

Architectural and Site Control Commission
Special Field Meeting 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte Project
and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

May 10, 2010

(Note: The agenda published for this meeting included a special afternoon site session that was to take place at 385 Westridge Drive at 4:00 p.m. to consider plans for an accessory structure proposed by Mr. Allen Cooper. At the request of the applicant, this meeting was cancelled and will be re-noticed when the applicant advises the town he is ready for ASCC consideration.)

Chair Warr called the special ASCC field meeting was to order at 5:05 p.m. at 35 Antonio Court.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Breen, Clark
ASCC Absent: Hughes
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Others present relative to the Chung/Lacerte project*:

Joyce Chung and Rene Lacerte, property owners/applicants
David Solnick, project architect
Carolyn Chin, project architect
Stefan Thuilot, project landscape architect
Robert Larson (with son Eric), 40 Antonio Court, Lot 1 Priory Subdivision
Mark and Mary Ryan, 20 Antonio Court
Ann Brown, 30 Antonio Court
Tricia Herrick, Lot 3, Priory Subdivision

•Note: Others may have been present during the course of the special site meeting and may not have been identified for the record.

Preliminary 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

Vlasic presented the May 7, 2010 staff report on this project and explained that the current review is preliminary and that after the site and evening ASCC meetings and offering of comments, project consideration would be continued to the next regular meeting, now scheduled for June 14, 2010. In reviewing the staff report, Vlasic discussed the joint driveway and related easement issues and the concerns of Mr. Robert Larson as presented in his May 5, 2010 letter to the ASCC with attachments. He noted that discussions between the applicant and Mr. Larson continue in order to resolve the neighbor's concerns.

The applicants and project design team members presented the following plans evaluated in the staff report and, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/3/10, prepared by David Solnick Architect:

Sheet 0, Project Data, 3/4/10
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 L4.1, Planting Plan, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10
Sheet L5.1, Lighting, Thuilot Associates
Sheet L7.0, Sections, Thuilot Associates
Sheet L7.1, Sections, Thuilot Associates
Sheet L8.0P, (Landscape) Materials Board, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10
Sheet L8.0P, Perspectives, Thuilot Associates
Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, MacCleod and Associates
Sheet C-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, MacCleod and Associates
Sheet GB-1, Green Point Rated Checklist

Also referenced or considered were the project 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.

Using the project plans and materials and story poles installed to facilitate the field evaluation, the applicants and project design team led all present on an inspection of site conditions. During the course of the site review, the design team explained the project and offered clarifications as follows:

- The plans were developed to cut the house into the site and to make use of existing slopes to the extent possible. A key element of the design was to return the front yard area, now largely asphalt, to a more native condition. Further, the planned rear yard spaces and new pool were placed and organized around existing slopes and significant east side trees to minimize changes in terms of views to and from adjoining parcels. In particular, care was taken to carefully consider views to and from the building sites on the Priory subdivision parcels.
- The concerns of Mr. Larson are understood and appreciated. The plans are being modified to move the house at least six feet further to the east and away from the driveway easement to address neighbor concerns and the setback issue discussed in the staff report. It is understood that this could be accomplished with some reduction in the space between the main house and detached accessory structure. The adjustments would allow for more screen planting between the house and joint driveway and other changes are being considered, e.g., changes to the width of the driveway between the joint drive and garage apron to further minimize visual concern and access issues.
- The two story accessory structure now proposed at 759 sf, will be reduced by 9 sf to avoid any potential for conflict with the 750 sf guest house limit, i.e., as recommended in the staff report.
- The proposed guest parking approach was developed to provide parking adjacent to the street and minimize the need for on-site paving. The bays would be pulled further into the site to address the concerns of the public works director as noted in the staff report. In response to comments from neighbors and ASCC members, it was agreed that options for the parking spaces away from the edge of the cul-de-sac edge would be considered, including parking bays along the common driveway, or in the garage driveway apron area. It was noted, however, that such options would likely result in more concerns over the views from the common driveway also serving the Larson property.

