

Architectural and Site Control Commission **January 28, 2008**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Gelpi, Breen, Clark, Von Feldt, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Reorganization of Agenda

Staff recommended and ASCC members concurred to reorganize the agenda to have the Pica architectural review considered near the top of the agenda, immediately prior to consideration of the Prado architectural review follow-up matter. It was noted that this item would likely be handled relatively expeditiously, while other agenda items would take considerably longer.

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 reviewed the comments in the January 24, 2008 staff report on this follow-up matter. He explained that the project design team is still working to develop plans to address conditions of both ASCC and planning commission approvals. As a result, it was recommended that the follow-up review be continued to the February 11 regular ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the February 11, 2008 regular ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for carport conversion, 8 Franciscan Ridge, Portola Valley Ranch, Pica

Vlastic presented the January 24, 2008 staff report on this proposal for enclosure of the existing flat roof, detached carport located on the subject parcel on the southeast side of the Franciscan Ridge cul-de-sac bulb in Portola Valley Ranch. He explained that the proposed enclosure would be accomplished with the installation of two new garage doors with a dividing post, all finished to match existing house and carport improvements.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the application package received January 11, 2008. It was noted that the four 8.5" x 11" plan sheets attached to the application include a description statement, cost estimate from Artistic Garage Doors, Inc., and proposed elevation for the front of the garage with a description of the proposed enclosure, and a partial existing site plan. Also considered was a letter from the Portola Valley Ranch design committee dated December 7, 2007 conditionally approving the proposal.

Mr. and Mrs. Pica were present and advised they had nothing to add beyond the data in the staff report. They did, however, emphasize that the plans do include the automatic garage door opener and that this element is important to the project.

After receiving brief clarification of the Ranch carport enclosure criteria and basis for ASCC consideration, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 5-0, approval of the proposal as requested.

Follow-up Architectural Review for house additions, 333 Willowbrook Drive, Prado

Vlasic presented the January 24, 2008 staff report on this follow-up review request. He noted that on August 27, 2007 the ASCC conditionally approved the subject architectural review for house addition on the Willowbrook Drive property and that, subsequently, the planning commission approved a variance application for replacement of the existing swimming pool. Vlasic advised that the variance application was also considered by the ASCC, i.e., at its November 12, 2007 meeting.

Vlasic clarified that the subject submittal addresses only those conditions specific to the architectural approval and is limited to exterior house materials and finishes, driveway surface materials, and light fixture design specifications. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans and materials:

- Revised colors (and materials) board, received December 18, 2007 (to be presented at the ASCC meeting)
- Light fixture cut sheet received December 18, 2007 (copy attached)
- December 17, 2008 letter from project architect, Elsbeth Newfield

It was noted that the colors board includes a sample of the proposed driveway gravel material.

Elsbeth Newfield, AIA, presented the information to the ASCC and offered that the applicant is willing to modify the proposed exterior stucco color to conform to the town's 40% policy limit regarding light reflectivity values (LRV). She also advised that while the proposed light fixture can accommodate a range of compact florescent light (CFL) bulbs, the intent was to not go beyond an illumination level equivalent to a 75-watt incandescent bulb. It was noted that a 13-watt CFL light bulb would be equivalent to a 75-watt incandescent bulb.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Breen 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 plans shall specifically note a maximum illumination of 13-watts for the CFL bulb to be installed in the wall mounted light fixtures. Compliance with this wattage limitation shall be verified by planning staff prior to “finaling” of the building permit for the house additions.
2. The colors and materials board shall be revised to identify an exterior stucco siding color conforming to the town’s 40% policy limit regarding light reflectivity values.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-578, 18 Redberry Ridge, Lot 14 Blue Oaks Subdivision, Salah

Vlasic presented the January 24, 2008 staff report on this continued application review. He discussed the preliminary, December 10, 2007, ASCC project consideration and design adjustments made in response to the December 10 review and events that took place after the December ASCC meeting. He then reviewed the following modified project plans, unless otherwise noted, revised through 1/16/08 and prepared by the project architectural team of Carrie Burke, Lorin Hill and W. David Winitzky:

