

**Special Field Meeting 135 Crescent Avenue, Aalfs, and
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Breen called the special field meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 135 Crescent Avenue.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

ASCC Absent: Warr

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the Aalfs request:

Sally and Jeff Aalfs, applicants

Stan Fields, project architect

Mary Urbach, 142 Crescent Avenue

Graciela Walker, 139 Crescent Avenue

**Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-584 for house additions,
detached carport, and detached accessory structure, 135 Crescent Avenue, Aalfs**

Vlastic reviewed the May 8, 2008 staff report on this proposal for house and accessory structure additions, totaling 1,959 sf, to be made to the existing 1,857 sf residential improvements on the subject .77 acre Brookside Park property. He advised that the proposal calls for 87.9% of the total floor area to be in the single largest structure, that this is 119 sf over the 85% floor area limit, and that the applicant is requesting the ASCC to make the findings to permit the proposed concentration of space. Vlastic further advised that the plans had been refined to correct an issue with the grading and retaining wall aspects of the proposed carport, as shown on revised plan Sheet A3.0, received by the town on May 9, 2008. He noted that this revision and the grading plan revisions dated 4/28/08 had yet to be commented on by all site development permit committee members and that, as a result, ASCC action on the site development permit would need to be deferred until all comments were available.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans:

Architectural Plans, unless otherwise noted by Field Architecture, dated 4/30/08

Cover Sheet (with project rendering)

Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 1/18/08

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan

Sheet A1.1, Landscape Plan

Sheet A1.2, Lighting Plan

Sheet A1.3, Tree Removal Plan

Sheet A2.0, Lower Floor Plan

Sheet A2.1, Upper Floor Plan

Sheet A2.2, Roof Plan

Sheet A3.0, Elevations (revised plan received 5/9/08)

Civil Plans, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc, revised 4/28/08

Sheet C-1, Title Sheet
Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet C-3, Details
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details

Also considered were the cut sheets, received April 30, 2008, for the proposed exterior light fixtures, including the light planned for the new spa, a color version of the rendering shown on the cover sheet of the architectural plans and the color version of the sheet describing the exterior finishes proposed for the house additions.

Mr. and Mrs. Aalfs and project architect Stan Field presented the plans to the ASCC. They reviewed site conditions and explained the design proposal. They also led all present on an inspection of the site and described in more detail the proposed house additions, carport design and design for the planned detached "sanctuary" structure. During the course of the site visit the following comments and clarifications were offered:

- The pine tree on the west side of the carport is shown for removal on the engineering plans, but it may be possible to save it. In response to a question, it was noted that the existing parking deck, west of the proposed carport site, had been installed by the previous owner and that the current owners were not fully aware of the details associated with the design, and nature of any town review.
- The subject plans were revised to eliminate an originally proposed lap pool. The intent now is to fill the existing pool with dirt, but essentially leave the lower pool wall and deck elements in place, much as they are today. This approach is being considered to control project costs.
- Two black oaks and one live oak are planned for removal to accommodate the house addition and the new detached "sanctuary." In response to a question, it was noted that consideration had been given to moving the addition and sanctuary further to the east to save the trees, but slope conditions and architectural alignment with existing house improvements were more difficult and the addition visibility would increase in terms of views from the house on the parcel to the east.
- It was noted that house plans were shared with the neighbors, including those immediately to the east and west, and found generally acceptable by them. Copies of approval letters from Tim and Paige Fulkerson, 121 Crescent Avenue (dated May 8, 2008) and Mary Urbach, 42 Crescent Avenue (dated May 12, 2008) were presented.
- In response to a comment in the staff report, it was clarified that proposed light fixture LB5 would be fitted with a solid top to ensure only downward light spill.
- In response to a comment in the staff report, it was clarified that the glazing for the windows in the dining room area would be "Low-E" glass, and that only typical, recessed down directed lighting was anticipated for interior of the dining room. It was clarified that the glazing material and down directed lighting should ensure minimum potential for interior light spill relative to views from off site.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Mary Urbach, 142 Crescent Avenue, spoke in support of the project, but wondered if the town required use of a carport, as she worried about visual clutter within such only partially covered parking areas.

