

Architectural and Site Control Commission **September 26, 2011**
Special Site Meeting, 50 Pine Ridge Way, Gilbert and
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Aalfs called the special site meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at 50 Pine Ridge Way.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Warr
Absent: Hughes
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others* present relative to the Gilbert application:

Dan Gilbert, applicant
Marc Lindsell, project architect
Kimberly Moses, project landscape designer
Vlad Iojica, project engineer
Drew Marin (?), project contractor
Judy Murphy, Conservation Committee
Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee
Stephanie Knott, 80 Pine Ridge Way
Robert and Ruby Seidl, 40 Pine Ridge Way
Susan Gold, 70 Pine Ridge Way

*Others may have been present and didn't identify themselves and/or may have come or left during the course of the site meeting.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-633, Residential Redevelopment, 50 Pine Ridge Way, Gilbert

Vlastic presented the September 22, 2011 staff report on the preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.4-acre Pine Ridge cul-de-sac property. He advised that while the proposed improvements are in much the same location as the existing development, changes include a new basement, and house and yard elements are resolving a number of site and ordinance compliance matters as explained in the staff report. Vlastic stressed that this is a preliminary review and that after the site meeting and evening ASCC session, project consideration should be continued to the regular October 10, 2011 ASCC meeting.

Vlastic pointed out that while the staff report is generally supportive of the proposal, including the request to concentrate most of the allowed floor area in the main house, there were some issues that need to be addressed or resolved as discussed in the staff report. In particular, he commented on the scope of exterior lighting, side yard "ornamental garden structure" screens, exterior plaster and soffit colors, and the need for a comprehensive construction staging plan.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans and materials.

- Two August 22, 2011 letters from project architect Marc Lindsell. The first discussing the design process leading to the decision to remove the existing house and the reasoning for the request to concentrate the floor area. The second discussing the location of the story poles set to facilitate project review and the story pole site plan with

ground and height elevations and architectural elevations that compare proposed heights and massing to existing conditions.

- The following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated August 22, 2011:

Architectural Plans, 2M Architecture:

Sheet A-0.0, Cover Sheet
Sheet A-1.1, Site Plan & External Building Lighting
Sheet A-1.2, Demo Upper Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.3, Demo Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.4, Proposed Upper Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.5, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.6, Proposed Basement Plan
Sheet A-1.7, Clerestory & Roof Plans
Sheet A-2.1, North Elevations
Sheet A-2.2, East Elevations
Sheet A-2.4, West Elevations
Sheet A-2.5, Perspective Views

Landscape Plans, Kimberly Moses Design:

Sheet L1.1, Landscape Plan
Sheet L1.2, Site Plan Stairs
Sheet L1.3, Site Lighting Plan
Sheet L3.1, Stair Section
Sheet L3.2, Stair Section
Sheet L3.3, Stair Section
Sheet L3.4, Stair Section
Sheet L3.5, West Stair Section
Sheet L5.1, Landscape Detail
Sheet L5.2, Landscape Details, Plant List
Sheet L5.3, Planting Details & Notes

Civil Plans, Vlad G. Iojica, P.E., August 24, 2011:

Sheet 1, Cover Sheet
Sheet 2, Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, 10/25/10
Sheet 3, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet 4, Driveway Plan and Profile
Sheet 5, Site Improvements
Sheet 6, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet 7, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

- Supporting materials from the project architect, the following materials have been provided in support of the application:

--Exterior "Color Palette," dated 8/22/11 that is discussed below and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting.
--Arborist report, McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated January 19, 2011.
--Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received August 24, 2011 (Fixtures F1, F2, F3, F4, F6, F7, and F8).
--Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, received 8/25/11.
--GreenPoint Rated Checklist with 8/25 transmittal letter targeting 197 points for the project whereas the minimum required BIG points is 194.

Dan Gilbert and Marc Lindsell reviewed the history of plan development, noting that it has been a four to five year process of living with site conditions and considering options for additions that finally resulted in the conclusion that the house should be replaced. They stressed the desires to develop a new plan that resolved a number of existing problems, including conflicts with current town standards and building requirements, including those for fire safety, and their objectives for more a sustainable house and landscaping. They reviewed the architectural plans, the story poles, and discussed constraints resulting from site geology, slope, and patterns of prior site grading and development.

