

**Architectural and Site Control Commission** **July 24, 2006**  
**Special Field Meeting 21 Deer Park Lane, Dailey and 280 Nathhorst Avenue, Mainzer, and  
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Vice Chair Schilling called the special afternoon field meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at 21 Deer Park Lane.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Schilling, Gelpi, Warr  
ASCC Absent: Chase  
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

**Others present relative to the Dailey project:**

Robert J. Dailey, applicant  
David Zink-Brody, project architect  
Joan Diengott, project architect  
John Aldridge, landscape architect  
Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane  
Tor and Nancy Lund, 240 Golden Hills Drive  
Jim McClenahan, project arborist  
John Bartlett, 220 Golden Hills Drive (At the start of the site meeting, Mr. Bartlett stated that his main concern was construction staging and potential impacts on the Deer Park Lane cul-de-sac bulb, but that otherwise the project was acceptable to him.)

**Continued Review -- Architectural Review for house additions, remodeling and detached accessory Structure, 21 Deer Park Lane, Dailey**

Vlastic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report and referenced the comments in the June 9, 2006 staff report on the subject project for the 2.0 acre Oak Hills subdivision property. He noted that based on concerns expressed at the June 12, 2006 ASCC meeting, the site meeting had been scheduled to look specifically at the proposed driveway and landscaping modifications, but that other project clarifications were also needed as discussed in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted dated 5/5/06 and prepared by dz-B Design:

Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet, Index and Zoning  
Sheet C1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Clements and Associates, 4/24/06  
Sheet A0.1, Site Plan  
Sheet A1, First Floor Plan  
Sheet A2, Proposed Upper Floor Plan  
Sheet A3, As-Built Plan  
Sheet A4, Elevations, 5/6/06  
Sheet A5, Detached Garage Floor Plan (Elevations), 5/9/06  
Sheet D1, As-Built Plan, 5/6/06  
Sheet D1, As-Built Plan, 1/29/06 (Elevations)

Sheet D2, As-Built Plan, 5/6/06 (Upper Floor Plan)  
Sheet D3, As-Built Plan, 5/6/06 (Demo Floor Plan)  
Sheet E1, Lighting Plan, 5/6/06  
Sheet L-1.0, Landscape Site Plan, revised 7/24/06  
Colors and materials board "21 Deer Park Materials"  
Tree Survey, April 3, 2006 prepared by McClenahan Consulting.  
Cut sheet for SPJ Lighting Inc. Fixtures SPJ31-03B

Robert Dailey and the design team members present described the driveway project and also pointed out the staking and driveway alignment chalking set to facilitate the site meeting. During the course of the site visit the applicant and design team members offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The proposed driveway alignment has been adjusted to avoid the need to take out any tree except for one small birch. A revised landscape plan, dated 7/24/06, was displayed to show the preservation of trees and revised planting scheme. It was noted that the plan includes the details for planting below the proposed pool terrace retaining wall.
- Referring to the revised landscape plan, it was noted that both trees #8 and #10 would be saved. Jim McClenahan noted, however, that tree #10 is in poor condition and that it would likely not survive even if the driveway alignment were not adjusted. McClenahan also noted that removing the existing asphalt section should actually help improve the long-term prognosis for the existing oaks.
- Dailey stressed his willingness to make adjustments as desired by ASCC with respect to the proposed planting plan.
- The proposed master bedroom privacy wall will be finished to match the proposed house stucco surfaces.

ASCC members inspected site conditions and then, at the invitation of Mr. Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane, visited his property and considered view impacts. During the visit to the Hanning property, Mr. Hanning provided the following comments:

- Don't see the on-site benefits for moving the driveway and off site impacts would be significant. Loss of privacy and peacefulness of Hanning backyard area are of most concern. Moving driveway will add impacts relative to car movement, noise and light.
- Don't necessarily want additional planting along the long stretch of driveway, okay with the way it is and open oak grassland.
- Shrubs planted by the previous owner were removed, and they provided some additional screening.
- Additional options should be explored for the garage location.
- The Hanning yard was designed around the existing driveway layout. Again, the proposed driveway changes impact the backyard design and privacy.

- The Oak Hills homeowners association granted approval for relief from the 50 foot setback for the new garage, but the question is, is this the best design solution for the site.

