

Exterior colors and materials board received November 13, 2006

Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures and detailed sheets for the proposed open wood and deer fences, received on 11/13/06

Story poles, staking and site markings were in place to facilitate the site meeting. The markings were provided in response to comments in the staff report for defining of the

alignments for the proposed property line deer fencing and the extent of grading for the expanded auto court area.

The applicant and design team members described the proposal and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The design inspiration for the new residence is the Lozano house, also located on Golden Oak Drive (i.e., at 123 Golden Oak Drive). The proposed house is much smaller, but the desire is to achieve a look and character similar to the inspiration house.
- The plans call for keeping the house footprint small and very similar to the footprint of existing improvements.
- The landscape plan is very conceptual at this point and will be refined based on further review and input from the preliminary review meeting.

During the course of the site and area inspection, neighbors in attendance offered the following comments and reactions:

Bacon opposed any property line fencing and stressed the need to minimize any potential for impact on wildlife movement. She also wondered about the adequacy of plans for parking and vehicular maneuvering on site. In addition, she suggested that an alternative one-story design should be considered to be more consistent with the form of houses generally found in the area. She specifically suggested removing the proposed second story and placing more building program “on the ground,” e.g., stepping down the northeast trending slopes of the site.

Poole suggested the need for a revision to the proposed colors, particularly the second story area so that the house would blend better with the colors of the site and adjacent tree canopy.

Leclerc concurred with Poole’s comments on color and also reacted to a suggestion that some of the second story mass should be placed over the planned garage. He commented that such an adjustment would have more potential for impacts on views from neighboring residences and outdoor areas than the current plans. He noted that the proposed second story would be visible from the street, but not as much as from neighboring houses and yards, as it would be with the suggested modification.

Kunz concurred with the color comments of her neighbors and reacted to a suggestion for removal of the existing large fir tree west of the proposed auto court. She opposed the tree removal noting it helped to break up views to the proposed house from the street and from her property.

After inspection of site and area conditions and receiving input from the applicants, design team members and neighbors, ASCC members provided the following preliminary reactions to the project proposals:

1. The main concern is with the proposed two-story height and mainly the height at the southern-most corner that is highly visible from Golden Oak Drive. Suggestions to

address this height issue ranged from lowering of proposed wall plate heights to relocation of the guest bedroom area from over the proposed living room to over the proposed garage. (Differences of opinion were provided by both ASCC members and neighbors, as noted above, as to whether or not moving the second story guest bedroom mass would be an improvement in terms of potential for off site impacts.)

2. It was agreed that while the proposed house needed to be lower in height, members also acknowledged as appropriate, the applicant's objectives to minimize site disturbance by keeping the footprint small and not "pushing" up against the parcel's floor area limits.
3. A darker color scheme needs to be considered, especially for the upper floor to ensure it blends into the tree backdrop on the site.
4. The guest parking area needs to be reconsidered. It appears that it may be too small in terms of vehicle ingress and egress and more maneuvering space appears needed to ensure against the need to back out to the street.
5. The plan for property line fencing appears inappropriate and should be adjusted so that fencing is for specific functions and not to just follow the property line.
6. The landscape plan needs to be modified to more "organically" respond to site conditions. The current plan appears to encourage "spilling out" of improvements from the house. The existing site plant materials need to be protected to the maximum extent feasible, especially if a two-story scheme is to be found acceptable. Further, it is not clear that the plan is realistic in terms of site conditions. The proposed site and landscape plans need to be reviewed in terms of ensuring they accurately identify existing site conditions, tree locations, contours, etc. It is possible that to accommodate the needed parking, the house may have to be shifted to the south or southeast.
7. The site plan needs to be checked to ensure trees are accurately located. Further, for reference and to enhance project understanding, the existing house footprint should be delineated by a dashed line on the proposed site and landscape plans.
8. The location of the proposed lawn on the north side of the house should be reconsidered because of the shady conditions that would exist at the site. Further, the utility area on the north side of the garage should be relocated or modified in size, as the current design appears to require excessive vegetation removal and site disturbance.
9. It is possible that some additional larger tree planting along the Golden Oak Drive side of the house could also be used to help reduce the visual presence of the proposed second story.

In response to the neighbor's suggestion that the proposed second story be removed and more building program placed on the ground, ASCC members and other neighbors, expressed concern over the potential grading and vegetation impacts from such an approach.

Following discussion, it was agreed that preliminary project review would be continued at the regular evening ASCC meeting and then continued to a January 2007 ASCC meeting.

