

**Architectural and Site Control Commission August 13, 2012
**Special Site Meetings, 260 Mapache Drive - Davison, and 25 Kiowa Court - Lin, and
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California****

Chair Hughes called the special site meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at 260 Mapache Drive for preliminary consideration of the Davison project for residential redevelopment of the 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision property.

Roll Call:

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

Others* present to the Davison project:

Glenda Flaim, project architect
Terry McFarland, project landscape architect
Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)
George Andreini, WASC
Jane Bourne, conservation committee
David Pejcha, 270 Mapache Drive
Sandy Welch, 277 Mapache Drive
Mr. Blume, architect for 277 Mapache Drive

*Others may have been present, including members of the project design team, during the course of the site meeting and may not be accounted for in this list of attendance.

Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, and Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison

Vlastic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report setting forth a preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property. He explained that the site meeting provided the opportunity for the ASCC and interested neighbors as well as other town committees to become more informed of the project proposals, seek plan clarifications and offer preliminary reactions. He advised that project discussion would continue at the regular evening meeting and then be continued to the September 10, 2012 regular meeting.

Vlastic briefly reviewed the issues discussed in the staff report, including need for clarification of grading proposals, and plan details associated with retaining walls, pool equipment location, fencing, landscaping, tree protection, exterior materials and finishes including the planned copper roofing, lighting, and construction staging. He also noted that relative to site development permit committee comments, input was needed from the conservation committee and issues were identified in the reports from the fire marshal and health officer.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated July 6, 2012 and prepared by Butler Armsden Architects:

Sheet A0.0, Title Sheet & Proposed Site Plan
Sheet A0.1, Area Calculations
Sheet A0.2, Story Pole Plan & LEED Checklist

Sheet A1.1, Existing/Demo Site Plan
 Sheet A2.1, Basement Proposed Plan
 Sheet A2.2, First Floor Proposed Plan
 Sheet A2.3, Roof Proposed Plan
 Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations (North & East)
 Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations (West & South)
 Sheet A3.3, Proposed Sections (North/South, Pool & Pool Shed)
 Sheet A3.4, Proposed Sections (North & South courtyards)
 Sheet A3.5, Renderings and Materials

 Sheet L-1.0, Tree Protection and Removal Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-1.1, Landscape Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-1.2, Planting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-1.3, Exterior Lighting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-2.1, Irrigation Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-2.2, Irrigation Legend & Notes, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-2.3, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-2.4, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
 Sheet L-2.5, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12

 Sheet C-1, Title Sheet (Civil Plans), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
 Sheet C-2, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.,
 7/2/12
 Sheet C-3, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.,
 7/2/12
 Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
 Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
 Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
 Sheet SS-1, Preliminary Septic System Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
 Sheet SU-1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/31/11, updated
 7/3/12

Also considered were the following materials provided with the project application:

- Samples for proposed Exterior plaster siding color and texture and copper roofing, received June 7, 2012
- Cut sheets for the proposed yard lighting fixtures identified on plan Sheet L-1.3. (It was noted that Sheet L-1.3 also identifies locations for wall-mounted fixtures, but proposed fixtures have yet to be determined.)
- Urban Tree Management, Inc., arborist report dated June 27, 2012
- Application for tree removal received June 9, 2012 (three redwood trees proposed for removal as identified on plan Sheet L-1.0)
- Completed *Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist*, 7/5/12
- LEED for Homes Simplified Project Checklist

Project design team members explained the project proposals and made use of story poles set for the site meeting to facilitate the site presentation. During the course of the site walk, the following clarifications were offered, a number provided in response to comments from neighbors:

- The building pad would be raised roughly two feet to accommodate the proposed new house.

- The project arborist has reviewed the plans and has concluded that the new driveway and garage access plans should not impact the two adjacent significant oaks.
- The stone pines are planned to remain.
- The low retaining wall proposed along the upper driveway may not be needed, and the need for the wall will be reconsidered in developing final site plans.
- The fencing plans will be corrected to address the height issue noted in the staff report. Further, the pool equipment will not be located in the side yard setback area.
- Retaining walls will be finished to match the stucco siding planned for the house.
- The copper roofing would likely dull significantly in 3-6 months and reach a full patina in 2-3 years.
- The project is being designed to achieve a minimum LEED residential gold certification.

