



Town of Paradise Valley

Minutes

Hillside Building Committee

Wednesday, June 10, 2020 at 8:00 AM Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Hillside Building Review Committee met on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at Town Hall, 6401 East Lincoln Drive, Paradise Valley, Arizona 85253. Committee Members present: Chair Scott Jarson, Scott Tonn, James Anton, Charles Covington, Johnathan Wainwright. Staff present: Hillside Development Administrator Hugo Vasquez, Town Engineer Paul Mood, Town Attorney Andrew Miller. Chair Scot Jarson called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None.

3. APPLICATION REVIEW

20-258 Solar combined review for the residence at 5211 E Arroyo Road (APN 169-29-021)

Hugo Vasquez introduced the Item and noted that the application for the solar panels was submitted in April 14, 2020 and would be reviewed under the current regulations. He shared that they were adding 129 panels to the residence that would be mounted flat.

Chairman Scott Jarson remarked that the colors and heights looked like they complied with code and noted that the screen walls were very helpful as well.

Member Charles Covington asked if most of the equipment was being stored inside the garage.

Mr. Vasquez replied much of the equipment was being kept in the garage.

Mr. Covington asked if the current roof was foam.

Eric Clements, Representing Schultz Development, responded that that the roof is foam and they planned to install the penetrations and then patch the foam to install the panels.



Member Scott Tonn asked if the finish they see from the aerial has a reflective value (LRV) of 28. He pointed out that the parapet seems to be covering the height of the panels.

Mr. Clement indicated that it was.

Mr. Jarson opened the meeting up for public comments on the Item.

Jon Bilstrom commented that he and other neighbors did not receive the letter from the applicant on this Item. He questioned if action could be taken if proper notice was not given.

Mr. Vasquez replied that they received an affidavit of mailing from the applicant that indicated they sent out letters to the residence on the notification list on April 10, 2020.

Mr. Jarson inquired if Mr. Bilstrom had concerns about the application.

Mr. Bilstrom responded he did not but brought it up as a matter of procedure.

Paul Mood clarified what the Town's two-step affidavit processes was and noted that some people may not have received notification since the mailing address listed on the county assessor's maps was not always the same as the property address.

Mr. Bilstrom commented that he was not going to question the legitimacy of an affidavit under oath and had no issue with them preceding with the application.

Andrew Miller asked if Mr. Bilstrom would provide his name and address. He expressed that he would like to look into this issue to be sure they are getting accurate reports of affidavit mailings, since this is an important form of notice.

Mr. Bilstrom provided his name and address for the Town Attorney.

Mr. Jarson motioned to approve Item 20-258 at 5211 E Arroyo Road subject to stipulations 1-6 recommended by Staff.

Mr. Tonn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-259 Formal review for a new single-family residence at 4250 E Keim Drive (APN 169-22-057)

Mr. Vasquez introduced the applicant's request to build a new single-family residence indicating that it was a two-story residence with a pool. He pointed out the application was submitted on November 4, 2019 and would be reviewed under current regulations.



Dan Mann, owner and civil engineer, clarified that they were not asking for any variances on the project and noted they have incorporated some of the recommendations made by the Committee at the last hearing including the addition of more desert landscape, removal of gates and fencing along the front entry drive, and addition of the granule material to the foam roof among other things.

Mr. Tonn asked if there had been any change in the height of the building since the conceptual review.

Mr. Vasquez replied that it had not.

Mr. Tonn thanked the applicant for the adjustments they had made since the conceptual review.

Mr. Jarson asked if other members of the committee were concerned about the can lighting in the north corner.

Mr. Vasquez noted they are below the max of 750 lumen and 45-degree optics.

Mr. Jarson explained that his biggest concern was its distance from the glazing and that it might light up the vertical surface.

Greg Kent noted that the overhang in that area was deeper and that the lights were centered in that overhang.

