

Architectural and Site Control Commission **November 24, 2008**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the regular meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Warr

Absent: None*

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni (arrived at approximately 8:20 p.m.)

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Borck

*With the appointment of former ASCC member Von Feldt to the planning commission, there are four filled and one vacant ASCC positions.

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Prior to consideration of the Roberts Market, Sequoias and Austin projects, Warr temporarily left the ASCC meeting room noting he would not participate in ASCC considerations of these agenda items. He explained that his Portola Road business office was within 500 feet of the Roberts Market and Austin project properties and that he had provided architectural services to the Sequoias.

Initial, "Periodic Review" of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-67, 4420 Alpine Road, Roberts Market

Vlasic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on the subject CUP "periodic review" matter. He explained that on December 13, 2007 the planning commission approved amendments to CUP X7D-67 to allow for Roberts Market to move into the Alpine Road building and site formally occupied by John's Valley Foods. He further explained that the following CUP condition requires periodic permit review, including a "four-month" review, for conformity with permit provisions:

18. This permit shall be subject to periodic review by the planning commission of no less than every three years to ensure continued conformity with permit provisions. However, after the first four (4) months of operation and again after one year of operation, i.e., both from the date of Market reopening, reviews by the planning commission shall be conducted relative to, in particular, the matters of circulation, outside seating and food consumption areas, loading dock use and use of the employee parking area, to determine if any adjustments are needed to ensure safe site use, proper relationship to adjoining residential uses, and appropriate service relative to the needs for outside seating and eating areas. The applicant shall be responsible for covering the costs associated with any permit reviews. If any adjustments are determined necessary, the market operator shall make such improvements to the satisfaction of the planning commission.

Vlasic clarified that the purpose of placing this matter on the 11/24 ASCC agenda was to facilitate the required four-month review by the planning commission, as explained in the

staff report, and that the commission review was scheduled to take place formally at the December 3 regular commission meeting.

Vlasic also commented that to date most input from the public regarding the market use has been positive, but he did review the few “noise” issues presented in a November 6, 2008 letter from Mr. Robert Allen, 211 Nathhorst Avenue.

George Roberts was present and noted that he was not fully aware of all of the concerns of Mr. Allen, but had reviewed them with Market staff after receiving the 11/6/08 letter.

Public comments were then requested. While no person was specifically present to comment on the use, one member of the public, present for a different application, did offer input in response to a question from ASCC Chair Breen as to the adequacy of number of bike racks. **Ms. Austin, 235 Echo Lane**, advised that she is often at the market and has never encountered the bike racks being full.

The only other comments presented were the following based on discussion between Mr. Roberts and ASCC members:

- In response to a question on parking, both staff and Mr. Roberts noted that there has been no record of any parking or traffic flow problems.
- Mr. Roberts noted that the outside eating areas have been regularly used and the only problem encountered has been with “yellow-jackets” during the warm months. He noted that the market has taken steps to place traps to help control the problem.
- In response to a question with regard to a palm tree that was planted in the parking area at the store entry, Mr. Roberts noted that the tree was destroyed by a truck and would be replanted in the same planting area, but in a less vulnerable location.
- ASCC member Clark noted that there was some asphalt curb damage in the parking lot, likely due to impacts from delivery trucks and recommended that the curb damage be repaired.
- In response to questions regarding the comments in the November 6, 2008 letter from Mr. Allen, Mr. Roberts noted he has asked his staff to refrain from using the beeper lock systems on their cars during the early morning periods. Further, staff clarified that the summertime equipment noise concerns of Mr. Allen were largely due to the atmospheric conditions during very warm periods. It was explained that the equipment sound levels had been measured after installation and found to meet the standards anticipated with the approved use permit. It was clarified, however, that a few adjustments were made so that the equipment would run quieter. It was also noted that the original acoustical analysis indicated that during very warm periods, cooling equipment noise would likely be more apparent due to the “inversion” atmospheric conditions. It was agreed that staff and Mr. Roberts would continue to monitor the matter with Mr. Allen and determine what additional measures might be considered to further reduce sound levels during the very warm periods and that this would likely take place during the 2009 Spring/Summer/Fall season and be reported on again to the planning commission during the 2009 required CUP review.
- Clark commented that he was pleased to see that the exterior lighting appeared to be acceptable in terms of evening light spill and that he believed it met the Market's need

for a safe parking area for patrons and employees. Mr. Roberts confirmed that he had not received any comments about inadequate lighting in the parking areas.

