

Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Warr
Absent: Hughes
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: Gilbert
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Prior to consideration of the following application Warr temporarily left the meeting room noting that his firm was providing the architectural services for the project.

Architectural Review for new driveway entry gate and fencing, 4 Grove Court, Howe

Vlastic briefly reviewed the comments in the July 6, 2011 staff report on this application for installation of a new metal, four-foot high driveway entry gate and associated fencing and fieldstone covered gate support columns on the subject 1.2-acre Grove Court parcel. He explained that the applicant was still working to resolve issues as noted in the staff report and that further continuance has been requested to the July 25, 2011 ASCC meeting. He noted that neighbors and other interested parties were informed of the continuance request.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the July 25, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for Remodeling and house additions, 111 Tan Oak Drive, Russell

Vlastic presented the July 6, 2011 staff report on this proposal for approval of the addition of 369 sf of living area to an existing two-story, 2,596 sf residence, on the subject .28-acre Brookside Park property. He clarified that the plans include remodeling of the existing main level family room, kitchen and dining area at the rear of the existing house with roof changes to this area and that the addition would be at the main, entry level and include a new entry hall and media/living room.

Vlastic explained that the plans can be completed with minimum grading or vegetation removal, but would result in 88% of the allowed floor area being concentrated in the main house. He noted that this is over the 85% limit and the concentration of floor area is only possible subject to specific findings being made by the ASCC. He discussed these findings, as evaluated in the staff report, and concluded that in this case the ASCC could make the findings.

Vlasic then noted that the project plans had been revised since preparation of the staff report and that the revised plans had been distributed by email to ASCC members earlier in the day. He explained that the revised plans received July 11, 2011 correct the daylight plane issue discussed in the staff report. The ASCC considered the revised proposal as presented on the following plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by CJW Architecture and received by the town July 11, 2011:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet, 7/5/11
Sheet: T-0.2, Key Notes, B.I.G. Checklist, 6/10/2011
Sheet 1 of 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey Plan, BGT Land Surveying, Mar. 2010
Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plans, 6/10/11
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
Sheet: A-1.2, Construction Staging and Site Plan, 6/10/11
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan
Sheet: A-2.2, Roof Plan
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations, Sections
Sheet: A-3.2, Exterior Elevations

Also considered by the ASCC were the:

- Cut sheets for the proposed pendant, wall mounted and stair light fixtures all received by the town June 14, 2011
- * Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 6/21/11
- Colors and materials board, 6/21/11, revised 7/7/11 to include a darker trim color (i.e., KM-228 "Charro")

Mrs. Russell and Mark Sutherland, project architect, presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They noted that they would likely further refine the revised plans relative to the clerestory feature over the new entry addition to ensure it blends better with the other elevation forms.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project and stated support for it and for the proposed concentration of floor area as evaluated in the staff report.

Following discussion Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the revised plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. The design of the clerestory entry feature may be refined with the final design subject to review and approval by planning staff.
3. With issuance of the building permit, provision shall be made for a site check and the possible addition of one screen planting shrub or tree on the north side of the new addition. This site check shall take place prior to final of the building permit by a designated member. Site conditions shall be checked by the designated member and the added screening provided if determined necessary.

Following consideration of the Russell application Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Architectural Review for House Additions, 15 Coalmine View, Portola Valley Ranch, Sohn

Vlasic presented the July 6, 2011 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 206 sf of floor area to the existing multi-level, flat and pitch roof, 4,174 sf residence, on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. He noted that the additions represent very minor changes to the current house design, scale and massing. He also clarified that the revised plans before the ASCC for action include all of the design adjustments requested in the June 3, 2011 Ranch design committee approval letter.

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following project plans unless otherwise noted revised through 6/20/11 and prepared by Harrell Remodeling:

- Sheet A.1, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A1.1.1, Existing & Demo Plan (Basement)
- Sheet A1.2.1, Proposed Floor Plan (Basement)
- Sheet A1.1.2, Existing & Demo Plan (First Floor)
- Sheet A1.2.2, Proposed Floor Plan (First Floor)
- Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations (Existing and Proposed Front)
- Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations (Existing and Proposed Rear)
- Sheet A3.3, Exterior Elevations (Existing and Proposed East Side)
- Sheet A3.4, Exterior Elevations (Existing and Proposed West Side)
- Sheet A3.5, Solar Layout

Also considered were plans were the following details presented on sheets received by the town on June 21, 2011:

- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixture
- Details for the roofing, awnings and hot tub and the proposed frosted glass door
- Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, dated 6/20/11
- BIG Existing Home Checklist targeting 108 BIG points

It was also noted that the application states that all new improvements would match existing materials and finishes, including decks and railings. Vlasic clarified that existing wood siding, trim and fascia boards are all finished in a darker, chocolate brown color.

Project design team representatives Iris Harrell and Winnie Hung presented the proposal to the ASCC. They presented a sample of the proposed awning color that was in medium tan/taupe shades and all agreed it would work well in the proposed location.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered:

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the project as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
2. The application plans shall be clarified to specify the awning material by manufacturer and color.

Architectural Review for new driveway entry gate and fencing, 1135 Westridge Drive, Rachleff

Vlasic presented the July 6, 2011 staff report on this proposal for installation of a new redwood clad, four-foot high, metal driveway entry gate and associated fencing on the subject 1.9-acre Westridge Drive parcel. The ASCC considered the gate proposal as shown on the enclosed "Rachleff Entry Gate," plan, Sheet L-1A, dated 5/17/11, prepared by Walker Warner Architects.

Vlasic noted that the proposed four-foot high gate was designed to town horse fence standards and would be across the recently constructed driveway, over 160 feet east of the Westridge Drive and well out of the front yard 50-foot setback area. He clarified that the gate would be supported by redwood clad steel posts and connected to existing, recently repaired north side yard fencing by a six-foot high post and rail fence matching the design of the proposed gate. On the south side, the gate would be connected to existing tennis court fencing by a six-foot high fence of the same design proposed for the north side connection to the property line. Vlasic explained that a north side six-foot high fence connection to the existing fence could not be higher than four feet for conformity to the town's fence standards.

No one was present to represent the applicant and, while public comments were requested, none were offered.

After brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the gate and fencing plan as proposed subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit for the new gate:

1. The fence extension in the northerly side yard shall be reduced from six feet in height to four feet in height.
2. The white oleanders on front side of the applicant's neighboring property (i.e., 1125 Westridge Drive) shall be removed.
3. No additional landscaping shall be installed other than was shown on the approved landscape plan for the new house project at 1135 Westridge Drive.

(Immediately following completion of the above action an applicant representative did arrive and he was informed of the action. He advised that the side yard six-foot high fence had been modified already to conform to the four foot height limit.)

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0-1 (Warr), approval of the June 27, 2011 minutes with the following corrections:

Page 3. Change the last sentence in the first bullet point under ASCC comments on the Chen project to read, "The new oaks should be planted further uphill, closer to the features to be screened, so that the screening will be more effective in a shorter period of time and so that the lower meadow areas would be returned to a more open, oak-grassland condition."

Page 5. Correct the order of words in the comments from Jon Silver at the top of the page to state, ". . . planting of redwoods under oaks will jeopardize the oaks."

Page 8. Correct condition 2.a. in the first sentence to read ". . . the redwood trees and other non-natives and invasive plant materials along the Golden Oak Drive frontage."

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

T. Vlastic