

**ASCC Field Meeting, 30 Holden Court, Review of Preliminary Design for a new residence and associated landscape improvements.**

Chair Ross called the field meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

ASCC: Commissioners Wilson, Breen, Vice Chair Sill and Chair Ross

Town Staff: Planning Director Debbie Pedro and Planner Cynthia Richardson

Conservation Committee: Judith Murphy

Others present relative to the proposal for 30 Holden Court

Fu-Tung Cheng, Project Architect

Ann Kim, Project Architect

Randy Thueme, Landscape Architect

Elizabeth Olek, owner

Virginia Bacon, neighbor

Barbara and Robert Oliver, neighbor

Planner Cynthia Richardson presented the project which consists of a new 4,060 new residence on 1.27 acre property located at 30 Holden Court. She discussed the unconditioned space located below the master bedroom suite. She also advised that the roofing material did not meet the Town's light reflectivity value.

Planner Richardson mentioned that the Planning Commission will be considering the Geologic Map Modification later this week. If approved, the floor area for the lot will increase.

The project architect, Fu-Tung Chen, reviewed the massing, story poles and discussed the site constraints of steep slopes, geologic concerns, and the existing trees.

The group walked around the existing house to view the location of the new house and bocci ball court and other walkways and proposed landscaping.

Commissioner Breen said the redwood trees should be removed to create a pristine site. She commented that the redwoods need a substantial amount of water where the oaks do not.

Virginia Bacon, neighbor, talked about the need for additional parking and for utility separation within the street.

Chair Ross stated that Commissioners would offer further comments on the proposal at the regular evening meeting that evening. The field meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**ASCC Field Meeting, 9 Buck Meadow Drive, Architectural Review for a New Residence, Garage/ADU, Pool & Landscaping**

Vice Chair Sill called the field meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

ASCC: Commissioners Wilson (late arriving), Breen, Koch, Vice Chair Sill and Chair Ross (late arriving)

Town Staff: Planning Director Debbie Pedro and Associate Planner Arly Cassidy

Conservation Committee: Judith Murphy

Others present relative to the proposal for 9 Buck Meadow Drive

Clay Baker and Carter Warr, project architects

John Toor, Blue Oaks HOA and resident, 2 Buck Meadow Drive

Associate Planner Arly Cassidy presented the report regarding the project which consists of a 4,166 square foot single story home with a 1,479 square foot basement, detached 528 square foot garage with 528 square foot ADU below, and landscaping and a new pool on the 1.74 acre property located at 9 Buck Meadow Drive. The lot is located in the Blue Oaks Planned Unit Development, at the top of Buck Meadow, and is surrounded by single family homes.

Following her presentation, Architect Warr presented some of the plans and provided additional context for the site. He answered questions regarding materials and solar installation (intended, not yet planned), before leading the group through the site to view the story poles.

Commissioner Koch asked if the garage or ADU had windows facing onto the street and learned that only the garage above did. Commissioner Sill asked if the HOA was okay with the proposal to plant so many oak trees around the house; Warr responded that they had been in front of the HOA a couple of times, and they hadn't made an objection to the trees. John Toor responded that the HOA hadn't reviewed the plans since June 2017.

The group moved to the lower side yard where the planned pool lay, and looked up at the story poles from there. Planner Cassidy noted that a significant amount of dirt would need to be removed to flatten the pool deck and allow for an at-grade exit from the exposed basement. Warr stated that they could leave the grade higher, and create a downward slope to the pool; this would likely cause them to put the pool higher up out of the ground. No further comments were made.

Chair Ross stated that Commissioners would offer further comments on the proposal at the regular evening meeting that evening. Members thanked the applicant and design team for participation in the site meeting. The field meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Ross called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House Meeting Room, 765 Portola Road.