Sheet A 1.0, Cover – Project Information, 1/18/08
Sheet A 2.0, Site Plan
Sheet A 3.0, Floor Plans
Sheet A 4.0, Dwelling and Office Elevations, Materials Key, Bldg. Section
Sheet A 4.1, Garage Elevations, Materials & Building Section, Chimney Detail
Sheet L1.00, Landscape Baseplan, Lutsko Associates, 1/15/08
Sheet L1.01, Landscape Baseplan, Lutsko Associates, 1/13/08
Sheet C1.0, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, Sherwood Design Engineers,
1/16/08
Sheet EL 0.1, Electrical Site Lighting Plan, 1/28/08

Also referenced was the eight-page reduced set of plan details received on January 22, 2008, provided by the project design team. It was noted that the eight-page set contains a colored rendering of the proposed building, details for exterior materials options, a colored rendering of the landscape plan, and light fixture details and cut sheets.

Vlasic advised that the project design team would also be providing some clarifying data at the meeting to address questions and comments raised in the staff report. In addition, he referred to the following communications received since the staff report was prepared:

Email communication dated January 27, 2008 from James Gibbons
January 28, 2008 letter from Louis and Lea Anne Borders
Phone communication from Mark Foster, President of the Blue Oaks Homeowners
Association (HOA)

With respect to the Gibbons email, Vlasic noted that Mr. and Mrs. Gibbons were present and would likely provide comments on it. As to the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Borders, Vlasic reviewed the comments and clarifications he provided in a “comment by comment” January 28, 2008 email response to Mr. and Mrs. Borders.

Vlasic advised that Mr. Foster had informed him that he had reviewed the plans and found them acceptable, but that full homeowners association consideration and action would likely not take place until the February 4, 2008 HOA meeting. Vlasic noted, therefore, that should the ASCC act on the plans prior to HOA action, the applicant would be assuming some risk, and if the HOA action required significant plan adjustments, the plans would need to be presented to the ASCC for reconsideration.

Mr. Salah, and the following project design team members presented the revised plans to the ASCC:

Carrie Burke, project architect
Lorin Hill, project architect
Ron Lutsko, project landscape architect
Peter Hessell, project landscape architect

The following comments and clarifications were offered:

- A package of 8.5" x 11" sheets was provided to address, in particular, questions and comments in the staff report. It was noted that the package included a cover sheet summarizing the edits and "supplemental revisions" covered by the package. It was further noted that the clarifications addressed the garage walls, materials locations, and light fixtures W2 and W3. It was explained that the package included responses to specific lighting questions contained in the staff report and site line sections from Lot 12 (Gibbons) to Lot 14 (Salah).
- The south garage wall is to be faced in stone and screen landscaping installed below the wall. The proposed plantings would likely grow to heights of 8-12 feet.
- The planting proposed in the area between Lots 14 and 15 will need to be finalized with the adjacent owner, but it is believed the concepts reflect the desires of both owners for privacy and view protection.
- The proposed olive trees are of the size and character believed appropriate for screening between Lots 14 and 15. It is understood that these trees do not conform to the PUD provisions and alternative plants will likely be needed. At the same time, the applicant desires olives for harvesting of the fruit and would like to have such trees as proposed or elsewhere on the property.
- The reflecting pools are only roughly 18 inches deep and are part of the water harvesting system. It is likely, however, that "sub-grade" cisterns will be needed.
- The first preference is for the "green" vegetated roof. However, as the sheet explaining materials applications shows, an alternative metal alloy roof may be used. Final roof selection will be based on energy modeling and efficiency calculations. Further, the alternatives for the "chimney" energy and light wells and siding applications will be finalized based on energy calculations. The proposed siding alternatives are tied to the final designs for these "chimney" features.