After discussion, Vlastic advised that the input from the ASCC meeting would be shared with the planning commission as part of the required planning commission four-month CUP review.

Variance Application X7E-132, rear yard setback encroachment for installation of two electrical transformer enclosures, 501 Portola Road, The Sequoias

Vlastic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on this request for a variance to permit installation of two new electrical transformer enclosures along the rear parcel line and within the required 20-foot rear yard setback area of The Sequoias retirement facility property. He explained that on November 5, 2008 the planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the request and received public input with respect to not only the variance, but also on-going sound and noise issues of concern to immediate neighbors.

Vlastic advised that based on input received relative to the sound and noise issues, additional work is needed by both staff and the applicant before the variance request is ready for ASCC consideration or planning commission hearing. He referenced the November 19, 2008 status report memorandum to the planning commission on the matter and provided an update of the efforts that are proceeding relative to the noise issues. He recommended that review of the request be continued indefinitely and stated that a new meeting notice would be distributed when the project is ready for ASCC consideration.

Public input was then requested but none was offered. Thereafter, project review was indefinitely continued as recommended by staff.

Architectural Review for house remodeling, and new garage with home office, 235 Echo Lane, Austin

Vlastic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on this proposal for the addition of a 776 sf detached, single story garage with home office on the subject .44 acre Brookside Park property. He noted that the project includes a 612 sf garage, with 164 sf office and also calls for substantial remodeling of the existing single story, 1,976 residence, He also advised that the project would remove a significant amount of existing impervious surface area, as well as a detached, minimal carport. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials submitted by the applicant and, unless otherwise noted, dated October 12, 2008:

- Sheet A-0.0, Cover Sheet, Notes, Legend
- Sheet A-0.1, Architectural Site Plan, September 9, 2008
- Sheet A-1.0, Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.0, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-3.0, Architectural Sections
- Sheet A-4.0, Architectural Sections
- Sheet L-1.0, Existing Impervious Surfaces
- Sheet L-1.1, Proposed Impervious Surfaces
- Sheet L-1.2, Landscape Planting Plan
- Sheet LT-0.1, Exterior Lighting Site Plan
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, including the recessed down lights, wall mounted, down-directed sconce lights and "solar bud" path lights

“Illustrative materials list” (8.5”x11” sheet)

Vlasic advised that since the staff report was prepared, the town had received one additional comment on the proposal. Copies of this November 24, 2008 email from Susan Coffman, 239 Echo Lane, were distributed to ASCC members. Vlasic noted that the neighbor’s concerns centered on proximity of the new garage/office to the front property line and potential for privacy impacts from the east side office windows, which face the Coffman property. Vlasic noted the following:

- The new building would be no closer to the front property line than 23 feet, whereas a 20-foot setback is required. He stated that Ms. Coffman indicated her house is 27 feet from the front property line.
- The proposed office is over 52 feet from the eastern property line that is along the parcel “panhandle” between the Austin and Coffman properties, whereas only a 10-foot side yard setback is required. It was also noted that the office would be over 75 feet from the neighboring residence.
- Existing trees and six foot high property line fencing provide for additional separation and privacy between the Austin and Coffman properties.
- The windows proposed on the east side of the office would be translucent, “Channel Glass,” and not clear glass. While light can be seen through the Channel Glass panels, there would not be clear views through the panels. He noted this “glass” material, the distance between neighboring properties and structures, and tree and fencing elements between properties should mitigate any privacy, or visual impact concerns.

Vlasic did, however, stress the need for at least planning staff and a designated ASCC member to see and approve actual samples of the proposed “Channel Glass,” as well as the other proposed exterior materials and finishes prior to release of any project building permit.

