Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-580 for new residence, 3 Redberry Ridge, Lot 7 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Evans

Vlasic presented the June 5, 2008 staff report on this follow-up request. He discussed the conditions of the February 25, 2008 ASCC project approval and also the May 21, 2008 planning commission action on the site development permit request. He then reviewed the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted dated "30 April 2008 Planning Commission," with a printed date of 4/30/08, and prepared by Noel F. Cross Architect, AIA, submitted to satisfy the ASCC conditions:

Sheet A0.0, Project Data, Sustainable Design Specs, Neighborhood Plan, Notes, etc.

Sheet A1.0, Project Data (ASCC Approval Conditions)

Sheets A0.2, & A0.3, Tree Survey, McClenahan Consulting, LLC, March 24, 2008 & April 9, 2008

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan, Construction Staging & Tree Protection Plan, printed 5/5/08

Sheet A1.0a, Site Plan, Neighborhood Plan, Driveway Paver Material "Calstone"

Sheet A1.1, Site Sections

Sheet A1.2, Site Sections

Sheet A1.3, Site Sections

Sheet A2.4, Lower Floor Layout Plan (with exterior lighting locations and fixture data)

Sheet A2.5, Main Floor Layout Plan (with exterior lighting locations and fixture data)

Sheet A5.0, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A5.1, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A5.2, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A6.0, Roof Plan (with layout for photovoltaic panel system)

Sheet FAR-1, Floor Area Calculations

Sheet PS1.0, Foundation Detail Section, Jakaby Engineering, 4/30/08

Landscape Plans, unless otherwise noted by Christopher Yates,

Landscape Architecture, revised through 4/30/08:

Sheet L-1, Preliminary Landscape Plan, revised 4/03/08, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., (for driveway area as developed with Mr. Mills, owner of 1 Redberry Ridge)

Sheet L-1.0, Tree Protection/Removal Plan

Sheet L-2.1, Landscape Site plan, 2/18/08

Sheet L-3.1, Planting Plan, 2/18/08

Sheet L-4.0, Landscape Lighting Plan, 2/18/08 (Note: no lights are proposed on this sheet as lighting along the driveway was eliminated at ASCC direction. This sheet does, however, include the cut sheets for the ASCC approved landscape light fixtures.)

Sheet L-4.1, Landscape Lighting Plan, 2/18/08

Civil Engineering Plans, BKF Engineers, unless otherwise noted dated 4/24/08:

Sheet C-1, Cover Sheet (Grading and Drainage Plan)

Sheet C-2, (Grading) Drainage and Utility Plan

Sheet C-3, (Grading) Drainage and Utility Plan

Sheet C-4, Erosion Control Plan

Sheet C-5, Erosion Control Notes and Details

Sheet C-6, Construction Details

Sheet C-7, Storm Drain Exhibit

Sheet T-1, Existing Topography, 11/27/07

It was noted that in support of the revised plans, the following were provided:

May 6, 2008 letter from Noel Cross explaining the adjustments and clarifications provided in response to ASCC directions and conditions.

April 1, 2008 letter from BKF Engineers addressing storm water runoff and the proposed drainage plans.

May 8, 2008 letter from McClenahan Consulting, LLC, specifically addressing foundation design, construction and protection in relationships to four specific Blue Oak trees, i.e., #s 59, 60, 64 and 65 as identified on the plan sheets.

Mr. and Mrs. Evans and Noel Cross presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC. They discussed the comments in the staff report and, while understanding requirements for tree replacement, worried about the ability to, in particular, find a Blue Oak replacement tree. They also stressed that they would carefully follow all of the arborist's recommendations for tree protection, including hand excavation within any potential root zone so that foundations could be installed with minimum potential for impacting any of the trees to be preserved.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members considered the staff report and comments from the applicant. For the most part, members found the follow-up submittal acceptable as presented subject to completion of the items noted in the staff report. Also, members concurred with Von Feldt relative to the need to make some landscape plan adjustments relative to alternative selection for four of the plant materials specified on the plan for the area along the eastern and southeastern edges of the building site. During discussion, members concurred that use of coast live oaks as an alternative would not be consistent with the site conditions, and particularly the Blue Oak environment.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Warr and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up submittal 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 following plant materials shown on the landscape plan along the eastern and southeastern edges of the building envelope shall be replaced with materials more suitable to the Blue Oak environment:

Carex testacea Pennisetum alopecuroides Laurus 'Saratoga' Luma apiculata

The final selection of alternative plant materials shall be based on input and recommendations from the conservation committee.

