

Architectural and Site Control Commission **June 25, 2012**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California and
Special Site Session, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Rubin

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, Warr
Absent: Koch
Planning Commission liaison: Von Feldt
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Agenda Organization and Modifications

Hughes advised that after consideration of agenda items 4a., 5a., and 6, the meeting would continue at the special site session at 120 Golden Hills Drive to consider agenda item 4b. He further advised that he would not participate in agenda 4a., 4b., or 6 as he is conflicted on the first two and was not at the June 11th meeting and, therefore, could not act on the minutes. He clarified that after consideration of item 5a., he would leave the ASCC meeting and, thereafter, Breen would chair the meeting.

After brief discussion, and given the forgoing, it was agreed that the agenda should be reorganized and that agenda item 5a. would be considered first.

Prior to consideration of the following project, Warr temporarily removed himself from the ASCC meeting room. He explained that he was conflicted from participating in the review as his architectural firm is doing a project for a neighbor within 300 feet of the Cervantes Road property.

Architectural Review for Garage Addition, 245 Cervantes Road, Choi

Vlastic presented the June 21, 2012 staff report on this proposal for demolition of an existing attached carport and construction, in essentially the same place as the carport, of a new attached garage. He explained that the work is part of an ongoing project for renovation of the existing contemporary design residence and other site features on the subject 1.0-acre, Cervantes Road property.

Vlastic clarified that, as evaluated in the staff report, there are no significant concerns or questions with the garage project, but that there are a few issues that have been raised in the June 19, 2012 email from neighbor Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive. He noted that these are related to existing improvements along the property common with the Fanton property and that these are also evaluated in the staff report. Vlastic noted that the garden shed matter is considered a non-conforming, pre-existing condition, but that the issue of plan accuracy relative to the subject project driveway, and particularly the driveway

extending on to the Fanton property, should be addressed as part of impervious surface considerations as suggested in the staff report.

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

- Sheet CDA-6, Carport Conversion Plan & Details, McKim Design Group, 5/16/12
- Sheet CDA-7, Carport Conversion Elevations, McKim Design Group, 5/16/12
- Sheet S1, Standards Details, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12
- Sheet S2, Foundation & First Floor Framing Plan, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12
- Sheet S3, Structural Details, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12
- An exterior materials sheet, received 6/1/12
- Cut sheet for proposed "Progress Lighting" wall mounted cylinder light fixture, received 6/1/12
- Completed Build It Green checklist received 6/1/12 targeting 32 BIG points whereas a minimum of 25 would be required for this self-certified "Elements" project

Applicants Michele Ono and George Choi, and project architect Kirk McKim, presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments, largely in response to the concerns raised in the June 19, 2012 email from neighbor Gary Fanton.

- The concerns of Mr. Fanton were reviewed with him at the time of property purchase. Survey work was completed and it is recognized that the pavement and fencing do extend onto the neighboring parcel. Mr. Fanton has been informed that the matter will be resolved and, in particular, the fencing can be moved to the property line.
- In any case, the intent is to continue discussions with Mr. Fanton to resolve any of his concerns and this will be done between neighbors.
- The building permit plan submittal will include information to satisfy the recommendations in the staff report for a comprehensive lighting plan and relative to impervious surface area. Further, the on-going work in the rear yard area associated with the existing pool and garden structure is to repair and replace existing impervious surfaces and not add new impervious surface area.
- In response to a question regarding any plans for removal of the large eucalyptus trees, it was noted that there are no plans at this time, but this might be considered. It was noted that this would be costly. (Marianne Plunder from the conservation committee offered concerns over wind breaking branches from the trees and these traveling to the meadow or even the house.)

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the plans and encouraged the applicant to work with his neighbor regarding the property line issues. Clark encouraged the applicant to manage the "meadow" area on the property between the house and Cervantes Road to control invasive materials like star thistle before the plants go to seed. It was also agreed that if the eucalyptus trees are removed, a plan for landscaping along the parcel frontage should be provided to a designated ASCC member for review and approval.

Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise

noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to release of a building permit:

1. Materials and finishes for the garage doors shall be specified.
2. A comprehensive house and yard lighting plan shall be provided that is consistent with current town standards and guidelines.
3. The site plan shall be modified to correctly show all site impervious surface area and calculations for the scope of the area shall be provided for the record to the satisfaction of town planning staff.
4. If, prior to completion of the project, removal of the eucalyptus trees along Cervantes Road is proposed, a landscape plan shall be provided. Further, if any new landscape plan is proposed for the area between the garage site and Cervantes Road prior to project permit sign off, whether or not the eucalyptus trees are removed, the plan shall be subject to review and approval by a designated ASCC member. Any such plan, once approved by the designated ASCC member, shall be implemented prior to final building permit "sign-off."

After consideration of the Choi project Hughes left the meeting and Breen assumed the ASCC Chair. Also, Warr returned to his place on the ASCC.

Continued consideration -- Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, 274 Corte Madera Road, Byrne/Dickerson

Vlasic presented the June 21, 2012 staff report on this continued project review that was initiated at the June 11, 2012 ASCC meeting. He clarified that at the 6/11 meeting, the ASCC concluded general support for the proposal, but identified some concerns for consideration by the applicant and project design team prior to final ASCC action. Vlasic also noted that the 6/11 ASCC review, as set forth in the meeting minutes, also included a tentative conclusion that the requested concentration of floor area was appropriate based on the staff report analysis and the findings from the 6/11 site meeting.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following modified plan package with a release date of June 20, 2012, prepared by Feldman Architecture (modifications addressing 6/11 review comments noted in bold and italics):

- Sheet G.00, Project Info
- Sheet G.01, Build it Green Checklist
- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, 3/13/12
- Sheet L1.00, Landscape Site Plan, Peter Rosekrans (***Modified -- landscape changes***)
- Sheet A1.00, Site Plan (***Modified -- exterior house lighting additions***)
- Sheet A2.00, First Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.01, Second Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.02, Roof Plan
- Sheet A2.03, Cabana Plans

Sheet A3.00, East and West Elevations (front and rear) (**Modified – corrected note 3 re: garage door materials to be wood to match house and added note 14 re: exterior house lights**)

Sheet A3.01, South and North Elevations (left and right sides) (**Modified – added note 8 re: exterior house lights**)

Sheet A3.02, Patio Elevations

Sheet A3.03, Cabana Elevations

Also considered were:

- Light fixture cut sheet for FX Luminaire TC 20 for proposed wall mounted house fixtures.
- June 15, 2012 email from the project arborist John Henry McClenahan advising that the location of the proposed cabana near the 36" blue oak should result in minimum potential for root pruning and that tree prognosis is "considered favorable" with implementation of measures outlined in the email and original arborist report.
- June 21, 2012 letter from Peter Rosekrans explaining the changes made to the landscape plan to address the 6/11 review comments.
- Exterior materials board dated 5/1/12
- Outdoor water use efficiency checklist, 4/30/12
- Arborist Report, McClenahan Consulting, April 4, 2012

Vlasic advised that since the staff report was prepared one neighbor comment had been received. He reviewed the June 25, 2012 email from Whitney Miller, 266 Corte Madera Road, raising concerns over potential impacts of the proposed project work on a large cypress tree and a large oak tree on her property with branches extending over the common parcel boundary. He noted that the email requests several measures to be taken to protect the trees. Vlasic advised that the measures identified are specific to actions that might be taken on the subject property. He advised the ASCC should require that the project arborist consider the neighbor concerns and address them with an addendum report and appropriate recommendations that would be part of a final construction staging and tree protection plan provided with the project building permit submittal.

Andrew Byrne and Peter Rosekrans presented the modified plans to the ASCC and explained how they responded to the various ASCC conditions. Mr. Rosekrans noted that the landscape plans had been revised to address ASCC concerns, as noted in his June 21, 2012 submittal statement and that he did not consider the proposed planting "aggressive." He clarified that they were responsive to the applicants' needs for some view protection between the parcels in the area. Mr. Byrne commented that the project arborist was aware of the concerns of Ms. Whitney and had already developed responses to ensure there would not be impacts on the cypress and oak trees of concern to the neighbor.

Public comments were requested. Marianne Plunder advised that the Conservation Committee would have some additional comments to make after the committee's next meeting.

