



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)  
Monday, June 14, 2010  
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting  
Historic Schoolhouse  
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

---

**7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA\***

1. Call to Order:
2. Roll Call: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr
3. Oral Communications:

Persons wishing to address the Commission on any subject, not on the agenda, may do so now. Please note, however, the Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion or action tonight on items not on the agenda.

4. Old Business:
  - a. [Continued Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Accessory Structure, Swimming Pool and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-613, 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte](#)
5. New Business:
  - a. [Architectural Review for Proposed Driveway Entry Features, 120 Golden Hills, Rubin](#)
6. Approval of Minutes: May 10, 2010
7. Adjournment

---

\*For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

---

**PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE.** The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

**WRITTEN MATERIALS.** Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours.

---

**ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

---

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: June 11, 2010

Carol Borck  
Planning Technician

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner  
**DATE:** June 10, 2010  
**RE:** Agenda for June 14, 2010 ASCC Meeting

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the ASCC agenda.

**4a. CONTINUED ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-613, 35 ANTONIO COURT, *CHUNG/LACERTE***

---

On May 10, 2010, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the subject proposal and the review included a special afternoon site meeting with the applicant, design team members and neighbors. ASCC members offered preliminary review comments at the conclusion of the evening meeting discussion on the project. The attached May 7, 2010 staff report and enclosed draft 5/10/10 meeting minutes provide the background and overview of the preliminary review.

Since the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, the applicant and design team have been working to respond to the input received at the meeting and to specifically address the concerns raised by the neighbors. The attached June 10, 2010 email from the applicants describes the efforts that have been made and incorporated into the revised plans. As ASCC members may remember, one key matter had to do with Mr. Robert Larson's concerns over the impact of the project and planned joint driveway use on access to his property at 40 Antonio Court (i.e., Lot 1 of the Priory subdivision). While efforts have been made to respond to both ASCC and neighbor comments relative to the driveway access, Mr. Larson has provided the attached June 10, 2010 letter asking that more time be allowed for him to work with the subject applicants on a final design for the driveway configuration and landscaping. Additional comments are offered on this matter below.

In response to the preliminary review process, the project design team has submitted the following enclosed revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 6/4/10, prepared by David Solnick Architect:

Sheet 0, Project Data  
Sheet 1, Site Plan  
Sheet 2, Floor Plans  
Sheet 2.1, Area Calculations  
Sheet 3, Elevations  
Sheet L1.0L, Landscape Plan, Thuilot Associates  
Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Layout, Thuilot Associates  
Sheet L4.0, Planting Plan, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10  
Sheet L4.1, Plant List and Notes, Thuilot Associates  
Sheet L5.1, Lighting, Thuilot Associates  
Sheet L7.0, Sections, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10  
Sheet L7.1, Sections, Thuilot Associates, 6/2/10  
Sheet L8.0P, (Landscape) Materials Board, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10  
Sheet L8.0P, Perspectives, Thuilot Associates  
Sheet GB-1, Green Point Rated Checklist

The engineering plan sheets submitted with the original plans have yet to be revised, but would be for consistency with the above listed plans following ASCC action. The applicant would prefer to obtain ASCC concurrence with the revisions prior to incurring the costs associated with revisions to the final engineering grading plans.

The revised site and landscape plans have been reviewed by project engineer, MacLeod and Associates, Inc., to determine the scope of change in earthwork. The attached sheet from the engineer dated June 7, 2010 shows that the revised plans will require a total of 975 cubic yards of grading counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance. This is 90 cubic yards more than was required with the original design, but still under the 1,000 cubic yard threshold requiring planning commission review.

Still part of the formal plan submittal are the attached arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting LLC, dated December 9, 2009, and the exterior colors board prepared by the project architect, received on March 5, 2010. The colors board was found generally acceptable by the ASCC at the May 10, 2010 meeting and will be available for reference on Monday night.