During the course of the Hanning property visit, a vehicle was moved along the existing driveway alignment and this movement was considered against possible changes that would result with the proposed driveway realignment. ASCC members noted that the changes were not great and that vehicle movement along the existing long section of driveway above the Hanning property appeared to be more significant in terms of impacts on the Hanning property. It was noted that no changes were proposed to this driveway section, but it was suggested that the proposed driveway changes allowed the opportunity for the ASCC to consider additional landscaping along this existing driveway section to enhance screening and privacy for the Hanning yard.

Also during the course of the site walk, Nancy and Tor Lund indicated general support for the project as proposed.

At the conclusion of the site inspection, ASCC members identified the following items and issues and offered the following comments:

- The proposed driveway realignment is an acceptable site solution and better in terms of keeping blue oaks together in the driveway island.
- The changes in terms of potential impacts on the Hanning property are not significant. Most of the visual and privacy impacts result from the existing driveway that really can't be changed due to parcel configuration and location of the established building site. Further, moving the proposed garage to a new location would have more potential for off site impacts.
- In general, the plan for driveway realignment is supported and is viewed as providing the "nexus" to allow the ASCC to require more screen landscaping along existing driveway. Landscaping should be more with shrubs and tiered with some new blue oaks. Use of live oaks for new landscaping is not supported, as they would eventually take over the Blue Oaks.
- All existing oaks should be preserved at this point. If, however, tree #10 has to eventually be removed, new tree planting could take place then.
- The proposed design "pulls" the planting island into the top of the hill. The garage proposal and slight driveway realignment are appropriate for site conditions and don't increase impacts on adjoining parcels in any significant way.
- With appropriate planting and removal of lights from the existing garage area and in the existing driveway island, the new design could actually be a "win/win" for both the Dailey and Hanning properties.

Following discussion, it was agreed that project review would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Schilling then advised, i.e., at approximately 4:56 p.m., that the special site meeting would continue at 280 Nathhorst Avenue as soon as ASCC members

could convene at the site. Mr. Dailey and the site neighbors were thanked for their input at the site meeting.

**Preliminary Architectural Review of plans for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-556, 280 Nathhorst Avenue, Mainzer**

ASCC members Chase, Breen, Schilling, Gelpi, and Warr convened at the subject site at 5:00 p.m. They were joined by planning commission liaison McIntosh, deputy town planner Vlastic and the following individuals:

Ruth and Bill Mainzer, applicants  
John Barksdale, project architect  
Jeff Booth, 250 Nathhorst Avenue  
Phil Vincent, 165 Portola Road

Vlastic noted that the site meeting was part of preliminary ASCC review of the subject project for construction of a new, single story, 4,988 sf residence, and accessory improvements including driveway and parking areas and a lap swimming pool, on the subject 1.3 acre Portola Terrace site. He reviewed the background on the project and project site, and preliminary plan evaluation as presented in the July 20, 2006 staff report. He then reviewed project details as presented on the following application plans dated June 16, 2006 and prepared by Woodson Barksdale Architects:

Sheet sk 1, Preliminary Site Plan  
Sheet sk 2, Grading/Drainage Plan  
Sheet sk 3, Site Lighting Plan  
Sheet sk 4, Preliminary Landscape Plan, June 9, 2006  
Sheet sk 5, Preliminary Floor Plan  
Sheet sk 6, Preliminary Exterior Elevations  
Sheet sk 7, Preliminary Exterior Elevations

The ASCC considered the project plans and staff report as well as the staking and story poles placed to facilitate the site meeting. Also considered were the June 16, 2006 letter from the project architect advising on plan modifications made after a preliminary meeting with town staff, a colors and materials board received June 20, 2006, cut sheets for the proposed exterior lights and a 9/1/01 report on the condition of site trees prepared by Ray Morneau, Arborist.

Vlastic noted that since this was a preliminary review, ASCC members did not need to take any action on the proposal; and, after preliminary review, project consideration should be continued to the August 28, 2006 meeting. He added that the continuation would permit the opportunity for all staff and committee reviews of the site development permit request to be completed and, particularly, for the trails issues discussed in the 7/20 staff report to be addressed.

Vlastic briefly highlighted the other issues discussed in the staff report including driveway width and surface materials, pool security fencing, parcel 50-foot frontage definition, and concerns over exterior lighting.

