

Architectural and Site Control Commission
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

August 24, 2009

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: Toben
Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-589, 17 Redberry Ridge, Lot 13 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Demienne

Vlastic presented the August 20, 2009 staff report on the subject follow-up review. He discussed the conditions of the April 27, 2009 ASCC project approval and how the plans listed below address approval conditions. He noted that the following plans, unless otherwise noted, were revised through August 18, 2009 and prepared by William Maston Architect and Associates:

Sheet A0.01, Cover Sheet and Project Data
Sheet A1.02, Construction Staging Plan
Sheet A2.03A, Roof Plan
Sheet A5.01, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A5.02, Exterior Elevations
Sheet E1.01, Exterior Electrical Plan
Sheet E1.02, Exterior Floor Lighting Plan
Sheet L-1, Planting Plan, Planting Legends, Thomas Scherer Associates, Landscape Architecture, 8/3/09
Sheet L-1, Planting Details & Notes, Thomas Scherer Associates, Landscape Architecture, 8/3/09

Vlastic advised that based on discussions with the project architect, as noted in the comments in the staff report, he understood that the project design team would be providing further plan revisions at the ASCC meeting, particularly with respect to the proposed exterior lighting and landscaping. Vlastic also discussed the status of the planned roof deck, the ASCC condition relative to the roof deck, and the August 20, 2009 letter from neighbors Lynn and Jim Gibbons reviewing their roof deck concerns and asking that the feature be eliminated from the plans.

George Demienne, Bill Maston and Tom Scherer presented the follow-up submittal package to the ASCC. The following plan clarifications and comments were offered:

- Revised "redlined," lighting plans were submitted (i.e., Sheets E1.01 and E1.02). It was noted that on Sheet E1.01 the lighting reductions include 11 landscape fixtures, 1 wall

fixture and 2 down lights. On Sheet E1.02, the “lower level” plan shows a reduction of 3 recessed ceiling lights. It was pointed out that a note was added to Sheet E1.01 relative to the pool lights. It was clarified that the pool and spa lights had yet to be selected, but that the lighting would be no more than the minimum called for by the code. It was also stated that a final decision had yet to be made on the color for the pool plaster and that the final pool/spa lighting plan would be developed based on the color and to minimize light spill. It was noted that consideration was being given to a plaster color similar to the light gray/green finish used for the Blue Oaks recreation center pool.

- In response to comments in the staff report, “redlined” versions of landscape plan Sheets L-1 and L-2 were submitted. It was clarified that the notes called for the reduction of planting in the “front yard” area, addition of screen trees on the berm above the east side rear terrace wall, and addition of taller plant materials below the pool.
- Relative to the roof deck, it was noted that the design had been changed to address the ASCC condition and that the railing could be modified, as suggested in the staff report, to further ensure that the deck “disappears” into the form of the roof. It was clarified, however, that the desire was to have a solid “railing” form for the first 32 inches, but a more open design for the top 12 inches so that there would be views out for those sitting in the deck area. It was also noted that both the existing Owen house (Lot 17) and Salah house now under construction (Lot 14) had roof decks.

Public comments were requested. **Lynn Gibbons, 15 Redberry Ridge**, reviewed the comments in her and her husband’s 8/20/09 letter to the ASCC. She asked the ASCC to stand by the approval condition and ensure that if the deck is part of the project it “disappears into the roof.” She worried over privacy and placement of deck “furniture” and umbrellas calling further attention to the roof deck area.

ASCC members discussed the revised lighting and landscaping plans and noted that final selection of materials should ensure the plants are as deer resistant as possible. Further, it was stressed that the trees planted above the east side rear terrace wall needed to be “significant” and should be large sized, as called for in the condition. Warr noted that he had recommended the condition and expected that the trees at planting would have heights of 12 to 14 feet. He stressed this was intended to screen views from the glass areas of the living room and dining porch. It was also clarified that trees other than live oaks would be preferred.

Relative to the lighting plans, it was noted that while the revisions appear appropriate, the rear terrace step lights should be mounted so as to direct light back into the house and not out from it. It was suggested that a “skirt” or curb be added to the outside edge of the stairs and that the step light be mounted in this feature directing light back to the stairs and house.

Relative to the roof deck all ASCC members concurred that the current plans did not satisfy the approval condition. Warr stressed that more of an effort was needed to make the deck “disappear” into the roof, including use of a pitched roof form to the top of the deck “railing.”

