

**Special Field Meeting 170 Mapache Drive, Holland/Yates, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chairman Gelpi called the special field meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. at 170 Mapache Drive.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr

ASCC Absent: Clark

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the Holland/Yates project:

Linda Yates, applicant

Mohit Bharagava, project architect

Tom Klope, project landscape architect

Jim Lipman, 25 Palmer Lane

Alison Wells, 15 Naranja Way

George Andreini, 187 Mapache Drive

David Jorgensen, 20 Zapata Way (arrived during the course of the site meeting, at approximately 4:20 p.m.)

Mary Enright, 171 Mapache Drive (arrived at approximately 4:20 p.m.)

Follow-up 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 discussed the comments in the March 8, 2007 staff report on the subject follow-up review. He noted that the specific purpose of the afternoon site meeting was to field consider the proposed Follansbee Steel TCS II Terne-coated stainless steel roof material as well as the March 7, 2007 perimeter planting plan by Thomas Klope Associates. He advised that Breen and he had the opportunity to visit the site at noon as requested by Mr. and Mrs. Jorgensen, 20 Zapata Way, to view the roof sample in the noon-time sun light from the Jorgensen property. Vlastic clarified, however, that the installed larger roof sample was a "fresh" TCS II material and not the weathered sample that Ms. Yates was to share at the site meeting.

Ms. Yates presented the weathered sample of the proposed roof material. She also provided copies of data on the roof material including an April 1, 2004 laboratory report analysis relative to specifically "Solar Spectrum Reflectometer" readings of "fresh" and "aged" Terne alloy coated stainless steel roofing. It was noted that the reading for the "fresh" surface was .63 and .21 for the aged surface. She also offered the following regarding the proposed roof material and its importance to sustainable building:

- The roof steel at installation is approximately 65%-95% recycled material.
- The roof is a 100 year product and at the end of its effective roof life is 100% recyclable.
- Solar panels can be installed on the roof without impact on the effectiveness of the panels or adverse impact on the roof.

- There is no leaching of toxic materials from the roof that could contaminate ground water conditions. This is essential to the overall plan that is to keep as much storm water runoff on site as possible.
- The roof ages naturally through oxidation, like copper, and chemicals are not needed for the ageing process.

Jim Lipman commented that he had been a member of the ASCC and was at the meeting because of his concern with the proposed stainless steel roof material. He noted that his initial impressions were that a stainless steel roof was not appropriate for houses in the town due to the potential impacts from reflectivity. He cited the Walt Disney Concert Hall “stainless steel” building in downtown Los Angeles and noted the problems of glare and heat reflected from what appear to be shiny, highly polished surfaces.

ASCC members and others present viewed the aged sample and then walked to the northeastern corner of the site to consider the proposed perimeter planting plan and view the aged roof sample against the larger, “fresh” sample installed at the location of the approved detached garage. It was noted that the larger sample installation was placed at an angle consistent with that proposed for the slope of the garage roof. ASCC members compared the aged sample to the “fresh” roof panels and agreed the color and finish of the aged sample was acceptable.

Tom Klope reviewed the screen planting plan and discussed the growth characteristics of the proposed plant materials. He stressed that this plan was only to address the perimeter screen planting issues and that the required overall detailed landscape plan, consistent with the previously approved concept landscape plan, would be provided with the project building permit submittal. He further explained that the intent is to plant the screen materials as soon after ASCC approval as possible. In response to a question, Mr. Klope advised that the landscape and grading plans could be modified to preserve at least one of the existing Italian Stone Pines on the slope above the garage site.

Landscape plan discussion also focused on the 15 gallon size of the proposed *Prunus ilicifolia*. Mr. Klope noted that the applicants are willing to install 24 inch box size plantings, but that it has proven difficult to find a source for this size of plants.

During the course of review of the planting plan, Mr. Jorgensen arrived and presented a March 6, 2007 letter (page 2 dated March 12) with attached photo-simulation. Mr. Jorgensen advised that as stated in the letter he was finding difficulty in confirming the time period for and effects of the stainless steel ageing process presented in the 4/1/04 laboratory report provided by Ms. Yates. At the same time, he viewed the aged sample and agreed if the proposed roofing material would age to the condition of the sample within the suggested 18-22 month period, the material would be acceptable. He stressed his concern was with the ability to verify the data, even after discussions with representatives of Follansbee Steel.

Mr. Jorgensen also worried about the size of the proposed screen plant materials. He requested that larger plants be considered. In response to a question regarding the applicants offer to install transplanted olives on his property for faster screening, Mr. Jorgensen advised he is not interested in any additional olive trees on his parcel.