- The proposed roof garden plantings would have a maximum height of 12" to 18". They would not grow above the height of the roof.
- In response to a question regarding the chimney designs, it was noted that they had been scaled back in size and height as far as possible, but not to the point that their "energy" functions would be adversely impacted. It was also noted that the lighting proposed at the interior base of the "chimneys" was a small LED fixture, with the light fully directed downward, and that no interior light would be directed to shine "up" though the "chimney." It was again stressed that final energy modeling would take place and that this modeling would be used in the final design of the chimney features and selection of other exterior elements and materials. For example, the detailed plans for the chimney features were reviewed, and it was noted that under one design a metal alloy would actually be used for the siding below the chimney shaft.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Victor Perlroth, owner of Lot 15 stated appreciation for project refinements. He discussed his desire to work with the applicants on details for the mounding and planting between parcels and hoped that a somewhat higher mound could be considered. He worried over the expanse of the roof area when viewed from his property, supported the vegetated roof and asked for consideration of a deeper roof garden well, i.e., six feet instead of five feet. Mr. Perlroth also worried over potential drainage impacts and sought assurance that, with the mound, drainage from the Salah property would not be directed toward his property. Lastly, Mr. Perlroth advised that he would be willing to support a common driveway and grant an easement for it over the panhandle to his property, but asked for consideration of an easement on Lot 14 to support a better driveway alignment to his property. He presented a partial plan to show the scope of easement he had in mind to accommodate the driveway alignment. He noted that this alignment would require less grading and retaining wall work.

Lynn Gibbons, Blue Oaks Lot 12, sought clarification of the proposed vegetated roof and how the selected plant materials would blend with the natural surroundings of the site. She worried that the plant selection might not be in harmony with the more native site and area conditions.

Ron Lutsko, responded to Mrs. Gibbons and explained that the roof plantings would be selected to be consistent with the native materials of Blue Oaks. It was also clarified that the materials would have low height characteristics and would not require "regular mowing," but could be trimmed periodically as needed. It was further explained that the depth of soil on the roof would range from 3 to 4 inches, but might be as deep as 12 inches. It was stressed that the soil was accounted for in the building elevations and measurement of building height.

Mr. Lutsko also advised that, with the proposed mound and grading to accommodate the subject project, water could not be directed from Lot 14 to Lot 15. He added, that this would be further clarified with the final grading, drainage, and landscape plans submitted with the building permit application.

ASCC members discussed the project and concurred that the plan refinements and clarifications were appropriate and appreciated. Members also concurred that the site plan, and house siting, massing, etc., and general landscape concepts were appropriate, as was the proposed five-foot depth for the roof garden "well." Concerns were expressed over the lack of refinements associated with the proposed exterior materials and colors, and also specifically over the planned use of olive trees outside of the building envelope. Some concerns were expressed over the proposed lighting plans, particularly frequency of use of the E2 lights, as discussed in the staff report, and need for an appropriate light switching plan, i.e., with exterior lights all either manually switched or controlled as required by the building code.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the revised plans as clarified at the 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 for the project:

1. All site development permit committee review conditions shall be complied with to the satisfaction of the reviewer, including the town geologist, town's engineering department (per report dated 12/3/07), and the fire marshal (per memo dated 12/3/07).
2. A final, detailed exterior materials plan, specifying the materials for all house exterior locations shall be provided. This shall be generally consistent with the descriptions provided with the application materials, but shall specify final materials and finishes proposed for all exterior surfaces, including railings, "chimneys," roof terminations, etc. In particular, the final roof materials shall be defined and explained in relationship to the final energy modeling, use of "chimney" features and linkages to the planned house siding surfaces.
4. A final exterior lighting plan, with switching zones and methods shall be provided that addresses the lighting concerns in the 1/24/08 staff report and incorporates the clarifications presented at the ASCC meeting. The plan shall also clarify that all exterior lights shall be manually controlled unless alternative controls are required to satisfy building code requirements.
5. A final landscape plan shall be provided that details planting by location, type and size and also explains the proposed irrigations system(s). The plan shall include the details for the planting of the green "vegetated" roof, if such a roof is part of the final project. The landscape plan shall specifically include elimination of the olive trees proposed in the area between the Lot 14 and 15 building envelopes. If olives are planned they shall only be located within the building envelope, i.e., within the ornamental area allowed for under the PUD provisions. Before the final landscape plan is presented to the ASCC for consideration, it shall be shared with the conservation committee for review and comment.
6. Detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plans shall be provided. Once approved by the ASCC, they shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
7. The approval is granted for either the separate or common (i.e., with Lot 15) driveway options.