After discussion, Warr moved seconded, by Breen and passed 5-0 to approve the follow-up submittal with the “redline” lighting and landscape plan revisions, but specifically excluding the proposed roof deck, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The exterior lighting plans shall be modified to be consistent with the “redline” revised lighting plan. The plans shall also be further modified so as to orient the rear terrace stair step lights into the site as discussed at the ASCC meeting.
2. The pool/spa lighting shall be specified and shall be selected in consideration of the planned plaster finish. The objective being to minimize light spill and reflection and provide for only the minimum lighting needed to satisfy code requirements for pool lighting.
3. A final detailed landscape plan shall be prepared that is consistent with the “redlined” revised plan. The final plan shall, in addition:
 - a. Include plants that are, to the extent possible, deer resistant.
 - b. Identify screen trees to be installed along the top of the east side rear terrace wall of a large size, 12 to 14 feet tall at planting. These shall be native trees, but preferably not live oaks. Limited use of live oaks, may, however, be acceptable. They shall be located as close to the house walls as possible for screening of views to the adjacent window areas
 - c. Incorporate more native grasses into the “reduction” in scope of front yard shrub planting.
 - d. Include planting details similar to those employed for the “Borders” project at Blue Oaks Lot 16.
4. The building permit plans shall include a specific schedule for early planting, i.e., as soon as possible after rough grading for site improvements is completed, of key screen materials to the satisfaction of planning staff. This planting shall be consistent with the final landscape plans and shall be incorporated into the building inspection schedule to ensure it is completed prior to inspection of foundation forms, i.e., prior to pouring of the foundation concrete.
5. The construction staging and vegetation protection plan, i.e., plan Sheet A1.02, shall be modified to address the construction staging issues and needed plan note corrections identified in the August 20, 2009 staff report. The plan modifications shall be to the satisfaction of the planning staff.

Relative to the roof deck, it was noted that if the deck is eliminated from the plans, the building permit process could proceed, subject to the above conditions, without the need for any further full ASCC plan consideration. It was further clarified, that if the roof deck were to be part of the project, the design would need to be significantly modified and that design presented to the full ASCC for further consideration.

Follow-up Architectural Review for residential additions and remodeling and Site Development Permit X9H-599, 10 La Sandra Way, Krosnick

Vlasic presented the August 20, 2009 staff report on the subject follow-up submittal. He discussed the conditions of the June 8, 2009 ASCC project approval and how the following plans, unless otherwise noted, revised through July 17, 2009 and prepared by Herring & Worley, Inc., satisfy the approval conditions:

Sheet 0, Existing Conditions
Sheet 1, General Site Plan, Project Data
Sheet 1.1, Detail Site Plan
Sheet C-1.2, Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan, Clifford Bechtel and Associates
Sheet 1.3, Planting Plan, Tree Protection Plan, Exterior Lighting
Sheet 2, Garage & Lower Floor Plan (and details)
Sheet 2.1, Main Floor Plan (and sections)
Sheet 2.2, Upper Floor Plan (and sections)
Sheet 3, Roof Plan (and details)
Sheet 4, Vertical Control Plan/Schematic Sections
Sheet 5, Exterior Elevations
Sheet 5.1, Exterior Elevations
Sheet 6, Mechanical & Electrical Plans

Jon Krosnick and Fred Herring presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The clarifications contained in the August 6, 2009 letter from Mr. Herring were reviewed relative to the original submittal. Also reviewed were the clarifications contained in the August 21, 2009 letter from Mr. Herring. It was noted that these responded to the comments in the August 20, 2009 staff report relative to construction staging, lighting, colors board and engineering plan corrections.
- All wall lights would be under soffit or roof areas and not exposed to direct views from off site. Further, the sconce would be directed “up” so that the light would be limited by the soffit or roof and, therefore, not have potential for “washing walls.” It was also noted that each sconce fixture would contain one 7-watt fluorescent lamp, i.e., equivalent to a 27-watt incandescent bulb.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the northwesterly row of Rhus Ovata shown on Sheet 1.3 was actually a plan note remnant from the original plan proposal, i.e., prior to the most recent grading plan changes, and that this planting is not now proposed with the revised project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Aalfs moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up submittal as clarified at the ASCC meeting, and in the 8/6/09 and 8/21/09 letters from Mr. Herring, subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of building permit:

1. Sheet 1.3 shall be revised to eliminate the northwesterly row of Rhus Ovata.
2. A final, detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be prepared that addresses the issues identified in the August 20, 2009 staff report and incorporates the provisions set forth in the 8/21/09 letter from Fred Herring.

It was also noted that final plan conformity with conditions of site development committee members, including public works director, fire marshal, health officer and town geologist, would be addressed as part of the standard building permit review process.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling, 5 Quail, Portola Valley Ranch, Eyre

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the August 20, 2009 staff report on this proposal for additions to the existing residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch property. He explained that the applicants have again requested a continuance, this time to the September 14th ASCC meeting. He noted that while the project has received approval by the Portola Valley Ranch Design committee, and the applicants still desire to pursue the subject architectural review approval, they have also placed the subject house on the market as they've encountered an opportunity to purchase another desired property in town. Vlasic clarified that the time conflicts associated with these circumstances have resulted in the request for additional continuance and that staff supports the request.