Bev Lipman, representing the WASC, expressed concern over the grading plans and the need to clarify the scope of grading, particularly relative to the planned two feet of fill on the building site. Jane Bourne noted that the conservation committee had completed a preliminary review of the proposal and distributed copies of the July 25, 2012 committee report.

ASCC members noted that the project appeared generally well designed, but concerns were noted relative to a number of project details. ASCC members advised that they would provide specific reactions and comments at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Thereafter, the project team and neighbors were thanked for their participation in the site meeting.

At 4:50 p.m., chair Hughes advised that the special site meeting would continue at 25 Kiowa Court as soon as ASCC members could convene at that property.

Architectural Review for Fence Permit, 25 Kiowa Court, Lin

At approximately 5:00 p.m., ASCC members Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch and Warr convened at 25 Kiowa Court. There were joined by town planner Vlastic, planning technician Brown and town council liaison Aalfs. Also present were applicant Connie Lin, and neighbors Marianne and Peter Plunder, 35 Kiowa Court.

Vlastic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of a fence proposed along a 140-foot section of the southerly property of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. He clarified that the fence permit application is before the ASCC because the fence will be in the side yard area of the parcel and on slopes that exceed the 20% limit set forth in the fence ordinance. He added that fences could only be placed on such slopes with ASCC approval and making of specific findings.

Vlastic reviewed the background on the proposal as set forth in the staff report, including the information on a previous site meeting with ASCC member Jeff Clark and the applicant. Vlastic advised that the ASCC site meeting was set based on concerns of staff and Mr. Clark over the ASCC's ability to make the findings needed to permit the proposed fence on slopes exceeding 20%.

ASCC members considered the staff report and fence proposal as described in the statement from the applicant received August 1, 2012. It was noted that the fence would be located along the southerly parcel boundary starting 25 feet back from the front, Kiowa Court, property line and from there it would run uphill for 140 feet. It was also noted that the fence would be four feet high, constructed of wood posts and wire mesh, with the distance between posts at 8 feet, but this may vary given topographic conditions.

Also considered by the ASCC were the concerns set forth in the August 3, 2012 email from Marianne Plunder, 35 Kiowa Court, and markers set to identify the proposed fencing alignment.

Applicant Connie Lin led all present on an inspection of the proposed fence alignment. She explained some issues with communication with the neighbors at 35 Kiowa Court, i.e., the Plunders present at the meeting, and her needs for the fencing. She offered that the main issue is to identify the property line so that there would be no question as to location for herself and her neighbors.

Ms. Plunder stated that as the neighbor sharing the property boundary proposed for fencing, she and her husband opposed the fencing and are now fully aware of the boundary line. She offered that there is no need for fencing to set the boundary and that she was also concerned with the precedent that would be set with allowing an exception for a fence along the steep slope.

ASCC members walked the site proposed for the fencing and considered physical conditions and the objectives the applicant. Warr offered that the fence ordinance included the opportunity for the ASCC to make exceptions when a fence was needed for an appropriate domestic purpose, particularly to ensure the "domestic enjoyment" of the property. He concluded that in this case, the fence was not needed for such a purpose and that there were other ways to identify the property line, in keeping with the objectives of the fence ordinance, to meet the needs of the applicant. As a result, Warr stated he could not make the finding needed for the exception and could not support the application.

Other ASCC members concurred with Warr and offered that this appeared to be more of a matter of dispute between neighbors than one where a fence would solve the problem. It was also emphasized that the findings needed to support the exception, as discussed in the staff report, could not be made in this case.

Following discussion, it was agreed that final comments and action on the request would take place at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Thereafter, chair Hughes thanked the applicant and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Vice Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Warr
Absent: None
Planning Commission liaison: McKitterick
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Planning Technician Brown

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Architectural Review for Fence Permit, 25 Kiowa Court, Lin

Vlasic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of a fence proposed along a 140-foot section of the southerly property of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. He discussed the issues associated with the proposal and the events and findings of the special afternoon site meeting on the request. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include reference to the materials describing the fence permit application.) Vlasic noted that at the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members tentatively advised that they could not make the finding needed to permit the fencing in the setback area on the steep slope exceeding the 20%, i.e., limit set in the fence ordinance.