Kimberly Moses reviewed the landscape plans and the comments in her September 26, 2011 written presentation on the landscape plans and various elements on the plans. She noted that the lighting plans would be revised to address the comments in the staff report and then discussed the use of the proposed side yard screen elements. She noted that in several cases, these elements replace existing solid board fencing that has been used to provide privacy between parcels.

Mr. Lindsell also advised that the plans would be modified to address the various concerns, including exterior lighting, colors, etc. discussed in the staff report. He and Ms. Moses then led all present on an inspection of site conditions pointing out the proposed changes and noting the sensitive visual and privacy relationships between the properties at the end of the Pine Ridge Way cul-de-sac. He clarified the design elements and elevations and commented on the story poles placed for the site meeting. Ms. Moses reviewed the deck, screen, pathway and other yard improvements proposed, including the changes to the south side pond and lawn area. She explained that the pond and trellis elements would be eliminated and that a seat wall would be used to limit the extent of the new outdoor use area. She asked and received clarifications relative to town lighting standards including the focus of exterior lighting for safety and specific tasks. She also had a sample of the proposed wire mesh that would be used in the side yard landscape screen elements.

At the conclusion of the site inspection, the following public comments were offered.

Susan Gold noted her concern that the new house would have more windows and she asked for clarification of planting on the southeast side, i.e., along the driveway that would help to screen views from her property. Ms. Moses noted the extensive planting shown on the landscape plan.

Ms. Gold also expressed concern over the construction period and the need to ensure that access to properties was not impacted by construction parking, delivery of materials, etc.

Judy Murphy commented that the scope of exterior lighting needed to be reduced.

Stephanie Knott also expressed concern over the construction period and potential light spill. She asked for and received clarification of the design of the front elevation of the house. It was explained that the elevation was essentially only one level and that the clerestory element would not have interior lighting.

Robert Seidl, as the neighbor immediately to the west, spoke in support of the project and the use of the landscape screens for privacy and screening. He also supported the proposed planting and noted that he would likely add some materials on his property too. His only concern was to ensure that construction parking and staging were controlled to limit impacts on access, etc.

Breen advised that since she could not attend the regular evening ASCC meeting due to a personal conflict, she wanted to offer the following comments on the project:

- Generally support the project as proposed, but it is ambitious. Initially concerned with the house elevations, but the site visit helped to clarify existing conditions and the new proposals. Also, support preservation of the large north side pine tree.
- The lighting needs to be scaled back significantly. Also, consideration should be given to the scope of interior lighting that can be seen looking up to the taller interiors from below through the large window areas.
- The landscape palette seems very ambitious and it should be reduced and refined to ensure the materials selected will be the most appropriate, particularly given the site's sandstone soils conditions. Further, there appear to be a number of riparian materials on the plant list that seem inappropriate for the site.
- Consideration should be given to phased removal of the non-native west side trees. This might help reduce the need for the extent of the proposed privacy screens. The east side screens seem appropriate.
- The oaks proposed along the east side of the driveway should be reconsidered. Shrubs and other trees might be considered for necessary screening of views from below, but the oaks will grow to block distant views from above and could lead to the desire to top the trees for view protection. This potential problem could be avoided with a different a modified planting approach.

Other ASCC members advised that they would comment on the project at the evening ASCC meeting.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, Chair Aalfs thanked the applicant, design team members, and neighbors for participation in the review and advised that project discussion would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Chair Aalfs called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Aalfs, Clark, Hughes, Warr

Absent: Breen

Planning Commission liaison: Zaffaroni

Town Council Liaison: None

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Request for re-approval of plans -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-609, 40 Antonio Court, Larson

Vlastic presented the September 22, 2011 staff report on this request for re-approval of plans for this project that would otherwise expire at the end of December of this year. He clarified that the current application is for approval of the exactly the same plans and with the same conditions as established with the ASCC approvals granted on December 14, 2009 and January 11, 2010 and the February 3, 2010 planning commission action on the site development permit. Vlastic concluded that based on the comments in the staff report and the extensive review previously given to the plans, staff was recommending approval of the request.

ASCC members considered the staff report and briefly discussed the proposal with applicant Robert Larson and project architect Michael Pierry.

Public comments were then requested. **Mr. Rene Lacerte, 35 Antonio Court**, stated general support for the request, but worried about impacts on the driveway that he shares with Mr. Larson in the easement across the "Lacerte" property. He noted that his house project is now nearing completion and that he hoped the Larson project would include provisions for repair to his driveway if it is completed before the Larson project moves ahead.