It is also noted that the story poles have been reset to model the changes to the house location as discussed below. The revised story poles have been in place since June 7<sup>th</sup>.

The following comments discuss how the revised plans respond to the preliminary review comments and are in addition to the clarifications provided in the attached June 10<sup>th</sup> email from the applicants:

1. **Shifting of proposed house improvement to the east and relationship to shared driveway.** The house improvements have been shifted 8 feet to the east. At the site meeting the applicant advised that adjustments could be made to move the house at least six feet, and with reduction of the distance between the house and detached accessory structure some additional movement to the east would be possible. Thus, the current plans include reducing the space between the house and detached accessory structure by two feet to permit the total 8-foot shift.

In addition to the change in house location, the scope of garage apron paving has been significantly reduced to increase the area available for planting between the apron and driveway extension to the Larson property. The changes to the paving and house location can be comparatively reviewed on Sheet 1 of the enclosed plans.

In response to ASCC directions, efforts have been made to keep the screen landscaping somewhat lower along the east side of the common driveway for preservation of a "view corridor." A few 24-inch box oaks and Swan Hill Olives are also proposed, but these are located somewhat farther to the east.

Mr. Larson, while understanding the plans for changes to the plant palette has expressed concern over the existence of an actual "view corridor" and the impact of keeping the "corridor" open on his views from the joint driveway to the proposed house improvements.

In light of Mr. Larson's June 10<sup>th</sup> letter, we visited the site again to inspect the repositioned story poles and views from the cul-de-sac. At this time the existing trees along the driveway easement screen views. In fact, there is no view across the house site or along the existing tree corridor to the knoll on the Priory property. Such a view is only possible with removal of the trees. In addition, the proposed house location will not block views to the "knoll," as it is not visible from the street across the top of the slope at the back of the applicants' property. Thus, the key issue is the sky view, but the current view to the sky would not change in any significant way with the proposal. Clearly, with the tree removal the new house on the west side would be more visible. The new oak and olive trees would provide screening to the street views, and the oak planned next to the house would offer some screening from the joint driveway. The plants proposed immediately adjacent to the easement and particularly along the east side of the driveway extension to the Larson property are largely shrubs and would not offer as much vertical screening and this is a concern to Mr. Larson.

Given the above, we believe it is fair to consider the comments in Mr. Larson's letter. The main factor would be to permit the addition of some taller screen planting in the area between the driveway extension and the subject garage apron. In addition, we believe it is reasonable to consider some additional taller plants along the lower portion of the driveway corridor near the cul-de-sac bulb.

In the comments from Mr. Larson there is also the suggestion that the topography along the east side of the driveway be enhanced or mounded to further distinguish the driveway corridor from the subject site improvements. While it is likely the plan could be refined to accomplish this in a manner the works well with the proposed site improvements, it would probably result in more on site fill and less off-haul of materials. This could also push the grading over the 1,000 cubic yard threshold, although there would be the possibility to use roughly 25 cubic yards for the mound enhancement.

In any case, the house has been shifted to the east as committed to at the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and as explained by the applicants, the landscape plans have been adjusted relative to the ASCC's "view corridor" comments. If the ASCC concludes the changes in house siting are acceptable, and also that the concerns of Mr.

Larson should be further considered, it could act to approve the project with provisions that would allow for more work on the landscape plan to enhance screening along the driveway, subject to final landscape plan approval by the ASCC.

2. **Location of guest parking spaces.** In response to ASCC, neighbor and public works director concerns, the guest parking spaces have been pulled further into the site, i.e., five feet, and are to be surfaced with a grass block material. Pulling the spaces into the site, use of grass block surface material and, also, elimination of the retaining walls help reduce the visual presence of the parking spaces along the cul-de-sac.