- Two optional roof materials were presented. It was explained that lighter, cool roof, cream colored option has a significantly higher energy efficiency rating and is preferred. It was also noted that the roofs would not be visible off site and that for this reason the lighter option was identified and is preferred.
- The landscape plans, and related grading were explained and clarified. It was noted that the pines were to be replaced with trees with longer lives and conditions that were more in keeping with town landscape guidelines. It was also explained that the existing rear yard pistachio trees would be preserved to protect views to and from the property.
- In response to comments offered over the more organized formality of the walls and some other aspects of the landscape proposal, the design team advised that they would address the concerns as project plans are refined. In response to a question, it was noted that approximately five years would be needed after planting for the new materials to be effective in screening along the driveway.

Also during the course of the site meeting, neighbors offered the following comments:

Ms. Brown expressed concern over the proximity of the proposed two story portion of the house to her property. She worried over view and noise impacts.

Mr. and Mrs. Ryan advised that the scope of existing site development was set in the 1970's in conjunction with the development of the other Antonio Court parcels. They noted that the current plans move the house massing more to the west and change the view impacts from the current conditions. Mr. Ryan stated that after the site meeting he better appreciated the site constraints and basis for the new design, but still had concerns over the view impacts associated with the changes in the location of the two story massing. He also expressed concern with the proposed guest parking extending into the street, but did find the general approach to landscaping to be good.

Mr. Larson appreciated the changes that were being proposed to address his concerns, but noted that he needed to take time to fully appreciate the benefits that might be associated with the six foot shift of the house away from the driveway easement. He noted that he was also still concerned about the impact of the guest parking spaces on the Antonio Court streetscape. He also wondered if some reduction in the proposed size of the house could help resolve some of his concerns and those of the other neighbors.

Ms. Herrick stated her main concerns were understanding of the proposed landscape plan and the existing materials to be preserved. She advised that the site meeting helped her better appreciate the project.

Mr. Lacerte noted again that the guest parking approach was to reduce visual impacts associated with the current scope of onsite paving. He further noted that the design allowed for guest parking to have less impact on the full use of the cul-de-sac bulb turnaround area.

Due to the lateness of the site meeting, ASCC members agreed they would offer comments on the proposal at the regular evening ASCC meeting. After the site inspection and sharing of the above comments and reactions, ASCC members thanked the applicants and others present for their participation in the site meeting. It was also noted that ASCC consideration of the request would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 6:05 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Breen, Clark
Absent: Hughes
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Architectural Review and for new freestanding sign for Glenoaks Equestrian Center
CUP X7D-73, 3639 Alpine Road, Murdoch/Stanford University**

Vlastic presented the May 7, 2010 staff report on this proposal for installation of a permanent freestanding sign along the east side of Alpine Road at the entry to the existing Glenoaks Equestrian Center. He clarified that there is currently no “business” sign for this existing use, which is located on lands of Stanford University. Vlastic further explained that the request is to also permit use of a temporary banner to announce specific special events. He noted that the equestrian use is regulated under the terms of town conditional use permit X7D-73, most recently amended in 2002, and that any such sign request is subject to ASCC review and approval for conformity with the provisions of the zoning ordinance and the use permit.

ASCC members considered the proposals as evaluated in the staff report and described in the letter from equestrian center owner David Murdoch, received by the town on April 20, 2010. Also considered and highlighted were the concerns of the public works director relative to the need for an encroachment permit for placement of the proposed permanent sign in the Alpine Road right of way.

Mr. Murdoch was present to explain his request to the ASCC. He advised that he was flexible as to the location and sign size, as well as color, but felt the permanent sign was needed for safety relative to access to the equestrian center. He noted that the final location would need to take into account the plans for relocation of the Stanford C1 Trail. He also offered the following clarifications:

- The sign would be no higher than five feet.
- The color on the submittal is not really what is desired and is too “green.” The design can be modified to address the concerns noted in the staff report.
- In response to a question, it was noted that lighting was placed in line with requirements of the use permit, and that some “spots” are used for safety of loading and unloading of horses at night. It was clarified that these are on motion sensors and set to turn-off after specific periods of time.

