

**Architectural and Site Control Commission** **January 14, 2013**  
**Special Site Meeting 10 Sioux Way (Clark) and**  
**Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Hughes called the special site meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. at 10 Sioux Way.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Koch, Ross\*

ASCC absent: Clark

Town Staff: Interim Planning Manager Padovan, Acting Assistant Planner Borck

-----

\*Ross arrived at approximately 3:15 p.m.

Others\* present relative to the proposal for 10 Sioux Way were:

Deirdre Clark, applicant/owner

Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect

Mr. and Mrs. Jason Schmidt, 20 Sioux Way

Judith Murphy, Conservation Committee

-----

\*Others may have been present during the course of the site meeting but did not formally identify themselves for the record.

**Continued Architectural Review for new residence with detached guest house, and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-645, 10 Sioux Way, Clark**

Padovan presented the January 14, 2013 staff report on this continued consideration of proposals for a new single-family dwelling on the vacant 1.09-acre lot. He stated that the preliminary project review had occurred on December 10, 2012 and, based on ASCC comments, a set of revised plans was developed for the January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was noted that the story poles had been reconfigured to show the revised proposals for reduced building envelope and the relocated dwelling. Mr. Padovan walked the group around the site, identifying the property line, summarizing the design and landscape changes and indicating where those changes occur on the site. The applicant, Ms. Clark, further clarified the changes and explained why they chose to retain the single-story design. She further identified on the property where the proposed dwelling floor area had been reduced and the changes in the building footprint.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Jason Schmidt** stated that he was concerned with the type of landscaping proposed along the property line between 10 and 20 Sioux Way and if the taller plants would block his views. No other members of the public provided comments.

**Mr. Cleaver**, landscape architect, explained the varying heights of the proposed plantings and suggested that the plants be clustered and stepped back in height from the property line with the shorter bushes planted along the property line to screen vehicle headlights and the taller shrubs near the dwelling to provide screening.

**Judith Murphy** added that she was very happy with the redesigned driveway, which retained the two existing blue oaks.

ASCC members considered the January 14, 2013 staff report, revised story pole configuration comments from the applicant and the site neighbor and the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/8/13 and prepared by Jeff Clark Architect:

Sheet A-0: Cover Sheet  
Sheet A-1: Impervious Surface and Floor Area Calculations  
Sheet A-2: Site Plan  
Sheet A-3: Main Dwelling; Floor Plan  
Sheet A-4: Main Dwelling; Roof Plan  
Sheet A-5: Main Dwelling; East and South Elevations  
Sheet A-6: Main Dwelling; West and North Elevations  
Sheet A-7: Guest House; Floor Plan and Elevations  
Sheet A-8: Exterior Lighting Plan  
Sheet L-1: Landscape Plan; Cleaver Design Associates, 1/6/13  
Sheet C-1: Topographic Survey Plan; MacLeod and Assoc., 8/6/12  
Sheet C-2: Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan; MacLeod and Assoc., 11/2/12  
Sheet C-3: Erosion and Sedimentation Plan; MacLeod and Assoc., 11/2/12

In addition to consideration of the above comments and revised plans, also considered and still part of the application materials were the following:

- Color Board, received 11/19/12
- Cut Sheets for proposed lighting fixtures
- Completed Build It Green checklist targeting 138 points for the proposed main house and 107 points for the guest house.
- Completed Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist

ASCC members offered the following comments on the revised plans:

**Commissioner Breen** stated that she was pleased with the preservation of the two blue oaks along the driveway but that the dirt piled at the base of each tree created an unnatural grade and should be removed as soon as possible to ensure their healthy survival. She further added that every effort should be made to lower the clerestory roof over the central portion of the house by a “couple of feet” to better integrate the structure into the site.

Mr. Padovan stated that the plate height in the main dwelling was reduced by one foot and that the re-compaction of the site would likely result in the finished grade of the building pad being one to two feet lower than what is currently existing. Mr. Cleaver added that the clerestory could be narrowed which would then reduce the height.

**Commissioner Koch** agreed that saving the oaks was very beneficial and she appreciated the reduction in floor area to the 85% AMFA level. Preserving the existing homeowner’s views at 20 Sioux Way was very important and she agreed with Commissioner Breen that the clerestory roof should be lowered.

