



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)  
Monday, October 25, 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 Consideration of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application X7D-169, Request to Permit Additional Floor Area and Impervious Surface Area on 229-Acre Parcel, 555 Portola Road, Spring Ridge LLC (Neely/Myers)
5. New Business:
  - a. Architectural Review for New Entry Gate, 10 Tagus Court, Mabardy
6. Approval of Minutes: October 11, 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.

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
**DATE:** October 21, 2010  
**RE:** Agenda for October 25, 2010 ASCC Meeting

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

**4a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) APPLICATION X7D-169, REQUEST TO PERMIT ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA AND IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA ON 229-ACRE PARCEL, 555 PORTOLA ROAD, SPRING RIDGE LLC (NEELY/MYERS)**

---

This matter is on the October 25, 2010 ASCC agenda for two specific purposes. The **first** is for further consideration of the proposal for an Agricultural building in the meadow area of the 229-acre property and the **second** is for the ASCC to review the other aspects of the proposal and to offer any additional comments on them for consideration by the planning commission when it conducts its public hearing on the CUP request. There is considerable background data attached to this report that sets the framework for ASCC discussion and this material is listed below. Due to the large volume of attached, relevant background information, the comments that follow will largely be to focus on the key purposes of the October 25 meeting and not attempt to further characterize all aspects of the proposal or site conditions.

It is emphasized that the primary purpose of ASCC review on Monday is to formulate or refine comments for planning commission consideration. No formal approval or denial action of the ASCC is required.

1. **Background data.** On September 13, 2010 the ASCC considered the revised plan package for this project listed in the attached minutes of the 9/13 meeting and discussed in the attached 9/10/10 staff report. The 9/13 meeting, which included a joint field session with the planning commission, largely focused on the proposed Agricultural building and the ASCC offered comments for further consideration relative to building design and location. The Agricultural building was further discussed at the September 15<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting. Prior to that meeting, and in response to a request by the commission made during the 9/13 site meeting, we prepared the attached September 15<sup>th</sup> report setting forth General Plan provisions relative to the meadow area. The commission considered this report and

the findings from the site meeting and commission comments and reactions are presented in the attached minutes of the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

In addition to the above information relative to the 9/13 ASCC and 9/15 commission meetings, the following background data is attached for reference in preparing for the discussion on Monday night:

October 15, 2010 Email from the conservation committee regarding the meadow planting and Agricultural building location.

August 31, 2010 Report from the town geologist regarding the project and questions relative to the proposed Agricultural building in the fault setback area

August 19, 2010 report from the health officer

September 2, 2010 report from the fire marshal

Applicants Statement regarding the use of the proposed Agricultural building

Minutes from the November 23, 2009 ASCC site meeting with the planning commission

November 12, 2009 staff report to the planning commission, which includes reports and minutes associated with June and July 2009 ASCC project reviews

Minutes and Staff report from the June 8, 2009 ASCC meeting

During the course of the 2009 ASCC reviews, ASCC members found most of the project proposals that were clearly defined at that time conditionally acceptable. However, issues associated with the lack of specificity for “future” buildings, particularly the Agricultural building, resulted in project consideration being delayed until the applicant developed more detailed plans for the “future” buildings. This was finally done and ready for the next rounds of ASCC and planning commission consideration with the August 2010 plan submittal discussed in the materials associated with the September 13, 2010 joint meeting and the September 15<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting.

2. **Revised/clarified plans for Agricultural building.** Based on the input received at the 9/13 and 9/15 meetings, the project design team, i.e., CJW Architecture, has prepared the following enclosed revised plans for the Agricultural building dated 10/4/10:

Sheet: A-1.0, Site Plan All Projects

Sheet: A-1.1A, Site Plan Cabana

Sheet: A-1.1E, Site Plan Ag. Building

Sheet: A-1.1F, Updated Agricultural Building Site Plan

Sheet: A-1.1A is not related to the Agricultural building but has been revised relative to the proposed location for the water tanks. This revised plan is discussed separately below.

As to the Agricultural building, the following are noted:

- The revised location is still on the east side of the meadow area and within the fault setback zone. The current location is roughly 100 feet further to the north

and closer to the secondary, gated access to Portola Road. It is south of this access road. The conservation committee suggested a more northerly location, north of the access road.

- The building would still be visible from portions of the trail along the west side of Portola Road and from the entry to the open space district parking lot. The building height is 20'-6". Ground elevation is approximately 510 and this is roughly 5-10 feet lower than the elevation of the site considered at the 9/13 meeting. The maximum height of the building is approximately three feet less than the height shown on the plans and modeled by the story poles considered at the September site meeting.
- The proposed new location has been identified with story poles for ASCC consideration prior to the October 25, 2010 meeting. These should be viewed from the Portola Road corridor, the public trail, and from locations to the north and south of the meadow area.
- The building design has been simplified to be more barn-like, further the intentions relative to building usage, including what it would contain, are detailed on Sheet: A-1.1.F. The current plans appear to suggest a metal building with metal roof. The intent with the materials should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The revised plans, while identifying a location that is potentially less visually intrusive than the earlier Agricultural building plan, does not move the building out of the fault setback zone. Further, no information is presented relative to the possible location on the southwest side of the meadow as suggested by the ASCC. We understand that this option is not desired by the applicant and he does not want to pursue efforts evaluating it.