Mr. Murdoch advised he was happy to work with a subcommittee of the ASCC and town staff, including the public works director, to finalize the design and location of the signs as recommended in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and generally concurred with the recommendations in the staff report. In addition, Breen commented that the existing vegetation along the parcel frontage, near the equestrian center entry, could be trimmed to enhance visibility and that this should be considered during final efforts for placement of any signage.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0 approval of the sign request subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of town staff and a subcommittee of two ASCC members prior to placement of any sign on the site:

1. The design of the proposed permanent sign shall be modified to address the concerns in the staff report regarding size, height and color. These factors shall be considered in light of final decisions made regarding sign location (see condition #2 following).
2. The sign location shall be determined based on a site meeting with town staff, including the public works director, the ASCC subcommittee, and the applicant. The final location shall take into account the concerns of the Public Works director relative to any encroachment permit, possible vegetation clearing and the alignment for the relocation of the C1 trail. *(Note: ASCC members concluded that a location in the wide Alpine Road right of way was acceptable, but recognized that the concerns of the public works director would need to be addressed if an encroachment permit were to be issued by him.)*
3. One location on the subject property, and not in the Alpine Road right of way, shall be identified for placement of the "temporary event banner." This shall be the only location for placement of such banner. The size of the temporary "banner" sign may not exceed a maximum of 12 sf. Further, any temporary event banner may only be used for a total period of two months in any calendar year. The banner must be dated when installed to ensure compliance with the time limit. The proposed design for each event banner shall be provided prior to installation for approval by a designated ASCC member. With the design submittal, the applicant shall provide a record of the temporary event banner use for the previous months of the year to verify conformity to the two-month total time limit.
4. No lighting shall be provided for either the permanent or temporary signs.

In taking the above action, ASCC members asked that staff and the ASCC sign subcommittee review site lighting to ensure conformity with the provisions of the approved conditional use permit. Aalfs and Clark agreed to serve as the ASCC subcommittee for this application.

Modifications to previous approval -- Architectural Review for new Blue Oaks residence and Site Development Permit X9H-611, 2 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 36 Blue Oaks), Toor

Vlasic presented the May 7, 2010 staff report on this request for modifications to plans approved by the ASCC on March 8, 2010. He explained the reasons for the adjustments to

the driveway design is to avoid conflicts with land outside of the driveway easement that serves the subject parcel, but crosses the property at 4 Buck Meadow Drive.

The ASCC considered the staff report and the driveway design revisions described in the attached April 22, 2010 communication from project architect Tom Carrubba and shown on the following plans:

Sheet A1.01, Site Plan/Project Data/Tabulation, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
Sheet A1.02, Partial Site Plan, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
Sheet A1.03, Partial Site Plan Main Level & Basement Level, Partial Floor Plans, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 4/21/10
Sheet C-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 4/21/10
Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan, Joni L. Janecki & Associates, 4/21/10

Also considered were photo images for the "3-D" model prepared to clarify the revised driveway design with retaining walls, boulders and landscaping.

Mr. Toor was present to discuss the plan revisions with ASCC members. He presented a modification to the above revised plans dated May 5, 2010. He explained that the adjustments don't change the grading for retaining wall plans, but aligned the driveway so that it maintains a minimum five feet of separation from the 20-inch oak on the north side of the driveway easement. In support of the May 5th modification, Mr. Toor presented a May 10, 2010 email from the Blue Oaks Homeowners association, stating approval of the change and a May 6, 2010 email from the fire marshal also approving the change.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0 approval of the plan revisions subject to the same conditions included with the March 8, 2010 ASCC project approval. It was stressed, however, that construction staging and tree protection plans required with the original conditions needed to pay particular attention to protecting the 20-inch oak from construction activities.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence with detached garage/guest unit, detached cabana, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-614, 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbernd

Vlasic presented the May 7, 2010 staff report on the continuing review of this application. He noted that after ASCC action on the architectural review portion of the project, the site development permit would be presented to the planning commission for hearing and that this hearing has tentatively been set for May 19, 2010.