**Commissioner Hughes** also agreed with lowering the height of the clerestory roof and that lowering the plate height and narrowing the clerestory portion of the roof are possible options.

After the site discussions and sharing of preliminary comments, the ASCC members agreed that they would offer additional comments on the proposal at the regular evening ASCC

meeting. The ASCC Chair thanked the applicant and neighbor for their participation in the site meeting and continued the item to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The special site meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

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

**January 14, 2013**

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Ross

Absent: None

Planning Commission liaison: McKitterick

Town Council Liaison: Aalfs

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Principal Planner Kristiansson, Interim  
Planning Manager Padovan, Acting Planning Assistant Borck

**Oral Communications**

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

**Continued Consideration – Request for Amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP)  
X7D-302 Portola Road, The Priory School**

Kristiansson presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on the ASCC's continued consideration of the subject proposal for CUP amendment for a parcel merger and to allow installation of a new track with artificial turf infill. She clarified that the ASCC does not need to formally act on the project but should provide recommendations to the planning commission, which is responsible for acting on the proposed use permit applications and amendments. She also clarified that ASCC consideration and recommendations should focus on the aesthetics and design of the proposed project.

Vlasic advised that the planning commission is scheduled to continue its public hearing on the requested amendments on February 6, 2013, but that it is unlikely that meeting date could be met. He noted that the response to comments process will take longer and that it is most likely the commission hearing would be continued to at least the February 20<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting.

Kristiansson discussed the history of project review to date and that while most of the design aspects of the proposals have not been the subjects of any significant debate, the primary concerns have focused on the plans for use of artificial turf. She then discussed the following revised plans and how they were modified to address input received at the previous planning commission and ASCC meetings identified in the staff report:

Sheet A-1.2, Area Expansion/Lot Merger & Athletic Fields Improvements,  
10/2/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.3, Enlarged Plan of Merger Area, 11/5/2012, prepared by CJW  
Architecture

Sheet A-1.3A, Merger Detail, 9/4/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.4, Merger Detail, 10/8/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.5, Grading Plan at Trail, 11/7/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet 1, Sewer Relocation - Context Plan, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet 2, Sewer Relocation, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet F-1, Drainage Map, Existing Conditions, 5/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet F-2, Drainage Map, Proposed Condition, 5/12, prepared by BKF

Tim Molak, Head of School, and project architects Carter Warr and Kevin Schwarckopf presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered the following comments:

- The basics of the project have been before the town and ASCC for some time. The key design issues associated with the berm removal, track layout, softball field, shed, trail modifications and landscaping have been addressed as noted in the staff report. Further, there appear to be no issues with the proposed parcel merger.
- The drainage issues have been clarified by the project consultants to the satisfaction of the town public works director, including recent communications from project engineering consultants at BKF.
- Concur with the staff suggestion that details associated with the landscaping, final frontage fencing and also final grading details can be addressed through conditions to any action on the request CUP amendment. The ASCC would then be fully involved in working out the details of such plans.
- It now appears that the key issues are those associated with the proposed artificial turf.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the softball field area would be surfaced in dirt and real grass (grass) and not artificial turf (turf). It was also clarified that the turf infield of the track area would be used for soccer and football activities already on-going at the school. It was noted that it could also be used for Lacrosse if that sport was reintroduced at the school.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the tree removal count is for the berm and no significant tree removal along the Portola Road frontage is planned at this time.
- In response to a question regarding the 2,000 sf size of the proposed storage building, it was noted that the structure was to house existing equipment and materials used in association with the fields that are now housed in at least three locations around the campus. It was explained that it could be smaller, but that this would not solve the scope of the current storage problem. It was further noted that the final design could be improved and that structure could be lower, and that the Priory is prepared to work with the town on a final design that addressed any concerns. It was also clarified that the current design has a plate height of eight feet.

**Project FieldTurf representative David Brown** provided samples of the previous generation of his company's product (i.e., as used at Woodside School) and what was identified as the most current generation (as used at the other schools identified in the staff report materials). He emphasized that the older generation had grass blade elements that were more reflective than the current generation and that the "visual improvements" was a result in changes to blade form and color. He also noted that the color of the current generation of infill material was improved over the previous generation and the current turf is much cooler than the version used at Woodside school.