During the course of the site walk Ruth and Bill Mainzer and project architect John Barksdale provided the following information and clarifications:

- The project design evolution was explained and it was noted that discussions had been initiated with the public works director with respect to trail and drainage issues. It was also noted that an August 8 meeting had been set with the trails committee to focus on the trail issues, particularly the matter of possible Portola Road trail realignment.
- The proposed approach to drainage control was explained and it was stressed that efforts were being made to keep all increased “runoff” from the project on site.
- The design and location for the proposed berm along Portola Road were explained and identified. It was noted that the berm was desired for privacy and to screen views to and from Portola Road.
- Possible possible trail realignment options were detailed with the objective being moving the existing trail off of private property and into the existing public right of way. The concern over moving the trail closer to the road was noted.
- It appears that a pool cover may be an acceptable solution for pool security. If so, then the proposed wrought iron pool security fencing would be eliminated from the project.
- The plans anticipate approximately 12”-18” of excavation for construction of the concrete slab for the house. The dirt from this excavation would be used for the proposed berm adjacent to the Portola Road right of way. This will permit the dirt to be kept on site and eliminate the need for any off haul of excavated materials.

During the course of the site walk the following public comments were offered:

**Phil Vincent** expressed concern over the potential visual impact of a berm along Portola Road, but appreciated the desire to screen views to the road. He also expressed concern over moving public trail closer to Portola Road and stressed that drainage was a “big” site issue. He added that a considerable amount of water ponds on the site during the rainy season.

**Jeff Booth** offered comments in general support for the proposed design, but also stressed that the main site design issue will be dealing with on site water problems and poorly drained soils.

After receiving the above input and walking the site, ASCC members identified the following project items and issues and offered the following comments:

- The proposed design is a “good project” and both the house and site plans are, for the most part, appropriate for the site and neighborhood.
- The main issue centers on the proposed berm and potential artificial appearance. The berm design needs to be reconsidered in light of final resolution of trail issues with the trails committee and public works director. Further, efforts are needed to design the berm so that it’s appearance will be more natural. It should be “toned down,” and not

suggest a sense of “little mountains.” Also, the berm should be largely grass covered. It should not be over planted like has occurred on some berm projects implemented along Westridge Drive.

- Consideration should be given to less mounding and possible use of landscaping for screening. As possible, the open orchard/meadow condition should be preserved. Efforts need to be made to reduce the proposed berm height and length. The site’s beauty is in it’s open orchard/meadow condition.
- Once the site and berm plan have been modified to address ASCC concerns, the proposed berm height and length should be staked for ASCC field consideration. The potential impact of the revised berm design on trees will be particularly important in the ASCC’s consideration of the revised plans.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members agreed that project discussion should continue at the regular evening meeting, but only to take any additional input that may be provided. Chase thanked the applicant and project architect for the site meeting presentation and efforts that have been made to develop a design in keeping with site and area conditions.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 5:55 p.m. the field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:03 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, Planning Technician Borck

-----  
\*Warr did not participate in the meeting until after completion of review and action on the Cocco application as his firm was providing architectural services on the project.

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Architectural Review for new residence and detached accessory structure, 163 Brookside Drive, Cocco**

Vlastic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this project for residential redevelopment of the subject .71 acre Brookside Orchard area property. He explained that at a June 12, 2006 site meeting, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this proposal and, while finding it generally acceptable, identified a number of items needing modification or clarification. Vlastic then reviewed the following revised plans unless otherwise noted dated July 5, 2006 and prepared by CJW Architecture, prepared in response to the comments and recommendations of the ASCC, as well as those offered by site neighbors at the June 12 meeting:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet

Sheet: C-0.1, Boundary and Topography Map, Pat McNulty, Professional Land Surveyor, April 2005

Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan & Flood Plain Data

Sheet: A-0.2, Grading, Staging Site Plan & Tree Protection Plan

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, Exterior Lighting Plan

Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan

Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Sheet: A-3.2, Cabana Exterior Elevations

Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design

Sheet: D-1, Drainage Plan

It was noted that submitted in support of the revised plans was the July 6, 2006 letter from the project architect describing how the new plans specifically address the ASCC comments and the commitments made by the applicant at the June 12 meeting.

Also presented was the original proposed colors and materials board, dated April 13, 2006. Vlastic advised that the board was tentatively found acceptable at the June 12 ASCC meeting

as were the cut sheets for the proposed Arroyo Craftsman house and TEKA Illumination yard light fixtures.