Vlasic explained that on April 26, 2010, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the subject proposal that included a joint, special afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. He then reviewed the May 5, 2010 letter to the town from the project design team providing a detailed summary of plan changes, made in response to the preliminary review process, that are shown on following plans, unless otherwise noted, with a revision date of 5/5/10, and prepared by Swatt/Miers Architects:

Sheet DR1, Title Sheet
Sheet DR2, Reference Site Plan
Sheet DR3, Site Plan A
Sheet DR4, Site Plan B
Sheet DR5, Ground Floor Plan
Sheet DR6, Second Floor Plan
Sheet DR7, Third Floor Plan
Sheet DR8, Roof Plan
Sheet DR9, Building Elevations
Sheet DR10, Building Elevations
Sheet DR12, Exterior & Landscape Lighting Plan
Sheet DR13, Exterior & Lighting Plan
Sheet DR14, Exterior Lighting Cut Sheets
Sheet DR15, Build-It-Green Green-Building Checklist

Sheet L-1, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 5/3/10
Sheet L-2, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 5/3/10

Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07
Sheet SU2, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07
Sheet C-1, "Preliminary" Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Overall Site), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
Sheet C-3, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Area of Detail), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control & Construction Operations Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10

It was noted that still part of the project application is the arborist's report prepared by Econo Tree Service, Inc., dated 3/11/10, and the exterior colors board prepared by the project architect, received on March 10, 2010. Vlastic clarified that the colors board was found generally acceptable at the April 26th meeting and that the concepts for the driveway entry gate, to be outside of any required setback area, were found generally acceptable as described in the images contained in the project booklet, received 3/10/10.

Ms. Vidalakis, Mr. Elsbernd, project design team members Bob Swatt, Valerie Remitz, Miya Muraki, and project contractor Rich Tincher presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They explained the revisions that were made, particularly to the grading and courtyard plans to respond to the preliminary review issues. They reviewed the revised plans and project model to explain all the changes detailed in the May 5, 2010 letter to the town.

Mr. Swatt clarified that the proposed driveway gate details would be developed further, but that the intent is for the gate to be open and not of a "solid" character. Reference was made to the gate image in the project booklet and it was noted that there would be open spaces between the horizontal boards and, again, it was stressed that the gate is not intended to be a "solid" feature.

Ms. Remitz advised that the changes made to the landscape plan are still being refined to ensure conformity with the town's new water conservation ordinance and that this effort will continue. She clarified that some aspects of the ordinance still need to be reviewed for full understanding, but that it is assumed that by the time the building permit is submitted that all of the issues and details would be worked out relative to water conservation ordinance conformity.

Mr. Tincher then focused on the considerations being given to the provisions for the construction staging plan in addition to those set forth in the May 5, 2010 project revision letter. Specifically he noted the following:

- The site size is large and more than adequate for onsite staging of construction operations. With the changes noted in the May 5th letter, including widening of the entry driveway, the need for any parking, turning of vehicles, or project staging uses of Alamos Road or the Ash Lane cul-de-sac bulb can be eliminated.
- A carefully prepared plan for on-site management of vehicles and materials storage is a typically part of Mr. Tincher's construction projects and this will be developed for this project. Further, control of delivery of materials to the site and removal of debris and off-haul of excess cut will be controlled to limit impacts on streets and traffic. A traffic management plan would be included with the construction staging plan.
- The level area on site would be temporarily enlarged to accommodate the radius needed for turning of larger construction vehicles.
- The site construction area and entry drive would be controlled with secure construction fencing. A secure, wide gate would be included. The gate would be located to ensure any large vehicle arriving early would have a place to wait onsite between Ash Lane and the gate.
- A security camera will be placed on site for 24 hour security. This is effective in ensuring against problems and if any do occur to determine "why" and "by whom," so corrective actions can be taken as necessary.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the radius at the intersection of Ash Lane and Alamos Road would be temporarily widened if found necessary to ensure safe and adequate access for larger construction vehicles.
- In response to a question, it was stated that the trucks to be used to off-haul excess cut could contain 20 to 30 cubic yards of materials.