- 2. The final project construction schedule, i.e., as set with the project contractor at the time of the pre-construction meeting with staff, shall include a specific time for ASCC review of the proposals for solar panels, i.e., the panel design and colors. This review shall be to ensure that there is minimum potential for visual impact relative to the contrast between panel and roof colors. The final construction time line shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff.
- 3. The construction staging and tree protection plan shall be revised to the satisfaction of planning staff to include provisions for replacement of trees that are shown on the plans for preservation but that do not survive the construction process. The final plan shall provide that the selection of any replacement plant shall be based on the circumstances associated with the tree lost and the most appropriate replacement plant material to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member. (Note: it was understood that the main focus would be tree protection and preservation and the "replacement" requirement was only included as a safeguard if needed to ensure long term screening of critical views, etc. It was further understood that plant replacement would likely be dictated by the most appropriate native materials that are available at the time any replacement effort would become necessary.)
- 4. The final project construction schedule shall be revised to the satisfaction of planning staff to provide for early installation of the driveway and Jaggers side key plantings so they are established when the new house is ready for occupancy. Specifically, the final schedule shall provide that these materials are installed and properly protected, i.e., with protection fencing, within eight weeks of completion of rough grading.

Prior to consideration of the **Deaser**, **Morgan** and **Alpine Hills Tennis** & **Swimming Club** agenda items, **Warr** advised that he would temporarily leave the ASCC meeting room. He noted that he would not participate in review of the Deaser item as his firm is the project architect for the application and that he would also not participate in the Alpine Hills discussion as he is a club member and has also provided architectural services to the club. He clarified that he had not

previously participated in review of the Morgan request and was a neighbor on Willowbrook Drive, but not within 500 feet of the property.

, , , , , ,

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for new residence and detached accessory structure, 163 Brookside Drive, Deaser

Vlasic presented the June 5, 2008 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He reviewed the December 10, 2007 ASCC project approval conditions and the following plans, received May 8, 2008, and prepared by CJW Architecture to address ASCC approval conditions:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet, 3/21/08

Sheet: T-0.3, Geotechnical Report, 1/30/08

Sheet C-4, Erosion Control Plan, AP Consulting Engineers, 1/18/08

Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design, 1/21/08

Sheet: A-0.2, Construction Staging Plan, 1/30/08

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, 3/21/08

Sheet: A2.1, Main Floor Plan, 3/21/08

Sheet: A2.2, Garage, Basement, & Cabana Floor Plans, 3/21/08

Sheet: A2.3, Main Roof Plan, 3/21/08

Sheet: A2.4, Garage & Cabana Roof Plans, 3/21/08

Sheet: A3.2, Exterior Elevations, 3/21/08

Vlasic noted that since the approval, and very recently, a large Alder tree fell on the site during high winds. He advised that the tree fell across the creek, damaging a house on the parcel immediately to the northwest. He further advised that the town permitted removal of this tree and also allowed the applicant to remove other trees shown on the ASCC approved plans for removal. Vlasic clarified, however, that he had visited the site earlier in the day and there may have been tree removal beyond that shown on the ASCC approved plans.

Joi Deaser and Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect, presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The revised arborist report called for in the approval conditions will likely be provided to the town in the next day or two and it includes recommendations for additional tree removal beyond that shown on the approved plans. This is the case as significant problems were encountered with several other trees on the site.
- The planting proposed along the southern boundary was modified by Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect, based on conservation committee comments. The proposed "Berberis Ken Hartman" is a large variety of California Grape Holly that should grow to provide the ASCC and neighbor desired screening and work well in this environment. The applicant is, however, agreeable to other and additional plantings for screening if desired by the ASCC.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Mr. Mathews, 445 Portola Road, advised that his property now had a view from it's living areas as a result of the fallen Alder tree. He said the tree damaged not only deck and railing on his property, but also the roof. He wondered about the loss of visual screening and what would be done to replace the lost buffer screening.

Barbara Gaal, 155 Brookside Drive offered that her concerns were over tree removal and construction staging. She offered that she shared the tree removal concerns expressed in a June 9, 2008 email from Scott Devereaux, 159 Brookside Drive, to Carol Borck. She also expressed concern over the start time of recent tree removal work, i.e., at 8:00 am, and wondered if this was consistent with the town noise ordinance. Lastly, she noted that the truck parking on Portola Road, that was part of the recent tree removal work, took place near the easterly intersection of Portola Road and Brookside Drive. She advised that this parking made egress from Brookside particularly dangerous and should be prohibited.

Vlasic pointed out that the town noise ordinance permitted work to take place between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. He also suggested that the final construction staging for this project include a prohibition relative to any construction parking along Portola Road.

ASCC members discussed the project and the clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting. Members concluded that the follow-up submittal was acceptable generally as presented, but recognized that the landscape plan needed to be revised to accommodate for the loss of the fallen Alder tree and any other tree removal beyond that shown on the original, ASCC approved site plan. Members also concurred that there should be no construction related parking on Portola Road.