Mr. and Mrs. Austin presented their project to the ASCC. They noted that they had visited their neighbors to share project data with them. They also presented images from “Google Earth” to demonstrate the separation between the proposed improvements and those on neighboring parcels. They then offered the following comments, mostly in response to questions from ASCC members:

- The proposed solar pathway light fixture would be ‘switched’ so that it would not be on all night long.
- The site has been evaluated relative to installation of a photovoltaic solar panel system, but at this point, the cost can’t be justified. This, however, will continue to be evaluated as system costs come down and overall project budgets are clarified.
- A small fence will be added to the plans. It is to separate the driveway from the front entry and would be located along the north side of the proposed new driveway/garage apron paving. The fence would likely be no higher than four feet.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members stated general support for the project and agreed that the accessory structure findings required for the detached garage with office could be made as evaluated in the staff report.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 to approve the proposal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and planning staff prior to release of a building permit:

1. A comprehensive construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. Samples of final exterior building materials, including the "Channel Glass Wall," shall be provided.
3. Final specifications and samples for the driveway paver materials shall be provided.
4. The switching details for the solar powered path lights shall be provided.
5. Details for the fence planned along the north side of the driveway/parking area paving shall be provided.

It was also noted by staff that the drainage concerns described in the November 6, 2008 email from Don Priest, 227 Echo Lane, would be considered during the normal course of the building permit review process.

Following action on the Austin project, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-593, proposed detached garage and detached guest house, 48 Hillbrook Drive, Fouquet & Zdasiuk

Vlasic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on this proposal for the addition of two detached accessory structures on the subject 1.0 acre, residentially developed Hillbrook Drive property. He explained that the project includes a detached single story, 499 sf garage, to be located roughly 15 feet to the southeast of the existing, "lower level" garage attached to the two-level main house, and a 747 sf detached guest house, which would be located at the northernmost corner of the property.

Vlasic advised that the proposal calls for grading to develop desired walkways and redevelopment of the driveway connection from the existing garage apron and parking spaces to Hillbrook Drive. He noted that the total volume of grading needed for the driveway and other site work would be 210 cubic yards, including 110 cubic yards of cut and 100 cubic yards of fill. He clarified that such grading requires the subject site development permit, and the ASCC is the approving authority for such permits where grading is between 100 and 1,000 cubic yards.

Vlasic reviewed the issues discussed in the staff report, including adjustments to the garage location, height of the proposed guest house, and heights of proposed retaining walls in the front yard setback area. He also reviewed issues relative to exterior colors and lighting for the guest house, need for guest house findings pursuant to the town's policy statement, and

possible need for a deed restriction relative to the guest house. Vlastic advised that these issues were discussed with the project design team and that presentations in response to the concerns noted in the staff report were expected at the ASCC meeting.

Vlastic also noted that since preparation of the staff report, the neighboring resident immediately to the north of the project site, i.e., the neighboring parcel served by Paso del Arroyo, advised planning staff that she was concerned with the view impacts of the proposed guest house on her property. Vlastic offered that, depending on input received at the ASCC meeting, members might conclude that a site meeting on the application is needed.

Carol Borck then reviewed the “sustainability” aspects of the project as presented in her October 28, 2008 memorandum. She discussed the durable materials proposed and provided a general overview of the planned “green” elements of the project.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans and materials:

Architectural Plans, unless otherwise noted by BSA Designs, dated 10/09/08:

Sheet T, Cover Sheet with Sheet Index and Project Data

Sheet A.1.0, Topographic Map, Arcturus Surveys, (survey date 8/14/07)

Sheet A.2.0, Guest House Floor, Exterior Wall Lighting and Roof Plans

Sheet A.2.1, Guest House Floor Plan

Sheet A.3.0, Guest House Exterior Elevations

Sheet A.4.0, Garage Floor and Roof Plans and Exterior Elevations

Landscape Plans by Ron Benoit Associates, dated 10/8/08:

Sheet L.1, Master Plan & Site Lighting Plan

Sheet L.2, Master Plan & Site Lighting Details & Legend

Civil Engineering Plans, Alcon Engineering, dated 9/2/08:

Sheet 1, Title sheet

Sheet 2, Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plans

Sheet 3, Details Sheet

Submitted in support of the proposal:

Three (3) colors and materials sheets, received 10/10/08. (One sheet identifying by color chip and manufacturers data the proposed exterior materials and colors. The other sheets containing rendered elevations and color photo images of the existing residence.

Cut sheet, received 10/14/08, for the proposed wall mounted light fixture to be used on both the planned garage and guest house.