Applicant Connie Lin again reviewed the proposal and her objective to identify the property line for separation between neighbors. She provided a photo of the type of fence desired and noted it would not exceed four feet in height.

Public comments were requested. Nate McKitterick, planning commission liaison, thanked the ASCC for dealing with this request and carefully considering the purpose statements and other provisions of the fence ordinance.

ASCC members discussed the proposal further and the findings from the site meeting. Warr again stressed that he could not find that the proposed fence achieved a domestic purpose consistent with fence ordinance provisions and, therefore, could not make the necessary findings to permit the fence in the setback area on a slope that exceeded 20%. Other ASCC members concurred and Koch suggested that the issues may best be resolved with mediation between neighbors.

Clark commented that he had given considerable thought to the matter and felt that there were other ways to identify the property boundary to resolve the applicant's concerns. He, thus, concluded he could not support the exception request. He also noted that the applicant could place a fence outside of the setback area without the need for a permit, but this would not achieve the objective of marking the property boundary.

Hughes also stated he could not support the proposal and that the objectives of the fencing seems more focused on a neighbor dispute than any fencing objective consistent with fence ordinance provisions.

Following discussion, Warr moved to deny the fence permit application. The motion was seconded by Breen and passed 5-0. Vlasic advised that the applicant could appeal the action within 15 days to the planning commission, which would consider it sitting as the board of adjustment.

Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, and Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison

Vlasic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report on the preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the application. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of application plans and materials.) Vlasic advised that the preliminary review should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting and that project consideration should then be continued to the regular September 10, 2012 ASCC meeting.

Anne and Scott Davison and project architect Glenda Flaim were present to discuss the proposal further with ASCC members. They offered the following additional clarifications to those presented at the site meeting:

- Complete grading calculations will be developed and the trees of concern will be subjected to further review by the project arborist to address comments offered at the site meeting. It was noted, however, that siting adjustments had been made already to ensure the trees would not be adversely impacted by the proposed construction.
- While the grading data will be clarified, their objective is to not remove any materials from the site.
- Concerns over the irrigation plans, retaining walls, copper roofing, etc., will be addressed in development of plan clarifications and revisions.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

David Pejcha, 270 Mapache Drive, stated support for the plans, but was concerned over the screening for views between properties, particularly to the proposed garage access retaining walls.

Rusty Day, WASC, reviewed the concerns in the 8/8/12 letter from his committee. He stressed concerns over grading and off-haul of materials and also potential for impacts on the significant Blue Oaks adjacent to the garage access. He added that the WASC would oppose any grading that included significant off-haul of materials over Westridge streets.

Marianne Plunder, conservation committee member, expressed concern over the planting proposed under the 24-inch oak and potential impacts of vehicles driving over the oak roots to access the proposed lower level garage.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the site meeting and preliminary review of the application. Following the August 13th preliminary review, including both the afternoon and evening sessions, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

While ASCC members concluded that the general approach to site development and architectural design were appropriate, it was agreed that more data was needed to clarify the plans and that some adjustments should be considered to address the following specific preliminary review comments.

- Grading calculations need to be complete and include all dirt to be left on site. They need to be clear as to any off haul of materials and specifically show where all fill is to be placed, including that to raise the existing house pad.
- The basement area calculations need to be revisited, as necessary, based on the fill clarifications. Specifically, the zoning ordinance states that the “underside of the floor joists of the floor above are not more than eighteen inches above the adjoining natural or finished grade at any point, whichever is lower.” So the final 18 inch calculations for basement area need to account for any fill that has been added over natural grade.
- * The landscape comments in the July 25, 2012 preliminary review memo from the conservation committee need to be addressed.
- The scope of grading and of retaining wall use needs to be reconsidered. It is noted that the low wall along the east side of the driveway can likely be eliminated. Further, it is recommended that the walls at the pool and for access to the lower, rear garden area be re-evaluated, hopefully, with the reduction of fill. It is suggested that if the fill were not used, then there would not be the need for all of the walls.
- In addition to the above retaining wall comments, there is significant concern over the walls used to achieve access to the lower level garage. Specifically, this focuses on the excavation for the walls and basement adjacent to the 60-inch oak and also the 24-inch oak. The design team is encouraged consider providing more separation from the oaks if possible. In any case, the project arborist should further review the basement excavation relative to the 60-inch oak roots. Also, the arborist should comment on the plans for planting and irrigation within the oak canopies.
- The plans need to clarify the materials, finishes, landscaping, etc, for all retaining walls
- Consideration should be given to removal of one of the three rear yard stone pines. Also, the eucalyptus tree should be removed with the acacias.
- The landscape plan needs to be revised to limit the scope of planting in the front yard area. New oaks don't appear to be needed and overall, the approach should be restoration of the oak grassland.
- The irrigation plans are excessive and need to be scaled back. The proposed system will require significant water usage.
- Locations, size, etc. for new utility meters/boxes need to be identified.
- The scope of exterior lighting needs to be reduced, and this includes lighting in the pool/spa areas.
- Use of the copper roof should be at least reconsidered due to environmental concerns.

