

**Special Field Meeting 3 Redberry Ridge, Evans, and
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Breen called the special field meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at 3 Redberry Ridge.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

ASCC Absent: Warr

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the Evans request:

Cheryl and Eric Evans, applicants

Noel Cross, project architect

Kurt Jagers, 5 & 6 Blue Oaks Court

Tim Mills, 1 Redberry Ridge

Tom Klope, landscape architect and consultant to both Kurt Jagers and Tim Mills

John McGraw, 5 Redberry Ridge

Mark Foster, President Blue Oaks Homeowners Association

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

Vlastic presented the February 21, 2008 staff report on the subject proposal for new development of a largely single story residence with attached garage and partial daylight basement on the subject 2.62 acre Blue Oaks parcel. He advised that on February 11, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the proposal that included an afternoon site meeting and follow-up discussion at the regular evening ASCC meeting. He explained that while ASCC members were generally supportive of the project, it was agreed that some additional data was needed and that a second site meeting would be appropriate to, in particular, consider further view concerns relative to the Jagers properties at 5 and 6 Blue Oaks Court.

Vlastic also advised that since the staff report had been prepared, revised plans had been submitted by the applicant and that the scope of the revisions were summarized in a February 21, 2008 letter from the project architect. Vlastic stated that the plans and materials presented at the February 11 ASCC meeting, as listed and described in the February 7 staff report, remain the plans before the ASCC for consideration, except for the following revised plan sheets received 2/22/07:

Revised architectural plan sheets - dated 2/21/08:

Sheets A1.0, A1.0a, A2.4, A2.5, A5.1 and A5.2

Revised landscape plans dated 2/18/08:

Sheets L-1.0, L-2.0, L-2.1, L-3.1, L-4.0 and L-4.1

Vlastic also advised that Mr. Tom Klope had provided a February 25, 2008 letter relative to the driveway plans expressing concerns over any driveway plan revisions, including, in

particular, issues with the proposed use of a gravel surface and any adjustments that would negatively impact drainage as it relates to the blue oaks.

Vlasic noted that the key project issues identified at the February 11 preliminary review meeting were:

- Project impacts on the site's blue oaks and the need for additional arborist evaluation.
- Need for a better understanding of view relationships to outdoor areas, i.e., spa and lower terrace, from the Jagger's residence.
- Need to ensure that drainage/run-off is directed away from the oaks.
- Need for evaluation of solar panel and roof finish to ensure minimum contrast
- Concern over the appropriateness of proposed landscaping for blue oak environment.
- Recommendation that a smaller basement area be considered.
- Need to set a preliminary review with the Planning Commission with respect to the proposed grading permit.

Vlasic also commented that he had reviewed the revised plans and while they appear to address a number of the matters discussed at the February 11 meeting, and in the February 7, 2008 staff report, there was still the need for additional evaluation by the project arborist, and that the scope of exterior lighting, particularly at the bedroom terrace areas, needed some additional reduction.

Responding to the comments in Mr. Klope's letter regarding concerns over the use of gravel, Vlasic advised that this is a matter that should be resolved between neighbors and that from the point of view of staff, either the original plan for pervious pavers or the gravel surface would be acceptable.

Cheryl and Eric Evans, and **Noel Cross** presented the revised plans and explained the plan changes as summarized in the February 21, 2008 letter from Mr. Cross. They discussed the additional modeling in the spa and fire pit terrace area done for the site meeting, including the modeling of the privacy walls. It was noted that the lower screen wall included a five-foot high stone base and on top of this wall a four-foot high "fin" screen of cor-ten steel to allow for views out from the site, but to also screen views to and from the Jaggers property. It was also noted that a steel screen would be placed behind the gas fire pit area for fire safety. Perspective drawings of the revised proposals with views to and from the Jaggers properties were provided for referenced during the course of the site visit.

In response to a question, Cross advised that the total volume of grading counted against the provisions of the site development ordinance was roughly 1,650 cubic yards. He clarified that this included 432 cubic yards of cut and 1,218 cubic yards of fill. He also advised that materials excavated from the basement and not counted against the ordinance limits included 1,462 cubic yards of materials that would be exported from the site.

Tom Klope then reviewed the comments in his February 25, 2008 letter relative to the panhandle driveway proposal. In addition, he noted that recent discussions between neighbors resulted in a mutually desired modification to the panhandle driveway plan. Specifically, it was agreed that the addition of a low, dry-stack wall would permit preservation of four, now well established, oaks on the McGraw property.