Planning Director Debbie Pedro called roll:

Present: ASCC: Commissioners Breen, Koch, and Wilson; and Vice Chair Sill, Chair Ross  
Absent: None  
Planning Commission Liaison: Chair Denise Gilbert  
Town Council Liaison: Vice Mayor John Richards  
Town Staff: Planning Director Debbie Pedro, Planner Cynthia Richardson,  
Associate Planner Arly Cassidy

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Joseph Krauskopf, 1 Meadowcreek Court. Mr. Krauskopf thanked the Commissioners for volunteering their time and their service to the community. He talked about the proposed house at 40 Firethorn Way. He said while it is not on tonight's agenda, the proposed house at 40 Firethorn Way cannot be separated from the subdivision, which is on tonight's agenda. He said all the families on Meadowcreek Court are opposed to the project and object to what they see on the story poles. He said the proposed house is significantly taller and wider than the existing residence, looks directly down on their homes, and will impact their privacy and ability to use their properties. He said the noise generated from the property will disrupt the quiet serenity of their neighborhood. He said the façade facing their homes is nearly two stories of glass, and the light pollution from that will impact their western views every evening. He said they strongly urge the commission to reexamine the proposed structure.

Mark Wilson expressed appreciation for the Commissioners' service to the community. Mr. Wilson shared a photograph taken from their cul-de-sac which showed the hillside and roofline of the current residence. He traced the story poles onto the photo to clearly show the significant difference. He said this project, as proposed, is not consistent with the community values and is a mistake that everyone will live to regret. He said they are asking the Commission to give the people involved the chance to make this a better project. He said, as neighbors down below, they can contribute to the process and the ultimate results.

**OLD BUSINESS**

- (1) **Final Architectural Review of a proposed two-lot Subdivision. File #03-2016, X6D-218. Owner: YLCL Investments, 40 Firethorn Way, APN 079-080-030.**

Chair Ross noted that the ASCC action tonight is in the form of a recommendation to the Planning Commission. He also said, to the extent the ASCC recommends approvals of a subdivision, it in no way implies approval of any structure that might be built on either parcel. He said any applications for a new residence will involve additional review and more opportunities for public input.

Planner Richardson described the background regarding the proposed two-lot subdivision at 40 Firethorn Way, and presented the staff report. Staff requested that the ASCC review all the information and provide recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding the Tentative Map and recommended conditions of approval, as detailed in the staff report. She noted the Planning Commission will conduct a final review at their December 6, 2017 meeting.

Planner Richardson said the preliminary architectural review was conducted regarding the proposed new house on October 9, 2017. She said it is tentatively scheduled to come before the ASCC on December 11, 2017, for final review. She said all of these hearings were publicly noticed.

Chair Ross asked if the ASCC review of the new residence scheduled for December 11, 2017, was contingent on Planning Commission action on the subdivision. Planner Richardson said it is not contingent on the Planning Commission's action regarding the subdivision. She said since the property is presently considered to be one lot, they can build a new home there since they are removing the existing house, regardless of if the property is subdivided.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners.

Chair Ross asked if there was any indication of why or by whom the trees were planted on the property. Planner Richardson said staff has no indication of who planted the trees. Chair Ross asked if the trees were at all on the public right-of-way. Planner Richardson showed which trees are in the road right-of-way and which are on the subject property. She said the civil engineer, Lea & Braze, may be able to provide additional clarification.

With no further questions from the Commissioners, Chair Ross invited comment from the applicant.

John Halbom, project civil engineer from Lea & Braze Engineering. He said the initial design was to propose a wood retaining wall to make the grade elevation work and to save the heritage oak trees. He said the ASCC preferred the property be graded back and remove the trees.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Ross invited public comment.

Joseph Krauskopf, 1 Meadowcreek Court. Mr. Krauskopf said the four houses in the cul-de-sac are opposed to the subdivision. He said they are a small neighborhood that already has to deal with excessive traffic on Los Trancos Road, with cars and trucks and delivery vehicles using their cul-de-sac as a turnaround and temporary parking area, sometimes lingering and disrupting their children playing in the area. They are concerned about more traffic due to the road widening and creating a new entrance just up the street from their cul-de-sac, and the additional traffic due to the new house, all of which are detrimental to their rural lifestyle. They are concerned about the noise, dust, and disruption to their daily lives from the road widening. They are also concerned about the removal of the trees. He said they appreciate the desire to widen the road and add a bicycle path, but do not understand the need to remove the trees. He said they understand the Commission's concern about the linear planting, but for them, it screens the property. He said the proposed house looms above them which will be worse with the screening trees removed. He said all of the homes in their cul-de-sac suffer from excessive runoff each winter, with water cascading down the hill, across the street, and down the cul-de-sac, and under their homes. He said they're concerned the road widening will add to the runoff problem and cause them even more damage in subsequent winters. He said they urge the

Commission not to recommend approval of the subdivision because it's a mistake for the community.