Following discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0, approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member:

- 1. The updated arborist report shall be provided and shall include evaluation of the 60-inch redwood tree as called for in original project approval condition #2.
- 2. The landscape plan shall be revised to include additional screen planting to address the view impact issues associated with the loss of the fallen Alder tree.
- 3. The landscape plan shall be revised to include additional screen planting as may be necessary if it is determined that tree removal beyond that shown on the original site plan has taken place.
- 4. The construction staging plan shall be modified to the satisfaction of planning staff to specifically prohibit any construction related parking or staging to take place along Portola Road.

The above action was taken with the understanding that a site meeting would be convened with the project design team, town staff and designated ASCC member to determine the scope of needed additional screen landscaping. It was understood that the neighbors impacted by the fallen Alder would be invited to participate in the meeting.

The action was taken also with the understanding that original approval conditions #3 (deed restriction), #4 (final tree protection and construction staging plan), #5 (final drainage plan), and #7 (public works project review conditions) would be satisfied prior to issuance of a building permit as called for in the conditions.

.....

Prior to discussion of the Morgan application, Breen noted that while she did live in the general area of the request, her property was not within 500 feet of the application site and that she did not feel in any way conflicted relative to project consideration.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for detached garage with guest unit, 110 Willowbrook Drive, Morgan

Vlasic presented the June 5, 2008 staff report on this follow-up review. He discussed the conditions associated with the February 11, 2008 and March 24, 2008 ASCC actions on the project and the events that transpired since the 3/24/08 ASCC meeting, as discussed in the staff report. He advised that based on the interaction between staff and the applicant since March, at this point, the applicant is specifically seeking ASCC follow-up garage/guest house approval of the ten sheet "Garage & Home" plans prepared by Mr. Morgan and dated 5/10/08.

Mr. and Mrs. Morgan presented their project to the ASCC. Mr. Morgan advised that he understood the conditions recommended in the staff report, including the required 94 sf reduction in proposed floor area. He noted that he would reduce the building footprint sufficient to ensure floor area conformity. He also requested a "variance" or other relief to allow for a higher fence along the Willowbrook Drive frontage of his property.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC had previously completed review and approval of the applicant's fence proposal and that this matter was not noticed for any discussion or reconsideration at this meeting. He clarified that in this case, while a taller fence might be possible without a variance, staff was not prepared to discuss the matter and it should not be reviewed until the applicant files a specific request for staff and ASCC consideration.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and the guesthouse banister/conversion issue identified in the staff report. While some differing opinions were presented, it was eventually concluded with the required deed restriction the proposed open banister would not create a problem in terms of conversion to a guest unit larger than 750 sf. In particular, it was noted that attempting to add interior stairs would be a more significant effort and that the space needed for stairs would make the lower entertainment space less desirable and useful.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0 approval of the follow-up submittal subject to completion of the following conditions to, unless otherwise noted, the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

- 1. There shall only be one exterior light at each of the points of entry, i.e., only a total of three exterior wall lights, as shown on the site landscape plan dated 2/18/08. Specifically, the two lights shown on the east elevation of the building plans shall not be provided unless mandated by building code provisions.
- 2. A deed restriction shall be recorded to the satisfaction of the town attorney stating that the new structure shall at all times be used in conformity with town zoning second unit and accessory structures zoning regulations.
- 3. The trim color used on the new detached structure shall conform to the town's policy limit for a light reflective value of 50% or less.
- 4. All roof colors and materials shall be specified and shall conform to the town's policy limit for a light reflective value of 40% or less.
- 5. The floor area of the proposed guest house/garage shall be reduced as necessary, to the satisfaction of planning staff, to ensure conformity with the floor area limits for the property.

Review for conformity with Conditional Use Permit X7D-13, relocation of garbage dumpster facilities, 4139 Alpine Road, Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club

Vlasic presented the June 5, 2008 staff report on this request by Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club for ASCC approval of the proposed <u>Dumpster Relocation Plan, dated June 9, 2008</u>, prepared by Jackson+Cohorts Architects, and received by the town on May 12, 2008. Vlasic clarified that the request is being made as a minor change to the amended Club Conditional Use Permit (CUP) plan, as authorized by planning commission Resolutions Nos. 2003-411 and 2005-415.

Pam Stroud, new manager of Alpine Hills, and project architect Neil Jackson presented the proposal to the ASCC. Mr. Jackson first introduced Ms. Stroud and noted she had recently replaced Jerry Pang as club manager as Mr. Pang had resigned to take a similar position in Marin County.

Mr. Jackson then noted that in addition to the application data and the information in the staff report, he wanted to clarify how waste collection trucks have to access the area originally planned for the dumpster. He explained that the trucks have to drive into the site and then back out, with the backup bell sounding for a relatively long time. He stated that the proposed location allowed for easier truck access and avoided any need for a long backup.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the plan and found it acceptable and within the provisions of the approved use permit. It was noted, however, that, as discussed in the staff report, the originally approved location may still be needed if Club owned Parcel A were ever sold for private residential development.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 4-0, approval of the dumpster relocation plan as proposed.