After review at the project site, meeting participants continued to the Jorgensen property to consider views from the Jorgensen house, pool terrace and other outdoor areas. Discussion continued on the screen planting plan, and data relative to aging of the proposed roof materials. It was also suggested that some additional planting of native shrubs along the "brow" of the slope just beyond the south end of the Jorgensen swimming pool could screen much of the views from the property to the proposed house roof. Mr. Jorgensen expressed concern over the potential for such planting to impact the view across and beyond the "infinity" edge of his swimming pool.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members concurred that project discussion should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Members also concluded that based on viewing the "fresh" and "aged" roof samples from both on site and the Jorgensen property, the aged sample was acceptable and would be consistent with the intent of the town's light reflectivity value policy limits. This conclusion was offered with the understanding that the confusion encountered by Mr. Jorgensen relative to aging of the roof material, as explained in his letter to the ASCC, could be resolved and the ASCC would be provided with reasonable assurances regarding the aging process.

Chairman Gelpi thanked Ms. Yates and her design team members for the site presentation. He also thanked Mr. Jorgensen for his input and the opportunity to view the roof samples from his property.

Adjournment

At approximately 4:50 p.m. the special ASCC field meeting was adjourned.

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up 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 March 8, 2007 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting regarding review of the proposed roof material samples and the proposed perimeter, screen landscaping plan. (See above site meeting minutes for a summary of the site meeting events and tentative conclusions.) Vlastic also referenced the March 12, 2007 letter from Mr. Jorgensen presented at the site meeting and two email communications from Jim Lipman, 25 Palmer Lane.

With respect to the emails from Mr. Lipman, Vlastic advised that prior to the site meeting, Mr. Lipman had sent a 3/12/07 email to the ASCC expressing serious concerns and reservations about the use of stainless steel roofing. Vlastic then reviewed the 3/12 email sent to the ASCC by Mr. Lipman after the site meeting. Vlastic noted that the second email contained the following statements:

“...having seen the sample of aged stainless steel roofing material that Linda Yates is proposing to use, I find that this stainless steel is a very acceptable material to use for exterior surfaces. I am sorry to have raised an issue before I knew just what material was being proposed.”

ASCC members considered the staff report, data gathered at the site meeting, the communications from Mr. Jorgensen and Mr. Lipman and the following plans and materials, for the most part dated March 7, 2007 and, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Hill Glaizer Architects:

Sheet A-2.2, Roof Plan, Overall

Sheet A-5.1, Exterior Elevations, Main House

Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Site Plan, Thomas Klope Associates

Sheet L1.5, Perimeter Screening (Landscape) Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc.

Sheet LD-0, Landscape Lighting Legend, Truax Design Group, Inc.

Sheet LD-1, Overall Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc.
Sheet LD-2, South Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc.
Sheet LD-3, North Landscape Lighting Plan, Truax Design Group, Inc.

It was also noted that the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee had already completed action and approved the aged sample of the proposed Follansbee TS II Terne-Coated Stainless Steel metal roof material and reference was made to the February 16, 2007 approval letter from the committee.

Linda Yates and Paul Holland, applicants, Mohit Bharagava, project architect and Tom Klope, project landscape architect were present to discuss the follow-up submittal with ASCC members. They offered their belief that the comments in the letter from Mr. Jorgensen were based on discussion relative to the Terne II roof material and not the proposed TCS II material. They stressed that the TCS II material will naturally age without the need for painting or any chemical treatment and this is one of the critical reasons the roof was selected.

Public comments were requested.

Mr. Jorgensen, 20 Zapata Way, reviewed the comments presented in his March 6, 2007 letter (page 2 dated March 12) to the ASCC. He continued to find the "aged" sample of the proposed roof acceptable; but, also discussed the confusion he experienced in attempting to obtain clear data from the roof material manufacturer that would confirm the aging process and roof characteristics to be expected within the suggested 18-22 month ageing period.

No other public comments were offered.

Jeff Clark advised that although he had not attended the afternoon site meeting, he had an opportunity to view the roof samples, including the "aged" one and was prepared to discuss the proposal.