Mark Wilson, 3 Meadowcreek Court. Mr. Wilson said unfortunately no one in the cul-de-sac noticed that any of this was going on until a couple of days ago. He said for the Commission to continue to act without giving them the opportunity to provide informed feedback is a mistake. He said they can really help the process end up with something everybody is happy with. He said although the subdivision is only one piece of the puzzle, it is an important one, and delaying approval is an opportunity for the Commission to give the neighbors 30 to 60 days to gather their resources to be able to provide informed input into the process. In response to Chair Ross's question, Mark Wilson said the trees were there when John Goodrich owned the property and had been there at least since 1992.

Melissa Beriker, 30 Firethorn. Ms. Beriker said she was not previously aware of the proposed road widening. She said if the corner is widened any more, there will be more drivers parking their cars to talk on their cell phones, which is already a big issue that is steadily increasing on Los Trancos before and after Firethorn, in front of the mailboxes. She said it's a safety issue as well as an aesthetic issue, obscuring the scenic portion of the street.

Mr. Halbom said there is no widening proposed for 40 Firethorn Way, it is a dedication so that the right-of-way meets the minimum standard and does not involve paving on Firethorn. He said Los Trancos will be widened with pavement, and 40 Firethorn Way will remain untouched. He said it is simply a dedication line offsetting the property line so that the right-of-way half-width is 35 feet. Chair Ross asked if the traffic lane will be widened in the process. Planner Richardson said there is no official bike lane there, but it is to widen from the fog line over, so it will not be widening the existing traveled way, and is mainly for safety for bicyclists. Commissioner Breen asked if this decision was driven by the engineer, the Town, or SamTrans. Planner Richardson said the Town's subdivision ordinance has specific requirements regarding the width of a public right-of-way.

Mark Wilson said Ms. Beriker's comments demonstrate his point that while the legal notices had apparently been done appropriately, the reality is that they just learned about this.

Chair Ross referred to photo imagery from October 1991 Google Earth, which appears to show the trees did not exist at that time. Mark Wilson said the trees were very small at that time.

With no further public comment, Chair Ross brought the issue back to the Commission for discussion.

In response to Chair Ross's question, Planner Richardson said the ASCC should decide on the appropriateness of the new building site on Parcel B, the accessway, and all improvements that will be made for the subdivision from a visual standpoint. Planning Director Pedro said they should also decide if the proposed subdivision meets the minimum requirements for creating the two parcels.

Mr. Krauskopf said there is also a visual issue when coming down Los Trancos Road. He said as the road curves you will look right into the driveway and the house on Parcel B, and he asked how the proposed building site will affect the trees, vegetation, and grading of the site.

Planning Director Pedro said there is a conceptual location for a house on Parcel B. She said for the subdivision, the applicant must provide a conceptual location of where it could be located; however, that location may change. She said based on the conceptual location

submitted, there appear to be three or four trees over the footprint of that home that would need to be removed.

Vice Chair Sill said he supports the decisions made in the preliminary review. He thinks opening up the hillside by eliminating the trees will improve the experience of driving along Los Trancos Road because the hedge of oak trees looks very artificial. He said the impact of the house on Parcel A must be addressed, but it is not what is being discussed tonight. He said he thinks it is reasonable to move forward, but would also be willing to consider providing more time for the residents to have a chance to make a more persuasive argument.

Planning Director Pedro said the next hearing on the matter will be in December with the Planning Commission, so there will be an opportunity for the neighbors learn more about the project and to provide additional feedback to the Planning Commission at that time.