Vlasic advised that since the July 20, 2006 staff report was prepared the town had received a July 20, 2006 letter from project architect Robert Sandoval to William Patterson, owner/builder of 167 Brookside Drive, responding to comments in a July 13, 2006 letter from Mr. Patterson. Also received, was a revised site plan dated July 20, 2006 providing for more space between the proposed driveway and property line common with 167 Brookside Drive and proposing larger plants for screening along the common property boundary.

Vlasic also referenced a letter dated July 24, 2006 from Scott Devereaux, 159 Brookside Drive, offering comments, questions and concerns relative to the project. Vlasic noted that among other things, the letter raises concerns regarding the protection of the large redwood tree on the south side of the proposed house, size and extent of screen plantings, drainage and the proposed detached accessory structure.

Mike Cocco and project architect Mark Sutherland presented the revised proposal and reviewed the comments in the July 6, and July 20 letters to the town from CJW Architecture. He offered the following clarifications:

- The arborist will review all building permit plans and will provide the measures to be taken to ensure the redwood tree of concern to the neighbor, as well as all other trees to be preserved, are in fact protected from the construction process.
- The applicant will provide additional landscaping to address the concerns of the neighbors.
- The accessory structure has been designed to conform to the town's accessory structures policy statement and the applicant is willing to record a deed restriction against the property to ensure it is not converted to a living structure. Also, the applicant is willing to modify the design to eliminate the bathtub/shower facilities as recommended in the staff report.
- The plans will be revised as necessary to address the drainage and vegetation location concerns set forth in the letter from Mr. Devereaux. The "drafting errors" relative to these features were acknowledged and an apology for them was offered.
- In response to height and massing relationship concerns of the neighbor at 167 Brookside Drive, comparison elevations were presented of the proposed and under construction projects on the neighboring sites.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**William Matthews, 445 Portola Road**, expressed concern with the proposed detached accessory structure. He noted that while the location may be the same as the existing detached structure, the new building would be taller and have more potential for visual impact as demonstrated by the story poles.



**Bill Henderson, 117 Brookside Drive**, expressed concern with the proposed cabana and noted that the letter from Mr. Devereaux, 159 Brookside Drive, appeared to offer an “unhappy” tone over the proposed project and, particularly, the proposed cabana. He suggested that project review should be delayed until Mr. Devereaux could be present.

**Richard Merk, Brookside Drive**, expressed displeasure with the comments in the July 13, 2006 letter from Mr. Patterson that appear to express an opinion about Mr. Merk’s expectations. Mr. Merk noted he had no discussions with Mr. Patterson on this nor did he authorize any reference to his opinions.

**Blair Porteous, Portside LLC, and owner/builder of 167 Brookside Drive**, expressed concerns with the location, height and window placement of the proposed cabana in terms of potential privacy impacts on the new residence under construction on his property.

ASCC members considered the July 20, 2006 staff report, input received at the meeting, including the July 24, 2006 letter from Mr. Devereaux, and the revised site plan dated 7/20/06 along with the July 20, 2006 letter from the project architect. Members concurred that the revised plans were responsive to ASCC and other concerns identified at the June 12 meeting.

After discussion of the various issues raised at the meeting, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of revised plans and materials, including the July 20, 2006 revised site plan. The approval was granted 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 revised landscape plan shall be prepared that clearly states the 15 gallon size for the screen plantings as committed to in the July 20, letter from the project architect and at the ASCC meeting. The revised plan shall also specifically address the screen planting concerns noted in the July 24, 2006 letter from Scott Devereaux and suggestions offered in the staff report for a mix of screen plant materials along the property line common with 167 Brookside Drive. The plan shall make it clear that the sod lawn shall not be under the drip line of any oaks.
2. The arborist report shall be revised to specifically address the redwood tree protection concerns noted in the July 24, 2006 letter from Scott Devereaux.
3. The cabana plans shall be revised to eliminate any bathing facilities (i.e., there shall be no bathtub or shower) in the attached bathroom. (An outdoor shower may be added to replace the deleted bathtub.) Further, only entertainment type food preparation facilities, consistent with the town’s accessory structures policies statement, shall be identified in the cabana. Also, in developing the final plans for the cabana, consideration shall be given to reducing the proposed height so that the structure is as close as possible to the height of the existing detached accessory structure it is replacing.
4. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property stating that the detached cabana shall only be used and occupied in conformity with town zoning limitations. The deed restriction shall be recorded to the satisfaction of the town attorney prior to issuance of any building permit for the structure.