Mr. Mann indicated he did not have any objections on moving the lights further away from the glazing.

Mr. Tonn expressed concern with the Muhlenbergia grass since it was not certain that it was a non-invasive plant.

Mr. Mann replied that they would be willing to substitute it with a different ornamental grass.

Mr. Jarson asked if anyone from the community would like to make a comment. No public comments were made.

Mr. Vasquez pointed out they have begun asking for an As-Built survey done by the landscape designer to be provided before a certificate of occupancy is granted. He noted that was included in Stipulation 11.

Mr. Jarson motioned to approve the application with the 11 stipulations from Staff and two additional stipulations. Stipulation 12, that the north patio recess can lights to be relocated



with the location to be approved by Staff and Chair. Stipulation 13, that the Muhlenbergia plant material be substituted with the selection to be approved by Staff and Chair.

Mr. Tonn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Member Johnathan Wainwright thanked everyone for their hard work on this application and the attention to detail.

20-260 Formal review for a major remodel and addition at 6024 N 42nd Street (APN 169-22-041)

Mr. Vasquez stated that they received some public comments that were not included in the Staff report since they were received yesterday but those comments had been e-mailed to the Committee Members.

Mr. Vasquez reviewed the remodeling plans for the existing home and shared some renderings of the designs. He noted that the planned footprint of the home was almost the same as the existing footprint and that it was a one-story home. He continued to review other details about the home including proposed materials.

Eric Spry introduced himself as the project architect. He acknowledged that the neighbor to the East was concerned about the driveway but shared that the driveway was an existing feature of the property and they did not have a lot of room to plan landscaping to block car lights in some areas. He remarked that all the comments made during the conceptual review were incorporated into the design. He reiterated that they were keeping the footprint of the existing home with the exception of the garage in the back of the property.

Mr. Jarson asked if there was nothing that could be done with landscaping to help mitigate the neighbor's concern with lights shining in his home from the driveway.

Mr. Spry indicated that area was non-disturbed area and could only add landscaping if the Town allowed them to disturb more of the property. He suggested that the neighbor could plant more landscaping since he had more space to do so on his property.

Mr. Vasquez indicated that he should be able to get a Chair Approval to have additional disturbed area for landscaping to shield headlights by the driveway.

Mr. Jarson stated that in his opinion adding more landscape to that area would be revegetation and not a disturbance.

Mr. Jarson inquired if the applicant would be willing to top the flat roof surfaces with a chip or granule material to make it look more natural to the homes above.

Mr. Spry responded he was willing to consider that.



Mr. Mood pointed out they would need to add a stipulation to bring the roofing plans back for Chairman Approval.

Member James Anton pointed out that if the neighbor was to get a roller shade they would be protected from any car lights as well as the afternoon sun. He stated that he feels the applicant is doing everything they are required to and more.

Mr. Tonn asked if they had plans to resurface the existing driveway.

Mr. Spry replied they were resurfacing the driveway with pavers.

Mr. Jarson called for any public comment on the Item. No public comments were offered.

Mr. Jarson stated he felt they had taken the public comments that were submitted by the next-door neighbor seriously and have found a solution within reason to mitigate the problem.

Mr. Tonn cautioned the applicant to be careful with the travertine choice and be sure it is LRV compliant since the natural material can vary in color.

Mr. Tonn motioned to approve Item 20-260 at 6042 North 42nd Street subject to Staffs existing stipulations 1-11 with the addition of two more stipulations. Stipulation 12 for the addition of plantings in the area located at approximately elevation 1372 through the Northeast corner to approximately elevation 1377 for the purpose of blocking potential headlights on the driveway from the neighboring property subject to Staff and Chair approval. Stipulation 13 that the applicant incorporate rock chip on the roof subject to LRV requirements and Staff and Chair approval.