The above approval was granted with the understanding that action by the HOA could require the plans to be reconsidered by the ASCC. Also, it was with the understanding that interaction would continue between the applicant and neighbors as the final landscape plan is developed to consider mutual concerns, particularly those of Mr. Perlroth for the area between the building envelopes on Lots 14 and 15. Lastly, while it was understood that there would be continuing interaction between the owners of Lot 14 and 15 regarding the possibility of a common driveway plan, such interaction and plan were not required by the ASCC.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-579, 215 Golden Hills Drive, Debroeck & Heinen

Vlasic presented the January 24, 2008 staff report on this project. He explained that ASCC plan consideration was initiated on January 14, 2008 with a preliminary review, including a site meeting with neighbors and members of the Oak Hills homeowners association. He further explained that while the ASCC found the project generally acceptable, several comments were offered for plan clarification or refinement. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following modified plans received 1/22/08 and, unless otherwise noted, dated 11/9/07, prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects Incorporated:

Sheet A-1, Title Sheet

Sheet 1, Partial Topographic Survey-Existing, Lea & Sung Engineering, Inc., 8/28/07

Sheet A-2, Full Site Plan

Sheet A-3, Partial Site Plan, 11/26/07

Sheet C1.0, Grading Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 9/27/07

Sheet C2.0, Erosion Control Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 9/24/07

Sheet A-4, Floor Plans

Sheet A-5, Roof Plan

Sheet A-6, North and East Elevations

Sheet A-7, South and West Elevations

Sheet L-1.1, Landscape Plan, Willie Lang, Landscape Architect, 9/15/07

Also considered were the "new" cut sheet for the proposed recessed compact florescent light fixture (i.e., for Fixture "A" on Sheet A-3, replacing the original proposal for "A.") and the cut sheets for proposed exterior light fixtures B and C/C1. In addition, the colors and materials board, dated November 30, 2007, found acceptable at the 1/14 meeting, was available for reference as was the project arborist's report dated September 21, 2007, prepared by Net Patchett, certified arborist.

Applicants Nancy Heinen and Dennis DeBroeck were present as were the following design team members:

Bob Stoecker, project architect,

Clare Malone Prichard, project architect

Willie Lang, project landscape architect

Mr. DeBroeck stated that his family purchased the property because of the oak cover and views. He stressed that the arborist was involved early to ensure best practices were followed for tree protection and enhancement and that Mr. Lang was engaged because of his more natural design approach and experience with such properties and use of native plant materials. The following comments and design clarifications were then offered:

- A packet of 8.5" x 11" sheets were provided including the following:

- Revised Proposed Driveway Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 1/28/08
- Pool Equipment (Structure) Section
- Photo image of proposed cable railing
- Photo image of proposed deck underside lattice system

It was stated that the driveway plan responded to the January 14 ASCC meeting recommendations and was being pursued with the fire marshal. (It was noted by the design team and deputy town planner that the fire marshal had expressed a willingness to consider the revised approach to driveway design as recommended by the ASCC.)

The cable railing and deck designs were explained, and it was noted that the plan now is for the house light fixtures to be recessed down lights, rather than the surface mounted lights presented at the 1/14 meeting.