Public comments were sought, but none offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the September 14, 2009 regular ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Architectural Review for residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-604, 133 Stonegate Road, McAdam

Vlasic referenced the August 20, 2009 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.28-acre Stonegate Subdivision property. He noted that the site meeting on the project scheduled for earlier in the day had to be cancelled because the required project story poles were not in place and would not be installed until just prior to the September 14, 2009 ASCC meeting. It was noted, therefore, that the applicant had requested a continuance to the September 14th meeting and that staff concurred with the request.

Public comments were then sought on the project, but none offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the September 14, 2009 regular ASCC meeting. It was noted that this review would begin with an afternoon site session.

Prior to consideration of the following project Warr temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room. He explained that he would not participate in project review as his architectural firm was providing services to the applicant on the project.

Architectural Review for house remodeling and additions, 3350 Alpine Road, Miller

Vlasic presented the August 20, 2009 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 1,340 sf to the existing single story, 2,660 sf Ranch style residence on the subject 2.96-acre Westridge subdivision property. He explained that the project calls for additions that include a new three-car garage to replace the existing garage to be demolished, a new dining room, new master bath, and a small, 300 sf, second-story office. Vlasic also noted that with the new garage, an expanded auto court is planned and that the proposal includes a new front yard terrace with defined pathway to the new front door.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials unless otherwise noted prepared by CJW Architecture, dated July 29, 2009:

- Sheet: T-01, Title Sheet (and project data)
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan (with exterior lighting data)

Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
Light fixture cut sheets received August 5, 2009
Finish color board dated 7/23/09

It was also noted that since this project is within the Westridge Subdivision area it is subject to review and approval by the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) of the Westridge homeowners association (HOA). Vlasic advised that the WASC has reviewed the subject plans and provided an August 19, 2009 approval letter, copies of which were made available to ASCC members.

Mr. Miller and Mark Sutherland, project architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC. The following comments and clarifications were offered.

- The plans show an existing cedar tree at the eastern end of the parking court to be preserved and a blue spruce, just east of the planned family room, to be removed to accommodate a new covered patio. As noted in the staff report, the applicant would like the option to remove the cedar and preserve the spruce.
- In response to a question regarding the existing driveway lights, the applicant advised they are rarely used.
- In response to a question regarding the visual presence of the proposed service yard in terms of the applicant's arrival at the building site, Mr. Sutherland advised he would consider this matter in development of final building permit plans. (It was clarified that this was not an ASCC design issue, but only a suggestion to the applicant.)
- The motor court will likely be surfaced with pavers.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as presented and clarified, including the requested cedar and spruce tree options, subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Final plans shall specify paver materials and the terrace stone. Also, the stone to be used for portions of the siding on the remodeled house shall be specified.
2. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. The building permit plans shall include the completed BIG checklist showing the targeted 49 points. Further, prior to project sign-off, a letter or other statement shall be provided by the applicant and/or project architect verifying the checklist elements that have actually been incorporated into the construction project.

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

Architectural Review for driveway entry gate addition, 22 Grove Drive, Marshall

Vlasic presented the August 20, 2009 staff report on this proposal for the approval of plans for installation of a new driveway entry gate on the subject 2.1-acre Grove Drive property. He explained that the proposal is to place the gate 25 feet from the Grove Drive right of way as shown on the plan dated August 4, 2009 prepared by Thuilot Associates. He added that 8.5-inch by 11-inch sheets, with an 8/14/09 transmittal from Thuilot Associates, provides proposed plan refinements and supplements, largely to reduce the widths of the proposed driveway gates and column placement.

Mr. Marshall was present to discuss his proposal with ASCC members. He offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to comments in the staff report and questions from ASCC members:

- Plans for the call box have not been finalized. The intent is to have it as minimal as possible. It would likely only include a lighted keypad, and an LED photocell system would be considered.
- The gate and column finishes/colors would match those used on the new garage. The columns would be board-form concrete with Corten steel panels. The gate elements would be constructed with a steel frame in a dark red patina finish. In the open, more transparent gate panels, ¾-inch steel rods finished to match the frame and in a branch design, would be used.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, ASCC members found the proposed gate design acceptable and in conformity with town standards. Members agreed, however, they would prefer less use of gates in town, but that this design was appropriate relative to town design standards if a gate was really desired by the applicant. Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Warr and passed 5-0 approval of the gate plans as modified by the 8/14/09 transmittal from Thuilot Associates and clarified at the ASCC meeting. The approval was granted subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit for the gate to the satisfaction of planning staff:

1. Call box design details, i.e., height, materials, lighting, etc., shall be specified.
2. A final colors/materials specification sheet shall be provided verifying that the materials and finishes for the gate will match those used on the new garage.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0-1 (Warr), approval of the August 10, 2009 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

T. Vlasic