At approximately 4:35 p.m., the Lamm site meeting was concluded. Chase advised that the special ASCC field meeting would continue at 18 Redberry Ridge as soon as ASCC members could convene at that site.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence, Lot 14, 18 Redberry Ridge, Blue Oaks Subdivision, Creative Ventures (Howard Family Trust)

At approximately 4:45 p.m., all ASCC members convened at the subject Blue Oaks subdivision property. Joining them were planning commission liaison Chip McIntosh, deputy town planner Vlastic and the following individuals:

John Schink, applicant
Chris Spalding, project architect
Jim Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge
Bob Klein, 11 Buck Meadow Drive
Josetta Owens, 14 Redberry Ridge
Linda Elkind, 14 Hawk View, Portola Valley Ranch
Steve Halprin, 12 Hawk View, member of Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee

Also present was a representative of the project contractor.

Vlastic presented the comments in the December 7, 2006 staff report on this preliminary review of this proposal for development of a largely single story, 5,490 sf residence with partial basement on the subject 1.33 acre Blue Oaks parcel. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and data, unless otherwise noted, dated 10/24/06 and prepared by Chris Spalding Architect:

Sheet 1, Cover Sheet/Site Plan
Sheet 2, Basement Floor Plan
Sheet 3, Main Floor Plan
Sheet 4, Rear and Front Exterior Elevations
Sheet 5, Left and Right Side Exterior Elevations
Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Winterbotham Partnership
Three exterior materials "sample" boards with photo images detailing proposed exterior materials and finishes
Cut sheet for the proposed exterior "sconce" light fixtures

Mr. Schink and Mr. Spalding, presented the proposal and described the story poles, staking and roof form taping set for the site meeting. They led all present on an inspection of site conditions and offered the following design clarifications during the course of the site meeting:

- The basic approaches to site development and house design are similar to the plans approved in 2000 for the Howard family for combined Lots 14/15. Many of the proposed exterior materials are the same, including the color/finish of the proposed roofing.

- The issues discussed in the staff report including conformity to height limits, protection of important manzanita plants, and lighting plan adjustments are being addressed with plan revisions that will be submitted prior to final ASCC project review in January.
- In response to comments in the staff report and offered at the site meeting, it was agreed that an alternative, flat tile or slate roof material would be considered and that the color would be in dark brown tones.
- After ASCC review of the architectural plans, engineering grading plans will be developed and the necessary site development permit application filed.

During the course of the site visit the following public comments were offered.

Elkind expressed concern over debris left in the area of the panhandle extension to Lot 15 and the need to consider the subject plans in light of possible improvement of vacant Lot 15. (In response to Elkind's comments ASCC members considered the plans in light of the building envelope on Lot 15 and tree cover on that parcel.)

Gibbons expressed concern over the potential visual impacts of the proposed red tone, barrel tile roofing. He encouraged a more low profile material with darker colors that would blend harmoniously into the colors and textures of the site. He also expressed concern over the views from his property back to the garage doors and parking area/garage apron proposed for the subject property. (In response to these concerns ASCC members visited the Gibbons site and considered views to and from the proposed garage/parking area.)

After inspection of site and area conditions, and receiving input from the applicant, project architect, neighbors and representatives of Portola Valley Ranch, ASCC members provided the following preliminary reactions to the proposal:

1. The plans need to be revised to clearly define the locations for all of the significant, old growth manzanita on the site and the siting of proposed improvements appropriately adjusted to ensure preservation of the manzanita.
2. The plans need to be adjusted to address the height and exterior lighting issues discussed in the staff report.
3. Accurate grading data is needed.
4. The roof material needs to be reconsidered. A darker, low profile material should be selected that has minimum light reflectivity properties. Further, design modifications need to be considered that would "move the architectural character away" from the currently proposed Mediterranean style.
5. Consideration needs to be given to cutting the house further into the site. The intent is to further screen views from the Gibbons property to the lower level garage and parking area. Mounding should also be considered to help screen views.

6. Sections need to be provided that extend through the site to the Gibbons property so that view and height relationships can be better understood.

In addition to the above comments, Warr suggested that a study should be made of shifting the entire garage and driveway access program to the north side of the house. He offered that this would reduce the length of driveway and grading associated with it and also help mitigate views from the Gibbons property to the site. Others were concerned that such an adjustment could potentially make it difficult to preserve the old growth manzanita, and have more impact on views from Portola Valley Ranch. Vlasic also advised the ASCC that provisions in the Blue Oaks subdivision certified EIR and adopted PUD, call for minimizing the impact of new construction with respect to views from Portola Valley Ranch, and were less sensitive in terms of interior Blue Oaks subdivision view relationships.