.....

Following action on the Alpine Hills Tennis & Swimming Club application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

.....

Change in agenda order

When it was determined that no one was present to represent Valley Presbyterian Church relative to the sunroom addition request, it was agreed to first consider the Benevento application. This reordering was done with the hope that a church representative would eventually arrive to participate in ASCC consideration of the Church's application.

Architectural Review for residential additions, 355 Cervantes Road, Benevento

Vlasic presented the June 5, 2008 staff report on this proposal for additions to and remodeling of the existing 3,665 sf, single story residence on the subject 1.0 acre Arrowhead Meadows property. He advised that the project includes some demolition of the existing residence with a net increase in floor area of 850 sf. He clarified that the proposed total area in the main house would be 4,515 sf and 89.7% of the total allowed site floor area. He noted that this would exceed the 85% single largest structure floor area limit by 237 sf, that the applicant is requesting the ASCC make the findings to permit the proposed concentration of space and that this request is evaluated in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Anderson, McKelvey Architecture and Planning and dated May 12, 2008:

Sheet A1, Site Plan, Vicinity Map, Project Data, General Notes

Sheet 1, Plot Plan (Existing), Kier & Wright Civil Engineering and Surveyors, Inc., April 2008

Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan, Warnecke Rosekrans, Inc., 5/15/08

Sheet A2, Existing Plan

Sheet A3, Proposed Floor Plan

Sheet A4, Proposed Elevations

Sheet A5, Proposed Roof Plan & Venting Calculations

Sheet E1, Exterior Lighting Plan

Also considered were the cut sheets, received May 20, 2008, for the proposed exterior light fixtures, including the pendant lights planned for the new rear yard "loggia," a proposed materials and colors board received 5/20/08 and color images of the existing house provided by the applicant.

Borck reviewed her May 27, 2008 report on the sustainability aspect of the project and pointed out the "green" elements that would be incorporated and those still being considered. She also commented stucco siding is considered a very sustainable material.

Mr. and Mrs. Benevento, and project architect Joe Andmck presented the plans to the ASCC. They clarified that there would be no changes to the existing windows and for this reason they would like to preserve the exiting trim color and match all new windows to the existing windows and doors.

With respect to lighting, the applicants explained that they would like to preserve the proposed column mounted lights in the rear yard that were questioned in the staff report, but also agreed to remove a number of planter lights in response to ASCC questioning.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After discussion, ASCC members concurred they could make the required findings to allow for the proposed concentration of floor area. Members also concurred that given the site circumstances and applicants clarifying data that existing windows were to be preserved, they could support the color scheme as proposed even thought the trim and door and window colors would be lighter than the town's light reflectivity value policy limits.

Following discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

- 1. The lighting plan shall be revised to eliminate five (5) of the proposed rear yard planter area pathway fixtures, i.e., those located in the planter mainly for decorative and not pathway lighting purposes. Further, the plan shall specify that these lights will be manually switched and not on a timer.
- 2. The one existing "up" tree light in the front yard area shall be eliminated. Further, any other existing lighting fixtures determined to be non-conforming relative to current town guidelines and regulations shall be eliminated.

Review for conformity with Provisions of Conditional Use Permit X7D-129, sunroom addition to Lane Hall, 945 Portola Road, Valley Presbyterian Church

Vlasic briefly reviewed the June 5, 2008 staff report relative to the subject request by Valley Presbyterian Church for ASCC approval of a 152 sf "Sunroom" addition, including a landing for handicap access, to the existing "Lane" Fellowship Hall. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 5/5/08, prepared by Diedreich & Kim Architects:

Sheet A 1, Site Plan Sheet A 2, Floor Plan Sheet A 3, Sections and Exterior Elevations Sheet A 4, Perspectives

Also considered were two color images of existing conditions in the area of the proposed addition and three color images of the proposal perspectives shown on plan sheet A 4. It was noted that all of the images were provided by the applicant with the original submittal package.

It was noted that no one was present to represent the Church. Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members concluded that the project was a very minor change to existing conditions and within the provisions of the conditional use permit previously granted to the Church. As a result, ASCC member agreed to further consider and act on the application.

After brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 5-0 approval of the request as proposed subject to the following condition to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

The proposed sunroom glazing materials and interior lighting shall be specified. The purpose of this specification and additional review is to ensure minimum potential for evening light spill from the sunroom space, particularly in terms of views down to the space from the house on the parcel to the west.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0-1 (Warr), approval of the May 12, 2008 meeting minutes as drafted.

June 23, 2008 Meeting Attendance

Gelpi advised he could not attend this meeting. All other ASCC members noted they had no conflicts relative to meeting attendance.

Adjournment

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

T. Vlasic