During questioning of Mr. Brown about the turf materials there was some confusion over the sample products being displayed. It was determined that the "current" generation sample had the correct grass blades and included an infill material of the right color, but that was made from recycled tires. The applicant and staff advised that the recycled tire material was

not proposed for the project and/or what has been analyzed in the proposed environmental documents. It was eventually determined that a true sample of the material should be presented to the ASCC and that the correct sample should be available for consideration at the continued planning commission public hearing.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Andy Brown, Portola Valley resident**, stated opposition to the use of turf and stated it was against all the values in town planning documents calling of protecting the natural character of the planning area. He worried about what was done with the old turf materials when they had to be replaced and concluded that this was making the “earth conform to us” rather than living with and protecting the earth.

**Bev Lipman, Westridge resident**, expressed confusion as to what turf was proposed and asked that this be clarified.

**Sally Anne Reiss, Golden Oak Drive**, spoke in favor of the Priory request and stressed that local use of water would be reduced and that she understood that 90-95% of the turf materials were recyclable and that it was a green product. She noted that the town now mandates use of manufactured materials for roofing due to fire safety objectives and that you make adjustments when materials are better suited for the specific location and purpose of use. She noted that her “artificial” roofing, while not the real wood she originally desired, did not detract from the aesthetics of her house or how it fit in the residential environment of the town. She also noted that there is already artificial turf at t locations in the town including a small amount in the children’s play area at the town center.

**Larry Cagan, Alamos Road**, noted he was an active soccer player and that he supported the Priory plans for use of turf because it will allow the school to play the games and practice at home as intended with the school’s fields. He acknowledged that a perfectly maintained grass field is best for play but this is not practical for anything but the most unusual situations, i.e., like Stanford stadium where there are only 30 games a year. He stressed that for any high use field, grass is difficult to maintain to a proper use standard.

**Jon Silver, Portola Road**, opposed the use of turf and found it to be fully inconsistent with the general plan provisions calling for preserving the natural beauty of the town and its planning area. He stated that the protection of the natural environment should come first even if it is not convenient needs. He took issue with the sample materials provided by the applicant and worried over the true ability to recycle turf when the surface needs to be replaced. He stressed that the samples look fake and that the turf at Woodside school was not only fake looking due to maintenance issues but also due to the design and general character. He concluded that “fake” grass was unacceptable in Portola Valley.

**David Patzer, 350 Cervantes Road**, commented that he supported the use of turf and that this should be a practical decision. He stressed that this was a good solution for the school use and that lawns on residential properties in town were also not consistent with preserving the natural condition of the planning area.

ASCC members considered the staff report, applicant input and public comments. Members then shared the following reactions on matters other than the use of turf:

- **Grading and tree removal.** Members found the proposals generally acceptable. Members concurred that consideration should be given to removal of the large

eucalyptus tree on the Rutherford property, but retention of the olive trees was acceptable. Members also noted that a CUP condition should call for a detailed plan for vegetation thinning along Portola Road consistent with the concepts shown on the landscape plan. It was recognized, however, that all existing materials along the frontage of the Rutherford property are not fully defined on the current plans. Members also were reminded that, eventually, detailed grading and drainage plans would need to be submitted for town approval with a formal site development permit and that this permit process would be recognized in conditions attendant to any planning commission action on the proposed CUP amendments.

- **Shed.** The proposed location and general size and design approach were found acceptable. It was agreed, however, that the building should be lowered with a change in roof pitch and it should be no larger than absolutely necessary to meet the needs associated with the field use. Further, members concurred that the final design details, including clarification of space needs, should be subject to ASCC review and approval to ensure the best possible design to blend with conditions at the proposed location and minimum visual intrusion relative to views from the public trail. Again, it was agreed that such final plan review should be a condition of and action to approve the CUP.
- **Track location and design.** The facility, location and general approach to design were found acceptable. Members discussed possible optional colors for the track surface, but concurred that either the currently proposed cinder color (a specific sample was available for review) or perhaps a tan or medium gray color would be acceptable. It was agreed, however, that final color should be based on consideration of all site conditions and that this also should be subject to ASCC review and approval at an appropriate time in the project implementation process, likely when the berm removal has been completed and the final landscaping plan is under consideration.
- **Landscape plan.** The plan concepts were found generally acceptable, but it was agreed that as a condition of CUP approval, a final, detailed landscape plan, including parcel frontage fencing, should be provided and subject to ASCC review and approval. A particular focus will be on the existing plantings on the Rutherford property and the scope of thinning and removal that would be appropriate. It was understood that this could include more removal of materials not appropriate for the Portola Road corridor frontage and additional planting of appropriate materials, e.g., more valley oaks, for necessary screening and softening of views. Members also concurred that after a period of time when the new plantings are in place, there should be a follow-up ASCC review to determine if additional plantings are needed or if other landscape adjustments should be made to ensure compatibility with the Portola Road Corridor. It was noted that the follow-up review might take place 18 to 24 months after the new plantings are installed.