Mr. Wainwright seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-261 Formal review for a new single-family residence at 5452 E Morrison Lane (APN 169-06-064)

Mr. Vasquez introduced the Item and noted that the existing home would be demolished, and they would be keeping the existing driveway. He pointed out that the application date was October 31, 2019 and would be reviewed under current regulations. He noted that the new property would include approximately 11,000 square feet of livable area, pool, patio, putting green area and more. He noted that the foot print of the new home remained almost the same as the existing home with small extensions on the West and Northeast side. He reviewed the grading and drainage plan, site elevations, landscaping, lighting, gate, materials, and more.



Scott Carson introduced himself as the project architect and reiterated that they were trying to limit the amount of disturbance by using the existing building pad for the majority of the new structure. He indicated that they tried to blend in the structure with the site through different elements including the height and colors.

Mr. Jarson inquired how they would remove the existing home without disturbing the area around it.

Mr. Carson responded their contractor was familiar with hillside projects and had a plan to dismantle the existing home using the driveway.

Greg Hunt indicated he was the project contractor and added that they would put a fence around everything to help protect the surrounding area and planned to dismantle it from the front of the house and work their way to the West side. He noted that this would be a time-consuming process due to the site and access but was confident they could do it while protecting the surrounding area.

John Sigwa commented this would be a soft demolition which would reduce the number of heavy trucks needed for the demolition process.

Mr. Jarson asked if they were looking for alternative to the decorative sconces at the entry gate.

Mr. Vasquez replied they were since the Town would classify them as landscape lighting which was limited to 250 lumens. He pointed out the current sconces were 400 lumens.

Mr. Jarson inquired what the design plans were for the flat portions of the roof.

Mr. Carson indicated they would have them painted to match the rest of the roof and in the darkest color to create the least amount of reflection while still maintaining their roof warranty.

Mr. Jarson commented there was not many flat roof portions and was not concerned with requiring them to cover it with rock chip.

Mr. Jarson asked if the Committee would like to see the up lights aimed at trees to be fixed.

Mr. Tonn expressed that he did not see them pointing the lights anywhere else.

Mr. Anton shared that he believed only the homeowner would be affected by those lights

Mr. Covington inquired if the cantilever met code.



Mr. Vasquez indicated that the balconies were under two feet and so they were considered as part of the structure rather than cantilevers. Mr. Vasquez indicated that there were plans to stain the banding on the driveway a darker color to blend in with the natural terrain.

Mr. Anton asked if the staining required maintenance.

Mr. Vasquez responded that since the stain was on a stone surface it would likely not need much maintenance.

Mr. Jarson asked if there were any public comments on the Item. None were offered.

Amit Upadhye inquired about the aluminum material used on the windows.

Mr. Carson explained that they chose a lighter color for the window frame, so it was not as noticeable. He added that the material was LRV complaint and was not very reflective.

Mr. Jarson commented that he did not feel the material was a bad choice for this particular location. He recommended that the applicant verify the material is LRV complaint with Staff before they invest in a window package.

Mr. Jarson motioned they approve application 20-261 with stipulations 1-12 as submitted by Staff and an additional stipulation 13 that the window frame LRV to be LRV complaint as approved on sample and any substitution to be approved by Staff.

Mr. Tonn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-262 Combined review for a remodel and addition 5704 E Starlight Way (APN 172-02-011A)

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the property and the proposed remodel and addition for the site. The remodel and addition included plans for a large lap pool, roofed terrace, and lower living area, and new garage among other things. He briefly reviewed the grading and drainage plan, landscaping and landscape lighting, building lighting, and proposed materials.

Simon Templeton announced he was the project architect and presented further details about the remodel and addition plans including that the owners wanted to reinstate more of the natural grade to the property by removing the tennis court. He noted that the extension of the home was minimal adding a bedroom to the Northeast corner.

Mr. Tonn asked what challenges they faced with retention on the site.



