

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

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

*Vlastic stated that Warr had called him at the end of the day to advise he was sick and was not intending to come to the meeting unless there was a quorum problem.

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

Follow-up -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-635 for new residential development – 3 Thistle (Lot 3004 Portola Valley Ranch), Portola Valley Associates

Vlastic presented the March 21, 2012 staff report on this follow-up project submittal. He reviewed the March 14, 2012 letter from Torin Knorr, project architect, and the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated March 13, 2012 and prepared by Knorr Architecture, and explained how they responded to the February 12, 2012 ASCC approval conditions:

- Sheet A 1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet A 2.1, Floor Plan
- Sheet A 2.4, Building Elevations
- Sheet A 2.5, Building Elevations
- Sheet A 2.7, Exterior Lighting
- Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 3/1/12
- Sheet L-1, Mandatory Landscape Plan, Galli and Associates, 3/8/12
- Sheet L-2, Optional Landscape Plan, Galli and Associates, 3/8/12

Vlastic also reviewed the proposed skylight and east side deck changes discussed in the letter from the project architect and evaluated in the March 21st staff report.

Applicants Joe and Mike Whelan and Torin Knorr presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following additional comments and clarifications.

- On March 23rd the revised deck plans were shared with Rex Brooks, owner of 1 Thistle, i.e., the currently vacant property immediately to the east. Mr. Brooks was supportive of the changes during the 3/23 meeting.
- The applicant is agreeable to revise the lighting plans by removing one, i.e., east side, light fixture on the front elevation of the garage as recommended in the staff report.

Breen asked about removing the east side oak tree near the proposed mounding as requested in the March 24, 2012 email transmittal from Christopher Berg, 4 Thistle Street, to open views between 1 and 3 Thistle. Mr. Knorr responded that this tree was important to screening between 1 and 3 Thistle and that likely Mr. Brooks, owner of 1 Thistle, would be very concerned with its removal. (**Note:** *The email from Mr. Berg was sent directly to ASCC members. Planning staff and the applicant did not receive knowledge of it or its request until the ASCC meeting.*)

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Breen commented that while she found the follow-up submittal acceptable, she did encourage the applicant to consider additional thinning and removal of oaks to open views as site landscaping proceeded. She stressed that, in her opinion and based on current town landscape guidelines and standards, the Portola Valley Ranch development was over planted. Further, she noted that, as requested by the ASCC, the site plans call for removal of redwood trees, but a note on Sheet C-1 of the engineering plans still provides for protective boxing around the redwood trees. She stated that this note should be removed from the sheet and Mr. Knorr agreed. Other ASCC members concurred with the comments offered by Breen.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0, approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The lighting plans shall be revised to eliminate the light fixture shown on the east side of the front elevation of the garage.
2. Sheet C-1 shall be revised to remove the note calling for boxing of the redwood trees and shall include a note that the redwood trees shall be removed with project construction.

Architectural Review -- proposed residential additions and remodeling, new guest house, pool, and related yard and driveway improvements, 25 Bear Gulch Drive, Richardson/Tabibiazar

Vlasic presented the March 21, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing two-story 4,007 sf, traditional design residence, with attached garage, on the subject 1.1-acre, Alpine Hills property. He clarified that the project also proposes replacement of a detached shed with a new guest house, replacement of the existing swimming pool with a new pool and other yard and landscaping improvements, e.g., new guest parking spaces, driveway surface changes, new entry gate, front yard fencing, etc.

Vlasic noted that while the staff review found no major issues with the project, there were a number of details discussed in the staff report, including need for arborist input on potential tree impacts, that need to be addressed before building permits should be issued for the planned work. He also noted that an email had been received by the town earlier in the day from Lela Blankenberg, 15 Bear Gulch Drive, expressing concerns relative to light spill and potential privacy impacts of new window areas.

Vlasic reviewed the March 24, 2012 report from the conservation committee received after the release of the ASCC packets on March 23, 2012. He noted that many of the planting

and other comments and concerns presented in the report were similar to those offered in the March 21st staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report, recent communications and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by the Hyland Design Group and dated 2/28/12:

- Sheet A0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet 1, Topographic and Survey Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 1/26/12
- Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, DMG Engineering, Inc., 1/17/12
- Sheet A2, Existing Floor Plans
- Sheet A3, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
- Sheet A4, Proposed Upper Floor Plan
- Sheet A5, Exterior Elevations (Front and Rear)
- Sheet A6, Exterior Elevations (Left and Right Sides)
- Sheet A7, Guest House Floor Plan, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet GB1, Build-It-Green Checklist, Energy Design Group, 1/24/12

Landscape Plans -- Zeterre Landscape Architecture, 1/11/12:

- Sheet L1.0, Title Sheet
- Sheet L2.0, Construction Layout Plan
- Sheet L3.0, Construction Details 1
- Sheet L3.1, Construction Details 2
- Sheet L4.0, Lighting Plan
- Sheet L5.0, Planting Plan
- Sheet L6.0, Planting Specifications
- Sheet L7.0, Irrigation Plan
- Sheet L8.0, Irrigation Specifications