As requested by the ASCC, the applicant did consider a number of options for the guest parking spaces. These are attached. The only practical options that don't involve parking along the cul-de-sac would be to place the guest parking along the common driveway or in the garage apron/auto court space. These all result in more impact on the character of the common driveway. If the parking is not placed along the common driveway, but extended further into the front of the site, then the scope of front yard paving would be increased for additional driveway and vehicle turnaround space. This would have a significant impact on the design objective of returning the front yard to a more open and natural landscape condition.

It is noted that this cul-de-sac has two houses with double access driveways and considerable "hedge" like planting along the street frontages. Both conditions are generally not consistent with current town design guidelines. Further, the ASCC typically discourages driveway solutions with direct view corridors to the garage from the street. The unique conditions with the joint driveway access support consideration of the subject proposal. This is not an approach that would necessarily be appropriate in many other situations, but given the site and neighborhood conditions, driveway access and efforts to reduce the scope of front yard paving, we believe the current design solution can be supported in this case as consistent with town design policies and guidelines.

3. **Site Development Committee Review.** As noted in the May 7<sup>th</sup> staff report, the following attached site development permit committee comments have been received on the project:

Public Works Director. The March 29, 2010 memo identifies standard conditions with no unusual conditions or issues noted, except for those associated with the guest parking spaces along the Antonio Court cul-de-sac. This concern has been addressed with the revised plans.

Town Geologist. The March 22, 2010 memo supports conditional approval of the grading plans.

Fire Marshal. The March 29, 2010 report sets forth fairly standard conditions of approval. It is also noted that use of exterior wood siding would need to be considered in light of the fire resistant requirements of Chapter 7a of the town's building code and the applicants are aware of this.

Conservation Committee. The March 24, 2010 memo from the conservation committee notes two planting concerns. Use of Bay trees is no longer planned and the Red Sedge issue would be addressed with plant selection.

Trails Committee. The March 18, 2010 communication from the committee discusses mainly concerns over possible drainage impacts on the trail on the Priory subdivision lands. As pointed out previously, these concerns would be addressed by the public works director in his final review and approval of the grading and drainage plans.

The existing and proposed site improvements are served by the existing sanitary sewer and, therefore, no report from the health department is expected.

Any action to approve the request should include provisions calling for conformity to the requirements of the site development permit committee conditions.

4. **Floor area adjustments.** The total proposed floor area has increased slightly, but only due to the fact that shifting of the house means less of the lower level can be considered exempt basement space. The plans now propose a total floor area of 5,158 sf and under the 5,222 sf limit for the property. The floor area of the main house, including the attached garage, is 4,408 sf and 31 sf below the 85% limit. The revised plans concentrate 84% of the floor area in the main house.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area number shown on the site plans has increased from 6,335 sf to 6,444 sf, but is still well under the 7,732 sf IS limit. Actually, the site plan number includes buildings, which do not need to be included in the IS figures. In any case, the revised proposal is well under the IS limits.

5. **Conformance with second unit and accessory structure zoning standards.** This matter is discussed in the attached May 7, 2010 staff report. As recommended in the report, the floor area of the detached accessory structure has been reduced to 750 sf to avoid any concerns relative to guest unit limits and findings.
6. **Landscaping.** The landscape plan has been modified to reduce the scope of retaining walls and more “stylized” and “architectural” character of the improvements. The plan, as discussed previously, focuses on restoration of front yard area. It has considerable texture, but is not directed at creating a hedge-like condition along the street frontage. The landscape architect will be at the 6/14 meeting to fully explain the design changes.

The plans also have been modified to include the proposed replacement of the existing, six-foot high “back-yard” area chain link fence with a four-foot high post and welded wire fence. This is the design that was discussed at the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Eventually, a detail for the fencing should be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

7. **Exterior Lighting.** The proposed exterior yard lighting is shown on Sheet L5.1. While there have been some minor changes to the plan, our concerns over the approach to front walkway lighting remain as set forth in the attached May 7<sup>th</sup> report. Further, pool lighting will eventually need to be defined, as will the approach to lighting of the exterior of the house. Thus, any action on the project should include

a condition requiring a complete final exterior lighting plan to be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC and this plan should include a reduction of the lighting planned along the front walkway.