Mr. Templeton indicated their biggest challenge was not onsite retention but dealing with offsite flows along the west property line that could flow onto the property during a major storm event. He explained that they wanted to keep the wash as is with the exception of the restoration of the natural grade. He noted that new curbing would be done along the street which may help prevent as much water coming onto the site.

Mr. Jarson cautioned about using travertine as a material that it is uniform, and all meets LRV compliance. He requested that the Mexican Feather Grass be substituted with another plant since it is invasive. He asked for further time to review the revegetation seed mix and verify that it is appropriate for the location.

Mr. Jarson called for any public comments on the Item. No comments were offered.

Mr. Covington inquired if the drive pavers were porous.

Discussion was made on the elevation of the drive and determined that the curb would keep some of the water from running down into the drive.

Mr. Covington asked if there were presently Oleanders on the property.

Mr. Templeton replied there were, but they were dying. He explained that they wanted to use the natural wash to deter people from walking on site rather than a suburban hedge. He added that their plans were to create more dynamic landscaping rather than having a wall of Oleanders.

Mr. Wainwright commented that there might be a disease effecting the Oleanders and their removal was timely. He indicated that he was supportive of the removal of the tennis court.

Mr. Covington inquired if there would be a problem with headlights shining in the property windows along the West side.

Mr. Templeton explained that they were aware of that and noted that they would be using more indigenous plants to mitigate that problem. He added that there was a lot of tall vegetation within the wash to help prevent lights shining in as well.

Mr. Jarson motioned to approve file 20-262 application for combined remodel and addition at 5704 E Starlight Way with the stipulations 1-12 provided by Staff as well as two additional stipulations. Stipulation 13, landscape Mexican Feather Grass to be substituted with alternate compliant plant choice to be approved by Staff and Chair. Stipulation 14, revegetation seed mix to be subject to further review and final approval by Staff and Chair.

Mr. Tonn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.



20-263 Combined review for a remodel and addition at 5001 E McDonald Drive (APN 172-02-011A)

Mr. Vasquez presented a brief overview of the proposed remodel and addition. He noted that the footprint for the site should remain relatively the same with the exception of extensions to the garage and master bedroom. He shared that additions included new patio areas, pool, planter walls, and vegetation on the north side along with removal of all the palm trees from the property. He added that they were removing a fence on the property that was an existing non-conforming fence that would also significantly lower the amount of disturbed area on the property.

Mr. Vasquez provided further details on the application including information on the grading and drainage plan, landscape and hardscape plans, structure heights, and proposed materials for the site.

Dan Bowman stated he was the project architect and identified some of the improvements they were making to the site including the removal of palm trees and the non-compliant fence as well as the addition of more natural vegetation. He shared that they planned to keep relatively the same shape of the home with the exception of the extensions on the master bedroom and garage. He noted that they planned to use travertine and was aware they needed to be sure it was still LRV compliant when the actual materials came in.

Mr. Covington suggested the use of tumbled travertine since it is less slippery around pool areas and would likely bring the LRV down.

Mr. Jarson requested they top the flat portions of the roof with ballast or stone chip to help naturalize the look of it more.

Mr. Bowman replied they would look into that.

Mr. Wainwright suggested they consider doing the whole driveway in pavers rather than using asphalt.

Mr. Bowman expressed that they had chosen to do only a portion of the driveway in pavers due to cost but would reconsider doing more of it in pavers.

Mr. Anton agreed that doing the entire driveway in pavers would be a great addition and would recommend doing it now.

Mr. Jarson asked if anyone from the community would like to make a comment. No public comments were offered.

Mr. Tonn asked if they should recommend a catch basin at the bottom of the driveway since it slopes down into the street.



Mr. Vasquez stated that they could not force them to put a catch basin at that location, but the Town would appreciate it. He noted that they can only require them to provide retention for new construction and not an existing condition.

John Mitchell indicated they would look into it and would be willing to do it if the cost was reasonable.