Vice Chair Sill said he does not think that one more house will have much of a traffic impact. He said perhaps it should also be determined if the changes being proposed with the subdivision will affect the water runoff. He said the neighbors apparently feel like they have not had a chance to make their case, and the residents should feel like they've had their say. He said Parcel B does appear to have a reasonable building site, and it does not look like it would be difficult to hide it so that it's not visibly objectionable from Los Trancos Road. He said the basic things such as visual aesthetics, adequacy of building sites, and appropriateness of lot lines, all look reasonable as a first pass, but he is also willing to wait a reasonable amount of time to let the neighbors have a chance to make more of a case.

Commissioner Breen said she initially did not support the road widening. She said, however, retaining walls are contrary to the experience of being in a rural community. She explained that after discussion, they decided it was a better solution to grade and remove the hedge of oak trees. She said behind the hedge of trees is a golden meadow, and meadows are at a premium in Town. She said the ASCC wanted to bring the experience of the land back to the people and stop the hedging. She said if the road must be widened, then she supports their initial response, which is to remove the artificial construct of linear oak trees that have now become a hedge. She said there will be plenty of opportunity on Lots A and B for screening in a more effective manner. She said it is reasonable to proceed with the application. She said the neighbors have a month to study and then go to the Planning Commission to make their case. She said it is a reasonable and appropriate building site and it should move forward.

Commissioner Wilson said she would prefer to postpone the decision and give the neighbors more time to build a case. She said she is concerned about the drainage runoff after removing the trees.

Commissioner Koch asked if there was any existing or proposed drainage associated with the road widening. Mr. Halbom said there is a lot of talk about the impact of surface runoff. He said it may need to be confirmed by an arborist, but surface runoff does not benefit trees. He pointed out the existing catch basin and the AC swale that conveys drainage to that point. He said with regard to the water damage concerns, the runoff is required to be captured, stored, and discharged at a metered rate either as it is or less. He said in no way would a development on this parcel increase any runoff. He said they will provide supporting calculations at the December 11th Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Koch said if there were a hedge of trees in the scenic corridor, it would be removed. She said if there were trees in the Town's right-of-way, they would be removed. She

said the road needs to be widened, the trees are in the Town right-of-way, and a retaining wall is not desirable. She said the siting of these two parcels is appropriate. She said it sounds like water runoff is not an issue. She said she understands that the neighbors love what they see right now, but said there is great opportunity to make it look even better and more organic. She does not support delaying the approval of the subdivision.

Chair Ross thanked the neighbors for bringing their concerns. He said there is still a final review to be done for the new residence on Parcel A and there is nothing before them for Parcel B. He said it is not uncommon that when a house is built on a previously undeveloped parcel, longstanding neighbors become concerned about the change. He said the ASCC do take into account needs for screening and meeting design guidelines to keep the impacts to a minimum. He said the visual impact of developing Parcel B will be that people will see a house there and that may also be true for portions of Parcel A. He hopes that everyone comes to the meeting when the house on Parcel A is proposed. He said the proposal for the subdivision is complete and meets the requirements. He said he is not concerned about drainage issues because the engineering was done at the time Los Trancos Road was last improved. He said if there is an issue, there is an engineering solution and legal requirements that must be met.

Chair Ross said road widening always has pros and cons. He said pulling over to use a cell phone could be looked at as a benefit or a cost, and he does not see it as a compelling argument to not widen the road. He said the trees were planted illegally and are unsightly as a hedge, don't actually screen anything other than a very low elevation on the hillside, and he is supportive of removing them. He said the concept is that the views belong to everyone. He said the Planning Commission, as the approving body, recognizing neighborhood concerns, may decide to table their discussion for a while, but there is not a reason for the ASCC to withhold their recommendations.

Commissioner Breen said she was supportive of moving forward and approving the recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Koch suggested they recommend to the Planning Commission that no additional signage be allowed in conjunction with the road widening.

Chair Ross said the current application does not include signage, and he'd also like to keep it that way.

Mr. Wilson suggested a reason to delay this decision to move forward with the subdivision could be because it involves widening the road, and the Commission has not fully considered the issues around that yet, based upon the conversations that have occurred so far. Chair Ross said this project has been under review for 1-1/2 years and the road widening issue was extensively discussed during the preliminary review meetings in mid-2016.