Public comments were requested. **Rusty Day, Chair of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)**, stated that while the committee was generally supportive of the project, they had not seen the revised plans and had outstanding concerns regarding lighting, the "third floor" area, fencing, and the construction staging process.

After some interaction between WASC members, the applicant and ASCC members it was agreed that project consideration should be continued for a brief period to allow the project design team to work with WASC members outside of the meeting room to hopefully reach closure relative to WASC project support. This "continuance" took place, and ASCC members then considered the next item on the agenda (i.e., preliminary review of plans for 35 Antonio Court.)

After an approximately 30 minute "continuance," WASC members and the project team returned to the meeting room and ASCC members continued review of the revised project.

Mr. Day reported that the continuance permitted the WASC to consider the revised project and reach a position to support it. He noted that the committee was satisfied with the overall

design and reached agreement with the applicant and design team members on measures to be taken to reduce the overall project illumination with either fewer fixtures or less wattage in the exterior fixtures. He also noted that the construction staging operation was discussed and that the WASC is looking forward to the construction staging plan to ensure that traffic impacts on local streets are properly controlled.

Mr. Day noted, however, that the only item where there remains a difference of opinion has to do with the proposed fencing. He noted that the WASC still considers the new fencing "perimeter fencing" and wants it pulled further into the site.

The fencing matter was discussed and the applicants noted that the fencing is fully within the building envelope and not along the perimeter of the site. They offered that the open areas on the property outside the fencing would be larger than many parcels in the vicinity. They were agreeable, however, to modifying the plan to "soften" the more angular corners of the fence alignment shown on the proposed plans.

The applicants also commented that the desired fencing was for safety of the property and protection for children. They stressed that they had made a number of concessions with the plan refinements and felt the fencing proposals were reasonable and fully consistent with town guidelines and regulations. It was also noted that the fencing was for required pool security.

ASCC members, while generally supportive of the approach to site fencing, concurred that the alignment should be pulled somewhat further into the site and adjusted to better follow contours and the natural features. ASCC members then also discussed a few matters associated with the proposal, but concluded it was generally supportive of the revised plans.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0, to make the required findings in support of the proposed guest unit and other detached accessory structures and to approve the architectural review application, as revised and clarified, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Conformity with the 28-foot height limit, i.e., clarifying the single height limit matter discussed in the April 21st staff report, shall be demonstrated.
2. The architectural plans shall be corrected for consistency with the landscape plans to show that the northeasterly path terminates prior to reaching the proposed fence.
3. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC consistent with the presentations by the project contractor at the May 10, 2010 ASCC meeting.
4. The proposed "deer" fencing plan shall be modified to curve the sharp corners so they better adjust to site contours, and to "pull" the fence further into the site.
5. Detailed plans for the proposed entry gate shall be provided consistent with the open design described by the project architect at the May 10, 2010 ASCC meeting.
6. The final lighting plan shall be provided for ASCC approval.

ASCC members also recommended planning commission approval of the proposed site development permit for the grading shown on the revised project plans.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new detached accessory structure “hobby Barn,” and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-587, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper

Vlasic referenced the May 7, 2010 staff report and noted that at the request of applicant, the scheduled afternoon site meeting on the project was cancelled and that, at this time, application review should be continued to a unspecified date. Vlasic added that the applicant has advised that issues raised by the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee are being reviewed and that when resolutions can be identified he would advise the town to reschedule the ASCC review process.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Based on the foregoing, project review was continued to an unspecified time. It was understood that when the matter is to be considered by the ASCC a new meeting notice would be distributed consistent with the noticing requirements in the zoning ordinance.