Tim Mills also commented on his concerns over any driveway plan changes and, particularly, impact of storm water runoff on oaks. He stressed his willingness to grant an easement over his parcel for installation of a buried drainage line if such a line is found needed to protect the oak forest.

Kurt Jagers then reviewed his concerns over view and tree impacts as set forth in his communications to the ASCC, including his January 7, 2008 letter. He commented on the potential loss of oaks, beyond the tree removal noted on the proposed plans and opening of views to Redberry Ridge.

Thereafter, ASCC members and others present inspected the new site modeling in the spa and fire pit area and proceeded to the Jagers property to view the modeling and project story poles. Views were considered from deck and spa areas on the Jagers property and from living spaces within the residence. Also, views were considered from the pool and terrace area at 6 Blue Oaks Court. During the visit to the main Jagers residence, Mr. Jagers pointed out two blue oaks that were in decline adjacent to his house. He advised that he had taken all the precautions recommended by his project arborist, the same one used for the Evans project, and noted that the trees appear to have been impacted by the development or other factors. He stressed the sensitive nature of the Blue Oaks and difficulty of relying on them for long terms screening.

After visiting the Jagers properties and returning to the Evans parcel ASCC members offered some additional reactions as follows:

- Clark again stated basic support for the project, but did worry about tree protection and, particularly, protection of tree #65 within the pool terrace area and surrounded by proposed improvements. He suggested that plans should be made for future replacement of this tree as he worried if it could really survive construction impacts. He also suggested that a cor-ten fin extension be considered for the upper privacy wall on the southeast side of the fire pit/spa area to fill one gap in the view from the Jagers parcel.
- Gelpi also stated basic support for the project and shared Clark's concerns over potential tree impacts. He did not see the need for an additional fin wall, but noted that he still encouraged a smaller basement area and less off-haul of dirt. He noted, however, that he was "very supportive" of the revised and clarified project.
- Von Feldt stated support for the project as revised and appreciated the efforts made by the design team. She offered that pervious pavers would be fine for the driveway surface in the panhandle area, and supported the design change with the small dry-stack wall to protect the four established oaks. She supported staff comments regarding the need for further reduction of lighting at the bedroom terraces and also encouraged additional revisions to the landscape plan to only use appropriate natives in the POSE area, and eliminate moisture needing plants from the palate to ensure against any potential for impacting the Blue Oaks. She commented again that the proposed driveway area planting of Myrica should be replaced with Toyon, which are more suited to this environment. She stressed the need for final arborist comments and also supported Gelpi's suggestion for less basement area.

- Breen stated strong support for the proposed design and appreciated the plan revisions and clarifications. She stated that she typically “wished” houses were “smaller,” but did support the proposed plan. She concurred with the landscape plan comments offered by Von Feldt and also supported the use of pervious pavers for the driveway in the panhandle area of the property.

Elkind commented that she wished the proposed house was smaller, particularly considering tree impacts. She noted the difficulty of trying to fit this size house in the limited building envelope.

Vlasic reminded meeting participants of the provisions of the Blue Oaks PUD, noting that the building envelopes were unique because this is a “cluster” project with building areas limited particularly by slope and geology. He also noted that while the parcels have areas of roughly 1.5 to 2.5 acres, the overall project density is less, i.e., roughly 7 acres per dwelling unit, as portions of the parcels are actually included in the large, undivided open space area dedicated on Coal Mine Ridge.

In response to the comment by Mr. Clark on the need for an additional cor-ten screen, Mr. Cross pointed out that landscaping would fill the gap and that, as noted during viewing from the Jagers house, the deck area on the McGraw property is higher and far more open to view than the outside areas planned on the Evans project.

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 5:17 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: None

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Review - Conditional use Permit X7D-67 and Architectural Review for remodeling and expansion of existing market, 4420 Alpine Road, Roberts of Portola Valley

Vlastic presented the February 21, 2008 staff report on this follow-up review. He explained that on November 26, 2007, the ASCC completed review and recommendations on the subject applications, and planning commission approval of the requested CUP amendment was granted on December 13, 2007. He then reviewed the January 18, 2008 letter from Michael Brown, Sutti Associates, submitted with the following materials and plans received 1/23/08 to address a number of use permit conditions:

Sign details for refurbishing and lighting of the two existing monument signs

Detail for modification of eaves and removal of existing rotted rafter tails

December 17, 2007 Statement, Roth LaMotte re: vines on rear of building

Project Sustainability Report, revised 1/24/08, Sutti Associates

Solar Electric Analysis, Horizon Energy Systems, January 15, 2008

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan, 1/15/08, Sutti Associates

Sheet L 1.0, Landscape Site Plan, Roth LaMotte, 12/21/07

Sheet L 2.01, Planting Plan, Roth LaMotte, 12/21/07

Sheet L 2.02, Planting Plan, Roth LaMotte, 1/21/07

George Roberts, Brian Roberts, and Michael Brown presented the materials to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- As explained in the staff report, the desire is to further refine the landscape plan to “cut-back” on the extent of new planting, particularly along the Alpine Road side of the building. The mound area in the back of the rear parking lot will be planted with the required screen planting, and the planting in the parking area would also be accomplished as originally expected. Further, the planting of vines to cover the rear of the added to building would be achieved as provided for in the ASCC approval. The focus of desired changes would be to reduce the scope of planting along the front and

sides of the building, with the emphasis being the clean-up of existing planting beds and plant materials. It is hoped that these adjustments could be developed in conjunction with a designated ASCC member.

- The staff report recommends the addition of a second bike rack at the north end of the building. At this point, there appears to be no need or demand for such a rack and school children will often simply lean bikes against the building. If there is need for additional bike racks in the future they could be provided.
- As noted in the 1/18/08 letter, consideration is being given to the use of a concrete “wood-like” siding that Danna Breen suggested be considered for covering of the concrete block walls of, at least, portions of the buildings. Samples of the siding as well as concrete stone were presented for consideration.
- Product sheets for the proposed outside concrete benches and tables were presented. It was noted that the proposed furniture was manufactured by Barco Products and was ADA accessible. It was further noted that these products were selected for durability and because they could not be easily damaged or stolen.
- The proposed new signs would be of the same size as the two existing signs and placed on top of the existing concrete bases. The design would be much the same as the existing signs with a dark wood frame, lighter background and brown lettering. The proposed down light would be a four-foot long shielded florescent tube along the six-foot long sign.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that there would be at least 4-5 trash receptacles for public use.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the hope was to finish the work so that the market could be opened in June, but this was still a very tentative target date.
- As noted in the sustainability report, the new market systems have been designed for energy efficiency.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members found the follow-up submittal generally acceptable and supported the concept for use of the concrete “wood-like” siding materials. It was noted, however, that the lighter stained version of the siding should be considered and, if the final decision is to make use of the siding, a detailed plan should be prepared for full ASCC consideration. Members also cautioned that the mix of siding and concrete stone should be evaluated with care so that the appearance is not too busy and that, further, the ASCC was not pushing for extensive use of either the wood or stone concrete materials. With respect to the proposed “outdoor concrete furniture,” ASCC members did not find the scale and character appropriate and directed that alternative furniture be selected.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0 approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised, as discussed at the ASCC meeting. The process for plan revision shall include interaction with and approval by a designated ASCC member. The effort shall, in particular, ensure that landscape screening anticipated with the conceptual plan in the "rear" mound and parking area is achieved.
2. Only one bike rack needs to be provided at this time.
3. Alternatives for the outside tables and benches shall be selected to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
4. While the ASCC, in general, supports the use of the suggested concrete "wood-like" siding, any plan for such siding or use of the concrete "stone" shall be subject to prior review and approval by the ASCC.

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

Vlasic presented the February 21, 2008 staff report on this request and also reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project. (See above site meeting minutes, which include reference to the project plans, including the plan revisions considered at the site meeting). Vlasic highlighted the few ASCC concerns remaining with the project as noted at the site session.

Cheryl and Eric Evans and Noel Cross reviewed the efforts made to address neighbor and town concerns to this point in the project review process. They noted changes to the landscape plans to address neighbor concerns and also expressed frustration with regard to suggestions for further reduction in the scope of exterior lighting. They wondered about fair treatment in terms of their proposal when compared to lighting that existed on neighboring parcels. They also agreed that the panhandle driveway plan would be revised to specify the originally agreed to pervious paver surface, to add the dry-stack wall to protect the four oaks on the McGraw property and also to replace the use of Myrica with toyon in areas adjacent to Blue Oaks.

With respect to the staff lighting suggestions, Vlasic advised that sensitivity to scope of lighting has grown in town even since the first houses were built in Blue Oaks. At the same time, he noted that he had not done a recent review of existing projects to determine if any exterior lighting had been added after town "sign-off" of building permits.

