

**Architectural and Site Control Commission** **December 10, 2007**  
**Special Field Meeting 727 Westridge Drive, Conley, and 18 Redberry Ridge, Salah, and**  
**Regular ASCC Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chairman Gelpi called the special field meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. at 727 Westridge Drive.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr

ASCC Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Davis

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Others present relative to the Conley request:**

Ray and Jennie Conley, applicants

Peter Duxbury, project architect

Tom Klope, project landscape architect

Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached garage/workshop, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-577, 727 Westridge Drive, Conley**

Vlastic briefly reviewed the comments in the December 6, 2007 staff report on this preliminary review of plans for construction of a new, two-story, 6,440 sf contemporary version of a Ranch style residence with attached garage on the subject 2.9 acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He explained that the project includes a detached, 768 sf single story accessory structure containing garage and workshop spaces, a new swimming pool, pool terrace, sports court, vegetable garden and associated pathways, and landscaping. Vlastic also explained that the proposed grading of 930 cubic yards requires the subject site development permit, and the ASCC is the approving authority for the permit. He pointed out that the application proposes 88% of the permitted floor area to be concentrated in the main house and that exceeding 85% of the floor area limit in the single largest structure is only possible if the ASCC can make specific required findings as explained and evaluated in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 11/21/07, prepared by Duxbury Architects:

Sheet G-001, Cover Sheet

Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Mission Engineers, 6/15/06

Sheet L1, (Landscape) Site Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L2, Impervious Surface Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L3, (Landscape) Lighting Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L4, Fencing and Gate Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L5, Tree Status Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L6, Landscape Screening Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet C-1, (Engineering) Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07

Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07

Sheet C-3, (Engineering) Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07  
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07  
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/10/07

Sheet AS-101, Architectural Site Plan  
Sheet AS-301, Site Sections  
Sheet A-101, Floor Plans  
Sheet A-102, Floor Plans  
Sheet A-104, Roof Plan  
Sheet A-201, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A-202, Detached Garage: Exterior Elevations, Floor and Roof Plans  
Sheet X-101, Area Calculation Diagram

Also considered were a project arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated November 14, 2006, cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures and a colors and materials board, dated November 21, 2007.

Vlasic stressed that this was a preliminary review of the proposal and, at the conclusion of the 12/10 review, project consideration should be continued to the January 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting. He noted that this would provide the applicant the opportunity to consider and respond to comments from the ASCC, WASC, and others and to also allow time for full town staff and committee project review.

The applicant, Mr. Duxbury, and Mr. Klope reviewed background relative to the development of the proposed plans and also pointed out the story poles and other site markings and identifications set for the field meeting. They reviewed the proposed plans and shared a site analysis diagram explaining factors considered in development of the proposal. Also, a project model was presented for reference. Following review of the plans and supporting materials, the project design team led all present on an inspection of site conditions. During the course of the plan presentation and site inspection, the design team offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The existing two-story house was constructed in 1957, and the new house is sited in much the same location as the existing structure. The majority of site trees, particularly native oaks, are to be preserved, but several non-native trees, e.g., pine and eucalyptus, would be removed. A few larger pines, however, along the eastern parcel boundary would be preserved for screening of views between the building sites on the subject and adjacent parcel to the east.
- The plans for the proposed basement light well were described and, in response to concerns over the proposed removal of the oak identified as tree #21, it was noted that the plans would be further evaluated to determine if this tree and the small adjacent oak could be saved in place or relocated.
- It was noted that the driveway and auto court surfaces would be asphalt and that the plans would be annotated for clarity as to surface materials. It was commented that a permeable asphalt material is also being considered.

- The pool equipment will be located in the proposed fenced area noted as the “trash enclosure,” and the plans will be clarified as to this equipment location.
- The tentative plans for sustainable components of the proposal were reviewed, including a geothermal system, gray water system, using the sports court surface to collect heat that would be used to heat the proposed swimming pool, etc. It was also noted that the plans tentatively call for recycling of existing site materials and balancing on site, to the extent possible, of grading materials. It was explained that, at this point, approximately 300 cubic yards of excess earth material would be hauled off site, but that additional study is being pursued that might result in more materials being kept on site.
- The plans have been shared with the site neighbors and all that have seen the plans have commented positively on them.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the ball wall at the sports court would be concrete or concrete block with a height of approximately eight feet. It was clarified that the wall would be painted to match the house siding, that vegetation screening would be provided to soften views to the wall, and that grading would be controlled to protect the large oak on the north side of the proposed court.
- Options for the house siding and trim colors are still being considered. While the intent is to meet the light reflectivity values (LRV) of the colors shown on the colors board, tones with more blue and/or green rather than the gray tones on the current colors board are being studied.
- The lighting plans were reviewed and it was noted that the proposed upper rear deck lights were all to be low mounted step lights and that the front veranda lights were primarily recessed fixtures. It was also noted that there was no plan to light the sports court.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the appropriate grass seed mix for the planned meadow area was still being studied, but that likely the mix preferred for use in Portola Valley would be selected.