ASCC members discussed the roofing materials, data associated with the ageing process, possibility of pre-aging of the materials, the perimeter landscaping plans and other aspects of the follow-up submittal. It was agreed that while the aged roof sample was acceptable, the confusion encountered by Mr. Jorgensen needed to be properly resolved. Members also concurred that some additional refinement of the perimeter landscape plan was needed.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up submittal including the *Follansbee TCS II Terne-Coated Stainless Steel* roof material 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 applicant shall provide documentation from the *Follansbee* roof material manufacturer to clearly describe the roof material in terms of the ageing process and specifically to confirm that the aged sample considered at the March 12, 2007 ASCC site meeting is representative of what can be expected for the proposed TCS II roof installation. In particular, the documentation shall provide data to support the ASCC's intent that it is reasonable to expect the SSR value of the roofing, i.e., as defined and evaluated in the independent laboratory analysis dated April 1, 2004, to be near .4

within a 18 to 22 month period and eventually .21 as stated in the laboratory analysis. In addition, it is requested that the roof manufacturer comment on the possibility of pre-weathering of the material to, if possible, shorten the period of time for "after-installation" weathering. The documentation shall include the name of the responsible person for the roof manufacturer who would be available to answer questions relative to the information.

2. The "fresh" larger TCS II roofing sample temporarily installed at the site and, also considered at the March 12, 2007 ASCC site meeting, shall be maintained on the property during the course of project construction in order to provide a local example of the time needed for weathering of the steel roof material.
3. The perimeter screen landscape plan shall be modified to include protection of the two existing pines on the slope below the Jorgensen property during the course of the construction process. Further, the plan shall provide for the pines to either be preserved or replaced with another tree/shrub of similar size and screen bulk until such time that the perimeter landscaping has accomplished the ASCC intent for screening views to the roof. In addition, a second transplanted oak should be located within the screen landscape area shown adjacent to the Jorgensen property for added help in more immediate screening of views between parcels. If available plantings of *Prunus ilicifolia* larger than 15 gallon size, possibly 24" box size, should be used.
4. Once the perimeter screen landscape plan is revised and approved by staff, the plan shall be implemented as soon as possible to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. The final, overall detailed site landscape plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC. The plan shall be generally consistent with the 10/27/06 landscape plan approved at the December 11, 2006 ASCC meeting.
6. The final tree protection and construction staging plan shall be provided with the building permit application to the satisfaction of building and planning staff. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

In taking this action, the ASCC specifically directed staff to share the data from the roof manufacturer with Mr. Jorgensen. It was further understood that the revised perimeter screen landscape plan would be shared with Mr. Jorgensen.

Follow-up Review, Site Development Permit X9H-568 -- Architectural Review for detached guest house accessory structure, 300 Alamos Road, Christensen

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2007 staff report on this request. He explained, however, that since plan revision and clarification efforts are needed relative to the septic system the follow-up submittal and site development permit were not ready for ASCC review or action.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the next regular ASCC meeting. (See comments at the end of these minutes as to the timing of the next ASCC meeting.)

Follow-up Review and Site Development Permit X9H-561 -- Architectural Review, for new residence, swimming pool and pool cabana, 171 Mapache Drive, Enright

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2007 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He noted that on November 13, 2006, the ASCC conditionally approved the architectural review application for the project, but that not all aspects of staff review of the site development request had been completed. Vlasic then reviewed the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated February 8, 2007, prepared by Taylor Lombardo Architects LLP, and submitted to satisfy the approval conditions:

Sheet A1.1, Site Plan
Sheet E-1.2, First Floor Lighting and Power Plan
Sheet L-1, Demolition Plan (vegetation construction staging), Cleaver Design
Sheet L-2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design
Sheet C0.0, Title Sheet (Civil Plans), Freyer & Laureta, Inc.
Sheets C0.1 & Co.2, Notes (Civil Plans), Freyer & Laureta, Inc.
Sheet C3.1, Grading Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc.
Sheet C5.1, Erosion Control Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc.
Sheet C8.1, Site Details (Civil Plans), Freyer & Laureta, Inc.

Vlasic also provided copies of the cut sheets for the light fixtures approved for use on the project. It was noted that the cut sheets were received 9/13/06 and approved at the November 13 ASCC meeting.

Vlasic explained that after the 3/8/07 staff report had been prepared, the applicant advised the town a new metal roof sample had been selected and installed at the site for viewing. He added that he had an opportunity to review the sample at the site in the mid-day sunlight and was concerned that it was very "shiny" even though it was a dark color. He commented generally on metal roof surfaces, their relationship to sustainable building objectives, and the broader problem associated with roof "sheen." He noted that the town's policies on light reflectivity values (LRV) are associated with color and do not really take "sheen" into consideration. He stated that now sheen is evolving as a more significant issue than the matter of LRVs associated with color.