At the conclusion of the site meeting Chase, advised that preliminary project review would continue at the evening ASCC meeting and then be continued to the first ASCC meeting in January, tentatively set for January 8, 2007.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:40 p.m. the special ASCC field meeting was adjourned.

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: Davis (left meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.)

Planning Commission Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications - Town Council Thank You to Chase and Schilling

Town Council member Maryann Derwin was present to recognize the retirement from the ASCC of Chase and Schilling. She spoke on behalf of the town council and Portola Valley community, expressing thanks and gratitude to Chase and Schilling for their years of service, 16 years and 8 years respectively. She noted the challenges that come with ASCC service, where commissioners must judge the "dream houses" of their neighbors and peers. She stressed that the results of the ASCC efforts are always better, more sensitive projects and that because of such efforts, "Portola Valley is still the best place to live."

Ms. Derwin presented Chase and Schilling with tokens of appreciation and also noted that resolutions of thanks would be presented to them formally at a council meeting in the New Year.

Continued Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-553, for new residence, swimming pool and other accessory structures and improvements, 170 Mapache Drive, Holland/Yates

Vlastic presented the December 7, 2006 staff report on this continued review of the subject project. He noted the issues considered at the 11/13 and 11/20 preliminary review meetings. He also referenced a December 11, 2006 email from David Jorgensen, 20 Zapata Way noting continuing concerns with the proposal and the December 11, 2006 approval letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC). ASCC members considered the staff report and email, WASC letter and the following revised plans and materials unless otherwise noted dated October 30, 2006 and prepared by Hill Glaizer Architects:

Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet

Sheet A0.1, Sheet Index

Sheet A1.1, Site Plan

Sheet A-2.1, First Floor Plan, Overall

Sheet A-2.2, Roof Plan, Overall

Sheet A-5.1, Exterior Elevations, Main House, 12/4/06

Sheet A-5.2, Exterior Elevations, Master (Wing) and Guest (House)

Sheet A-5.3, Exterior Elevations, Girls Wing and Garage

Sheet A-6.0, Site Section, March 28, 2006 (copies provided at the 12/11/06 ASCC meeting)

Sheet A-6.1, Sections
Sheet A-6.2, Sections
Sheet A-7.1, Wall Sections
Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Site Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., 10/27/06
Sheet L1.2, Tree Status Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., 10/27/06
Sheet L1.3, Impervious Surface Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., 10/27/06
Sheet L1.4, Landscape Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., 10/27/06
Sheet LD-0, Landscape Lighting Legend, Truax Design Group, Inc., 12/4/06
Sheet LD-1, Overall Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc., 12/4/06
Sheet LD-2, South Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc., 12/4/06
Sheet LD-3, North Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc., 12/4/06
Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, MacLeod and Associates,
10/27/06
Survey of Existing Site, Billy Martin, PLS, 5/04 and 5/05

Landscape Materials and Lighting Cut-sheets, September 9, 2006
Constructed Wetlands and Skylight Shading Devices, October 27, 2006
Exterior materials board, dated 10/30/06

“Roofing Material and lighting cut sheet,” document dated 12/4/06 and transmitted to the town with the 12/4/06 cover letter from the project architect

Paul Holland, Linda Yates, Bob Glazier, and Tom Klope presented the revised plans and materials and explained how they responded to the concerns identified through the preliminary ASCC review process. The following clarifications were offered:

- Klope presented the following revised plan sheets:
“Perimeter Screening Proposal,” dated 12/11/06 prepared by Thomas Klope Associates
“Jorgensen Property Line Section Plan,” dated 12/11/06 prepared by Thomas Klope Associates

Klope explained how they addressed the concerns of the Jorgensens, but also meet the applicants objectives relative to use of native materials, and support for wildlife habitat. He discussed proposed transplanting of existing materials, including oaks to screen views to the guest house. He also noted that the applicants continue to offer the neighbors transplanted olive trees for placement on the Jorgensen property to further enhance screening.

- The plans will be corrected to move the new fencing out of the setback area.
- The proposed roofing material was described in some detail and samples were reviewed. It was noted that extensive studies have been done relative to the roof location and potential sun angles and reflection. It was clarified that these studies show that the uphill roof surfaces would not reflect sun light back to the adjoining properties. It was also noted that significant areas of the metal roof would also be covered with solar photovoltaic panels.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Mr. and Mrs. Jorgensen, 20 Zapata Way, reviewed the comments and concerns contained in their 12/11/06 email. Mr. Jorgenson noted that with proper screening most of his concerns relative to views to the roof could be addressed, but he worried about the lightness and reflectivity of the proposed roof material. Mrs. Jorgensen noted that the plantings would take time to be established and that there was no short-term solution to the potential view impacts from the proposed "large" roof area and reflective roof material. She also worried about the soil conditions being able to support necessary plant growth.