Public comments were requested. **Bev Lipman** advised that the **WASC** was still in the process of plan review, but that she did not have any major questions at this time.

ASCC members noted that they would offer preliminary comments and reactions at the site meeting. **Warr**, however, commented that he would hope that the plans could be revised to save at least oak #21. **Breen** commented that initially she wondered about the preference for a single story house, but based on the site inspection concluded that the two-story solution resulted in a more compact design, with less site disturbance and fewer tree impacts.

Following the site inspection and sharing of the above clarifications and comments, project review was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting. It was noted that the purpose of the evening review would be for ASCC members and the public to offer additional preliminary review comments and that at the conclusion of the evening discussion project

review would be continued to the January 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting. Thereafter, ASCC chair Gelpi thanked all present for their participation in the site meeting.

At approximately 3:50 p.m. the Conley site meeting was concluded. Vlastic advised that the special field meeting would continue at 18 Redberry Ridge for preliminary review of the Salah project as soon as ASCC members could convene at the site.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-578, 18 Redberry Ridge, 18 Redberry Ridge, Lot 14 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Salah**

All ASCC members convened at 18 Redberry Ridge at approximately 4:00 p.m. They were joined by staff members Vlastic and Borck, town council liaison Davis and the following individuals:

George Salah, applicant  
Carrie Burke, project architect  
David Winitzky, project architect  
Lorrin Hill, project architect  
Ron Lutsko, project landscape architect  
Peter Hessel, project landscape architect  
Mark Foster, President Blue Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA)  
Victor Perlroth, Lot 15 Blue Oaks  
Jim Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge, (Lot 12 Blue Oaks)  
George Demienne and daughter, 17 Redberry Ridge, (Lot 13 Blue Oaks)  
Mr. and Mrs. Owens, 14 Redberry Ridge, (Lot 17 Blue Oaks)  
Cheryl and Eric Evans, 3 Redberry Ridge, (Lot 7 Blue Oaks)  
Linda Elkind, 14 Hawkview, Portola Valley Ranch  
Steve Helprin, 12 Hawkview, Portola Valley Ranch  
Pierre Fisher, 10 Valley Oak, Portola Valley Ranch  
Peter Duxbury, architect for Victor Perlroth, Lot 15 Blue Oaks  
Tom Klope, landscape architect for Victor Perlroth, Lot 15 Blue Oaks

Vlastic advised that this was a preliminary review of the subject proposal for development of a single story residence with detached garage and detached office and partial basement on the subject 1.25 acre Blue Oaks parcel. He noted that review of the request, following preliminary consideration, would be continued to at least the January 14, 2008 ASCC meeting. He clarified that the preliminary review provides the opportunity for the ASCC, the Blue Oaks HOA, and interested neighbors to obtain key information on the proposal and offer questions and preliminary reactions to it. Vlastic also noted that the continuance to the 1/14/08 meeting would provide the opportunity for the applicant to address preliminary review comments and for town staff and committees to complete their reviews of the proposal.

Vlastic then provided a brief overview of the project and referenced the comments in the December 6 staff report on it. He discussed the current status of the plans and some of the concerns set forth in the staff report regarding consistency between data presented on plan sheets, particularly grading and retaining wall data, and need for clarification of plan details, e.g., use of proposed exterior materials and finishes. Vlastic also referenced a December 8, 2007 memo to the ASCC from Victor and Daniella Perlroth and December 10,

2007 letter to the ASCC from Louis and Anne Borders, owner of Lot 16, both setting forth concerns over the proposal.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 11/27/07, prepared by the architectural team of Carrie Burke, Lorrin Hill and W. David Winitzky:

- Sheet A 1.0, Cover – Project Information
- Sheet A 2.0, Site and Grading Plan
- Sheet A 3.0, Floor Plans
- Sheet A 4.0, Dwelling and Office Elevations
- Sheet A 4.1, Left and Right Side Exterior Elevations
- Sheet EL 0.1, Electrical Site Lighting Plan
- Sheet L 1.01, Planting Zone Diagram, Lutsko Associates

Also considered was supporting information received 11/28/07 relative to sustainability considerations, with completed sustainability checklist and exterior lighting summary and cut sheets. It was noted that a site analysis and design principles presentation had been provided in digital format (pdf file) to reduce paper consumption. A proposed colors and materials sheet, received 11/28/07, was also available for reference.

Mr. Salah and his design team presented their plans and a project model. Ms. Burke noted that a power point presentation would be provided at the evening ASCC meeting focusing on site analysis and design evolution. She reviewed the data provided with the application submittal, including the materials contained in the pdf digital file. She stressed that “Green/sustainable” objectives have driven the design of the proposal and that the plans also conform to the requirements of the Blue Oaks PUD. It was explained how the plans respond to site conditions, including slopes, native manzanita plants, and “true north south orientation” for maximum opportunity to make use of natural systems for light, ventilation, and heating and cooling.

The design team also referenced the story poles and taping set for the site meeting and led those present on an inspection of site conditions. During the course of the presentation and site inspection, the following comments and clarifications were offered:

- The site modeling of the garage is incorrect and the taping and story poles as installed are further to the north than what is shown on the proposed plans. This will be corrected prior to the next ASCC review meeting.
- The plan elements that look like “chimneys” are actually for ventilation and capturing of daylight. They will help to bring daylight into the structure and reduce the mechanical loads for cooling and heating.
- The grading plans are preliminary and need to be further developed with input from the landscape architect. Mr. Lutsko joined the team relatively recently and will be working to, in particular, help refine the final site and grading plans.

- The design anticipates use of an on-site driveway, but discussions with Mr. Perlroth are underway that would allow for development of a common driveway within the panhandle serving Lot 15.
- The plans confine the house and other structures to the established building envelope and do not include any application of the permitted provisions for setback averaging. Further, the windows proposed along the north side of the house have been directed away from Lot 15.
- The site contains five to six different species of manzanita. The intent is to preserve as many of the old plantings as possible, and site planning details are still evolving regarding this. It was also noted that the old manzanita plants could be cut and the cuttings used to propagate new plants on site.
- It is recognized that the grading and architectural plans have some inconsistencies, but these will be resolved under the direction of the landscape architect. In particular, a number of the areas where the architectural and grading plans suggest the need for retaining walls, e.g., the western court/terrace area, will likely be modified to eliminate the need for, or significantly reduce the height and extent of, such walls.
- Consideration is being given to the use of a permeable surface for the driveway and parking areas.
- Additional review is being made to the garage wall exposed to the cul-de-sac. Some adjustments are anticipated to soften the view. These could include grading modifications and/or additional landscape solutions.
- The plans currently anticipate use of native grass roof material. This is one option. A comprehensive mechanical engineering analysis is underway to determine the best roof material from an energy efficiency standpoint. In response to concerns over the "height" of a green roof, it was noted that the planted roof surface is actually lower than the top of the eave and that height is measured from the eave and roof peak. (Vlasic advised that the roof forms and heights conform to the height limit, and in most areas the roof heights would actually be well under the limits. He also commented that the town has not found it necessary to worry over measuring the height of "growing materials" on a green roof and has wanted to encourage the use of such roofing.)
- In response to comments in the staff report regarding consideration of some minor adjustments to proposed house orientation, concerns were expressed over loss of "true north south orientation," impact on solar shading, and also loss of key views. Some additional explanation of window locations and orientation were offered to explain the design and analysis issues faced with any reorientation, even if it was only a minor adjustment.
- It was stressed that the project was being developed broadly in terms of energy efficiency, but that solar photovoltaic panels were not being considered due their potential for visual impacts. It was clarified that the intent is to achieve energy efficiency with other design considerations that would also respect site conditions and visual relationships to neighboring parcels. Additional design details including window

areas, glazing materials, “catchment pools” were discussed in terms of the energy efficiencies of the proposal.