After some further discussion with respect to lighting, the applicants agreed to consider elimination of the wall lights proposed at the bedroom terrace areas, but to retain the eave mounted down lights and to also add back to the plan two, low mounted wall down lights in the spa terrace area.

Public comments were requested.

Kurt Jagers, 5 & 6 Blue Oaks Court, state support for some additional screen planting relative to the outdoor spa and fire pit terrace area. He also noted that the planting in the POSE area should be native, and installed and maintained to ensure privacy between

parcels. He wondered about the possibility of a landscape maintenance agreement. Lastly, he continued to express concern over the project's potential impacts on the Blue Oak grove.

Tom Klope, landscape architect, again reviewed the comments in his February 25 letter to the town. He also asked that the grading and landscaping along the panhandle driveway, and in the areas where planting is to screen views between the proposed house and the Jagers parcels, be completed as soon as possible so that the screen planting would be established and growing when the new house is ready for occupancy.

ASCC members then discussed the project and concurred that the key remaining issues were focused on construction staging and tree protection. Members indicated appreciation for the applicants' willingness to make some additional adjustments to the bedroom terrace lighting plans, as noted above, and concurred with the panhandle driveway plan adjustments desired by the neighbors and agreed to by the applicants.

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, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final landscape plan shall be prepared that ensures plant compatibility with the Blue Oak environment. Prior to the plan being presented to the ASCC, it shall be shared with the Conservation Committee for comments and recommendations. Further, it is understood that the final plan would include some provisions for use of native plant materials propagated with cuttings from the site or general area (e.g., materials from the area of Lots 14 and 15 in conjunction with the plant propagation efforts of landscape architect for the Salah project approved for Lot 14).
2. Prior to installation of any solar panels, the panel design and colors shall be presented to the ASCC for approval with the main issue to be considered being visual impact associated with the contrast between panel and roof colors.
3. The final drainage plan shall be provided and shall be consistent with the project arborist's recommendations for protection of oaks from impacts associated with increased water runoff.
4. The panhandle driveway plan shall be revised to include a pervious paver surface and the addition of a low, dry-stack wall to protect the four established oaks on the McGraw property. Further, the proposed use of Myrica in the area of Blue Oaks shall be replaced with Toyon.
5. The proposed exterior lighting plan shall be modified as agreed to at the ASCC meeting.
6. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided and shall include final recommendations of the project arborist for protection of the oaks shown for preservation on the plans. The plan shall provide for implementing the arborist's recommendations and for replacement of any oaks that do not survive the construction process. Particular attention shall be paid to conditions associated with the trees close to the planned house foundation, including tree number 65. Once the construction staging and tree protection plans has been approved, they shall be implemented to the

satisfaction of planning staff. (Note: the ASCC recommended that an updated arborist's report be available for reference at the time the site development permit plan is submitted to the planning commission for action.)

7. Both the revised landscape plan and the construction staging plan shall provide for early installation of the driveway and Jagers side key plantings so they are established when the new house is ready for occupancy. The plans shall include provisions for protection of the plantings, once installed, from construction impacts.
8. The final drainage plans shall be subject to approval by the public works director and town geologist and shall be consistent with the fundamental drainage provisions of the Blue Oaks subdivision.

The above action was taken with the understanding that the site development permit request would need planning commission approval before any building permits could be pursued. It was also understood that, where noted in the conditions, the ASCC was recommending certain actions to facilitate planning commission consideration of the site development permit request, but that further ASCC consideration of the request would not take place until commission action on the site development permit.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence and detached accessory structures and Site Development Permit X9H-583, 140 Meadowood Drive, Hildebrand

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the February 21, 2008 staff report on the continued review of this project. He noted that, in response to comments offered at the ASCC 2/11/08 preliminary review meeting, the applicants provided a February 21, 2008 letter committing to making needed technical corrections and to also providing a revised landscape plan to address neighbors concerns and ASCC requests for more details. In addition, it was noted that the applicants and project architect would be presenting the following additional materials at the ASCC meeting:

- Larger samples of proposed exterior materials
- Photo simulations of the proposed house at the site
- Photos of similar houses to demonstrate the appropriateness of the style and materials for the rural setting

Further, Vlasic reviewed the package of 8.5" x 11" design revisions, i.e., four sheets dated 2/16/08, prepared by the project architect addressing changes to the roofline/form over the stairwell at the south side of the house and to the basement lightwell area. It was noted that the sheets depict both the original and proposed revised conditions.