Preliminary 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

Vlasic referenced the comments in the May 7, 2010 staff report on this request and discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) Vlasic again emphasized that this is a preliminary review of the proposal and that after offering of comments, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting, now tentatively scheduled for June 14, 2010.

Joyce Chung and Rene Lacerte, applicants, and project design team members David Solnick and Stefan Thuilot were present to further discuss the project with ASCC members. In consideration of comments offered during the afternoon site review, they offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The plans were developed with full awareness of the issues over driveway access, off street parking and view relationships between properties. The effort has been to locate the house in a similar location to the existing improvements, but with a better relationships to site conditions. In particular, the mass of the existing house and scope of paving will be significantly changed with the proposed design and architectural treatments. The new design is better adjusted to site contours and the proposed front yard landscaping will soften views at the end of the cul-de-sac.
- The common driveway area and concerns with its use are appreciated. The plans will be revised to move the house further to the east as discussed at the site meeting. Further, the landscape area will be enhanced.
- The relationships to the Brown property have been carefully considered. “Google Maps” data was referenced to show relationships, tree screening and view orientations. It was noted that the adjacent area of the Brown property is a “side yard” with driveway access and that the views from the residence appear to be largely to the northwest.

- As explained at the site meeting, it was felt that the guest parking location would minimize paving and view impacts along the cul-de-sac and also address parking issues with the current cul-de-sac bulb compromised with guest parking that takes place along it's edge.
- The proposed garage and driveway access to it has been designed to minimize and eliminate the view impacts associated with the current site improvements. The effort has been to improve views around the cul-de-sac for the "greater good of the neighborhood."
- The story poles will be modified to show the changes with the proposed house six feet further away from the driveway easement.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the existing six-foot chain link fence along the southerly and easterly property lines would be replaced with 4-foot-high post and welded wire mesh design. It was noted that the fence replacement was in part to ensure that trail users did not cross over onto the property.

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Robert Larson, 40 Antonio Court**, expressed concern over the guest parking design and also commented again on the joint driveway proposal. He acknowledged that when he purchased the property he never anticipated that he would be sharing a driveway as now proposed. He offered that, while he now appreciates that the applicants have the right to use the driveway easement, he remains concerned with the proximity of the house to the driveway and the impacts the design will have on the access to his property. He noted that he hopes that he can spend more time with the applicant and design team to work out the details for the improvements so that he can be satisfied that the character of the access to his property can be adequately protected.

Anne Ashmead, 10 Antonio Court expressed concern over the appearance of the proposed guest parking bay and its appropriateness along the cul-de-sac.

ASCC members discussed the project and while finding the house design and site plan generally acceptable as proposed offered the following preliminary review comments:

- Concerns over the relationship of the house to the joint driveway were noted. It was hoped that shifting of the house further east and additional interaction with Mr. Larson would lead to an acceptable solution.
- The forms of some of the landscaping with the retaining walls appears "stylized" and use of materials appears more organized, and less "organic," than would be encouraged by the town's design guidelines. A more detailed plan is needed that addresses these concerns. In particular, the landscape walls in the front yard area should be adjusted to "soften" views to these features. Overall, the walls and terraces should appear less "architectural" than suggested by the current plans. Also, the proposed fence and fence details need to be shown on the plans.
- The parking bay at the cul-de-sac appears out of character with the area and suggests a double access service to the property. The design should be reconsidered.
- The color board appears appropriate and the lighter roof color is supportable in this location and with this design.