Mr. Jarson asked if everyone was comfortable with the stipulation that the lights on the north west side of the property near the home be directed at plants, so they do not light up any vertical surfaces.

Mr. Tonn commented that there was a lot of walls in that area.

Mr. Jarson indicated that he would like to stipulate the addition of some sort of stone chipping on the flat roof. He noted that doing this can add to the life of the roof.

Mr. Mitchell stated he did not know what the cost was but was willing to do anything within reason.

Mr. Jarson motioned for file 20-263 the remodel at 5001 E McDonald Drive to accept the application with the stipulations 1-12 as indicated by Staff as well as stipulation 13 that all undisturbed areas shall be revegetated with a native seed mix to be approved by Staff and Chair. Stipulation 14 that flat portions of the roof should be top coated with an LRV compliant stone, sand or chip material to be approved by Staff and Chair.

Mr. Tonn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-264 Combined review for modifications to the previously approved plans at 4208 E Lamar Road (APN 169-53-038)

Mr. Vasquez announced that they received a comment from the neighbor to the west who indicated they were weary of the time it was taking for the property to get constructed but were in favor of the changes.

Mr. Vasquez stated that due to the limited space on the property the applicant is requesting to increase the height on the garage to allow for stacked parking with a lift. He shared that they were also requesting an extension on the pool and change of location for the spa. He noted that the other proposed change was to substitute the stucco wall on the west side to keep the view more open.

Amin Upadhye introduced himself as the architect for the project. He reiterated the changes Mr. Vasquez mentioned earlier and indicated all the changes were LRV



compliant. He then requested that the glass railing stipulation be removed and noted that the glass railing was limited to a small cantilever on the property.

Mr. Tonn indicated that he did not have any issues with the height change on the garage due to its location.

Discussion was made on the stipulation concerning the glass fencing.

Mr. Vasquez clarified that stipulations previously approved were not overridden by the new stipulations. He explained that these stipulations specifically applied to the changes being considered.

Further discussion was made on the glass railing stipulation. It was indicated that they could keep the currently proposed glass railing, but it would need to be sure that it was not reflecting any light. It was suggested to use a non-reflective coating on the glass.

Mr. Covington asked if they had addressed the Committees concern about the number of lights by the pool.

Mr. Vasquez shared that some lights were removed, and others were moved out further.

Mr. Jarson called for any public comments on the Item. No comments were offered.

Mr. Tonn motioned to approved Item 20-264 combined review for modifications to the previously approved plans at 4208 E Lamar Road subject to Staff stipulations 1-12.

Mr. Jarson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-265 Combined review for a sport court at 4700 E Charles Drive (APN 168-69-014)

Mr. Vasquez introduced the Item and pointed out some of the modifications that had been made including the reduction of the sport court area and changes in lighting. He reviewed other elements that had been previously approved including fencing, grading and drainage plans, and more.

Brent Armstrong stated he was the project architect. He reiterated that most of the plans had remained the same with the exception of an alteration in the size and shape of the sport court and reduction in lighting as well as substitution of the green turf with a tan colored turf.

Mr. Jarson expressed that he was not fond of the idea of adding a disturbance outside of the yard area for the sport court.



Mr. Armstrong explained that they had looked into placing the sport court on the East side but found it would be complex due to the septic system. He clarified for Mr. Tonn which of the Palo Verdes would be removed to make way for the sports court.

Mr. Jarson called for public comments on this Application. No comments were offered.

Mr. Tonn motioned to approved 20-265 at 4700 E Charles Drive the Combined review for the addition of the sport court subject to Staff stipulations 1-8.

Mr. Anton seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

20-266 Combined review for modifications to the previously approved plans at 5656 E Indian Bend Road (APN 169-55-006)

Mr. Vasquez presented an introduction of the Item and noted that the previous application and approval still stands and that this Item would be focusing on the Items being updated. He shared that the height and footprint of the property have not been altered but noted some of the smaller changes that had been made to the plan including changes in materials and other changes to details on the property including new turf, chimney topper, and more. He presented the updated grading and drainage plan for the property as well as newly proposed materials.