- In response to a question, it was noted that the basement space use and functions had yet to be fully evaluated or defined and that the proposed 3,000+ sf basement area may be larger than actually needed. It was noted that additional review of this matter is underway.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

**Victor Perlroth** reviewed the comments in his December 8, 2007 memorandum to the ASCC. He questioned the “860” level base elevation and requested further study of moving the proposed house somewhat further away from the higher “ridge” along the boundary between his property and the subject site. He suggested that both his project and the subject proposal should work to provide for as much screening and separation between the houses as possible by moving somewhat further away from the common property line and/or cutting the structures further into their building sites.

**Peter Duxbury**, also shared some of the comments in the 12/8/07 memorandum to the ASCC from Mr. Perlroth and wondered about the possibility of specifically grading the proposed house further into the site.

**Linda Elkind** stated her support for the proposal and particularly the “green building” components of it. She also stated support for the proposed palette of exterior materials and finishes.

**Steve Helprin** stated support for the “green building” aspects of the proposal, but particularly the use of the living “green roof.”

ASCC members advised that they would offer comments and preliminary reactions at the evening ASCC meeting. It was noted that at the evening meeting others would also be offered the opportunity to provide comments and reactions for consideration by the applicant, ASCC, and town staff.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, it was understood that preliminary project review would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Site meeting participants were reminded that the evening meeting would include the applicant’s power point presentation.

Vlasic again advised that, after the evening meeting, project review would be continued to at least the January 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting to provide the opportunity for the applicant to address issues as necessary. He noted that this would also permit time for the Blue Oaks homeowners association to, hopefully, complete its review of the project.

At the conclusion of the site discussion, Gelpi thanked the applicant and others present for their participation in the site meeting.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 5:00 p.m. the special ASCC field meeting was adjourned.

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr  
Absent: None  
Town Council Liaison: None  
Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

---

*Prior to discussion of the first two agenda items Warr temporarily stepped down from the ASCC noting his firm was the project architect for the Deaser proposal and that his firm had also provided architectural services to Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club*

---

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

Vlastic presented the December 6, 2007 staff report on this continuing project review. He explained that, based on concerns identified at the November 12 and November 26, 2007 ASCC meetings, the project plans were revised to address most all of the concerns identified, except that a revised arborist report is still being developed to be consistent with the plan revisions.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following revised plans prepared by CJW Architecture:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet, 10/5/07
- Boundary and Topography Map, Pat McNulty, Professional Land Surveyor, April 2005
- Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan & Flood Plain Data, 9/7/07
- Sheet: A-0.2, Grading, Staging Site Plan & Tree Protection Plan, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, 12/6/07
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan (Exterior Lighting Plan), 12/6/07
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan, 12/6/07
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations, 9/7/07
- Sheet: A-3.2, Cabana Exterior Elevations, 12/6/07
- Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design, 10/5/07

Also considered was a December 6, 2007 letter to the ASCC from the project architect explaining the plan changes. Vlastic advised that still part of the proposal are the finish board dated October 5, 2007, subject to the qualifications offered in the 12/6/07 letter from the project architect, and the light fixture cut sheets attached to the staff report.



Jeff Deaser, Kevin Schwarckopf, and Mark Sutherland presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They reviewed the comments in the 12/6/07 revision submittal letter and offered the following additional comments and clarifications:

- The revised arborist report will be provided, but is still being updated. According to the discussions with the arborist, as long as the new cabana is located within the footprint of the existing garage structure it is replacing and the foundation does not extend any closer to the adjacent redwood tree, there should be no tree impact issues. This will be confirmed with the final arborist report and the arborist's foundation recommendations will be adhered to.
- A proposed revised stucco color sample board dated 12/10/07 was presented. It was noted that the proposed color had a light reflectivity value of 39. It was also noted that the board included the sample provided to represent the proposed reuse of existing house redwood materials for the exterior siding of the new cabana, i.e., as discussed in the 12/6 submittal letter.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the revised plans and plan clarifications and found them generally acceptable. Members thanked the applicant for, particularly, the changes to the cabana plans and the scope of proposed rear yard improvements. Some concerns, however, remained over the proposed "S" shaped tile roofing, but members concurred with the commitments made with the 12/6 clarification letter regarding colors, use of stone, etc., and, therefore, concluded the roofing material was acceptable.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0 approval of the revised plans as clarified in the 12/6/07 submittal letter and at the 12/10 ASCC meeting 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, 2006 letter from the project architect. 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 2006 project staff reports for a mix of screen plant materials along the property line common with 167 Brookside Drive. The revised landscape plan shall be to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Prior to presentation of the plan to the ASCC, it shall be shared with the conservation committee for review and comment.
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 and to also address the 2007 project plan revisions. The report shall be updated to also consider the condition and protection of the pine tree along the front property line.
3. 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.