Mr. Larson responded by stating that the driveway easement agreement that he has entered into with Mr. Lacerte specifically addresses this matter and that it provides for repair of the driveway if the Larson project proceeds after completion of the Lacerte project.

Vlastic advised that typically the town's public works director would require driveway repairs as part of the final issuance of project permits and that such a condition could be added if the easement agreement does not include provisions for driveway repair. He noted, however, that if the agreement does provide for repairs, then there may be no need for the condition.

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0, approval of the plans as requested, subject to the condition for repair of the driveway on the Lacerte

property, as outlined by the town planner at the meeting, unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of town staff that the driveway easement agreement between the neighbors covers the repair matter.

Follow-up Review – Proposed final landscape plan and new proposal for driveway entry gate, 5592 Alpine Road, Letteroff

Vlasic presented the September 22, 2011 staff report on the status of this follow-up review matter. He explained that the ASCC last considered the project in February of 2010 and, at that time while a number of issues were outstanding, the main issue was the development of a final landscape plan to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Vlasic noted that a landscape plan had been drafted and shared with ASCC member Breen on September 21st and that based on review of the draft plan, some refinements were determined necessary, and it was also concluded that some additional data should be developed in support of the plan. Vlasic clarified that as a result, and to ensure adequate time for review of the revised plans and materials, it was agreed that consideration of this agenda item should be continued to the regular October 10, 2011 ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, the follow-up review was continued to the October 10th ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-633, Residential Redevelopment, 50 Pine Ridge Way, Gilbert

Vlasic presented the September 22, 2011 staff report on the preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.4-acre Pine Ridge cul-de-sac property. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting and the comments offered during the course of that meeting. (Refer to the above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Dan Gilbert and design team members Marc Lindsell, Kimberly Moses and Vlad Iojoca were present to discuss the project further with ASCC members. (They were present at the site meeting and their respective responsibilities were noted in the above minutes from that meeting.) They offered the following comments in response to matters discussed at the site meeting and ASCC questions:

- The proposed plaster siding color will be modified to be consistent with town policies. A larger sample of the proposed wood panel siding was presented for reference.
- The soffit plaster color is desired as it would extend visually into the inside of the house. *(After discussion with ASCC members, it was agreed that the color for the soffit plaster would be revised to meet the town's light reflectivity limit of 50%.)*
- The lighting plan will be revised and use of the "strip" and "bar" lights eliminated. Further, the concern over interior lighting will be addressed, likely at this point through a description of the intentions for interior lighting, particularly to ensure minimum potential for light spill through the tall windows.
- The grading for the basement will likely be approximately 1,100 cubic yards with the majority hauled away from the site.

Public comments were requested. **Robert Turcott, 60 Pine Ridge Way**, pointed out that he was the eastside neighbor and spoke in support of the design. He further discussed the relationship of the properties at the end of the cul-de-sac and supported the proposed landscape screen elements for privacy and screening. He noted that they will help replace the existing wood wall screen elements.

ASCC members then discussed the project and concluded that it was generally appropriate as designed and a positive response to site conditions. Members, however, did offer the following comments, in addition to those provided in the staff report and by Breen at the site meeting (particularly relative to house and yard lighting), for consideration in finalizing plans prior to the next ASCC review scheduled for the October 10, 2011 regular meeting:

- The soffit color needs to be consistent with town light reflectivity policy limits.
- The proposed finishes for the railings appear to be very reflective and due to the scope of the railing elements a less reflective finish needs to be used.
- The side yard paths with retaining walls seem very architectural. While physical constraints on the site are appreciated, consideration should be given to access pathways that are less architectural and structural. This should also include consideration of the use of planting for screening and privacy, as an alternative to the landscape screens with trellis extensions. This is mainly an issue relative to the proposals for the west side and less of concern relative to the proposals for the east side. The west side improvements should be moved further from the property line.
- Consider more off-sets or breaks in the landscape screen/trellis features so they have a somewhat more organic form. Considering removing the trellis elements.
- Consider a somewhat small upper deck.
- The landscape plan should provide for early planting of the screen materials along the east side of the driveway.
- A detailed construction staging plan will be needed.

Following discussion, project consideration was continued to the October 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Hughes moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 3-0-1 (Warr) approval of the September 12, 2011 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

T. Vlasic