In general, the ASCC was supportive of the portions of the proposals not associated with the turf matter discussed below, but with the understanding that final details for all project aspects needed to be considered together to ensure the plans achieved the intended site and scenic corridor integration.

Following the offering of the above comments, members offered the following individual inputs relative to the proposed turf material:

**Clark:**

- Has not reached a final position on the appropriateness of the turf. Perhaps the scope of turf use could be reduced if the infield semicircles at either end were in grass leaving the main play area in turf.
- The berm and associated tree removal will open views to the turf area and the landscaping will be important relative to proper visual integration into the road corridor.
- The misunderstandings created with the comments made by the FieldTurf representatives at the ASCC meeting need to be addressed and correct samples provided.

**Breen:**

- The Priory fields are located within the “heart” of the town’s important scenic corridor and the visual sensitivity of this corridor as identified in the general plan encourages preservation of the natural conditions to the extent possible. Use of living grass seems consistent with the intent of the general plan provisions and artificial turf does not.
- The existing turf field examples, including Woodside school, raise serious concerns over the potential visual impacts of a turf surface. Wear, maintenance, light reflection, all are factors that seem to emphasize the artificial condition. In this case, there would be significant views down to the field from Portola Road and the aesthetic impacts on these views appear potentially significant and inconsistent with the natural character called for in the general plan. In addition, part of the aesthetic experience anticipated in Portola Valley is wildlife grazing on real grass fields and meadows. This experience would not be preserved with the artificial turf surface.
- The turf data raises issues over maintenance that seem to conflict with the town’s setting. There would be animals, including deer and dogs, that would cross the turf and create maintenance problems that would appear to conflict with the product data for turf protection. Would fencing eventually be needed to control possible impacts and protect the turf warranty? Would normal use in the area result in the need to replace the turf surface more frequently? Worried over the true ability to recycle the materials.
- Remains concerned over the ability to control runoff of turf materials and impacts on soil and creek water quality.
- Worried that more usable surface would increase use and traffic.
- Based on all the issues, especially significant concern over visual impacts, can’t support the use of turf at this location, particularly within the Portola Road scenic corridor.

**Koch:**

- Concurs with comments offered by Breen. Turf is unnatural and in conflict with the preservation of the town’s natural setting as called for in the general plan. Lawns may not be natural either, but at least provide a living environment.
- Use of an artificial material for “grass” in the scenic corridor “feels” to be a conflict with the natural beauty for the town that the ASCC strives to protect.

**Ross:**

- Based on the data presented, the use of the turf material appears aesthetically acceptable. This is a school and the area in question is essentially for athletic field use consistent with the school’s function. Getting the best use of the facilities in line with school’s basic objectives seems appropriate.
- Once the turf is in place, it likely will not be highly identifiable as an artificial surface. Currently, those passing by the school likely take little notice of the field conditions and after the new landscaping is in place there will be a similar situation whether the surface is turf or grass.
- Maintained ornamental grass or “lawn” surfaces are not natural. Thus, the aesthetic differences between grass and turf fields seem minimal, and a maintained turf field

would appear to look very similar to a mowed grass field. In this case, improved functionality of the field for a school recognized on the general plan appears acceptable.

- Perhaps this provides an opportunity to test the use of a turf field in the town. It could be installed and then reconsidered after a specific period relative to the concerns and use objectives.