4. 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.
5. 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 and November 26, 2007 letters from Scott Devereaux. Once the plan has been accepted by the public works director, it shall be presented to the ASCC for final approval.
6. All plan sheets shall be revised as necessary for completeness and consistency of data and plan proposals and with the commitments made in the December 6, 2007 letter from project architect Mark Sutherland.
7. The requirements set forth in the November 1, 2007 plan review letter from Josh Maierle shall be met to the satisfaction of the public works director prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.
8. If any changes to the planned cabana wood siding are proposed, these shall be subject to prior review and approval by the ASCC.

**Continued review for conformity with conditions of Use Permit X7D-13, adjustments to exterior lighting plans, 4139 Alpine Road, Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club**

Vlasic presented the December 6, 2007 staff report on this request. He explained that pursuant to the provisions of the Alpine Hills Swimming & Tennis Clubs approved master plan, the club's architect has requested ASCC consideration of adjustments to the approved exterior lighting plans. He advised that the changes pertain to the rear parking area accessed from Los Trancos Road and the children's playground area west of the recently renovated locker room building.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the proposed changes shown on Lighting Plan Sheet LP-4 dated 11/30/07 prepared by Jackson+Cohorts Architects. Also considered were the cut sheets for the fixtures shown on the proposed revised plan.

Neil Jackson, project architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC. He clarified that the pole lights proposed for the rear parking lot area include a "house side shield" and a "custom shield." He also offered the following clarifications:

- The house side shield is the same as the shield used with the pole lights installed in the pool complex.
- The custom shield's impact in reducing light spill are not shown on the photometric drawing provided with the application submittal, and there will actually be less light spill towards the property line than indicated on the drawing.

- The existing tree-mounted floodlights in the children's play area will be removed with this proposal. Further, the proposed play area lights will be on a separate circuit and only on when the play area is being used.

Public comments were request. **Pat Lee, property owner of 4145 Alpine Road**, requested clarification of the location and design of the proposed children's play area lighting, and this was provided to her.

Following brief discussion, Breen moved approval of the plans as presented and clarified by the project architect at the ASCC meeting. Clark seconded the action, which was then approved 4-0.

---

*Following action on the Deaser and Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club requests, Warr returned to his ASCC position.*

---

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached garage/workshop, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-577, 727 Westridge Drive, Conley**

Vlasic presented the December 6, 2007 staff report on this proposal and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on it. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) He noted that since this is a preliminary review, the ASCC should receive additional public input and offer additional comments, as may be appropriate, to those presented during the site meeting and then continue project review to the January 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Conley, Peter Duxbury and Tom Klope were present to discuss their proposal further with ASCC members. They offered the following comments in response to those shared at the site meeting.

- The plans will be reconsidered to see if the two oak trees adjacent to the light well area could be preserved. It is possible that adjustments would permit saving the larger oak in place. It is likely that the smaller oak could be relocated on site.
- The sports court plans will be reviewed to ensure that the large adjacent oak is protected and additional screen planting will be provided.

Public comments were requested. **Bev Lipman, WASC**, advised that for the most part the project appears acceptable, but that the WASC would be reviewing details including exterior materials and colors and lighting.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and found it generally acceptable subject to the concerns shared at the site meeting, particularly regarding the oaks at the light well area, and the following comments:

- The scope of exterior lighting needs to be reduced. In particular, the number of step lights around the pool should be reduced because of the exposure to the downhill

neighbor. Further, there should be fewer lights on the house, particularly the elevation exposed to Westridge Drive, and the need for lighting along the pathway to the sports court was questioned.

- The removal of non-native trees is supported.
- Some concern over the size of the proposed basement. Encourage consideration of a smaller basement in terms of reducing the “carbon footprint” of the project.
- Support continued efforts to reduce the scope of off-hauling of grading materials. Attempt to balance grading on-site.
- Additional efforts are needed to soften the visual impact of the sports court ball wall. Additional landscaping is needed.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the January 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting.

