

Chairman Pro Tem Warr called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Gelpi, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Davis

Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

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

Vlastic presented the January 4, 2007 staff report on this continued review of the subject project. He noted that on December 11, 2006, ASCC project review was initiated at site and evening meetings. Vlastic then reviewed the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 12/21/06 and prepared by Chris Spalding Architect to address the preliminary review comments and recommendations offered at the 12/11/06 meeting by ASCC members and neighbors:

Sheet 1, Cover Sheet/Site Plan

Sheet 2, Basement Floor Plan

Sheet 3, Main Floor Plan

Sheet 4, Rear and Front Exterior Elevations

Sheet 5, Left and Right Side Exterior Elevations

Sheet 6, Site Cross-Section

Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Winterbotham Partnership, 10/24/06 (revised and received 1/4/07)

Vlastic advised that the following materials are also still part of the project proposal:

Three exterior materials "sample" boards with photo images detailing proposed exterior materials and finishes

Proposed exterior "sconce" light fixtures "cut sheet"

Vlastic clarified that the proposed roof material has been changed from barrel tile to a flat slate and a photo example of the slate material, received January 5, 2007, was displayed for reference. Vlastic also noted that he had received an email, dated 1/5/07, from Kurt Jagers, president of the Blue Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA), advising of HOA approval of the proposed plans. He further noted that the town had received a January 4, 2007 letter from Portola Valley Ranch homeowners advising of their concerns with the project. He clarified that many of the concerns in the letter had been addressed by the revised plans and that others would be addressed by the suggested approval conditions outlined in the staff report.

John Schink, applicant, and Chris Spalding, project architect, presented the revised submittal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Eventually, a larger sample of the proposed roof slate material will be presented to the ASCC. It will likely include more green tones and a bit less of the rust tones than is the case with the sample provided in the photo example. Further, Mrs. Owens, owner of Blue Oaks Lot 17, has asked that a somewhat different, darker tone be selected for the stucco wall color as the current sample is too close to the color of her house. The final color will be selected based on Mrs. Owens concerns and for harmony with the final mix of colors chosen for the slate roofing.
- The slate roofing is to have a rough split surface and will be selected to ensure that the surface is not highly reflective.
- In response to a question from planning commission liaison McKitterick, it was explained that photovoltaic electric panels were not considered for the project due to potential visual impacts on the Gibbons property. He noted that the roof slopes most appropriate for photovoltaic installation face the Gibbons property, 15 Redberry Ridge, and due to the neighbor's concerns over visual impact of the roof, it was determined that the addition of potentially reflective panels, in this case, would not be appropriate. It was also noted that the most efficient location for the panels might actually be on the slope below the driveway and this area is also highly visible to views from the Gibbons property.
- Responding to comments in the staff report and from ASCC members regarding lighting, it was noted that a revised lighting plan would be prepared that included only lighting to satisfy building code requirements and that alternative, downcast, "can" or "tube" fixtures with solid tops would be considered.
- In response to questions contained in the staff report, it was clarified that the driveway surface is to be AC paving and that the new window shutters would be stained wood.

Schink also advised that the conditions recommended by staff were acceptable to him.

Public comments were requested, and the following offered.

**Linda Elkind, 14 Hawk View, Portola Valley Ranch**, thanked the applicant for the project design changes and noted the main remaining concerns would be the final selection of roof color/material and exterior lighting.

**Ted Vian, 2 Sunhill, Portola Valley Ranch**, also thanked the applicant for the project design changes and emphasized the main remaining concerns relative to roofing material and exterior lighting. He stressed that all exterior lighting should be to serve safety and specific tasks and should not be for decorative purposes. He also stressed that Ranch residents are pleased that the garage is not on the side of the house exposed to Ranch views due to potential visual impact and the additional vegetation removal that would be needed to accommodate a garage and garage access on the north side.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and materials proposals and found them generally acceptable. Breen noted concerns with the landscape proposals and, in particular, the difficulty of

soils in this area to accommodate plant materials. Warr stressed the need to keep exterior lighting to the minimum and that there should be no sconce fixtures on the side of the house facing the Gibbons property. He encouraged the use of low mounted lights near the garage, i.e., in the driveway retaining wall on the east side of the driveway so the lights would face into the site.

John Schink noted he had shared the revised landscape plan with Mr. Gibbons and learned from him the efforts he had to pursue to ensure success of plantings his property. He advised that he would have his landscape architect interact with the Gibbons landscape architect and revise the plans accordingly based on the success of the Gibbons project.