- The other plaster color issue noted in the staff report should be reviewed and addressed as appropriate.
- Correct the rear yard fencing plans to be consistent with the six-foot height limit
- Correct the plans to show the pool equipment out of the side yard setback area.
- The upper parking area needs to be revised to accommodate the turning around of vehicles so they can head out of the site.

Following sharing of comments, project consideration was continued to the regular September 10, 2012 ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review – Carport Enclosure, Portola Valley Ranch PUD property, 16 Coalmine View, Middleman

Vlasic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report on this proposal for enclosure of the existing shed roof design, detached carport located on the subject parcel at the westerly end of Coalmine View in Portola Valley Ranch. He clarified that the proposed enclosure would be accomplished with the installation of a new automatic panel “roll up” metal garage door on the entry elevation and that the closing of the side openings would be with vertical siding matching existing carport materials and clear glazing in the upper areas near the peak of the shed roof. It was also noted that all new siding and the metal garage doors would be finished to match that on the existing carport, which is a medium chocolate brown solid stain.

ASCC members considered the staff report and proposal as described on the three sheet “Carport Conversion” plans received July 9, 2012, prepared by the applicant. Also considered were the following application materials:

- Applicant’s application statement on the proposed finish, i.e., approved PV Ranch Color Kelly-Moore, “Loam 413,” and noting that a similar, completed carport enclosure is located at 10 Valley Oak that could be viewed for comparison to this proposal.
- Color and materials samples of the proposed finish color and metal garage door material. It was noted that the metal has a wood grain character, similar to the surface of the carport siding.
- Specifications sheet for the C.H.I. overhead garage door.
- July 6, 2012 letter from the Portola Valley Ranch design committee approving the proposal “as submitted.”

Applicant Lee Middleman was present to answer questions on the proposal as necessary. He stated appreciation for the supportive comments in the staff report on the project plans.

Public comments were requested, but none were presented.

Following brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the applicant as proposed.

In response to a question from Mr. Middleman, Vlasic advised that the ASCC action would be final in 15 days, but that he could process his building permit during the 15-day appeal period and obtain the permit after the appeal period had expired.

Recommendations for Establishing ASCC Policy – Procedures for Conservation Committee Input to the ASCC

Vlasic presented the August 9, 2012 staff report on this matter. He noted that for a time there has been concern on the part of conservation committee members that some significant residential projects have not been referred to the committee for input. Vlasic explained the concerns and situations, as set forth in the staff report, and provided suggestions for procedures that could be used to resolve the concerns and allow for timely conservation committee input to the ASCC.

Planning Commission liaison McKitterick expressed some caution with the proposed procedures, worrying that they could place additional time and cost constraints on applications. He also suggested that given the range of ASCC considerations, referral to the conservation committee could be a duplication of review efforts.

ASCC members shared some of the concerns expressed by McKitterick and Breen commented that given the current ASCC membership, often the types of issues considered by the conservation committee are covered by ASCC review. Clark suggested, however, that it could be helpful to have conservation committee input earlier than an ASCC meeting and that this would be of benefit to applicants and their projects.

After discussion, it was agreed that the procedures suggested in the staff report should not be pursued at this time. Rather, ASCC members concurred that the conservation committee should be informed of all projects to be considered by the ASCC and that the committee would then have the opportunity to comment on them if desired.

Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0-2 (Koch, Warr) approval of the July 23, 2012 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

T. Vlasic