Mr. and Mrs. Hilderbrand and project architect Jon Jang presented the new materials to the ASCC and offered the following comments and plan clarifications:

- If the project is conditionally approved, the proposed plans, as listed in the materials for the 2/11 ASCC meeting, would be revised as committed to in the 2/21/08 letter to the ASCC and to incorporate the changes shown on the 2/16/08 plan revisions prepared by Mr. Jang.

- Photo simulations (four sheets) of the proposal were provided, but it was noted that they did not include the revisions shown on the 2/16/08 plan set. Also presented were 10 sheets of photo images of houses in the area with similar design styles and exterior materials to demonstrate their appropriateness for the site location and area setting.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the driveway material would likely be concrete with a brick or paver pattern, but that consideration would be given to a pervious surface material.

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Ray Villareal, 130 Meadowood Drive**, spoke in favor of the project, and supported the landscape plan changes as discussed at the 2/11 meeting and committed to in the 2/21/08 letter from the applicants. In particular, he appreciated the willingness of the applicants and ASCC to extend the screen planting along the parcel boundary between his and the subject property. He also commented on drainage and sought assurance that the project would not result in directing more water onto his property.

Vlasic advised that the public works director's project review and conditions would address the matter of drainage and limiting potential for increased run-off and erosion. He also noted that while the 2/16/08 proposed basement and lightwell changes come close to addressing the floor area concerns described in the February 7, 2008 staff report, some additional adjustment would be needed as committed to in the 2/21/08 letter from the applicant. Vlasic noted that this could include further adjustments to the basement area or some reduction to the size of the proposed detached guest unit. ASCC members indicated that either approach would be acceptable as long the final design conformed to the basement definition and floor area limits for the property.

ASCC members discussed the project and appreciated the design revisions and clarifications provided with the photos, photo simulations and larger materials samples. It was noted, that the final landscape plan, should, however, ensure a more informal planting condition, particularly along the front of the parcel.

Breen commented that while she appreciated the design changes and clarifications, she remained concerned over the project's compatibility with the neighborhood and felt she was not able to act on the project without a better understanding of the final landscape plan. Thus, she advised that she would abstain from any action to approve the plans.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0-1 (Breen) approval of the proposal as shown on the plans listed in the materials for the February 11 ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plan revisions and adjustments identified as being needed at the 2/11 meeting and agreed to in the February 21, 2008 letter from the applicants to the town shall be completed. The landscape plan shall also include revisions to reduce the formality of planting and other landscape improvements between the house and Meadowood Drive.
2. The plans shall be revised to incorporate the house changes shown on the four sheet plan set dated 2/16/08 prepared by project architect Jon Jang.

3. The requirements of all site development committee members shall be adhered to the satisfaction of the respective committee member. This shall include, but not be limited to, the 2/4/08 report from the public works director and the January 29, 2008 report from the fire marshal.

Conditional Use Permit Amendment X7D-29, Spring Down Equestrian Center, 725 Portola Road, Goodstein

Vlasic reviewed the staff report on this request and advised the project was placed on the February meeting agenda based on the understanding that the planning commission would be able to conduct a preliminary review of the request at the commission's February 20, 2008 meeting. Vlasic noted that this did not occur and that it was staff's recommendation that project consideration be continued to the March 10, 2008 regular meeting, which would permit the planning commission the opportunity to conduct its preliminary review on March 5.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the March 10 regular ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Review of Site Development Permit X9H-555 for landslide mitigation, 16 and 42 Santa Maria Avenue, Hibbard

Vlasic briefly reviewed the February 21, 2008 staff report on this application. He advised that the primary reason it was on the meeting agenda was for setting of a joint meeting date with the planning commission for preliminary consideration of the site development proposal.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project and requested public comments. No public comments were offered. Thereafter, ASCC members agreed to convene a special meeting at the project site with the planning commission at 4:00 p.m. on March 5. Vlasic noted that the staff report on the proposal would be distributed at the end of the week.

Approval of Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 4-0, approval of the February 11, 2008 afternoon site and regular evening meeting minutes with two typographical corrections, i.e., on page 3, in the second line of the third bullet item from the bottom of the page change "froth" to "forth," and on page 12 in the first bullet item under comments by Von Feldt, correct the spelling of "Lutsko."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

T. Vlasic