Brian Anuskewicz, project designer, and Ron Benoit, project landscape architect, presented the project to the ASCC and offered the following comments and plan clarifications:

- A revised 11/18/08 site/landscape plan was presented showing the adjustments to garage siting discussed in the staff report and modeled by story poles at the site. It was noted that the design adjustments were made to address visual impact concerns of the applicant, but also resulted in saving three oaks down hill of the garage site, allowing for a better visual relationship with respect to the property to the east.
- Revised architectural elevation plans for the guest house were presented with a modified roof form that was developed for conformity with the 28-foot height limit. A copy of these plans, dated 11/24/08 was provided to staff. It was noted that there had been some

confusion over the height limit requirements as presented in the zoning ordinance. This was briefly discussed. It was also noted that the revised elevation plans include changes to the window areas that should result in less concern over privacy and light spill relative to views from the property to the north.

- Benoit reviewed landscape plan revisions and adjustments made to keep retaining wall heights to a maximum for four feet within the 50-foot front yard setback area. He commented that with the current design, he would still need to have a “rail fence” on top of the retaining wall. (Vlasic advised that the maximum permitted height of four feet included both the wall and any “fence” on top of the wall. Benoit noted that he would need to develop further design revisions to meet the four-foot height limit.)

Public comments were requested. **Michael Berube, 40 Paso del Arroyo**, expressed his concerns with the project and commented that he wished he had been contacted by the applicant prior to the ASCC meeting. He noted that based on views from his property to the story poles placed for the guest house, the structure would be imposing and significantly intrude on his privacy. He also worried about the lighting impacts from the both exterior and interior lighting. He suggested that the story poles made it appear that the proposed structure would be “50 feet” high.

Mr. Berube and his wife Katrina, who was also present, both worried over health of the trees planted along the common property line and that the guest house might be located so as to be at risk from a tree falling. They also questioned if the guest house would need to maintain a setback from the 10-foot wide trail easement and worried over the noise impacts associated with any mechanical equipment, e.g., air conditioner sound.

In response to the trail easement setback question, Vlasic advised that the zoning ordinance does not require a setback to be taken from a trail easement line.

Jim Maliksi, 75 Sausal Drive, stated he was also concerned with the potential visual impacts of the proposed guest house. He advised that he was not certain as to what he might see of the guest house, but did not want it to impact on his views from his property across the “Biland,” Paso del Arroyo subdivision parcels.

ASCC members discussed the project and found the garage plans generally acceptable, and also supported the planned driveway improvements. Members did, however, agree that they wanted to see revised retaining wall plans, complying with the four-foot height limit, prior to completing action on this part of the project. Members also requested additional clarification of the proposed landscape plan, including retaining wall and driveway paver materials, vineyard planting, garden fencing, etc.

With respect to the guest house, members concluded a site meeting was needed to fully appreciate the proposal and the concerns of the neighbors. General reaction was favorable to the revised elevation plan dated 11/24/08, but members agreed that the site meeting would be beneficial to determine if the changes were sufficient to address the view impact concerns expressed at the ASCC meeting. Clark suggested the consideration be given to moving the guest house further to toward the main house and away from the northerly property line common with 40 Paso del Arroyo. Other members concurred that design options should be considered and shared with the neighbors prior to the site meeting.

Following discussion, project review was continued to a site meeting scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on December 8, 2008.

Prior to consideration of the following Kavanaugh project, Warr left the ASCC meeting room. He advised that his firm had recently provided architectural services to the applicant.

Architectural Review for carport and storage room replacement, 119 Tan Oak Drive, Kavanaugh

Vlasic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on this proposal is for the replacement of an existing attached carport and storage room with a new carport and storage room on the subject .21-acre Brookside Park property. He explained that the project includes removal of the existing flat roof carport and storage room, with a roof area of almost 850 sf, and replacing these with a new carport and storage space having a total floor area of 521 sf. He clarified that the improvements can be made with no grading, virtually no impact on existing vegetation and no increase in impervious surface area. He did note, however, that a minor plan adjustment would be needed for conformity with the required side yard setback, as explained in the staff report. He stated that this matter had been discussed with the project architect and that the needed plan adjustment would be developed with final building permit plans.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by BAS designs and dated 11/5/08:

- Sheet 1, Project Data, Existing Site Plan
- Sheet 2, New Site Plan, New Carport & Storage Room Plan
- Sheet 3, Exterior Elevations/Section Thru Framing Plan
- Sheet 4, Roof Plans and Details
- Sheet 5, Electrical – Lighting Plan/Site Improvements
- Sheet 6, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, Oct. 2005

Carport Colors and Materials Sheet (It was clarified in the sheet notes that the house will be repainted and re-roofed to match the colors and materials palette proposed for the carport.)