ASCC members reaffirmed the findings made in support of the proposed concentration of floor area at the 6/11 meeting and also appreciated the plan modifications developed to address preliminary review comments. Clark commented on the proposed "meadow" improvements and received clarification that the intent was to plant "no-mow" grasses and also to manage the area to control invasive plant materials.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0 to a) make the required findings for concentration of floor area based on the evaluations in the staff reports and findings from the preliminary review meeting and, b) to approve the project 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. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided. The plan shall incorporate the recommendations of the project arborist as set forth in his April 12, 2012 report and June 15, 2012 addendum email. Further, the project arborist shall consider the concerns and comments set forth in the June 25, 2012 email from Whitney Miller and shall advise in writing how the construction work will be managed to ensure trees of concern are not adversely impacted. The final construction staging and tree protection plan shall be specifically approved by the project arborist before submittal to the town with the project building permit plans.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised to further reduce the extent of landscaping, particularly to avoid linear planting along parcel boundaries. The final landscape plan shall be presented to the conservation committee for review and comment prior to being submitted to the designated ASCC member for approval.
3. The proposed exterior lighting plans shall be modified to eliminate one of the two front elevation garage lights as recommended in the June 21, 2012 staff report, and to also identify all house and yard switching patterns and controls.
4. The project building permit documents shall include, to the satisfaction of planning staff, provisions for periodic reports to the town from the project arborist during construction confirming compliance with his requirements and recommendations, particularly as related to cabana construction.

Approval of Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Warr, and passed 3-0 approval of the June 11, 2012 meeting minutes as drafted.

Miscellaneous comments

The following miscellaneous comments were offered:

1. Pepper Trees planted at 385 Cervantes Road, corner of Cervantes and Cherokee Way. Breen wondered if the pepper trees were on the approved landscape plan. She supported the use of the trees, but seem to recall that their use was of concern to the conservation committee. Staff advised it would check on the matter and report to Breen.
2. Star Thistle removal. Marianne Plunder thanked the ASCC for concern over removal of Star Thistle and also advised that now was the time to pursue removal before the plants go to seed.
3. Conservation Committee input to the ASCC. Vlasic advised that staff would be working with the conservation committee to develop a process and schedule that would allow for the committee to provide timely input to the ASCC on applications. He clarified that this process would be shared with the ASCC at a future meeting.

4. July 9th meeting attendance. Warr advised he would not attend the July 9th regular meeting. Breen noted that she may also not attend, but would consult her calendar and advise staff as soon as possible.

ASCC Meeting continuation to Special Site Session, 120 Golden Hills Drive

At approximately 8:20 p.m., the regular meeting at the Town Center historic School House meeting room was concluded and Breen advised that the meeting would continue with a special site session at 120 Golden Hills Drive for consideration of the Rubin matter as soon as ASCC members could convene at the property. Vlasic then, as had been arranged earlier in the day, called Dennis DeBroeck, Oak Hills Homeowners Association (HOA) representative, and Ulrich Aldag, 909 Westridge Drive, to advise them of the convening of the site meeting.

Special Site Meeting for Continued Architectural Review for changes to original exterior lighting plan, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Rubin

At approximately 8:30 p.m., ASCC members Breen, Clark and Warr convened 120 Golden Hills Drive for continued consideration of the subject request. Also present were the following:

Town Planner Vlastic
Planning Technician Brown
Planning Commission Liaison Von Feldt
Town Council Liaison Aalfs
Bob Stoecker, project architect
Clare Malone Prichard, project architect
Dennis DeBroeck, Oak Hills HOA
Bill Clancy, Oak Hills HOA
Ulrich Aldag, 909 Westridge Drive

Vlastic briefly reviewed the June 21, 2012 staff report on this continuing project review and special site meeting. He explained that the purpose of the site meeting was to consider the site lighting proposals as shown on the May 10, 2012 Site Lighting Plan prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects, Inc. He added that based on communications from neighbors, views would be considered from at least 938 Westridge Drive, i.e., the property of Robert and Mary Jack, and 125 La Sandra Way, i.e., the property of Mr. and Mrs. Lipa. Mr. Aldag, in response to a question, noted that he believed it was not necessary for the ASCC to visit his property as views from the Jack property should be similar, but he may have somewhat more direct view to the driveway.

Robert Stoecker and Clare Malone Prichard conducted an on-site inspection of existing and proposed lighting conditions. It was noted that in addition to the existing lights shown on the May 10th plan for removal, two additional lights were now proposed for removal along the common driveway serving the two parcels owned by the applicant. It was pointed out that “blackout” sleeves had also been placed on these two fixtures.