While the ASCC needs to provide reactions to the current plans, we still conclude that if such a building is desired, it be located further to the north on the property and outside of the fault setback areas. This position is explained further in the staff report prepared for the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. ASCC members should refer to this report, as well as the report on general plan provisions provided to the planning commission for discussion at the 9/15 commission meeting.

3. **Water Tanks at Cabana Site.** The revised plans, Sheet: A-1.1A., now show the buried water tanks in the meadow area immediately adjacent to the cabana structure. The earlier plans located the tanks on the hillside west of the cabana raising concerns over grading and vegetation impacts. While we believe the revised location should have minimum potential for grading or tree impacts, we do still need to visit the site and confirm this. We suggested that one or two ASCC members join staff in a site visit so that comments on the revised water tank proposal can be developed for eventual consideration by the planning commission. It will also be necessary to receive clarification on the overall water distribution system to address concerns noted in the August 31, 2010 report from the town geologist.
4. **Other site buildings.** During the 2009 reviews considerable attention was giving to the other plan proposals and ASCC reactions are set forth in the attached materials associated with these 2009 reviews, particularly those in June and July of 2009.

Plan adjustments since that time, including elimination of the proposed riding rings, is discussed in the attached September 9, 2010 staff report. ASCC members should consider this report and the 2009 materials and determine if any additional comments are needed or appropriate relative to the other CUP proposals for the structures not in the meadow area. We have also asked the project architect to again walk the ASCC through each of the other proposals. With this added clarification, the ASCC should determine if any additional comments, conditions, recommendations should be provided for planning commission consideration.

As noted above, following discussion at the October 25 meeting, ASCC members should finalize comments on the CUP application for consideration by the planning commission during its public hearing on the request.

**5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW ENTRY GATE, 10 TAGUS COURT, MABARDY**

This proposal is for installation of a new driveway entry gate on the subject 1.24-acre Alpine Hills area parcel. (Refer to the attached vicinity map for parcel location and site and area conditions.) The gate proposal is shown on the following enclosed plans received October 15, 2010 and prepared by Winges Architects:

Sheet A 1.1, Site Plan, 10/7/10  
Driveway Gate Elevation and Section

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in its review of this proposal.

- 1. Background, Site Description.** On April 14, 2008, the ASCC considered and approved plans for house additions and site improvements for the subject property and the permitted work associated with these plans is now nearing completion. The April 9, 2008 staff report prepared for the 4/14/08 meeting and meeting minutes are attached for reference. They provide a description of the site, previously approved project and project conditions that were to be addressed to the satisfaction of staff and a designated ASCC member.

While the current permit work is nearing completion, it has not yet been "finalized" by town building or planning staff. Plans for the existing front yard horse fence and entry trellis (ornamental garden feature) with gate were considered and approved by Jeff Clark in November of 2009 on behalf of the ASCC and pursuant the 2008 approval conditions. These features are shown on the enclosed site plan. Fence posts taller than four feet will need to be cut to the four-foot height limit prior to finalizing of the existing permits.

- 2. Compliance with gate standards of the zoning ordinance.** The proposed gate would be located across the existing driveway just at the point that the driveway transitions to the main asphalt parking area on the property. The gate would be within the 50-foot front yard setback area, but set back from the front property line 25 feet as required by the zoning ordinance.

The gate would have a maximum height of four feet, thus conforming to the height limit for the proposed front yard location. The gate would extend north across the 14-foot wide driveway from the end of the existing horse fence on the south side of

the driveway. The gate would have a total width of 16 feet. The intercom gate control box and fire district required "Knox box" are proposed to be located on the south side of the driveway at the point where the existing fence angles back to the proposed gate location.

The gate would be constructed of a tubular steel frame with horizontal and vertical cedar boards attached to it. The gate would operate on a track with the opening extending the gate to the south side of the driveway.

The gate design is similar to that of the cedar courtyard fence adjacent to the main entry of the house. The combination of 1"x 6" and 1"x 2" horizontal boards, while architecturally consistent with the design of the courtyard fencing, result in a relatively solid appearing gate. Unfortunately, while there are some openings between these horizontal elements, they do not provide sufficient opacity to render the design consistent with the fence ordinance limits. Specifically, we calculated that the proposed design has opacity of roughly 65%, and the ordinance limit for gates in the front yard area is a maximum opacity of 50%. We estimate that four of the eleven proposed 1"x 2" horizontal cedar boards may need to be removed to allow the gate to meet the opacity standards.

We understand that no new lighting is proposed with the gate. If, however, if there is any lighting associated with the intercom box, this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Also, the size and color of the gate operator box should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Except for the opacity issue and the need to clarify a few plan details, the proposal appears to be in conformity with the provisions of the zoning ordinance. Prior to acting on this request, however, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the October 25, 2010 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.  
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison  
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison  
Applicants

Mayor

**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: October 22, 2010

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning & Building Assistant

---