**Hughes:**

- Appreciates the various perspectives relative to the turf issue, both the comments in support and those opposed or with significant concerns.
- If turf were permitted, there should be no fencing to control passage of wildlife over the area.
- The first major goals of the general plan are to preserve and enhance the natural features of the planning area and to limit use so that the natural attributes can be sustained over time.
- Turf does not seem to stand the test called for in the basic goals of the general plan. Real grass, while not perfect, appears far more consistent with the objectives of the goals and would result in less impact on the lands than would artificial turf.
- Also remains concerned over the ability of the town to find that the manufacture, use and disposal of turf is consistent with town sustainability goals and objectives called for in the general plan.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC comments would be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration during the continued public hearing process on the proposed CUP amendments. He also advised that since the next ASCC meeting would take place prior to the continued commission public hearing the ASCC would have a chance to review the meeting minutes to ensure that they appropriately reflect the range of comments offered by ASCC members.

**Continued Consideration -- Architectural Review for new residence with detached guest house, tennis court and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-646, 187 Bolivar Lane, Goldband**

Vlasic presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on the continuing review of this proposal for construction of a new, single-story, contemporary design flat roof residence with attached garage on the subject 3.1-acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He summarized the events of the December 10, 2012 ASCC preliminary project review and then discussed how the revised plans and materials, listed below, address the preliminary review comments:

- 1/7/13 Letter from project architect with 1/7/13 letter from property owners. The letters specifically address each of the 8 points noted in the 12/10 meeting minutes.
- The project revisions discussed in the 1/7/13 letters are presented on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/7/13, prepared by Field Architecture:

Sheet A000, Cover Sheet

Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan and Lighting Plan, Skyline Design Studio

Sheet L-2, Landscape Water Use Plan, Skyline Design Studio

Sheet A050, Site Plan

Sheet A100, Floor Plan

Sheet A101, Construction Staging Plan

Sheet A200, Building Elevations

Sheet A201, Building Elevations

Sheet A202, Guest Elevations

Vlasic also explained that the following plans and materials, submitted with the original application, are still part of the formal proposal before the ASCC for action:

- Civil Plans, Lea and Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/8/12:
  - Sheet C-1, Title Sheet
  - Sheet C-2, Grading & Drainage Plan
  - Sheet C-3, Grading Specifications
  - Sheet C-4, Details
  - Sheet C-5, Plan Details
  - Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan
  - Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details
  - Sheet SU1-SU6, (six sheets), Topographic Survey, 10/25/12 (Sheets SU5 and U6 include tree identification tables for the trees discussed in the project arborist's report.)
- Arborist's report prepared by Ned Patchett Arboricultural Consultant revised through March 23, 2007.
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received November 9, 2012 (location for proposed lights is shown on plan Sheet L-1 and A100 and the cut sheets are also included on Sheet L-1).
- Colors and materials board, received November 9, 2012.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 11/9/12.

Vlasic noted that the Build It Green (BIG) Single Family Checklist for the project had been revised to reflect the added floor area of 277 sf and that the story poles at the site were modified to reflect the addition of 262 sf to the main house and 15 sf to the guest house.

Applicants Ellen Konar and Steve Goldband and project architects Stan Field and Jeff Field were present to discuss the revised proposal with ASCC members. In response to questions, they offered the following comments and clarifications:

- There will be no lights at the tennis court site and at this time no pathway has been planned for access to the court. (ASCC members encouraged that access simply be over the meadow grasses, that there be no formal pathway to the court area and the applicants advised they would consider this.)
- No lights are planned for the hot tub. Likely one light would be added on the garage entry elevation. (ASCC members concurred such a light was acceptable, but that the final lighting plans should be subject to review and approval by a designated ASCC member.)
- In response to some concerns over scope of entry pathway lighting, it was agreed that the proposed pathway lights would be dimmer controlled and that this would also be addressed on a revised lighting plan.
- The revised lighting plan will clarify if any trash enclosure lights are planned beyond the light at the east side garage door.
- Redwood tree removal will be worked out with the west side neighbor as most of the redwoods are not on the applicants property.

Clark asked that in the future, if possible, proposed yard and house lighting be presented on one plan sheet for ease of review. He also asked that for this project the revised lighting plan include on one sheet yard and house lighting proposals.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members concluded the revised project addressed the key preliminary review issues and appreciated why the applicant elected not to keep more of the planned cut material on site. Members, however, also concurred that the west side redwood trees on the site should be removed with the project and that this would, perhaps, also influence the neighbor to consider removal of the other redwoods on the parcel to the west.