- In moving the house and guest unit to the east, care should be taken to protect the large oak. The bridge connection from the house to the guest unit appears to be a good design feature. Some reduction in the space between the house and guest unit should, however, be considered to help move the proposed improvements to the east and away from the common driveway.
- Consideration needs to be given to preservation of the view corridor across the west side of the site to the knoll on the Priory subdivision lands. While the need to provide screening along the common driveway is appreciated, it should not be so significant that all views to the knoll and “sky” are lost.

Warr also commented that more consideration might be given to use of the existing house foundation to further enhance the sustainable aspects of the project.

Following discussion and offering of comments, project consideration was continued to the June 14, 2010 regular ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for House Additions, Carport Enclosure and Modification of Accessory Parking Easement (APE), 1 Fremontia, Portola Valley Ranch, Bower/Shaw

Vlasic referenced the comments in the May 7, 2010 staff report on the status of this request for the addition of 562 sf to the existing house on the subject Portola Valley Ranch property and the enclosure of an existing carport. He explained that the applicant and staff have agreed that project review should be continued until an issue regarding the accuracy of the plan data relative to the identified building envelope and Accessory Parking Easement (APE) boundaries on the property can be resolved with a new site survey.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

As a result of the foregoing, project consideration was continued until the site survey could be completed and the data incorporated into the plans and, as necessary, plan modifications completed. It was understood that when the work was completed a new notice of ASCC project consideration would be provided consistent with the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-615, for swimming pool grading and related site improvements, 10 Peak Lane, Kelly

Vlasic presented the May 7, 2010 staff report on this request for approval of plans for replacement of an existing swimming pool and the addition of a small, 130 sf spa and equipment pool house on the subject 1.3-acre parcel located at the intersection of Peak Lane and Cervantes Road. He explained that the pool, pool equipment structure and other proposed improvements would be located on the Cervantes side of the property and require a total of 270 cubic yards of earthwork for construction. He further clarified that in this case, the scope of work is essentially to redevelop an existing pool area and to extend level space.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the transmittal from the project architect dated April 15, 2010, and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated April 6, 2010 and prepared by Thayer Hopkins Architects:

Sheet A000, Cover Sheet
Sheet A101, Site Plan
Sheet A201, Pool House, Partial Site Plan
Sheet A202, RCP & Elect. Plan
Sheet A301, Pool House Elevations
Sheet A302, Pool House Sect./Elev.
Sheet A801, Pool House Details
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-2, (Overall) Site Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-3, (Area of Detail) Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-4, Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-5, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.

Also considered, attached to plan Sheet C-1, was a page of impervious surface calculations prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated 4/2/10 and the Materials Samples sheet dated 4/6/10 describing the materials for the pool equipment house, which are largely to match those used on the existing house on the property.

Mrs. Kelly and project architect Thayer Hopkins presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered brief comments on the project and clarified design details, mostly as discussed in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any building permits:

1. The requirements of the following site development permit committee reviews shall be adhered to the satisfaction of the reviewer:
 - a. Public Works Director. All requirements set forth in the completed public works standard guidelines and conditions checklist and all requirements of the public works director shall be satisfied.
 - b. Town Geologist. The town geologists requirements set forth in the May 6, 2010 memo shall be adhered to.
 - c. Conservation Committee. Any recommendations of the conservation committee shall be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff.
 - d. Health Department. A water test shall be completed to the satisfaction of the health officer.
2. If the existing house shingles are replaced with tongue and groove vertical cedar boards, the same board material may be used on pool equipment structure, with trim to also match that used on the main house. The final plans for materials and finishes shall be specified with the building permit application. If there are any changes to the finishes

from those presented in the materials board, these shall be defined to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

3. Plans for pool lighting shall be provided and consistent with town lighting guidelines. The lighting shall be to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
4. A construction access and staging plan shall be provided.

Approval of Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0, approval of the April 26, 2010 meeting minutes with correction of the spelling of "Jackson" in the last sentence of the first paragraph at the top of page 9.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

T. Vlasic