Mr. Covington asked where the turf would be located.

Mr. Vasquez replied it was located in the Southwest corner.

Mr. Jarson asked what drove the material changes and specifically the changes on the roof.

Bob Long introduced himself as the project designer and stated that the changes for the roof were mostly financially driven.

Mr. Jarson expressed concern with the lack of detail about the revegetation in an area of the property where there was not good soil for planting a native plant mix.

Mr. Long replied that they would need to add top soil to the area to make it more plantable. He added that adding plants in that area would help with some of the erosion issues they have had in the area as well.

Mr. Anton stated that the material used to fill in part of the hillside was inappropriate and did not blend with the natural landscape and suggested the fill be removed.



Mr. Covington stated that it looked like the slope there now was steeper than what it was prior to construction.

Mr. Vasquez indicated that there was previously a retaining wall in that location.

Mr. Wainwright commented that it was unfortunate that so much of the property had been spoiled and that some of the large native plants were no longer in existence. He suggested they plant some larger native trees and noted that it may help with some of the erosion problems.

Mr. Jarson stated that they will need to give more thought on the landscaping to get it back up to speed. He added that he did not have an issue with the color change and felt it was substantially compliant to what was originally approved.

Mr. Anton agreed and noted he was looking at the actual sample and felt there was hardly a difference in the color from what was previously approved.

Mr. Tonn asked why they wanted the color change if they were so similar.

Mr. Long explained that the owner felt the new color was richer than the previous one and preferred that.

Mr. Jarson reiterated felt the proposed landscape plan was lacking and the soils present were not harmonious to desert vegetation. He pointed out that the roof change was significant and noted how those changes can affect other elements of the plan such as how other materials look.

Mr. Covington asked what the LRV was for the original metal roof.

Mr. Vasquez stated that it had an LRV of 7.

Mr. Jarson noted that the proposed roof is lighter and was no longer a minor accent.

Mr. Tonn inquired if the Committee would have approved this application if they did not have the previous application to compare it with.

Mr. Tonn responded that he would have asked the applicant to try to blend the stucco surfaces with the vertical columns. He added that when they saw the original application the color looked browner and seemed to blend more with the columns and roof.

Mr. Covington stated that he was concerned that the wall replacing the metal railing was built before it was approved.

Mr. Jarson indicated that he could not approve this plan as it is and would either need to heavily stipulate things or request the application to come back before the Committee.



Don Neuerman remarked that he would be happy to work with Town Staff on landscape plans.

Mr. Wainwright commented that he would like to see some fairly large trees planted in the area to help hide the slope that was created.

Mr. Anton expressed that he would like to see a landscaping plan and how the colors will tie in come back before the Committee because he did not feel they had enough information to make a decision on plans that will ultimately affect everyone in the neighborhood.

Mr. Jarson called for public comments on the application.

Bruce Fieldman voiced his concern Mr. Long was a residential designer and not a commercial architect. He added that sever other elements of the project have been built or done before they received approval and it concerned himself and other neighbors that other elements of the project would not be done properly. He shared that they would like to see the vegetation restored to block the view of the home and parking area. He noted that the LRV of the roof has almost doubled and did not feel that was a good idea since the home was in the sun nearly the entire day. He clarified that he would not approve these plans and pointed out that certain elements that they were told to change during a review in 2018 were back on the application and did not feel those should be approved including the use of dark brown and blacks for fencing and railing among other things. He asked that a wall be built around the air conditioner to block any noise coming from it. He stated he was also concerned about the chimney cap going above the height limit.

Tony Corey agreed with what Dr. Fieldman stated. He clarified that there was an issue of trust and shared experiences he had with the property developers that have led him to not trust them including that the notice sign for this meeting was place behind a bush, so neighbors could not see it. He requested that the Town verify natural grade and that those requirements were actually being met in this project.