Following discussion, Koch moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the revised plans as clarified 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 lighting plans shall be revised to provide one soffit light at the garage entry elevation, clarify that pathway lighting will be dimmer controlled and clarify if any additional lights are planned at the trash enclosure. The revised plan for all exterior house and yard lighting shall be presented on one sheet and shall be subject to approval by a designated ASCC member.
2. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided that includes a comprehensive program for off-haul of excavated materials to minimize impacts on area streets and traffic. Prior to town approval, the plan shall be shared with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee for review and comment. The final plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. The project shall comply with all the requirements of site development permit committee members as set forth in the committee reports provided with the December 6, 2012 town planner report prepared for the 12/10 ASCC meeting.
4. If the existing driveway entry gate is repaired, it shall be moved back 25 feet from the cul-de-sac right of way line to conform to current town gate setback standards. Any proposal for a new driveway entry gate shall conform to all town standards and shall be subject to prior review and approval by the ASCC.
5. The west side redwood trees on the site shall be removed with the project.

**Continued Consideration -- Architectural Review for new residence with detached guest house, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-647, 45 Tagus Court, Kawaja**

Vlasic presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on this continuing review of these applications for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.9-acre Alpine Hills subdivision parcel. Vlasic discussed the December 10, 2012 preliminary project review and the comments and concerns identified at the meeting. He advised that since the 12/10 meeting the ASCC had received additional public input including the 12/12/12 email from owners of 410 Golden Oak Drive and the January 10, 2013 letter from Mr. Mike Nuttall, 55 Alhambra Court. Vlasic also highlighted continuing concerns discussed in the staff report regarding the "storage space" over the planned detached garage, exterior lighting and construction staging. He noted that the revised submittal included with the ASCC packet addressed a

number of the concerns and, in particular, included modifications to west side house elevations, the proposed guest house and landscaping, all intended to, in particular, reduce potential impacts on views from the west side.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following revised materials provided in response to the preliminary review process and comments:

- Modified plans, unless otherwise noted, revised through 1/4/13, and prepared by Backen Gillam Architects:

Civil Plans, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 1/3/13:

Sheet C-1, Cover Sheet  
Sheet C-2, Grading & Drainage Plan  
Sheet C-3, Erosion Control Plan

Sheet L1.1, Landscape Plan, Whisler Land Planning

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan-Existing  
Sheet A1.1A, Site Plan – Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
Sheet A1.1B, Site Plan – Proposed Upper Floor Plan  
Sheet A1.2, Site Lighting and Finish Plan  
Sheet A2.1, Ground Floor Plan  
Sheet A2.2, Upper Floor Plan  
Sheet A2.3, Roof Plan  
Sheet A3.0, North Elevation East Elevation  
Sheet A3.1, South Elevation Section B-B'  
Sheet A3.2, West Elevation Section A-A'  
Sheet A3.3, Garage Elevations and Sections

- “Responses to comments from Dec 10th ASCC Meeting regarding Site Development Permit X9H-647, 45 Tagus Court, Kawaja.” Applicants’ document containing a point-by-point response to the issues set forth in the summary list of comments in the 12/10 meeting minutes, including photos, plan adjustment sheets, other materials to facilitate understanding and the context for the responses including a product sheet on the proposed integral, 30-year life finish for the planned metal roof.
- November 20, 2012 “Arborist’s Report,” McClenahan Consulting. It was noted that the trees discussed in the report are identified by number on plan Sheet L1.1.

Vlasic advised that provided with the plans considered at the 12/10 meeting and still part of the formal application are the following materials:

- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received November 19, 2012 (location for proposed lights is shown on revised plan Sheet A-1.2)
- Colors and materials board received November 19, 2012
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 11/19/12
- Sheet A0.1, Cal Green Checklist (GreenPoint Rated Checklist Targeting 160 BIG points)

Jon Kawaja and Dr. Emma Morton-Bours, applicants, William Wilson, project architect, and Patrick Wisler, project landscape architect, presented the revised plans and materials to the ASCC. They presented the following two handouts for ASCC consideration:

*Response to Comments contained in the Agenda for the Jan 14<sup>th</sup> ASCC Meeting regarding 45 Tagus Court (six pages)*  
*Images of views from Alhambra Court and 410 Golden Oak to the project site (five pages)*

The comments and view relationships in these handouts were discussed including the factors influencing the design responses as presented on the revised plans. It was noted that plans include phased removal of exotic trees, particularly pines and eucalyptus, but the intent was to save some at least for the time being to minimize view impacts off site.