Vlasic advised that the town did not mandate use of carports for required covered parking, and typically left the design choice up to an applicant. He, however, noted that in Portola Valley Ranch, a planned unit development, carports were required, for the most part, to reduce the appearance of structural massing along the relative narrow street rights-of-way.

Graciela Walker, 139 Crescent Avenue, stated she was the neighbor to the east and supported the project.

ASCC members then offered the following reactions:

- The design solution, including exterior materials and finishes, appears fully appropriate for the site and consistent with the design of existing residential improvements.
- Loss of the pine tree adjacent to the carport or the live oak below the sanctuary are less of a concern than loss of the two black oaks. Black oaks are less prevalent, take longer to grow, and their protection and preservation where possible is more important than for the other trees. Hope was expressed that a plan adjustment might be found to save at least one of the two black oaks.
- Concern was expressed over the plans for the “elimination” of the existing pool. Members indicated that they had hoped the pool area would be restored to a more native condition and that the pool walls and other elements exposed on the downhill side would be removed. While members understood the cost issues, they also worried about the structural integrity of the proposed design solution and asked for additional clarification on this matter as part of the process of final ASCC site development permit review and action.

Following sharing of comments, Breen thanked the applicants and others present for their participation in the site meeting. ASCC members then agreed to continue project consideration at the regular evening meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 4:40 p.m. the special ASCC field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

Absent: Warr

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Planning Commission Liaison: Gilbert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Introduction of New Planning Commissioner Gilbert

Denise Gilbert was introduced as the recently appointed member of the planning commission and welcomed to her first opportunity to serve as commission liaison to the ASCC meetings.

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-584 for house additions, detached carport, and detached accessory structure, 135 Crescent Avenue, Aalfs

Vlastic presented the May 8, 2008 staff report on this request and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the proposal. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of the project plans and materials.) Borck then presented her April 3, 2008 report on the "sustainability" aspects of the project.

Mr. and Mrs. Aalfs and Stan Field presented the proposal and offered the following comments and clarifications in addition to those presented at the afternoon site meeting:

- Field Architecture recently received an AIA (American Institute of Architects) award for the Hughes residence located on Wayside Road, adjacent to the Portola Road Corridor, in Portola Valley. The same care and design approach has been exercised in the development of plans for the subject project and it is hoped it will also receive an award for architectural excellence.
- The design of the proposed addition has been to "weave" it into the natural foliage and slopes of the site and, with elimination of the pool, "bring back to life" the lower part of the property. The site slopes and the vegetation to be preserved will ensure that the project is in harmony with the site and area, and there should be minimum potential for any view impacts.
- Based on the site meeting and ASCC comments, the plan for pool demolition has been reconsidered. The desire is to preserve the architecture of the addition, which would require removal of the two black oaks. The plans will, however, be adjusted to restore

the pool site to the more original ground conditions. The restored slopes would “flow” to original grades in a more natural way and, as part of the restoration process, replacement black oaks would be planted.

- Material and color samples, consistent with the application submittal were presented for ASCC consideration.
- In response to questions, it was stressed that the proposal incorporates significant elements of passive solar architecture, but that consideration is also being given to application of a photovoltaic system, which would likely include placement of solar collector panels on the existing house roof.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that the *Prodema BAQ Panels* material may also be used for the soffit on the new carport.
- A number of contractors have been interviewed for the project and it is clear that construction staging, access and parking will be important issues. Detailed plans for these matters will be developed once the contractor is selected.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and considered possible options, including a sketch alternative provided by Clark, for saving at least one of the two black oaks planned for removal. At the conclusion of the discussion, however, members found support for the proposed architecture as presented. At the same time, they encouraged the project architect to continue to study possible adjustments for the lower deck with kitchen and sanctuary to determine if any plan consistent with the basic design, would also allow for preservation of the lower black oak. Other issues that were discussed included:

- History and conditions associated with the existing parking pad and the retaining wall and fill elements installed for its construction. Members worried about the structural integrity of the feature and also the need for a guardrail. It was stressed that any guard or handrail for this area should be coordinated with railing to be used at the back of the planned carport.
- Members concurred that the pine tree located between the existing parking deck and new carport could be removed.
- Need for consistency between the improvements shown on the architectural and engineering plans.
- Need for a more appropriate design solution for the pool demolition, including necessary civil engineering design criteria.
- Need to remove existing up lights in yard areas.
- Need for carefully prepared and executed vegetation protection and construction staging plans.

- Need for a detailed landscape plan, particularly for restoration of the existing pool area.

After discussion, members concurred that they could make the findings, as evaluated in the staff report, to permit the proposed concentration of floor area. Members also concurred that they supported the architectural design as presented, without any shifting of the addition to the east to preserve the black oaks, and that the loss of the black oaks would be permitted with the understanding that a detailed and appropriate plan would be developed and implemented for restoration of the swimming pool area, including restoration landscaping. Nonetheless, the applicant and architect were *encouraged* to continue to explore design adjustments that might allow for saving the lower of the two black oaks, but that tree preservation was not mandated as long as the final pool area restoration plan was found acceptable by the ASCC.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Von Feldt, and passed 4-0, approval of the architectural review application subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Review and action on the site development permit shall have been completed and the final site development permit plans shall include:
 - a. Consistently presented data on the architectural and civil plans.
 - b. Details for construction staging and tree/vegetation protection. An arborist's report shall be provided that includes information on condition of existing trees and provides recommendations for actions to preserve and protect trees not to be removed with this project.
 - c. Grading, drainage, and other details for restoration of the pool area to a more native condition.
2. The lighting plans shall be revised to provide for elimination of existing "up" directed landscape lighting.
3. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided for restoration of the pool area and shall include replacement planting of Black Oaks.
4. Details for the railing needed for the existing upper parking pad and any needed for the planned carport area shall be presented and shall be consistent in design.

ASCC members also asked that the applicant and/or staff provide any available information on the history of improvement of the existing parking pad, with the main concern being structural soundness, particularly with respect to the proximity of the adjacent work planned for carport construction.

Architectural Review for house additions, 112 Groveland Street, Sutherland

Vlasic presented the May 8, 2008 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 768 sf of living area to an existing single-story, 1,692 sf residence, on the subject .20 acre Brookside Park property. He explained that the plans include 653 sf master bedroom/living room and

115 sf kitchen area additions. He added that all new floor area would be single story and match the design and architectural character of the existing residence, that the total proposed floor area is under the 85% floor area limit for the single largest structure, and that no grading is proposed, i.e., counted pursuant to the permit requirements of the site development ordinance.

Borck then reviewed her May 6, 2008 report on the sustainability aspects of the project.

ASCC members considered the staff reports and the following proposed project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 4/16/08 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet

Sheet: 1 of 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey Plan, BGT Land Surveying, Nov. 2007

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan w/Grading, Drainage, Staging, & Tree Protection

Sheet: A-2.1, Main Floor Plan, Demo Plan & Roof Plan

Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Also considered were photo images of the existing exterior light fixtures that would be reused on the project and the proposed exterior materials and colors board, dated 4/16/08.