During the onsite inspection, consideration was given to lights that were illuminated within the residence and the proposed existing yard, pathway, deck and driveway lights to be preserved. Also inspected were the driveway concrete surface and the recent planting of Arbutus trees, oleanders and lavender along the north edge of the driveway to screen views to the driveway surface. Lastly, Mr. Stoecker identified the lighting needed to provide safety at the “bollard” gate grates and lighting associated with the “gate” call box was also noted.

In response to a question, Mr. Stoecker advised that he and his client had discussions about possible changes to the driveway surface and that this might be further considered depending on the final reactions to the current lighting plan proposals.

Following consideration of site conditions, meeting attendees traveled to 938 Westridge Drive and then to 125 La Sandra Way to consider views to the proposed lights. After these site checks, attendees returned to the project site to offer comments on what was learned during the site meeting.

At 938 Westridge Drive, Mr. and Mrs. Jack’s daughter, Leslie, graciously accommodated the field meeting attendees. Mr. DeBroeck, on behalf of the property owners, directed ASCC members to key viewing areas. He noted that Mr. and Mrs. Jack wanted the ASCC to

appreciate that in winter there are less leaves to screen views and that the garage wall lights illuminate the wall face of the garage.

During the viewing from the south side of the Jack property, lights were systematically turned on and off at the Rubin property. This included both interior and exterior lighting. It was noted that three rear yard spots illuminating a retaining wall south of the house appeared to spill light so that it actually illuminated the canopy of oaks "behind the house."

At 125 La Sandra Way, views were considered from a south side deck. Mr. Lipa stated that he was concerned that not all lights typically illuminated were being seen during the field visit. He offered a computer image he stated was taken the night prior to the site meeting to demonstrate his concern.

At the conclusion of the inspections at both 938 Westridge Drive and 125 La Sandra Way, the ASCC members thanked the property owners for allowing access to their properties. At the conclusion of the 125 La Sandra Way viewing, Breen advised that the ASCC would return to the 120 Golden Hills to conclude the site session.

At 120 Golden Hills attendees returned to the rear patio of the house to view, particularly, the three spots at the wall that appeared to be illuminating the north facing oak canopy. Vlasic advised that given the neighbor concerns, the ASCC should not complete final action in the field, but provide comments, reactions and directions as appropriate after receiving any public comments.

Breen requested public comments. **Mr. Aldag** advised that his main concern was the amount of lighting along the driveway and particularly the upper driveway. He also continued to express concern over the finish of the upper driveway surface.

Von Feldt did not comment on lighting, but expressed concern over the scope of irrigated lawn, particularly around the old Blue Oak trees, largely on the applicant's adjoining parcel. She noted that these old oaks may have already been impacted by the lawn irrigation and recommended that the lawn and irrigation be removed as soon as possible.

ASCC members then offered the following comments, reactions and suggestions for consideration by the applicant and Mr. Stoecker:

- The concerns shared by Von Feldt regarding the impacts of irrigation on the oaks are shared by the ASCC and it is recommended that the lawn and irrigation be removed.
- The screen planting recently installed in the front yard area along the driveway is not consistent with the approved screen landscape plan for the project and should be replaced with the approved plantings. In particular, the oleanders are a discouraged planting in town and the Arbutus trees are inappropriate for the location.
- Consideration should be given to a darker driveway surface to control reflection and light spill as was called for with the original project approval. At the same time, it was suggested that an appropriate screen landscape plan would likely solve the main problems with the driveway surface.
- The scope of proposed lighting is excessive relative to town lighting standards and guidelines. It is preferred that the site be returned to the lighting shown on the originally approved lighting plans. Clark identified areas where lighting reductions should

specifically be considered and Warr expanded on these comments. At the conclusion of the review, it was generally agreed that the driveway lights should be eliminated, as should the west side pathway lights and all lights leading to the rear lawn area and the three up lights at the back yard retaining wall. Warr advised that if an evening gathering was planned, temporary lighting should be used for it and not permanent lighting.

- The existing lights over the garage doors should be moved further out in the trellis so that there is less “washing” of light across the garage doors. Also, it appears that the lights associated with the “gate” call box are very bright and highly visible at night. This should be checked and adjustments made if found necessary.

After sharing of comments, project consideration was continued to the July 9, 2012 regular ASCC meeting. Breen thanked Mr. Stoecker for his presentation and organization for the site meeting and others for their participation in the meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 120 Golden Hills Drive at 10:00 p.m.

T. Vlasic