Also considered were the following materials submitted as part of the application and received on February 29, 2012:

- Light fixture “cut” sheet for proposed wall mounted lights.
- Color images of existing house and pool area conditions.
- Color image for proposed stone siding.
- Completed Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist dated 2/6/11 (should be dated 2/6/12)

Project designer Natalie Hyland and project landscape architects Jerrod Baumann and David Griffin (?), presented the plans to the ASCC. They also presented a video animation of the proposed improvements; and, during and after the presentation, offered the comments and clarifications set forth below. (**Note:** *the applicant was also present in the audience and provided input on background and existing conditions during the course of the project presentation.*)

- The applicants have owned the property for approximately two years. Since the purchase a number of improvements have been made to the existing house and this included stucco cladding and new off white windows and patio/French doors. The current color scheme was found acceptable by the town when the permits were issued for the recent work.

- The plans are to preserve the recently installed windows, with a “linen” finish cladding, and all new windows would match these “existing” windows. While the photo images submitted with the application and the video animation suggest a darker trim color, the proposal is actually to continue to make use of the existing tan stucco and white trim color scheme.
- An arborist has been consulted relative to potential tree impacts, but an “arborists report” has yet to be prepared. The intent is clearly to minimize impacts on trees and the plans have been developed with full consideration for tree protection. In any case, an arborist report will be prepared and submitted to the town with the final plans.
- The proposed rear yard barbeque and other proposed permanent improvements will be removed to address the concerns noted in the staff report.
- Both the proposed lower lawn area and the parking area have been developed with protection of the oaks in mind. The proposed lower lawn was previously an irrigated lawn that was allowed to return to grass land. In response to a question, it was noted that some consideration was given to grading the lower lawn “bench” to a more natural topographic condition, but concerns were identified with potential impacts of earth movement on the established roots of the adjacent oaks.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the oleanders would be removed from the site. It was also noted that a “no-mow” or meadow seed mix would be used for the lower lawn and that would satisfy the needs of the applicants for an outdoor play area.
- In response to a question, it was noted that no lights were planned for the lower lawn and that the lighting plan could be modified to eliminate lights along the path to the lawn. It was clarified that the desire is, however, to ensure safe night access from the guest parking area to the upper house.
- The existing columns at the driveway intersection with Bear Gulch Drive would be removed and replaced with the new gate and columns as shown on the plans. The proposed gate and columns have been designed to conform to town standards, and would be connected to the side property lines with a four-foot high fence. The fence will be detailed on future plans and the design and alignment have been developed to ensure that, with landscaping, the fence would not be a linear or strong visual element.
- The property is served by a septic tank and leachfield system. The plans do not show the location of either the septic tank or the leachfields. The applicant is aware that the septic tank is located in the northeast corner of the property. It was believed that the leachfields are located along the east side, between the driveway and easterly parcel boundary, but this has not been verified. The system will be identified on the final building permit plans and it is understood that with the new guest house that San Mateo County will need to approve the project for added system use.
- Exterior lighting plans were reviewed in more detail and it was noted that the plans would be revised to address concerns in the staff report and removal of lights along the paths to the lower lawn area. Further, it was noted that the guest parking area steps could be lighted for safety with fixtures in the steps rather than the taller path lights now shown on the plans. Also, it was clarified that exterior lights would be manually switched and not on timers or have switching controlled by motion sensors.

- In response to a question regarding removal of some established ornamental plantings along parcel boundaries, e.g., pines, liquid ambers, Deodara cedars, the owner clarified that in some discussions with neighbors, there has been the desire to preserve these or phase their removal to ensure existing privacy is not lost. Also, it was clarified that some of the existing plants in question, like north side redwoods, were actually on the neighboring parcel.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members then discussed the project and also agreed that the basic proposals for the house, guest house and site improvements were acceptable, but that a number of details needed attention including a comprehensive review of project plans by a certified arborist. Some concerns were discussed over the landscape plans, scope of planting, including irrigated lawn area and use of non-native plant materials. Further, the proposed exterior materials and finishes were discussed and members concurred the siding and trim should conform to town policies on Light Reflectivity Value (LRV) limits, although it was agreed that the proposed continued use of the off white clad windows used with the recent house remodeling project was acceptable.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the proposed plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting and subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A comprehensive exterior lighting plan shall be provided that identifies all existing lighting to remain and all new proposed lighting. The plan shall include at least the modifications discussed at the ASCC meeting and in the staff report and shall provide for elimination of any existing exterior spot or flood lights. Light switching patterns shall be identified.
2. The plans shall be revised to eliminate the proposed permanent rear yard setback area barbeque, dining and fireplace improvements.
3. The plans shall be revised to identify the locations of the existing septic tank and leachfield lines.
4. The plans shall be reviewed by a certified arborist and the arborist report provided to the town. The plans shall be revised as necessary to conform to the recommendations of the arborist to ensure tree protection during construction and long-term tree health. The report shall also consider the oaks in the lower lawn/bench area and determine if any change to existing fill is needed to ensure long-term tree health.
5. A comprehensive materials and colors board shall be provided that demonstrates that siding, trim and roof colors are within town LRV limits. The plans may, however, continue to use the same off-white clad windows and patio/French doors used with the recent house remodeling.
6. The landscape plan shall be revised to address the plant material concerns in the March 24, 2012 report from the conservation committee. In particular, there shall be more use of native materials, the "lower" lawn shall be a meadow or no-mow, drought tolerant native grass, and the scope of planting along the driveway south of the entry gate shall be significantly reduced. If any planting is proposed between the driveway and Bear Gulch Drive, it shall be minimal, with plants from the town's preferred planting list and