5. A final tree protection and construction staging plan shall be presented to the satisfaction of planning staff at the preconstruction meeting and shall include all final recommendations of the project arborist for tree protection and preservation. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. The final drainage plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the public works director and shall address the concerns identified in the July 24, 2006 letter from Scott Devereaux. Once the plan has been accepted by the public works director it shall be presented to the ASCC for final approval.
7. All plan sheets shall be revised as necessary for completeness and consistency of data and plan proposals.

It was understood that the neighbors would be noticed relative to the follow-up review for condition compliance.

-----  
Prior to discussion of this application, Chase left the meeting room noting her firm was providing architectural services on the Dailey project. Also, Warr returned to his place on the ASCC.  
-----

**Continued Review -- Architectural Review for house additions, remodeling and detached accessory Structure, 21 Deer Park Lane, Dailey**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this proposal for house additions, addition of a detached garage, driveway changes and construction of a new swimming pool on the subject 2.0 acre Oak Hills subdivision property. He discussed the June 12, 2006 review and the events of the site meeting conducted earlier in the day to address the concerns identified at the June 12 ASCC meeting. (See above site meeting minutes that include a listing of the proposed project plans and materials). Vlasic advised that most of the proposed improvements were found acceptable by the ASCC at the June 12 meeting, and that the afternoon site meeting focused on concerns expressed by neighbor Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane, over the proposed driveway changes and landscaping along the common boundary between his and the applicant's properties.

Joan Diengott, project architect and John Aldridge, project landscape architect were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. They again reviewed the July 24, 2006 revised landscape plan presented at the afternoon meeting and advised that the applicant is willing to add further landscape screening as suggested was needed by ASCC members at the afternoon site meeting.

Public comments were requested. **Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane**, reviewed his concerns expressed at the at the site meeting, and emphasized that the driveway changes would likely force him to add more screen landscaping on his property. He also presented a July 24, 2006 letter from **Don and Catherine Coluzzi, 15 Navajo Place** expressing concerns with respect to impact of vehicle headlights on their property.

In response to the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Coluzzi, Joan Diengott, noted that the proposed master bedroom privacy wall would block the lights and mitigate much of the existing vehicle light spill problem.

ASCC members considered the information presented in the July 20, 2006 staff report, data gathered at the site meeting and the revised landscape plan, dated 7/24/06 prepared by John Aldrich & Associates. Also considered were the additional comments presented at the evening meeting and clarifications offered by the project architect and landscape architect. Discussion focused on landscape screening, lighting and reducing potential light impacts, and tree protection.

ASCC members concluded that the proposal was acceptable for the site and site conditions. Warr then moved, seconded by Breen, and passed 4-0 approval of the proposed plans and materials, including the July 24, 2006 revised landscape plan, subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. All site plan sheets shall be revised to consistently show the proposed driveway alignment saving all trees, including trees #8 and #10, with the only tree removal being the small birch between trees #8 and #10.
2. A final exterior lighting plan shall be presented that addresses the issues discussed in the June 9, 2006 staff report. The plan shall also ensure that all existing lighting within the driveway turnaround circle is eliminated and there shall be no driveway lighting proposed.
3. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for a layered approach to the screen planting along the west side of the modified driveway alignment. The screen planting shall be essentially from the existing parking/turnout area to the western end of the house. The majority of plant materials shall be native shrubs that grow to heights sufficient to screen views of car movement and light, but that don't impact the overall character of the blue oak grassland environment. The revised plan shall also include the removal of some of the recently planted live oaks, but could introduce additional blue oaks, consistent with the concept of layering for screening of views.
4. At the west end of the guest parking area, a low wall shall be provided, similar in character to the privacy wall planned at the west end of the master bedroom. The purpose of the wall is to screen parked cars and particularly the potential for light spill from cars entering and leaving the guest parking area.
5. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided that addresses the concerns expressed by Mr. Hanning in his June 12, 2006 letter to the town, and incorporates the commitments made by the applicant at the June 12 ASCC meeting. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. The structural engineering evaluation of the existing house shall be provided with a clear statement of how much of the existing house can be preserved with the proposed improvements.