Mary Enright and Bob Cleaver presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to matters discussed in the staff report:

- The current roof sample is still being debated and there is no final word on roof material at this point. When a sample acceptable to the design team is identified, town staff and the ASCC will be advised.
- Plan sheets L-1, and L-2 have been revised to show the following (copies of the revised sheets, with 3/12/07 revisions dates, were provided for the record):
 1. The driveway surface will be asphalt.
 2. The existing wire fencing will be removed prior to final house inspection by the town.

3. The location of the driveway intersection with Mapache Drive and associated wall and drainage improvements will be moved approximately four feet to the north to ensure preservation of the two adjacent scrub oaks. Further, the plans have been modified to show the two drainage walls consistent with the engineered site plan. It was clarified that the walls would be approximately one foot high above the 12 inch diameter pipe to be under the driveway.
- The new driveway surface at the location of the trail crossing will be “roughened” as required by the town public works director to meet town trail standards.
 - The intent of the lighting plan is to have photocell controls only on the exterior fixtures where necessary to satisfy building code requirements.
 - In response to questions, it was noted that the proposed pool would have an automatic security cover and that there are no plans for any new fencing with this project.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

Members discussed the follow-up submittal as well as the final grading plans. A few concerns were offered with respect to exterior lighting and members complemented the applicant and Mr. Cleaver on the landscape proposals.

Following discussion, Warr moved seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the site development permit application and the follow-up submittal, including Sheets L-1 and L-2 revised 3/12/07, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit or the actual start of any site grading:

1. The exterior lighting plans shall be modified as follows:
 - a. Photocell controls shall be specified for only those exterior lights required by building code to have such controls. Otherwise all exterior lighting shall be manually switched.
 - b. The two exterior lights proposed for the upper level master bedroom deck shall be eliminated.
 - c. The up-lights proposed in the cabana shall be eliminated.
2. The new asphalt driveway surface at the location of the trail crossing shall be “roughened” as required by the town public works director to meet town trail standards.
3. The final selection of the roof material shall be to the satisfaction of the ASCC.
4. The project shall comply with the requirements of the following site development permit committee review reports to the satisfaction of the reviewer:

Public Works Director, 9/26/06, revised 2/20/07
Town Geologist, 2/22/07
Fire Marshal, received 2/15/07

In addition, the concerns of the conservation committee relative to the potential for summer watering impacting native trees shall be addressed with the final landscape plan.

5. The plans and project improvements shall be in conformity with the requirements of the health department to the satisfaction of the health officer.
6. The existing trail along the Mapache Drive frontage shall remain open during the construction period and there shall be no construction parking or materials storage in the trail area. Provisions for keeping the trail open shall be provided for in the final construction staging plan.
7. A final construction staging and tree protection plan shall be prepared with the project contractor. The general provisions relative to tree protection and construction staging on Sheet L-1 and the provisions for erosion control on the civil plans shall be included with the final construction staging plan. Further, the final plan shall include trail protection provisions (see condition 6 above) and ensure the work at the site is coordinated with any simultaneous construction work at 170 Mapache Drive so that there is minimum potential for impact on public street use.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr temporarily removed himself from his ASCC position. He noted that he would not participate in the discussion, as he has provided architectural services recently to a neighboring property owner immediately adjacent to the Quinn parcel.

Architectural Review for swimming pool/spa, fencing, and lighting, 4 Oak Forest Court, Portola Glen Estates PUD, Quinn

Vlasic presented the comments in the March 8, 2007 staff report on this application. He reviewed the history of the request, previous ASCC approval of the expired application and circumstances associated Mr. Quinn's efforts to reinstate the Portola Glen Estates homeowners association. Vlasic explained that for the reasons explained in the staff report that the applicant is now requesting new approval of the same plans and with the same conditions set with the 3/28/05 follow-up review. He then referred to the following plans dated 2/11/05 and prepared by Winterbotham Partnership, ASLA, as those conditionally approved by the ASCC on March 28, 2005:

Sheet L1, Landscape Plan
Sheet L2, Grading Plan

Mr. Quinn was present to discuss his current application with ASCC members. In response to a question, he advised that the actual project plans in their current form, address the conditions of the 2005 approval. He noted specifically, that the landscape plan adjustments

had already been made and that the revised landscape plan was part of the site development permit application that would be filed when the homeowner's association efforts are complete and the lot line adjustment, discussed in the staff report, could be formally pursued.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following brief discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the plans subject to the same six conditions set with the March 28, 2005 ASCC project approval.

.....
Following action on the Quinn application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.
.....