Mr. Krauskopf said he rides his bicycle on that road multiple times a week and has to dodge cars between Firethorn and Alpine, forcing him into the road. He said if it is widened, the intention of creating a safer passage for bicycles is lost when cars park there. Chair Ross said that would be a discussion for the Director of Public Works and the Planning Commission.

Mark Wilson said they live on the road and know about it in a way the Commission does not. He said the Commission should consider listening to what the people who live there can tell them about the road and delay the application.

Planning Director Pedro said the road is not being widened by 5 feet. She said it is being widened by an average of 2 to 3 feet to create a 5-foot shoulder because the shoulder is currently substandard. She said the intent is to provide a wide enough road for a cyclist's safe passage, not unlike what the Town is currently doing on Portola Road.

Mr. Krauskopf said the Commission talked about adding new landscaping and native vegetation after the removal of the trees during the development of the two houses. He asked when the new landscaping would be required after the road widening. Planner Richardson said in the recommended conditions of approval and within the CEQA document, there is a 2:1 replacement ratio of the nine significant trees that will be removed. She said the screening trees that will eventually be required for screening of the house are a separate issue.

Commissioner Breen said the 2:1 ratio is excessive. She said it all depended on the strategy of the screening. She said they will review at the time of the application if the property is adequately screened.

Mr. Krauskopf said his question is independent of the development of the property. He said he agrees that the trees should be placed in a more natural setting, but he is asking about the timing and how it relates to the development on the property. Planner Richardson said the CEQA document indicates that the mitigation for aesthetics is that the oak trees be replaced at 2:1 ratio and the design shall be implemented with the subdivision improvements prior to final inspection. She said the Commission could make a recommendation to modify that condition if they don't feel the 2:1 ratio is appropriate. In response to Mr. Krauskopf's question, Planner Richardson said the subdivision improvements included the road widening, utility extensions, sewer connections, utility connections, etc., and does not include the residential construction.

Chair Ross said his concern is that if there are 18 trees that need to be planted, plus the trees that come with the development application, there will be too many trees planted, when all of the historical photographs he's seen are of a bare hillside. Planner Richardson said they could make a condition that the subdivision trees be installed in conjunction with the house on Parcel A. She said they don't know if/when a house will come in on Parcel B, so they need to think about screening. Chair Ross said there is no structure there so there is nothing to screen. Planning Director Pedro said the option is to modify the staff recommendation for the 2:1 replacement or request the landscape plan with 18 trees comes back to the ASCC for review.

Commissioner Breen suggested the tree replacement be at the discretion of review by one or two members of the ASCC instead of a 2:1 ratio requirement.

Chair Ross asked, since Parcel A is before the Commission, if there was a way to tie at least half of the replacement tree requirement to the review process of Parcel A. He said he would rather do that than have the entire plan come back with more trees planted that aren't part of the review of Parcel A.

Vice Chair Sill said he preferred the ASCC have some flexibility rather than a 2:1 ratio. He said it needs to be communicated to the applicant to think about the screening.

Chair Ross suggested recommending that at least half of the tree replacement requirement be attached to the Parcel A development project, rather than treated separately as a requirement for the subdivision. With regard to Parcel B, Chair Ross suggested waiting to see when and if that site gets developed and then do the same process there, having the replacement trees assigned to that development project.

Commissioner Koch moved to recommend approval of the two lot subdivision as proposed with a modification to the Initial Study Mitigation Measure Aesthetic 1 to eliminate the 2:1 tree replacement ratio and instead tree replacement shall be at the discretion of the ASCC.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **(2) Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a New Residence, File #29-2017, 30 Holden Court, Lee Residence.**

Planner Richardson described the proposed project, a new 4,060-square-foot single-story residence with an attached garage, including a 724-square-foot lower level space with a 7-foot ceiling height used for storage and mechanical purposes and only accessed via an outside pathway. As this is quite a large space, staff suggested the ASCC discuss whether that area should count toward floor area, which would result in the project exceeding the 85% rule. Planner Richardson said the applicant has indicated that space would be used for housing utility equipment. The project also includes a modification to a portion of the Town's Ground Movement Potential Map, a matter that will be reviewed by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2017. She said the map modification will increase the allowable building footprint and maximum floor area. A field visit was held at the site earlier this afternoon. She said the Conservation Committee has reviewed the plan and is general supportive of the project.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Sill said the side setback and rear setback numbers in the staff report appeared to be incorrect in that there is not enough room to have setbacks that large. Planner Richardson said it was a typographical error and will correct the numbers.