Mr. Jarson responded that he believed Staff was looking into the natural grade and contours of the site.

Cliff Weigel indicated he was the project manager and explained that when they started to do the foundation for the building was not solid enough which caused them to go down 12 feet and turn the soil which has made the material look newer even though it is largely the same material that was there before.

Mr. Neuerman stated he was the property owner and commented that there was a proposed wall to be built around the air conditioning units. He shared that he wanted to move this project along but also wanted to respect his neighbors' concerns. He added that he would be willing to go back to the originally approved colors and roofing if the



Town wanted. He apologized for the changes made to the staircase from railing to being enclosed and expressed that it was not their intent to circumvent the Towns requirements or deceive anyone.

Mr. Jarson asked if they could continue this Item to a special meeting prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Vasquez responded that they could schedule an additional special meeting this month if they desired. He noted that there should not be any issues with notice on that meeting since it was a continuation of the Item.

Mr. Wainwright indicated he was comfortable having the landscape review be done at Chair level. He again suggested the use a significant number of trees in the landscape plans and added that he would appreciate a color for the home that was less orange.

Mr. Covington remarked that they often try to get homes to blend into the mountain side and that they should aim for a color that does not stand out. He asked if the pad of the home was at the same height of the original.

Mr. Long replied that it was within a few inches

Mr. Tonn remarked that it would be helpful to have a profession engineer identify the height of the pad. He identified issues with the stare well including that it did not have the 80% open railing and that once the retention basin below it was added that it may look even bigger. He suggested that in lieu of tearing out the wall and putting the railing in that they cover the area with landscaping. He inquired if the chimney cap put the building over the height limit.

Mr. Vasquez replied that he believed statements concerning the chimney being over the height limit were false.

Mr. Tonn shared that he agreed with Mr. Wainwrights comments about the color and that the Chair was capable of working with the applicant to come up with a solution for the landscaping. He noted that he would like to take up the applicants offer to put the roof back to the original metal that was proposed.

Mr. Long commented that the surveyor provided the lowest floor verification which is now 1472.01 and was previously 1472.

Mr. Corey stated that the previous home was much lower than 24 feet from the assumed natural grade and this home was 29 feet above the assumed natural grade.

Mr. Vasquez shared more detailed information concerning the height and natural grade of the site and how the overall height was determined. He noted that the building was



35.5 feet from the natural grade adjacent to the building structure or column to the highest point of the building which was below the 40-foot restriction.

Mr. Jarson reviewed the Committee's options of moving forward and indicated that he would also like to see the roof returned to its original design.

Mr. Anton concurred with the other members of the Committee. He expressed concern that the color on the house might not blend in with the mountain even if it is returned to the originally approved color.

Mr. Jarson inquired if the applicant would be willing to have this postponed until June 17, 2020 and to rework some of the plans before that time. He indicated that he and Staff would be willing to help them work through some of the plans before then.

Mr. Covington suggested not having the Committee members rotate until after that next meeting for the sake of continuity on this project.

Mr. Anton asked if there would be any pushback on the change on the garage door from eight to ten feet.

Mr. Wainwright noted his primary concerns were the landscape slope as well as the color of the home. He added that landscaping the slope would win a lot of favor with the neighbors and the Committee.

Mr. Tonn concurred with Mr. Wainwright's points and indicated that he shared Mr. Anton's concern about the color being more orange than brown.

Mr. Jarson motioned to continue this application until a special meeting held on June 24, 2020 at 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Anton seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Mood stated that they made updates to the Hillside Brochure and noted that they have received phone calls from people who did not know they were included in the hillside area.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

6. NEXT MEETING DATE



Mr. Jarson announced that the next regular meeting was Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 8:00 a.m. and the following meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 8:00 a.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jarson motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Anton seconded the motion.