7. If any swimming pool security fencing is proposed, the fencing shall be clearly described on the revised landscape plan.

---

Following consideration of the Dailey application, Chase returned to her position on the ASCC.

---

**Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for residential additions, 108 Tynan Way, Valikangas**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He explained that that on May 8, 2006, the ASCC conditionally approved this proposal for a 731 sf addition to existing, single story, 1,052 sf house on the subject .22 acre Woodside Highlands property. Vlasic then reviewed the following revised plans and materials unless otherwise noted, prepared by Scott Mitchell, Architect, and explained how they responded to the approval conditions:

Sheet 1, Site Plan, Lot Data, Construction Staging Plan, received 7/6/06  
Sheet 2, Floor Plan, received 7/6/06  
Preliminary Landscape Plan, Peter Wright Shaw Associates, 5/15/06  
Exterior Lighting Plan, Peter Wright Shaw Associates, received July 21, 2006  
Cut Sheet for Vista Path light #4211, 15 watt  
Revised Exterior Paint Colors Sheet, received July 6, 2006  
June 6, 2006 letter from applicant re: tree trimming and July 18, letter from Area Custom Tree Service, Inc. re: scope of tree thinning.

In addition to the plans, Vlasic reviewed a July 11, 2006 letter from the project architect explaining that installation of the stone/hot tub patio adjacent to the family room would be as close to existing grade as possible and that "steps" would be incorporated into the design to ensure minimum grading. He added that the letter notes that design details would be presented with the construction drawings.

Mrs. Valikangas, Scott Mitchell and Peter Shaw were present to discuss the follow-up submittal with ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- All existing spot lights on the garage and house would be removed and replaced with the down cast wall mounted fixture approved for use on the house.
- No new redwood trees have been installed during the past five years, but the two volunteer redwoods of concern to the neighbors will be removed. Further, the trees on the site need trimming and the trimming will be done according to the recommendations of the project arborist.

Public comments were requested. **Michael Fowler, 139 Russell Avenue**, expressed concern over the growth of oaks and other trees and the view impacts of this growth. He stressed the need for tree trimming and the need to ensure no new redwood tree growth.

After receiving input from the applicant and neighbors, Breen moved seconded by Warr and passed 5-0 approval of the revised submittal (including the above listed plans and documents and plan clarifications) as satisfying conditions 1, 2 and 3 of the May 8, 2006 ASCC approval subject to the requirement that the two "volunteer" redwood trees of concern to the neighbors be removed as part of this project.

In taking the action, ASCC members understood that remaining conditions 4 and 5 would be addressed as called for in the conditions.

**Site Development Permit X9H-557 associated with Architectural Review for New Residence with detached garage & guest house, 835 Westridge Drive, Van Cruyningen/Van Hart**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this application. He explained that on May 8, 2006, the ASCC conditionally approved architectural review plans for the subject project and at that time it was noted the processing of the site development permit was still needed. Vlasic added that based on the May 8 ASCC architectural approval, the applicants proceeded to have detailed grading plans prepared and filed the site development permit application with the town.

Vlasic then reviewed the comments in the staff report on the following proposed site development permit plans, unless otherwise noted dated June 15, 2006 and prepared by F. John Richards Architect:

- Sheet A01.1, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A01.2, Constraints Map
- Sheet A01.3, Site Plan
- Sheet A01.4, Floor Plans
- Sheet A02.1, Elevations
- Sheet L01.1, Landscape Plan
- Sheet CS, Construction Staging and Tree Protection Plan
- Sheet C01.1, Grading & Drainage Plan, A.C. & H. Civil Engineers, June 2006
- Topographic Map 1 and Map 2 (two sheets), Bruce Woodworth, 11/29/05 and 11/30/05, respectively

Also considered was the arborists report dated March 7, 2006, prepared by Michael Bench, Consulting Arborist, Barrie D. Coate and Associates.