- Willie Lang explained the refinements to the planting plan and discussed the reasons why there was not more reduction in proposed plantings. He stressed that the plantings were to deal with disturbed areas, screen views to landscape and pool wall elements and provide for other desired screening and privacy. He further stressed that the plan was not intended in any way to "overtake" the native planting conditions on the site. Stoecker commented that much of the grass areas of the site had been impacted previously and that most current site grasses were not the same as the original "native" under-story on the property.
- The planned limbing of trees was again reviewed (it was also discussed at the 1/14 site meeting). It was noted that samples from one apparently diseased limb had been sent to a lab for testing to determine if SOD was present. It was noted that if SOD were diagnosed, it would be an unusual occurrence for the area, as no bay tree is present nearby.
- Stoecker commented on the pool location and planned walls for the northern, "infinity" edge. He advised that the design had been fully reconsidered in light of the reactions from ASCC members offered at the 1/14 site meeting. He stressed that the design had been carefully developed to fit site conditions and the needs of the applicant. He clarified that the six foot high pool wall was set back well into the site and was not close to the required yard setback area. He further noted that the wall would not be highly visible from off site especially with implementation of the planned screen plantings.
- In response to questions regarding the planned pool equipment location, it was explained that the site had been selected to ensure minimum potential for view or noise

impacts on neighbors. It was further clarified that the pipes and other utility lines between the pool and equipment structure could be extended with little impact on trees or tree root systems.

- In response to a question regarding the west facing guest parking/driveway turnaround retaining walls, it was noted that the upper wall would be concrete with a continuous foundation, but that the lower wall would be a wood wall with 8-inch square support posts. It was emphasized that the posts would be located to minimize potential for impacts on tree roots and that the project arborist would be involved in this process.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that service access to the pool equipment location would be provided from the house site and that access from the lower street area was not possible or appropriate due to steepness of slope and tree cover.
- In response to a question, it was explained that the vegetable garden would no longer include a conventional fence, i.e., to resolve the ordinance constraints discussed at the 1/14 meeting. It was further clarified that an electric fence is now planned for garden protection against animals. The fence would include a single wire, two feet above ground.
- Given the site constraints and conditions, it is anticipated that a phased construction plan would be needed, with pool construction taking place before start of work on the house. The exact process and phasing of building permits will need to be worked out with planning and building staffs.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and, while finding most of the clarifications and plan refinements acceptable, spent considerable time reviewing with the design team the pool location plan and scope of proposed landscaping. Following this discussion, and the clarifications offered above, members found the plans conditionally acceptable and also agreed that findings could be supported, as discussed in the staff report and evaluated at the 1/14 site meeting, to permit the proposed concentration of floor area.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as clarified at the 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 conditions set forth in the following site development committee reports shall be adhered to the satisfaction of the reviewer:

Public Works/Engineering, 12/4/07
Town Geologist, 1/7/08
Trails committee, 12/12/07

2. A final detailed landscape plan shall be provided that is generally consistent with the Lang plan considered at the 1/28/08 ASCC meeting. The final plan shall, however, be modified to clearly identify and protect the native oak woodland environment on the

slopes below the swimming pool site, and this area shall be specifically called out for protection on the final construction staging and vegetation protection plan. Further, the detailed landscape plan shall include consideration for balancing planting objectives against needs for deer resistant materials. Also, the plan shall identify the location for the proposed "electric" garden fence. Prior to ASCC consideration of the final landscape plan, it shall be referred to the conservation committee for review and comment.

3. The final plan may include either the driveway access shown on the original plan submittal or the access design shown on the Revised "Proposed Driveway Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., 1/28/08." (It was understood that the preference was for the Revised plan, but that this plan was only possible if it or some variation to it were found acceptable by the Fire Marshal.)
4. A sample of the actual proposed roof material shall be provided.
5. The proposed pool equipment access route and pool service plan details shall be provided verifying that access and maintenance can be readily achieved without impacting the slopes and vegetation below the pool and pool terrace area.
6. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided that incorporates the recommendations of the project arborist and addresses the oak woodland protection called for in condition 2 above. Once approved, staging and protection plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Annual Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Vlasic advised that, pursuant to town policy, the ASCC is required to annually elect a chair and vice chair and that this is typically to take place in January. Thereafter, members voted unanimously to elect Breen Chair and Clark Vice Chair. Gelpi was also thanked for his year of Chairmanship of the ASCC.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0-1 (Gelpi), approval of the January 14, 2008 field and regular evening meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

T. Vlasic