In response to comments relative to a one story design option, the design team stressed that this would spread development out over the established building pad with potential for greater off site visual impacts, including more impacts on views from the east and south including properties along Bear Gulch Drive. The plan adjustments were explained in terms of site constraints and opportunities for outside use area and also to minimize view impacts taking into account an essentially 360 degree exposure. In addition, the options for guest house location and possible redesign were discussed and the landscape screening solutions as well as other changes identified.

In response to a question regarding the potential visual impact of the proposed roof materials, the project architect presented an approximately 2 foot by 2 foot sample of the proposed dark brown corrugated roof for ASCC inspection.

Public comments were requested and the following were offered:

**Robert Hess, 35 Tagus Court**, expressed concern over possible removal of eucalyptus and pine trees that screened views from his home to the project site. He noted that the trees of concern were on the southeasterly side of the subject property. After review of the plans it was clarified that the trees of concern to him were not proposed for removal.

**Virginia Bacon, 210 Golden Oak Drive**, presented a photo image of views from the west side to the subject property. She reviewed the comments in her 12/10/12 letter to the ASCC and strongly encouraged the applicants to consider and the ASCC to direct development of options for a single story house. She added that the current proposal is "too tall" and that the proposed oak screening is "unrealistic." She suggested elimination of the detached guest house and expressed that the site is not adequate for the scope of uses being proposed. She offered that in any case the house height should be lowered by at least three to four feet and all skylights eliminated from the proposal.

**Mike Nuttall, 55 Alhambra Court**, reviewed the comments in his two letters to the ASCC and focused on the key points presented in his January 10, 2013 communication relative to the pool and outdoor lighting, screening, and the main residence, the guest unit and the garage. He worried over the accuracy of the materials presented by the project team to explain the proposal and impact of design changes and screen planting. He also worried about garage design compliance with the "accessory structure" provisions in the town's design guidelines and reference was made to the page from the design guidelines relative to such structures.

In response to a comment, it was noted that ASCC members Hughes, Breen, Clark and Koch were present at the December 10, 2012 site meeting and did have an opportunity to view the project site from Mr. Nuttall's house. Further, Ross noted that while not formally an

ASCC member on December 10th, he did attend the meeting and also visited 55 Alhambra Court with ASCC members.

**Russell Mason, 45 Alhambra Court**, shared the concerns expressed by Mr. Nuttall and commented that the story poles suggest the proposed house is too high relative to the adjacent tree canopy and suggested a minimum lowering of five feet. He offered concerns over proposed siting and location of the guest house and height of the proposed garage.

**Yuri Mason, 45 Alhambra Court**, shared the concerns of her husband and Mr. Nuttall and offered that it was “not fair” for the applicants to develop their site in a way that would impact established views across it from off site locations, particularly at the end of Alhambra Court.

ASCC members then discussed the revised proposal and the concerns expressed by neighbors. Options were considered for the design of the garage and guest house and also changes to the western elevation of the main house. After discussion of options, members were generally satisfied that the design approach was appropriately developed for the site. Concerns did remain over garage design, exterior lighting and main house height. After discussion, Clark moved to make the proposed guest house consistent with town second unit and accessory structure findings and to approve the revised project 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 a building permit:

1. The lighting plan shall be revised to accomplish the following:
  - a. Minimize pool and pool trough lighting to the minimum needed to comply with required safety standards and all such lighting shall be manually controlled for turning lights on but shall have an off timer to ensure that lighting is not left on for decorative purposes.
  - b. The south side deck light for the guest house shall be eliminated.
  - c. The stair access lights for the garage storage area and lights in the area shall be manually controlled for turning lights on but shall have an off timer to ensure lights are not on for any extended period of time.
  - d. Permanent lighting within the house and guest house shall avoid any lights in skylight areas that would potentially spill light out at night.
2. The west side master bedroom windows flanking the balcony shall be modified to raise the window sill height to help minimize west side light spill.
3. The house height shall be lowered to the extent possible based final structural engineering data relative to the space needed between floors and consideration of plate height and roof pitch modifications. The objective is a 6-inch to one-foot lowering, if possible, given technical construction limitations and without compromise to the house architecture.
4. The proposed storage space over the garage is acceptable as storage space with the lighting limitations in condition #1 and with elimination of the west side windows. Further, a deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney ensuring that the space is only used for storage purposes.

