

Architectural and Site Control Commission **September 12, 2011**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni (arrived at 8:50 p.m.)
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Follow-up Review, Architectural Review for Garage Replacement, 155 Grove Drive, Reimund

Vlasic presented the September 8, 2011 staff report on this follow-up item. He explained that the project was conditionally approved by the ASCC on July 25, 2011 and that the revised plans listed below have been submitted to the town to address the approval conditions. The following plans were prepared by Scott Design Associates:

Sheet: A-1.1, Title Sheet and Site Plan, June 20, 2011
Sheet: A-2.1, Garage/Barn Plans and Elevations, June 20, 2011
Sheet: A-3.1, Electrical Plan, June 20, 2011
Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, August 18, 2011

In addition to the plans, the ASCC considered the Tree Preservation Report dated August 9, 2011 from Econo Tree Service, Inc.

Applicant Darci Reimund and Audry Kamomoto (?) from Scott Design Associates presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered the following plan clarifications:

- No pathway lights are planned and the plans will be corrected to remove the reference to pathway lights. It was noted that the proposed lights would be manually controlled except where another control is needed to meet building code requirements.
- The landscape plans would be revised to address the comments in the staff report relative to the linear nature of plantings proposed around the border of the property.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the pines on the site would likely be removed over time as other plant materials mature.
- Relative to the gate and entry fence features noted in the staff report, the details have yet to be defined. The intent, however, is to use these features, located outside of any required setback areas, to inform and guide visitors to the front door of the main house.

- The proposed use of Silverberry is desired because this plant has proven to be a good choice for the sites soil conditions. In response to a concern expressed over the relatively short life for the proposed 'Dark Star' Ceanothus, Ms. Reimund advised that she was willing to consider alternatives and would appreciate any recommendations the ASCC might make.
- In response to a comment that Prunus lyonii would be a better choice than Prunus ilicifolia, Ms. Reimund advised she would consider this in revising the landscape plan.
- In response to a comment relative to the approved metal roof material, it was noted that the material is the same as approved by the town for use on the existing residence and that it would only weather slightly over time.

Public comments were requested. **Craig Brandman, 99 Stonegate Road**, reviewed the issues in his July 19, 2011 letter to the ASCC and expressed concern over the proposed metal roof, building height and impacts on views in the neighborhood. He commented that several neighbors viewed this project as a significant change to the character of the area. He further requested more screen planting.

Ms. Reimund advised that she also had talked to several neighbors and that they all stated support for the project. She commented on other conditions in the area that she viewed as impacting views from her property and her privacy.

Vlasic advised that the project had been approved with conditions on July 25, 2011 and that the only purpose of this review was to ensure that the approval conditions were adequately addressed. He clarified that both the building design, with height and copula, and metal roof were approved.

Following consideration of the data in the staff report, and information provided at the ASCC meeting, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the follow-up submittal as clarified subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of the building permit:

1. The proposed landscape plan shall be revised to address the comments in the 9/8/11 staff report and the plant selection issues discussed at the ASCC meeting. Once approved, the plans shall be implemented prior to sign-off on the building permits for the project. This, however, shall include field placement of key screen plantings to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member, prior to framing inspection and sign-off of framing by the building official. The intent is to have the framing in place to be used for reference in placement of key screen plantings.
2. The plans shall be revised to remove the note referencing pathway lights.
3. The plans shall be revised to include details for the proposed ornamental gate and fence next to a circular feature, southwest of the new garage site.

All members commented that they appreciated the efforts made by the applicant and project design team to address the conditions. Clark encouraged continued interaction between neighbors relative to concerns and neighborhood issues.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Warr left the ASCC meeting. He noted that he would not participate in the discussion due to the architectural services his firm provides to a neighbor of the Pratt property, i.e., the Lefteroff property. He also noted that since there was a quorum for the minutes he would not return to the meeting this evening.

Proposed Lot Line Adjustment X6D-212, Alpine Road (Rapley & Simonic Trails), Lands of Deborah & Crawford Pratt

Vlasic presented the September 8, 2011 report to the ASCC and the data in the September 1, 2011 report to the planning commission on this application for lot line adjustment for the lands of Mr. and Mrs. Pratt located on the southwest hillsides of the town. He advised that the ASCC should consider the report and offer any comments for planning commission consideration in conducting its public hearing on the application and that the public hearing is tentatively scheduled for the September 21, 2011 commission meeting.

Vlasic advised that since the 9/8 report was prepared the applicant has advised that he has records showing easements for access for an existing driveway from Simonic Trail over the two parcels north of the subject site and that this driveway could be used for access to the larger of the two adjusted parcels. Vlasic noted that documentation for the "easements" would need to be provided to the satisfaction of the town with any specific development proposal. He clarified, however, that this was not a lot line adjustment matter.

Vlasic also noted that revised plat and legal descriptions had been received addressing the parcel area matter discussed in the September 1, 2011 staff report.

Mr. and Mrs. Pratt were present and noted they had no additional comments to offer at this time. Public input was then requested, but none was offered.

ASCC members considered the staff report materials and all members concluded that the lot line adjustment proposal seemed reasonable given the site and area conditions and factors reviewed in the staff report. Members agreed they had no concerns or issues to identify for planning commission consideration.

Approval of Minutes

Hughes moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0-1 (Breen), approval of the August 22, 2011 minutes with the following corrections:

Page 2. In the eighth line of the first full paragraph from the top of the page change "Lap" to "Lab."

Page 5. In the third full bullet item from the top of the page change "intrusive" to "invasive."

In addition to the changes, Breen noted that on the Cashin approval granted at the 8/22 meeting she had an observation for clarification. Specifically, she noted that while she did not participate in the project review, she hoped that the condition relative to removing the front house elevation up lights would include the spotlights at the garage. Vlasic clarified

that if the plans do continue to show changes at the garage, then any lighting at the garage would need to be brought into compliance with town standards. He noted that he would so advise planning and building staff.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

T. Vlastic