shall not extend into the public right of way. Further, the final landscape plan shall provide for removal of oleanders on the property and, over time, phased removal and/or replacement of the non-native trees with materials from the town's preferred plant list.

7. Complete plans for the proposed front yard fencing shall be provided.

Architectural Review -- proposed residential additions, 280 Willowbrook Drive, Frangione/Vaughan

Vlasic presented the March 21, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of plans for single story additions, totaling 702 sf, to the existing single level, 2,721 sf residence on the subject 1.1-acre, Willowbrook Drive property. He discussed the background associated with the previous August 2011 ASCC review and approval of guest house plans for the property, now implemented, and current building permit proposals for addition of a swimming pool and related site improvements, including fencing. He explained that the subject project is the third phase of work on the property since the property was purchased by the current owners and that it would include the house additions as well as modifications to the house entry porch and some pathway and exterior lighting changes.

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following project plans, dated February 6, 2012, prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet: T-0.2, Build-It-Green
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Also considered were cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures "A," "D" and "E" and an exterior finish board, dated 8/10/12 and received by the town 3/12/12. It was noted that the exterior finishes would match those approved for and installed on the completed guest house.

Applicants Tom Frangione and Becky Vaughan and project architect Kevin Schwarckopf presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The problem with the height of the recently installed south side fencing, as discussed in the staff report, has been corrected.
- The front yard landscaping will remain in place while the subject project is being constructed. After the construction the approved front yard fencing will be improved, the oleanders removed and some new landscaping installed.
- The existing mailbox pillar discussed in the staff report was installed by the previous owner and there are no plans for changes at this time.
- Flood plain clearance from the property was provided with the guest house project and the certification for clearance is on file with the town.
- The exterior lighting plans will be modified to provide for removal of existing spot lights and to also make the pathway light changes recommended in the staff report. The applicant is willing to reduce the number of lights at the front entry porch from four to

three rather than from four to two as recommended in the staff report. The changes were discussed with the ASCC and members found use of three lights in the entry porch area acceptable.

- While the proposed finish board calls for the house to be fully re-roofed with the same dark charcoal asphalt shingles used on the guest house, it is possible that only a portion of the existing roof would be impacted by the current project. Due to cost constraints, it is requested that the applicant be permitted to either use the new dark charcoal shingles or, if a large portion of the existing roof can be preserved, to complete the project using the existing ELK Prestique "Shakewood" shingles, with a dark brown/dark tan color mix.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion, ASCC members found the project acceptable and concurred that the roof options requested by the applicant were acceptable. Koch then moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the project 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. The exterior lighting plan shall be revised to identify all existing spot/flood lights and specify their removal with this project. Further, the plans shall be modified to:
 - Reduce the number of wall mounted fixtures at the front entry from four to three.
 - Eliminate one of the three pathway lights along the path from the street to the front door.
 - Eliminate one of the three pathway lights proposed along the west side of the garage.
2. The plans may be modified to provide for the roof options requested by the applicant at the ASCC meeting.
3. Once the house additions are framed, the applicant shall provide a proposed front yard landscape plan to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. The plan shall provide for removal of the oleanders and new planting consistent with the comments offered in the staff report and at the ASCC meeting, i.e., that extensive landscaping is not intended, but that the planting be consistent with town planting guidelines, particularly for front yard areas, that the landscaping be in concert with the approved new front yard fencing plans. It was further noted that the intent was to provide for planting only immediately along the street frontage and not for any extensive changes in the front yard area.

Proposed Changes to Appeals and Permit Time Limits

Vlasic reviewed the January 20, 2012 report from the town planner to the planning commission explaining the subject proposed zoning and site development ordinances changes. He noted that this matter was being shared with the ASCC for information and comment as discussed in the March 21, 2012 report to the ASCC.

Vlasic also reviewed the planning commission comments offered during the March 21st commission study session on the proposed changes. He advised that while planning commissioners suggested some wording modifications, they were supportive of the recommended changes to the appeal and permit time limits as set forth in the January 20, 2012 report. He also advised that any ASCC comments would be transmitted to the planning commission for consideration during the public hearing process on the proposed ordinance amendments.

ASCC members indicated general support for the proposed amendments and offered no specific comments on them. Further, public comment was allowed for, but none was offered.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Koch and passed 3-0-1 (Clark), approval of the March 12, 2012 special field meeting minutes as drafted.

Breen moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0, approval of the March 12, 2012 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

T. Vlasic