Chair Ross invited comments from the applicant. The Commission viewed the project model provided by the applicant. The applicant shared the thoughts behind the design decisions and narrated a presentation of the project.

Vice Chair Sill asked why they planned to hook up to the sewer rather than going with septic. The applicant said there is an existing operational leach field. However, he said the existing septic tank is an old system and does not meet the current codes in terms of distance to the house, the lot lines, and the slopes. He said they could not find a suitable location for the new system and were unfortunately forced to hook into the sewer system at Golden Oak, which is a significant expense.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Ross invited public comment.

Bill Lee, who owns the subject property with Elizabeth Olek, said they bought the property in 2014. He said the original intention was to remodel the existing home, but the amount of work involved in bringing the house up to code convinced them they needed to build a new house. He said this proposal is the result of 2-1/2 to 3 years of design work.

Barbara Oliver, neighbor to the east of the house. She said they are very impressed with the plan's sensitivity to the site and the neighbors, even extending to the landscaping. She said the project will be a positive addition to the neighborhood, and they are in full support of the project.

Robert Oliver said they have lived next door to the subject property for 46 years. He said they are very knowledgeable about the property and are very excited about the design. He said the

applicants have done a marvelous job. He said the project is probably most visible to him and they are delighted with the design, the materials, and are anxious to see the work begin.

With no further public comment, Chair Ross closed the public hearing and invited comment from the Commission.

Commissioner Koch agreed that the roof color should be changed to meet the reflectivity requirements. She said there was excessive landscape lighting going down to the vegetable garden and the entry lighting was a bit excessive as well. She was supportive of the size of the mechanical room. She said she would support significant removals of some redwoods and cleaning up around the existing manzanita.

Commissioner Wilson agreed that it is a beautiful design. She suggested a reduction in the exterior landscape lighting. She was supportive of the change of color of the roof. She was supportive of the size of the mechanical room and saw no reason to complicate the design by reducing it. She was supportive of removing some of the redwoods. She understood the desire to keep the bamboo for screening, but said it was not the right plant for the area.

Commissioner Breen said it is an elegant, beautiful project. She was supportive of the plant list and planting plan, mixing succulents and natives and creating a fun narrative. She said the site is almost virgin, with buckwheats coming up into the canyons. She said, because it is almost a pure setting, she supports the removal of the redwoods, which look artificial on the site. She was supportive of the mechanical room. She said they only needed one light at the garage door. She asked about the switching pattern on the lights going down to the vegetable garden and the court, saying they should only be on as needed.

Vice Chair Sill said it is a striking design and a great fit for the location. He was supportive of the landscaping plan, low water use, and keeping much of it undeveloped. He is supportive of the mechanical room. He supports using the alternate color for the roof rather than white. He agreed the redwoods should be removed. He also does not think the bamboo belongs on the site and said equivalent screening could be achieved with better plants.

Chair Ross said the design respects the design guidelines better than the existing house. He said it is wonderful the applicants are able to reuse the footprint because it is the best place on the site for the house. He preferred the proposed roof forms and massing of the building over what currently exists and said it does a better job of conforming to the existing landform. He said lowering it slightly would provide more generous views as you enter the house from the walkway and driveway. He said the applicants have one of the most spectacular views of Windy Hill in Town. He said the addition of the master bedroom wing on the west end will block some of that view, but will only happen for someone halfway down the steps to the entry of the new house and will afford a spectacular view from the master bedroom. He was in agreement with the suggested reductions in lighting. He said his concern is about light locations that are not visible to the owners but could possibly be left on inadvertently and shine toward the neighbors. He suggested some kind of timer on the lights. He said the bamboo goes better with the new house than the existing house, but there are better alternatives. He said he would be supportive of removing all the redwood trees if the applicant proposed that. He was supportive of the mechanical room. He was supportive of the materials board. He said he was indifferent regarding the roof color. The applicant said that color was chosen because Stephen Chu, the former Chair of the Department of Energy encouraged architects to use white roofs to reduce global warming and the carbon footprint. He said he understood the reflectivity part of it, but thought it would be okay since it was not visible to any neighbors. Chair Ross was impressed by

the manzanita shrubs that were doing so well.