John Gardner, 25 Naranja Way also expressed concern over the proposed roof material and potential impacts from sun reflection.

Considerable discussion followed relative to the proposed plantings and roof material. While ASCC members found the overall project well suited to the site and area, and appreciated the objectives for a "clean" and "cool" roof, they struggled with the color and reflectivity issues and appropriateness of the screen planting plans. Concerns were also expressed over the extent of exterior lighting.

Following discussion Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of revised plans and materials, including the following plan revisions provided at the ASCC meeting:

"Perimeter Screening Proposal," dated 12/11/06 prepared by Thomas Klope Associates

"Jorgensen Property Line Section Plan," dated 12/11/06 prepared by Thomas Klope Associates.

The approval of the plans and materials was subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final, detailed landscape plan shall be prepared that provides for controlled height screening of views from the Jorgensen property. The plan shall be considered along with the roof material to ensure the screening and roof material provide for appropriate control of view impacts from the Jorgensen property. The final landscape plan is to be in general conformity with the landscape plans included with the revised plan submittal. Further, it is understood that the final proposed planting would not be selected to completely hide all views from the Jorgensen property to the new improvements on the subject property; but would provide for sufficient screening to ensure minimum view disruption. The plan shall also fully conform to current fence ordinance requirements.
2. The plans shall be revised to consistently show lowering of chimney heights on all building elevation sheets.
3. The lighting plans shall be modified to reduce the scope of exterior lighting for full conformity with town lighting regulations, policies and guidelines.
4. Additional review of the proposed metal roofing material shall be conducted prior to the ASCC reaching a final position on its acceptability. The primary remaining issue is

reflectivity and conformity with the town's policy limit on reflectivity of roof material. The additional ASCC review shall include inspection of a "mock-up" larger roof sample installed at the site. The sample shall be installed at the proposed roof pitch so as to be visible from uphill properties. The desire is that, if possible, the mock-up sample be at the site long enough for some weathering to occur. If the ASCC determines that the combination of weathering and landscape material is not sufficient to ensure conformity with the basic intent of the town's light reflectivity policies, an alternative roof material shall be identified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

5. A final tree protection and construction staging plan shall be presented to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. The site development permit shall have received the required planning commission approval.

Modifications to Previous Architectural Review Approval -- Residential redevelopment of Westridge parcel and Site Development Permit X9H-532, 228 Alamos Road, Cagan

Vlasic presented the 12/7/06 staff report on this matter and recommendation for a special site meeting on the request. Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, review of the request was continued to a special field meeting scheduled for 9:00 a.m. on December 13, 2006. Chase, Breen and Schilling advised they could attend the 12/13 meeting. Gelpi stated he could not, and Warr noted he would not be able to participate because of his previous involvement in work with the applicant.

Architectural Review for house additions, 135 Shawnee Pass, *Chang*

Vlasic presented the December 7, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of an attached garage and laundry room to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.0 acre Arrowhead Meadows property. He explained that the plans propose demolition of a detached carport and a detached stable: and, with the demolition and proposed additions of 900 sf and, there would be a net increase of 56 sf to total site floor area. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated 8/30/06 prepared by Clay Baker Design, LLC.:

- Sheet A-0, Project Data
- Sheet A-1.0, Site Plan
- Sheet A-2.0, First Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.1, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-3.0, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheets S-1 through S-3, Structural Details, Mike Mahmoudian & Associates, 8/28/06
- Sheet L1, Landscape Design, Waterman & Sun, 12/5/06
- Materials and colors board received 10/30/06
- Product description sheets, received 10/30/06, for the proposed wall mounted Arroyo Craftsman light fixture.

Mr. Chang, and Clay Baker presented the plans to the ASCC. They noted some of the project issues discussed in the staff report and agreed to reduce the scope of rear yard landscape lighting and eliminate the existing white post and rail fence along the parcel's Shoshone frontage, both as recommended in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the proposal and encouraged the elimination of at least one of the existing three driveway connections to the public streets. Members also agreed there should be some reduction in the scope of planting proposed along the east side of the property. Thereafter, Gelpi moved seconded by Schilling and passed 5-0 approval of the project 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. Complete floor area and impervious surface area calculations shall be provided.
2. The exterior lighting plan shall be modified to eliminate the proposed pathway light fixtures edging the planned rear yard lawn area as recommended in the staff report. (Note: it was clarified that this would include removal of 4 to 5 proposed pathway fixtures.)
3. The landscape plan shall be revised, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member, to reduce the scope of screen planting within the area along the east side property line.
4. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. The existing white, post and rail fencing along the Shoshone frontage of the parcel shall be eliminated.