### **Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-578, 18 Redberry Ridge, Lot 14 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Salah**

Vlasic presented the December 6, 2007 staff report on this proposal and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on it. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) He noted that since this is a preliminary review, the ASCC should receive additional public input to that provided at the site meeting and also offer comments before continuing project review to the next regular ASCC meeting. Vlasic clarified that the applicant’s design team would be providing a power point presentation and following-up to comments shared during the course of the site meeting. He also noted that ASCC members had not provided any detailed comments or reactions during the site meeting discussion.

George Salah and design team members Carrie Burke, Lorrin Hill, David Winitzky, and Ron Lutsko were present to further discuss the proposal with ASCC members. Mr. Salah provided an overview of his approach in selecting a design team for this project and also the critical project design objectives. He stressed that the multi-architect team was selected for the depth of experience and understanding of the matters of most concern to him and his family. In particular, he reviewed his objectives of taking care of the natural conditions of the property, capturing views, and, more importantly, creating a healthy living environment that eliminates any “toxic exposures.” He further stressed that his desire for a “healthy” building was an extension of the broader objective of ensuring that new buildings contribute to the long-term health of the planet.

The project design team then made a power point presentation on the design efforts and analyses that resulted in the proposal as currently planned. They explained the factors considered including on and off site conditions, modeling of relationships to building envelopes and structures on adjoining parcels, solar exposures and orientations, site slope and contours, manzanita and other native plants, primary views, etc. It was stressed that living spaces were being evaluated for multi-function uses to ensure that planned square

footage was really needed to serve the lives of the Salah family. It was pointed out that the evaluation of the basement space, in particular, was still in process relative to family needs, but that at least some of this space would serve the energy efficient systems planned for the project.

The power point presentation included discussion of the functions of the proposed "chimney-like" ventilation and light elements. It was noted that the intent was for the house and its specific design elements to work in harmony with the natural conditions that influence the site. It was also stressed that with the recent involvement of Lutsko and Associates, more study would be made to the site plan, grading proposals, etc., to ensure the basic design objectives are fully achieved. It was further noted that with respect to lighting, Dave Nelson Associates, lighting consultants, were being employed to ensure the lighting plan is sensitive to town objectives, including low impacts and highly controlled illumination that are oriented to specific tasks.

At the conclusion of the power point presentation, it was noted that the planning effort is still somewhat of a work in progress, but that plan refinements would be developed with the involvement of Mr. Lutsko and the lighting consultant and to address ASCC and neighbor input.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Victor Perloth, Lot 15 Blue Oaks**, briefly reviewed the comments in his December 8, 2007 memorandum to the ASCC. He offered the additional observations:

- As a resident born and raised in Portola Valley, he views the town as a place to retreat to a low density environment where openness is "uplifting" and helps ones "blood pressure fall."
- While the proposed project concepts are generally appropriate, it would be more in keeping with site and area conditions, and more reflective to the low density character of the community, if it were cut further into the site and moved further away from the common property line with Lot 15. He again questioned the proposed base elevation and wondered if a more appropriate grading plan could be developed with a lower base elevation.
- Additional clarification is needed with respect to the other court area planned on the northwest side of the residence and the grading and retaining wall work that appears needed for its development.
- The main concern is the relationship of improvements along the high point of the area between Lots 14 and 15. Privacy and noise are key concerns. It was suggested that the combination of some additional cutting in of the house into the site, some movement away from the common property line and perhaps mounding as well as additional landscaping would resolve the key concerns with respect to openness, separation and privacy.
- While solar panels are not now planned, the concern is how they might be handled later on. This could be a significant future impact.

Mr. Perlroth concluded by stressing his desire to work with Mr. Salah and his design team to resolve his concerns and also his willingness to consider a joint driveway plan. He viewed appropriate design approaches to both these issues as important to the best solution for development of the two parcels.

**Pierre Fischer, 10 Valley Oak**, expressed concern over the potential for view impacts of the project from views in Portola Valley Ranch. He worried over light spill and encouraged control of lighting and colors and materials to minimize view impacts.