Prior to acting on this application, the ASCC should visit the subject site again, and consider the above comment as well as any new information presented at the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW OF PROPOSED DRIVEWAY ENTRY FEATURES, 120 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, RUBIN**

---

The request is for approval of plans for installation of a driveway entry feature that would consist of three, three-foot tall by 4.5-inch diameter, “automatic” bollards. The bollards would be installed on the subject 2.1-acre Oak Hills subdivision property shown on the attached vicinity map.

The bollard request is explained in the attached May 12, 2010 memorandum from project architect Bob Stoecker and shown on the enclosed plan prepared by Mr. Stoecker and dated May 13, 2010. In support of the request, the applicant has also provided the attached “Parking Sentries” product data with specifications for the bollards, including data on the LED lighting integrated in the bollard feature. Photo examples of the use of the bollards are also attached.

Pursuant to the provisions of the zoning ordinance, the ASCC is responsible for review and approval of entry features that require building permits. In this case, permits are needed for the electrical service to operate the “automatic” bollards. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete review of this application.

1. **Project description and background.** The request is described in detail in the attached May 12<sup>th</sup> memo from the project architect. The bollards would be located along the side property line, 12 feet in from the property boundary. They would be on the existing driveway beyond the end of the common driveway that serves the subject property and the house to the east at 130 Golden Hills Drive. A turnaround exists just to the east of the bollard location so that someone encountering the bollards could readily turnaround if they had come to the property uninvited or by mistake.

The site was developed in conformity with plans approved by the ASCC in 2007. Mr. Stoecker also designed the house and site plans then approved by the ASCC. Considerable design consideration has been given to the entry feature and all more typical gate options were rejected because of their visual impacts or because they did not fit site conditions. The current plan provides for the desired entry vehicle control with minimum visual presence and without the impression that the site is being “fenced-off” from neighbors or wildlife.

The LED lighting is desired to ensure awareness of the bollards at night. Because they represent a minimal presence, they could be encountered unexpectedly. The proposed low-level lighting would help to minimize potential for a vehicle or pedestrian running into the bollards. Given the actual distance from the street to the



bollards, we find the proposed lighting acceptable, but do support making any necessary illumination level adjustments as offered in the memo from Mr. Stocker.

It is noted that when the ASCC considered and approved the house and site plans, a 30-inch live oak existed just to the north of the driveway in the area adjacent to that proposed for the bollards. This tree was recently removed pursuant to a permit approved by the conservation committee. The tree was in decline and had indications of Sudden Death Oak (SOD) syndrome.

2. **Conformity with zoning provisions.** The proposed entry feature is unique and not specifically of a design or location considered when the fence ordinance and entry gate provisions were developed. As pointed out in the memo from Mr. Stoecker, the location is not a front yard, but the bollards have been located to be set back more than 50% of the required side yard area, as would be the case for a "gate" in a front yard setback. Further, they are less than four feet in height and the "opacity" is considerably less than would be the case for any typical gate and well under any fence ordinance limits.

Based on the foregoing, we believe the ASCC can support and approve the proposal as conforming to the zoning provisions. This, however, is a result of the unique design and location that is well removed from any typical "front yard" entry area.

Our only concern with the proposal is the "brushed" stainless steel finish. Pursuant the fence/gate ordinance, entry features are to have a light reflectivity value of 40% or less. We wonder if an alternative, darker finish is available or if a sample of the brushed stainless material could be provided that would demonstrate it would weather to conform to the light reflectively value limit.

3. **Recommendations for action.** Based on the foregoing, we do recommend approval of the proposal with understandings for lighting adjustments as may be determined necessary and subject to any bollard color condition the ASCC may determine is appropriate.

Prior to acting on this request ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments as well as any new information that may be presented at the June 14<sup>th</sup> ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.  
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison  
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison  
Applicants

Mayor