Chair Ross called for a five-minute break.

**(3) Architectural Review for an Addition, File #PLN ARCH 20-2017, 15 Kiowa Court, Sharma Residence.**

Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposed 584-square-foot addition and recommended conditions of approval, as detailed in the staff report. She said a neighbor requested that the uplighting be removed. Associate Planner Cassidy said two cypress trees had been planted in the right-of-way at the corner of Kiowa and Cervantes. The applicant expressed willingness to remove them, and staff has included that as a condition of approval for the ASCC to consider.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Ross invited comments from the applicant. Mr. Sharma said the corner at Kiowa and Cervantes looked dismal and someone posted on the PV Forum offering the two trees so he thought it would be a good idea to put them there. He did not realize he was not allowed to actually plant them outside the property line, and he will relocate them onto the property. Ms. Sharma asked if there was a problem with the tree itself or just the placement. Chair Ross the Town tries to encourage native plantings, and cypress doesn't fit the category, but it is also not permitted to plant them in the Town's right-of-way.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Ross invited comments from the public. Hearing none, Chair Ross brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Breen was supportive of the project. She supported the tree removal and suggested also removing the acacias along the fence line. She said all lighting needed to be in compliance – no uplights, no spotlights, no driveway lights.

Commissioner Wilson was supportive of the project. She was supportive of removing the trees and removing the clear lamppost. She suggested the applicant might consider removing one of the outside lights, perhaps the one nearest the front door.

Vice Chair Sill and Commissioner Koch were supportive of the project.

Chair Ross was supportive of the project. He said he was not bothered by the existing exterior light fixtures, but said the uplights should be removed. He was supportive of removing the cypress trees.

Vice Chair Sill moved to approve the project with the conditions proposed in the staff report and the additional conditions that the cypress trees be removed, the uplighting along the driveway be removed, and no skylights be added. Seconded by Commissioner Koch; the motion carried 5-0.

**(4) Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a New Residence, Detached ADU/Garage, Swimming Pool and Landscaping, File #PLN ARCH 23-2017, 9 Buck Meadow, King Residence.**

Associate Planner Cassidy described the proposed new home consisting of 4,166 square feet of living area with a 1,479-square-foot basement, a detached 528-square-foot garage with an ADU below, a new pool, and landscaping at 9 Buck Meadow Drive. She said the owner, Robert King, lives in China, and was not available to attend the meeting. A field visit was held at the site

earlier this afternoon. Associate Planner presented the proposed project as detailed in the staff report.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners.

Chair Ross asked how the height is measured on the sloping side. He asked if they would still measure from the lowest part of the slope to the highest part of the house if the house followed the line of the slope. Associate Planner Cassidy said maximum height for the entire structure is measured from the lowest point against the building wall to the highest point of the structure.

Chair Ross said a house that is built according to the design guidelines, that stretches out over some distance on a slope, will almost automatically violate the height limits the way they're stated. Associate Planner Cassidy said the site is a difficult one because the natural slope is above 15%. She said the applicants are stepping the house down with the first story cascading with the hillside. She said there would need to be more soil adjustment to make sure the height was not in violation.

With no further questions, Chair Ross invited the applicant to comment.

Carter Warr described the design process for the project. He pointed out the lots in Blue Oaks that have single-story homes with daylighted basements. He said they are only asking for equal consideration.

Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, he invited public comment.

Vice Mayor John Richards said that when the height limit was established in the mid-'80s, it was based on a house that was built in Westridge that was considerably over 34 feet. He said the intent was to limit that and sometimes the only solution was to build a smaller house. He said he would not like to see any precedent set here for the rest of the Town.