Holly Van Hart and Ike Van Cruyningen were present to discuss their project with ASCC members. They stated they had no comments to offer beyond what was presented in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the site development permit plans and follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and planning staff prior to issuance of the site development or building permits:

1. A final exterior lighting plan shall be provided.
2. The final procedures plans for occupancy of the existing house during construction of the new house shall provided.
3. The landscape plan shall be revised to address the conservation committee review comments as set forth on the sheet with the heading of "835 Westridge."
4. The requirements set forth in the following site development committee reports shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the reviewer prior to issuance of the permit:
  - Town Geologist, report dated July 12, 2006
  - Fire Marshal, report dated July 6, 2006
  - Health Officer, report dated July 10, 2006
5. All requirements of the public works director shall be addressed to his satisfaction prior to permit issuance.

**Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling, 196 Meadowood Drive, Katz**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 896 sf of floor area to the existing 3,146 sf residence on the subject 2.2 acre Oak Hills subdivision property. He noted that the addition would be made in a relatively level area on the south side of the existing house that currently contains an entry walk, patio, lawn and other landscape improvements and that only minor grading is proposed. Vlasic explained that other proposed improvements include some new roof forms, a new roof and modifications and repair to existing decks; but that, overall, there will be very little change to site conditions or views to the house from neighboring properties or residences. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed project plans, unless otherwise noted, revised through 5/22/06 and prepared by Duxbury Architects:

- Sheet G-001, Cover Sheet
- Sheet AS-101, Overall Site Plan
- Sheet AS-102, Architectural Partial Site Plan
- Sheet AS-103, Exterior Lighting Plan & Schedule
- Sheet AS-104, Arborist Report (James M McClenahan, 9/30/05)
- Sheet A-101, New 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Plan
- Sheet A-102, Basement Plan
- Sheet A-103, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-201, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-202, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-203, Building Sections
- Sheet XS-101, Floor Area Calculation Diagram
- Six (6) 8.5" x 11" sheets describing a proposed 3.5 foot, 47 sf extension at the east end of the master bedroom received 7/19/06
- June 7, 2006 McClenahan Consulting report on regarding the master bedroom addition
- Colors and materials board dated May 22, 2006

Mr. and Mrs. Katz and Peter Duxbury were present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members. In response to a question, Duxbury clarified that the proposed skylights would have dark brown metal frames. It was also noted that the project had been found acceptable by the Oak Hills homeowners association.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the following condition:

A tree protection and construction staging plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented, also to the satisfaction of planning staff.

**Preliminary Architectural Review of plans for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-556, 280 Nathhorst Avenue, Mainzer**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this proposal for new residential development on the subject 1.3 acre Portola Terrace property. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project (see above site meeting minutes which include a complete list of project plans and materials). He noted that this was a preliminary review of the proposal and that project consideration should be continued to the August 28 regular ASCC meeting.

Mr. and Mr. Mainzer and John Barksdale were present and offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to matters discussed at the site meeting:

- The trails issues will be considered with the trails committee at a meeting now scheduled for August 8.
- While the plans can be adjusted to provide for only a 12-foot driveway width, the “flares” connections to the street will need to be wider for safety of access and to meet the requirements of the public works director.
- The mound/berm design will be reconsidered as recommended by the ASCC at the site meeting. A section will be provided showing any revised mound design in relationship to the trail and Portola Road. Also, the mound will be staked for site review prior to the August 28 meeting.

Public comments were requested. **Council liaison Merk** stated concern over the intersection of the driveway with Nathhorst Avenue because it was not at a right angle. He, however, appreciated the clarifications offered relative to the wider “flares” to ensure safe access to and from the street.

After brief review of the issues discussed at the site meeting, ASCC members concurred that they found the project generally acceptable and well suited to the site. Further, members indicated that approval would likely be granted on August 28, and offered the following additional comments on the proposal to those stated at the site meeting:

1. The driveway width should be reduced to 12 feet, but with necessary returns at the Nathhorst Avenue provided to the satisfaction of the public works director. Further, the driveway surface from Nathhorst Avenue to the proposed driveway turnaround bulb should be asphalt and the surface treated as required by town trail standards in the area of the trail crossing.
2. The applicant should consider granting a trail easement for the existing Portola Road trail.
3. Proposed swimming pool wrought iron security fencing should be eliminated from the plan and an automatic pool cover used for required security.
4. An alternative for light fixture A should be proposed that does not wash the wall and cannot be adjusted to direct light out.
5. The proposed concentration of floor area in one structure is supported as evaluated in the staff report.
6. The public works director's comments and recommendations on the drainage plan are needed. Further, the applicant needs to be aware that significant water ponds on the site during the winter rainy period.
7. The only more substantive ASCC concern with the project is the proposed landscape berm along Portola Road and its potential for artificial appearance. It needs to be reconsidered in light of final resolution of the trail location with the trails committee. Consideration should be given to less mounding and possibly only using landscaping for screening. The open orchard/meadow condition should be preserved. The height and length of the mound should be reduced. The site beauty is really the open orchard/meadow condition. When a final mound plan is prepared, the height, width, and potential impacts on trees should be demonstrated with staking at the site.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the August 28, 2006 ASCC meeting.