Mr. and Mrs. Sutherland presented their proposal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The project was designed with sustainability in mind. The intent is to only add space that is needed and to reuse as much material as possible. The design is also for energy efficiency. There will be no air conditioning and, if the budget allows, radiant heating is to be used. Also, the skylights would be with vents to permit release of any heat build up.
- The changes will accommodate space needed for two children and also get the laundry facilities out of the garage and back in the house.
- The current front yard landscaping would be largely preserved with some native shrubs and one fruit tree relocated. The proposed short run of four foot high front yard fencing is "symbolic" and largely to define the entry and not "fence-in" any yard space. The details for the fencing will be provided to the ASCC for review and approval when they are developed.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the existing small redwood trees would be preserved along the parcel frontage. It was also noted that the large pine, while not necessarily the most desirable tree, provided screening and was, at this point, to be preserved, as cost to remove it would be very high. With respect to the redwoods, it was explained that they are trimmed and otherwise controlled to limit growth.
- The one existing spot light mounted on the house, and discussed in the staff report, will be removed.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Julius Ross, 308 Canyon Drive, expressed no concern over project design, but stressed his main worry was potential impacts of the construction process on local traffic and access. He clarified that every two weeks he receives a supply of oxygen for his wife, and that the delivery is made with a fairly large truck. He worried that, when the deliveries were made, construction traffic could block access. He also wondered about enforcement of construction hours, and noted that a number of construction trucks and other construction related traffic seemed to arrive well before the 8:00 a.m. prescribed time for start of construction by town ordinance.

Karl Kosling, 243 Canyon Drive, spoke in favor of the project.

Dean Asborn, neighbor immediately to the west, spoke in favor of the project and offered his driveway and parking area for use for alternative construction parking, i.e., in addition to that shown on the proposed staging plan.

Mr. Sutherland noted he had spoken to his neighbors regarding the project and received favorable responses. He also noted that he would coordinate his construction work with Mr. Ross to ensure that there would be no impact on the oxygen deliveries.

ASCC members discussed the project and found it generally acceptable as designed. Members concurred that the existing small redwoods would likely grow to potentially impact views in the area and recommended that they be phased out, i.e., replaced with other plantings, over time.

Following discussion, Von Feldt moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0 approval of the project as proposed and clarified at the ASCC meeting, subject to the following conditions, to be completed, unless otherwise specified, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Details for the new front yard fencing shall be specified to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The plans shall be revised to show removal of the existing house mounted spotlight.
3. A final, detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided, developed in conjunction with the project contractor, that shall include provisions for communication with neighbors if any construction activities would potentially impact local traffic. Further, the plan shall include a contact number for the contractor that shall be made available to site neighbors. Once approved, the final construction staging plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Staff Report - Status of work of the Planning Commission/ASCC Subgroup on Sustainability and "Green-Building"

Vlasic provided a brief update of the status of the work of the subgroup. He discussed the subgroups meeting of 5/1/08, and ideas shared for town workshops and/or "how to" information for "greening-up" of existing homes that don't go through any specific building review process, progress on the discussion of a green-building point system for the town,

and possible programs for local energy audits. He also noted that a meeting was to be held on May 14 with local realtors to discuss the possibility of energy audits, with the hope for "greening-up" of properties, around the point of sale of existing homes. He noted that a more complete update on the committee's work with recommendations would be forwarded to the ASCC and planning commission shortly.

ASCC members were particularly interested in the town making energy audits available to residents. It was suggested that the town might consider identifying audit sources or programs that a group of neighbors or a neighborhood might pursue and achieve economies with the larger scale audit effort.

Approval of Minutes

Von Feldt moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0, approval of the April 28, 2008 meeting minutes with the paragraph in the middle of page 5 starting with "Some comments were offered . . ." corrected to read as follows:

Some comments were offered with respect to the use of rosemary around the "rock garden" and it was suggested that dwarf coyote bush be considered. The applicants noted that they preferred it to coyote bush.

Tentative Cancellation of May 26, 2008 Regular ASCC Meeting

It was noted that the next regular meeting date conflicted with the Memorial Day Holiday. It was agreed that unless there was a significant matter requiring ASCC attention, the 5/26 meeting would be cancelled and not rescheduled and that the next ASCC meeting would be on the June 9, 2008 regular meeting date.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

T. Vlastic