Chair Ross asked if the same height limit applied to the two most visible houses immediately across the canyon. Associate Planner Cassidy said they have a two-story height limit, with the normal Town limit of 28-34. Planning Director Pedro said this proposal will not exceed the maximum overall height limit of 34 feet.

Associate Planner Cassidy said it is her understanding is that traditionally there has been an application of the idea that height is measured from the outside of the building wherever the grade touches the building. However, the definition says, "Building height is the vertical distance at any point from the natural ground level which existed prior to grading for any building or from the building pad, if excavated below natural ground level, whichever elevation is lower, to the highest part of the building directly above it." Mr. Warr said you don't measure from the pad if it is not exposed, for example, the bottom of the basement. Associate Planner Cassidy said in this project, however, it is exposed.

Chair Ross brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Koch said the site visit was very helpful because just looking at it on paper made it look very extreme. She said creating an intimate space is a challenge here for an outdoor entertainment area because it is extremely exposed to the road. She was supportive of the project. She was supportive of the undulating, different levels, which breaks up the massing and

adds depth and different variations. She was supportive of the material choices. She said it was odd to have landscaping on the other side of the easement driveway, but it was apparently something the neighbors wanted.

Commissioner Wilson agreed it is a challenging site. She was concerned about the comments that the story poles may not be correct. She said when viewing the site, it fits in perfectly with the other homes in the area. She said there are too many oaks on the landscaping plan trying to screen the neighbor's view.

Commissioner Breen said it is perplexing that no neighbors or the HOA representatives are at this meeting. Mr. Warr said the applicant is being required by the HOA to have written approvals from all of the neighbors.

Commissioner Breen said after seeing the site and story poles this afternoon, she understands the intention. She said the house modulates down the hill well. She said the intent of the PUD is for the grasslands to flow across the land, and if this is a grasslands plot, the landscape plan doesn't work. She does not support planting trees to hide the building. She asked if the applicant was being more responsive to the land or to the neighbors. Mr. Warr said initially the landscape plan was more responsive to the land, but a number of trees have been added in response to what they think the neighbors' issues are. Commissioner Breen said she did not support screening the house for the neighbors and changing the character of the land. She said they should probably get a new arborist report to review the large tree that is in trouble. She said she wants more details on the pool equipment, air conditioner, and generator when the application returns before the Commission.

Vice Chair Sill said the house design is perfect for the site and blends very well with the terrain, beyond what he expected. He said he objects to all of the oak trees, suggesting perhaps only having a couple on the east side of the lot. He does not think the oaks in the back or at the west are appropriate. He said the house blends in so well to the terrain that it does not need trees screening it which will change the whole feel of the area. He was supportive of the design and materials and said the applicant did a great job following the terrain and keeping a very minimalist approach in terms of impact. He was supportive of the landscaping plan except for the oak trees. He said turning a beautiful grassland site into a pseudo-oak site is the wrong direction to take.

Chair Ross said if the applicant is not 100 percent sure about the story poles, they should be checked – the contours versus the post elevations. Planning Director Pedro said the story poles at the site do not conform with the submitted grading plan. Mr. Warr said the story poles have been up since June 2016 and need to be rechecked. Chair Ross said there are too many oak trees proposed. He said when this proposal returns for final approval, there will likely be a small number of carefully placed screening trees, and they may ask that the placement of those trees occur after framing for optimal placement with respect to the neighbors.

### **COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Commissioner Wilson reviewed a proposal by the Sequoias to put in more bamboo, which she denied. Associate Planner Cassidy said it was verified today that everything would be corrected.

Vice Chair Sill and Commissioner Breen reviewed the landscape and the fence plan at Windmill School.

Chair Ross made an unofficial visit to 199 Mapache. He understands that the property owner has submitted a request to fill in a drainage swale and the project will come before the ASCC in the coming months.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **(5) ASCC Meeting of October 9, 2017**

Commissioner Breen moved to approve the October 9, 2017, minutes as submitted Seconded by Commissioner Koch, the motion passed 5-0.

**ADJOURNMENT** [10:16 p.m.]