#### **Architectural Review for residential additions, 235 Shawnee Pass, Andrighetto**

Vlasic presented the July 20, 2006 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 1,575 sf of new floor area to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.0 acre, Arrowhead Meadows site. He explained that most of the existing yard improvements and landscaping on the property would not change with the project and that the proposed additions would be single story and made in paved areas adjacent to the rear of the existing house. He noted that the floor area extensions would, however, add to the house depth and result in somewhat higher roof forms and ridges. He also noted that the proposal would concentrate essentially all permitted floor area in the single largest structure on the property, and that this is only possible subject to the ASCC making special findings as evaluated later in this report.



ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, received June 21, 2006 and prepared by Strathdee Design and Development:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 2, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet 3, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet 4, Roof Plan
- Sheet 5, Southeast and Northwest Elevations
- Sheet 6, Northeast and Southwest Elevations
- Sheet 7, Landscape Plan
- Proposed materials and colors sheet received June 21, 2006
- Annotated floor plan showing locations for proposed exterior light fixtures, received on June 22, 2006 with cut sheets for the proposed fixtures

In addition to these plans and materials, also considered was the June 23, 2006 letter from the project architect regarding the proposed concentration of floor area.

Project architect Fredrick Strathdee presented his proposal to the ASCC. In response to a concern in the staff report, he clarified that for floor area conformity, the existing barn would be removed prior to occupancy of the added to house, but that the applicants would like to use it for furniture storage during the construction process. He also noted that the applicants are willing to review the landscape plan as recommended in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed some concerns with the project including the issues evaluated in the staff report. It was finally agreed that the proposed height of the roof ridge over the garage needed to be lowered and that lighting plan and landscape plan adjustments were needed.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 5-0 approval of the proposed plans 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. The barn shall be demolished prior to occupancy of the added to house to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. A detailed construction staging plan shall be developed that ensures minimum potential for conflict with school and other traffic in the area. This plan shall be to the satisfaction of the public works director.
3. A vegetation protection plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of planning staff. Once approved, it shall be implemented also to the satisfaction of planning staff.
4. The plans shall be revised as necessary to lower the proposed height of the roof ridge over the garage area to be no higher than the roof ridge proposed over the east side of the house.

5. The lighting in the rear trellis area shall be reduced. Either the three wall lights or the four trellis lights shall be eliminated from the lighting plan.
6. The landscape plan shall be revised to eliminate the redwoods on the slope along the northeast side of the house. The plan shall provide for plantings of native, erosion control grasses and native shrubs on this slope.
7. The proposed exterior color scheme shall be revised to conform to town's color light reflectivity guidelines and also provide for darker, more "earthy" color tones.

ASCC members also suggested that consideration be given to simplifying the design of the proposed new house entry, but it was noted that this was not an issue of major concern to commission members.

### **Continued Discussion -- ASCC Post Construction Analysis of Residential Projects**

ASCC members considered and confirmed as final, those study findings contained in the May 3, 2006 project evaluation report and in the May 22, 2006 ASCC meeting minutes. It was acknowledged that these findings should be organized into a program for implementation that would first pursue changes to the design guidelines and new procedures to ensure conformity with plan approvals. It was suggested that any ordinance changes only be pursued as time allows.

Vlasic advised that a report on the steps for implementation would be presented to the ASCC for approval at a future meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0-2 (Warr, Schilling) approval of the June 26, 2006 meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Miscellaneous Comments**

Vlasic advised that the next regular ASCC meeting would be on August 28, 2006.

Borck advised that the town attorney wanted her to remind all ASCC members that they must complete state mandated ethics training by the end of the year. She provided a hand out relative to options for training sessions including "on-line" classes.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

T. Vlasic