Exterior lighting cut sheets (3 sheets), Fixtures A, B, C & D

Brian Anuskewicz, project designer, was present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members. He advised that he had nothing to add beyond the staff report. He did clarify, however, that he would be adjusting the building permit plans to ensure conformity with the required side yard setbacks.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC briefly discussed the proposal and found it acceptable as evaluated in the staff report. Thereafter, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 subject to the condition that the setback issued described in the staff report be resolved to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project.

Following action on the Kavanaugh project, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Prior to consideration of the Goulden/Lau project, Clark temporarily stepped down from his ASCC position. He explained that he lives within 500 feet of the project site.

Architectural Review and for house additions and remodeling, 132 Corte Madera Road, Goulden/Lau

Vlasic presented the November 20, 2008 staff report on this proposal for a 260 sf addition to an existing 3,428 sf, two-story residence on the subject .474-acre Brookside Park property. He explained that the project includes both upper and lower floor additions along the front elevation of the existing house to accommodate a new stairway to the upper level and allow for interior remodeling on both the main and upper level. He added that the project also includes improvements to the main house entry deck and paved yard surfaces, repair and replacement of existing yard retaining walls and fencing, and minor window changes and other minor exterior refinements.

Vlasic advised that the key reason ASCC review is required for this proposal is because it would concentrate almost 99% of the permitted floor area in the single largest structure, and this is only possible subject to findings that must be made by the ASCC. Vlasic then reviewed the required findings, as evaluated in the staff report, and concluded that, in this case, it appeared they could be made.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated November 3, 2008 and prepared by F. John Richards, Architect:

Sheet A.1, Site Plan
Sheet A.2, Floor Plans
Sheet A.3, Existing and Proposed Elevation

Goulden Remodel Exterior Information Sheets, received November 6, 2008. (Two sheets noting that, for the most part, the new improvements would match existing materials and finishes.)

Exterior lighting cut sheets (3 sheets), received November 6, 2008, including step and wall lighting proposed for the new front deck and the fixture to be used at the existing, remodeled garage.

Mr. Goulden and John Richards, project architect, were present to discuss the proposed project with ASCC members. Mr. Richards presented a revised sheet A.1, dated 11/20/08 with notes addressing the fence height issue discussed in the staff report. He also clarified that the decision to use pavers for the new driveway surface was in part due to the fact that pavers generate less heat from the sun than is the case with asphalt, resulting in a cooler environment around the house. He also clarified, in response to a question, that the pavers were designed to have a relatively solid surface and keep drainage away from the house and its foundation.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0, approval of the plans as presented, including revised Sheet A.1, dated 11/20/08. This action was taken with the

understanding that a construction staging plan would be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff as part of the normal building permit review process.

Following action on the above project, Clark returned to his ASCC position.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0, approval of the October 27, 2008 meeting minutes as drafted.

ASCC Direction with regard to Driveway Entry Gates for 3 Oak Forest Court, Taran

Vlasic advised that planning staff was working with the owners of the subject property to resolve issues associated with work started on a driveway entry gate system without benefit of planning review or a building permit. He explained that the gate supports were installed along the existing driveway within the 50-foot front yard setback area. He noted that the subject site is within the Portola Glen Estates planned unit development (PUD) area and that any such gate system not only requires town planning and building permit reviews, but also consideration by the PUD homeowners.

After receiving staff input, ASCC members directed that planning staff and ASCC member Clark should work with the property owner and/or the property owners' representatives to ensure that any final gate installation conforms to town fence and gate ordinance provisions and that the other PUD homeowners are informed of and given the opportunity to comment on the gate plans prior to final town approval.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

T. Vlasic