Following discussion Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0, approval of the proposed architectural plans, as clarified at the 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. An engineered grading plan shall be provided with the necessary site development permit application. The plan shall verify that the proposed grading will not adversely impact the larger, native Manzanita that are shown for protection on the proposed plans. Further, the scope of grading and vegetation removal proposed with this application in the panhandle to Lot 15 be clearly defined.
2. A larger roof material sample shall be provided at the site for ASCC consideration and approval. The sample shall be in line with the materials clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting by the applicant. Further, proposed wall colors shall be considered with the proposed roof material so that an integrated decision can be made relative to appropriateness of all exterior materials and finishes
3. The plans shall be revised to correct the height problem identified in the staff report. Specifically, this will require changing the roof form over the east end of dining room extension from gable to hip and elimination of upper bow window.
4. A complete exterior lighting plan shall be provided that includes all house and yard lighting and switching patterns for lighting in conformity with town lighting guidelines and regulations. The house lighting shall only include that which is necessary to satisfy building code requirements and all purely decorative house wall fixtures shall be eliminated from the plan. If any lower level garage or driveway lighting is desired, it shall be located in the retaining wall along the eastern edge of the driveway, i.e., facing back into the site. Also, the swimming pool lights shall be directed back to the house and not toward the north.
5. The scope of patio area on the northeast side of the site, i.e., along the boundary common with Lot 15, shall be pulled away from the property line at least an additional eight (8) feet and enhanced screen landscaping provided along boundary common with Lot 15 as recommended in the staff report. Further, the final landscape plan shall show the building envelope on lot 15 for better appreciation of the potential effectiveness of landscape screening.
6. The size of proposed trees to be planted on the east side of the driveway shall be increased from the proposed 15 gallon size to a minimum of 24 inch box size.

7. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for replanting of the proposed east side fill slope shown on the revised site plan.
8. Complete and accurate floor area calculations shall be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff.
9. The landscape plan shall be revised to ensure that the proposed plant materials will be successful in this soils environment and materials shall also be selected for resistance to deer impacts. Consideration should be given to limiting key screen planting materials to manzanita, live oak and blue oaks. Further, the landscape plan shall provide details for plant installation, irrigation and maintenance that are responsive to site soils conditions, sun exposure, plant requirements, etc. The intent is for the plan to effectively demonstrate the potential successfulness of installation of plant materials. The plan shall also include a general schedule for plant installation that provides for planting of the key screen plants shown to the east and southeast of the house site as soon after project rough grading as possible. Provisions for protection from construction activities of this "early installed" planting shall also be specified. The plan shall provide for ASCC site inspection and acceptance of plantings prior to town "finaling" of the project building permits and house occupancy. If, based on the ASCC site inspection, it is determined that more efforts are needed to ensure plant survival, such efforts shall be made by the applicant to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to town approval of house occupancy.
10. A detailed and comprehensive construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be developed. It shall ensure that all of the native plantings on the site outside of the construction area are protected from construction impacts with protective metal fencing or other appropriate barriers. Once approved, the construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the planning staff.

#### **Informational discussion -- Town Council interviews of applicants for vacant ASCC positions**

Vlasic advised that on January 10, the town council would be conducting interviews for the two vacant ASCC positions. He provided, for information, the "expression of interest" letters from the two applicants to be interviewed, i.e., Jeff Clark, a local architect, and Alexandra Von Feldt, a member of the conservation committee.

#### **Information discussion - Recent articles on housing size and "green building"**

ASCC members briefly discussed two recent articles on trends in house size and impacts of "green building" objectives on these trends. One article was from the American Planning Association (APA) "Northern News" December 2006–January 2007 and the other from the APA December 2006 "Planning" magazine. ASCC members commented on local and national housing size trends and, in particular, the local situation. Warr advised that while more of his firm's clients are sensitive to "green building" and seek green building elements in their residential projects, they still seem to "want" relatively large house sizes. He added, however, that more effort is being made to explain the impacts of size on "green building."

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the December 11, 2006 regular meeting minutes with the following typographical corrections:

**Page 7.** In the fifth line of the comments by Mr. and Mrs. Jorgenson, correct "not short term solution" to read "no short term solution."

**Page 10.** In the fourth line of the second paragraph of the Lamm review comments, correct "note push the proposed house" to read "not push the proposed house."

Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 1-0-2 (Gelpi, Warr) approval of the December 13, 2006 special field meeting minutes with the correction to the spelling of "Cagan" in the minutes heading on page 1.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

T. Vlastic