ASCC members then offered the following individual comments on the project:

**Von Fledt:**

- In response to Perlroth concerns, wondered about the basis for the house elevation. (Project team members explained the proposed indoor and outdoor relationships and view objectives.)
- Stated support for the general approach to house design, and excitement over the proposed architecture. Also stated support for the “green building” components including the chimney systems and particularly the “green” living roof.
- Expressed some concern over the proposed roof deck and understood the privacy concerns of the neighbors regarding the use of this deck. Encouraged working with the neighbors to resolve concerns.
- Expressed preference for a shared driveway solution.
- Expressed some concern over the use of an artificial looking berm for privacy between parcels and also some concern over the scope of glazing exposed toward Lot 12.
- Wondered about the need for the proposed large basement and encouraged reduction in basement size.
- Appreciated and supported sensitive design analyses used as a basis for plan development

**Warr:**

- Stated appreciation for the design efforts and support for the overall project elements including site design, building arrangements, sustainability, materials palette, etc. Noted, however, that this is still a big project and a better understanding of plan details is needed.
- Expressed concern that the grading drawings and plans don’t reflect the design objective statements and appreciated that more work was being pursued on these plans. Particularly concerned with the garage plans and the wall exposed on the cul-de-sac side of the structure.

- There is a need for a clearer and more complete understanding of how the materials are actually to be used on the planned buildings. This needs to be detailed.
- The roof deck needs to be re-evaluated in terms of potential impacts on the neighbor to the north. Perhaps an alternative location should be considered with limited or no overview of the Perlroth property. Further, the plans need to be clarified with respect to the stairs to the roof terrace.
- Need a precise identification of what existing plant materials are to be protected and preserved.
- Encourage the neighbors to work together to achieve the appropriate “natural or native” plan for separation between properties and also, hopefully, a joint driveway solution.
- Need a better understanding of the “chimney” elements and their functions. To appreciate the appropriateness of the design, the details of these elements should be explained.
- The landscape plan needs to be less diagrammatic and more reflective of site conditions. It is clear that considerably more work is needed on the site, landscape and grading plans before the project is next presented to the ASCC.

**Breen:**

- Excited over and supportive of the project. It is a “great” response to site conditions.
- The landscape concepts are existing and appropriate and look forward to the next version of a more detailed landscape plan. It is exciting to consider growing plants from site cuttings, but it may also be necessary to consider contract growing of plants that are otherwise hard to find.
- Support shared driveway as the right solution for both Lots 14 and 15 and encourage the neighbors to work together to achieve this and also resolve other site relationships of mutual concern.
- Prefer a design solution that does not rely on an artificial berm between parcels, i.e., for the area along the boundary between Lots 14 and 15.
- Don’t share others concerns with respect to the roof deck, but strongly encourage reduction in the size of the proposed basement.
- Very excited about the proposed project’s harmony with the lands and site and hope the greater community takes notice of the fundamentals used in this approach to design.

**Clark:**

- Shared comments of other commissioners regarding positive reactions to the general design approach.

- Shared Warr's concerns regarding the need for a better understanding of the "chimney" elements and their functions.
- Expressed concern that the grading drawings and plans and, particularly, the need to clarify the plans for the terrace area on the northwest side of the house. In particular, need to focus on the vision of the landscape architect for the site.
- With the involvement of the lighting consultant, efforts will be needed to minimize the scope of exterior lighting and potential for light spill.

### **Gelpi:**

- Shared others comments supporting the proposed design approach and general design solution. Stressed, however, the need for a more comprehensive need for evaluation and refinement of the grading plans. Also, stressed the need for a more detailed and complete landscaping proposal.
- Shared Warr's concerns over the need for revised plans to detail the application of the proposed exterior materials and finishes. In particular, strongly supported the use of the "green" living roof.
- Expressed concern over the proposed garage structure walls and wall exposures to the cul-de-sac. Requested more details with respect to grading and landscaping to address potential impacts.
- Shared concerns of others over the potential noise and privacy impacts of the proposed roof deck.
- Strongly encouraged reduction of the basement size to limit site impacts and scope of grading.
- Expressed the need for more details and clarification of the exterior lighting proposals.

Following the sharing of comments, project review was continued to the January 14, 2008 ASCC meeting. It was clarified, however, that it might take some additional time for plan refinements to be developed that the next plan review may need to be eventually continued to a later ASCC meeting. Ms. Burke stated she would attempt to advise the town by December 17 as to more specific time regarding plan revisions.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0-1, approval of the November 26, 2007 field meeting minutes as drafted. Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the November 26, 2007 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

### **January 14, 2008 ASCC Meeting Attendance**

Gelpi advised that due to a work conflict he would likely not be able to attend the regular January 14, 2008 ASCC meeting.



## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

T. Vlastic