Architectural Review of plans for garage addition, 312 Golden Hills Drive, Edwards

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2007 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for house and garage additions and remodeling that would add 1,600 sf of floor area to an existing 3,133 sf, partial two-story residence on the subject 2.9 acre Oak Hills subdivision property. Vlasic explained that the proposed modifications and additions were designed to fully match the more traditional Ranch style architecture of the existing residence and result in relatively minimal change to the appearance of site improvements. He then reviewed the few project issues discussed in the staff report, including height of the addition, grading, tree impacts, exterior colors and lighting. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans unless otherwise noted dated February 10, 2007 and prepared by ADL Design:

- Sheet A-1, Site Plan
- Sheet A-2, Elevations
- Sheet A-3, Floor Plan & Elevations, Electrical and Mechanical
- Sheet A-4, Roof Plan

Also considered was the cut sheet for the proposed wall mounted light fixture received 2/20/07 and the proposed colors and materials board.

Tony Luras, ADL Design, presented the project plans to the ASCC. He first offered some perspectives on steel and steel roofing based on his family's long involvement in the steel business. His comments were in response to the discussion that had taken place earlier in the evening on the TCS II stainless steel roof proposed for the Holland/Yates project.

Mr. Luras advised that he was not only the project designer, but currently living in the house at 312 Golden Hills Drive. He then offered the following plan clarifications, largely in response to issues discussed in the staff report.

- The property owner is interested in changing the color scheme of the house to be darker and more in line with the town's policy limits on Light Reflectivity Values (LRV). A specific proposal has yet to be defined, but will be presented to the ASCC when a final decision is made.

- Only one new light is anticipated and this would be mounted at the door shown on the rear elevation of the garage.
- The project structural engineer is working on the final foundation plans and as noted in the staff report, this will add height to the westernmost wall of the enlarged, two-story garage. The estimated added height is four feet and this appears to conflict with the 28 foot height limit.
- One of the key design objectives of the project is the proposed upper level space planned for the “full swing golf simulator.” The height requirements of the simulator dictate the plate height in the upper level. Thus, in order to modify the design to conform to the 28 foot height limit may require moving the location for the simulator. This will need further evaluation.
- In response to a question, it was noted that while one oak is to be removed to accommodate the garage expansion, a 16 inch and an 18 inch oak would be preserved along the west side of the garage. An arborist report is being completed on the trees and the one to be removed has been found to be in questionable condition. Tree protection and preservation measures would, however, be pursued for the two trees to remain.
- Also, in response to a question, it was noted that at this time there is no plan to place fill against the west elevation of the garage. It was acknowledged, however, that the plans are not clear in this regard and that the foundation data from the structural engineer should address this matter.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Vlastic, however, advised that the town had received a communication from the Oak Hills homeowners association (HOA) advising that the HOA has approved the proposal.

ASCC members discussed the project and while finding it generally acceptable, did indicate concern with the number of items still in the process of design decisions as noted by Mr. Lauras. Of particular concern were the height and potential tree impact issues.

Following discussion, and with concurrence of Mr. Lauras, project review was continued to the next regular ASCC meeting. It was noted that the continuance was to allow for the time needed to resolve the outstanding design issues.

Staff Informational Report - Update re: February 26, 2007 Ashmead Approval, 10 Antonio Court

Vlastic briefly reviewed the comments in the March 8, 2006 staff report on this item; and, specifically, a 1988 communication from the town to the previous owner of 10 Antonia Court found after the February 26, 2007 ASCC action on the Ashmead application. He noted that the 1988 communication addressed the then newly planted oleanders within the street right of way. Vlastic explained that after receiving assurances from the previous owner that the oleanders would be maintained so as not to obstruct the trail along the parcel frontage, the town granted “temporary and revocable permission” for the oleander

encroachment to continue subject to the property owner correcting any trail impairment upon notice by the town.

Vlasic stated the recent ASCC action on the Ashmead application included the condition for "back-up" landscaping in anticipation of the town, at some point, pursuing removal of the oleanders when necessary to clear any trail impairment. He added that even though the town had granted allowance for encroachment, the ASCC condition still appeared appropriate.

Council liaison Merk advised he had inspected the site after the 2/26/07 ASCC meeting and did find that the oleander hedge made the trail virtually unusable.

Cancellation of Regular March 26, 2007 ASCC meeting

Gelpi, Breen and Warr advised that they would not be available to attend the scheduled regular March 26, 2007 meeting. Alternative dates were explored for the second March meeting, but none could be identified where a quorum could be convened. Eventually, it was agreed that the next ASCC meeting would be the regular, April 9, 2007 meeting date. Staff was then directed to cancel the March 26 meeting due to the lack of a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0-1 (Warr) approval of the February 26, 2007 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

T. Vlasic