ASCC members also strongly encouraged the applicant to reduce one of the existing three driveway entrances to the property.

Architectural Review for residential redevelopment, 240 Golden Oak Dive, Lamm

Vlasic presented the December 7, 2006 staff report on this proposal and reviewed the events of the afternoon preliminary review site meeting. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of the proposed plans and project materials and a summary of ASCC preliminary review comments and recommendations.)

Mr. and Mrs. Lamm were present to discuss the plans with ASCC members. They advised that they and their project design team would be reviewing and working to address the comments offered by the ASCC and site neighbors at the site meeting. They clarified that they preferred to keep the house foot print small and not "push" the proposed house down the east side slopes as this would increase potential for impacting views from the neighboring properties to the north and north east.

Public comments were requested. **Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive**, presented a photo image she captured from 225 Golden Oak Drive to the site story poles. She noted that

the southeast corner of the house would be very visible from this property and encouraged a redesign that would step the house down the east side of the property. She noted that this approach would be more compatible with other houses in the neighborhood.

ASCC members reaffirmed the comments offered at the site meeting. Thereafter, project review was continued to the January 22, 2007 regular ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence, Lot 14, 18 Redberry Ridge, Blue Oaks Subdivision, Creative Ventures (Howard Family Trust)

Vlasic presented the December 7, 2006 staff report on this proposal and reviewed the events of the afternoon preliminary review site meeting. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of the proposed plans and project materials and a summary of ASCC preliminary review comments and recommendations.)

John Schink and project architect Chris Spalding were present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members and offered the following additional comments and clarifications to those presented at the site meeting:

- The plans will be adjusted to ensure preservation of the larger, important old manzanita plants, as recommended at the site meeting and in the staff report.
- The plans will be modified to control views from the Gibbons property to the new garage and lower parking area. This will include some additional cutting in of the area, mounding, etc. Further, consideration will be given to solid garage doors to ensure that light does not spill out from the garage level.
- Consideration will be given to changing the roof from barrel to flat tile or slate.
- In response to a question, it was noted that many of the fireplaces would be gas fired and not require traditional chimneys for venting.

Public comments were requested. **Ted Vian, Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee**, advised that the Ranch and design committee had not yet had an opportunity to review the proposal, but would attempt to do so prior to the next ASCC review of the project. He stated, however, that the project site is visible from a number of areas in the Ranch and that concerns would likely focus on building bulk and massing, colors, materials, and exterior lighting. He encouraged adjustments needed to preserve the manzanita plants and otherwise ensure the house blended into site conditions and did not stand out in contrast to them.

ASCC members reaffirmed the comments offered at the site meeting. Thereafter, project review was continued to the January 8, 2007 regular ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for "Sunroom" house additions, 420 Minoca Road, Kao

Vlasic briefly reviewed the comments in the December 7, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of a 189 sf sunroom on the subject property. He noted that it is being referred to the ASCC because the proposed floor area would be over the 85% single largest

structure limit, which is possible only with special findings and approval by the ASCC. Vlasic expressed some concerns with the adequacy of application data, but noted that since there is to be only one regular December ASCC meeting, staff agreed to see if the ASCC would also be willing to consider this request immediately before or after the special December 13 site meeting scheduled for the Cagan project.

ASCC members Chase, Breen and Schilling stated they would be willing to consider the request after the Cagan meeting if it is in form for review. Thereafter, public comments were requested, but none offered.

Vlasic advised that a decision would be made on Tuesday, December 12 as to whether or not the matter could be ready for ASCC consideration on December 13 and ASCC members would be advised if the special meeting were to actually be scheduled.

Approval of Minutes

Schilling moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0-1 (Warr) approval of the November 13, 2006 meeting minutes as drafted.

Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0-2 (Gelpi and Warr) approval of the November 20, 2006 special site meeting minutes as drafted.

Appreciation and Thanks to ASCC members Chase and Schilling

Gelpi, Breen and Warr thanked retiring members Chase and Schilling for all their contributions to the ASCC and the town and wished them well. Vlasic and Borck also thanked Chase and Schilling for their efforts and support and everyone present agreed that the perspectives provided by Chase and Schilling would be missed.

(Note: it is not possible to capture in these minutes the gratitude, and related emotions, expressed by ASCC colleagues and staff to Chase and Schilling for their years of service to the community. It is important to note, however, that everyone agreed they would be missed and hoped that they might consider returning to ASCC service at some time in the future.)

Adjournment

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

T. Vlasic