5. The western elevation of the guest house shall be modified to reduce window area in the exercise room space. Specifically, the outside two of the four glass panels shall be reduced in size to be more in the character of windows than doors.
6. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided that includes a comprehensive program for tree and vegetation protection and to ensure that construction parking is contained on site to avoid conflicts with Tagus Court use and access. The construction staging shall include specific provisions for early planting of key landscape materials, particularly transplanting of the pistache tree and installation of the new west side oaks, and for protection of the these trees once installed. Once approved, the construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
7. The project shall comply with all of the requirements of site development permit committee members as set forth in the committee reports provided with the December 6, 2012 town planner report prepared for the 12/10 ASCC meeting.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following matter, Clark, as the "applicant," temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room.*

---

**Continued Consideration -- Architectural Review for new residence with detached guest house, and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-645, 10 Sioux Way, Clark**

Padovan presented the January 14, 2013 staff report on this continued review of the subject applications for residential development of the subject 1.09-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property. He discussed the scope of the preliminary review comments offered at the December 10, 2012 ASCC meeting, plan revisions made in response to the comments, and consideration of the revisions by the ASCC at the second afternoon site meeting conducted earlier in the day. (Refer to above site meeting minutes that include a listing of revised project plans and all application materials.)

Deirdre Clark, applicant, and Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect, were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. In response to a comment from Ross, it was noted that fire department requirement for a house number visible at the street typically is met by the number being placed on the mail box at the driveway entry.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and considered the findings and neighbor input received at the afternoon site meeting. Members appreciated the design changes made to the project based on the December preliminary review, but had some remaining concerns regarding the height of the clerestory element, west side landscaping, and current conditions of the blue oaks along the driveway. A few other minor lighting and other matters were discussed. After discussion, Koch moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the project as revised and clarified 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. The clerestory element shall be reduced in height and the proposed plans for height

reduction shall be approved by the ASCC. (*Note, a specific number for lowering of height was not specified, but it was suggested that the changes could include lowering of the height of the side window wall, lowering the roof pitch, lowering the main level plate height, or narrowing of the clerestory width. It was agreed that the changes would be considered from an architectural perspective and that it was hoped that a one to two-foot lowering could be possible.*)

2. Modify the proposed "olive" cement plaster color to conform to the light reflectivity limit, i.e., 40%.
3. Modify the exterior lighting plan by removing the wall mounted fixture at the north side of the guest house and using a ground mounted path light instead for walkway illumination.
4. Remove the dirt from the base of the driveway area blue oaks. (*Note, ASCC members concurred that this should be done as soon as possible and the removal documented for submittal with the building permit application.*)
5. Modify the landscape plan to provide for the layering of materials between the proposed house and northwesterly property line. The distribution should be random with different plant sizes, i.e., one, five, 15-gallon and 24-inch box, and the taller materials should be located closer to the proposed house.
6. The building permit plans shall be clarified to demonstrate that there will be no lighting within the clerestory area.
7. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided and shall include the recommendations of the project arborist to ensure the work plan fully protects the driveway area blue oaks. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Ross commented in completing the action that he supported the use of the clerestory to bring natural light into the house and preferred such a "window" use to skylights. He also shared some concerns over the roof finish, but other ASCC members found the roof material acceptable as presented.

---

*Following discussion of the above request, Clark returned to his ASCC position.*

---

### **Review for Conformity to Provisions of Conditional Use Permit X7D-156, "Jelich Ranch," 683 Portola Road, White**

Vlasic presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on this request for approvals relative to additions to the main house and barn modifications on the subject 13.8-acre Portola Road property that is subject to the provisions of conditional use permit (CUP) X7D-156. Vlasic clarified that ASCC review is required for conformity with the provisions of the approved use permit and also because essentially all projects for parcels fronting on Portola Road require ASCC review and approval.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 12/2/12 and prepared by Walker Warner Architects:

Sheet A1.0, Site Plan/Cover Sheet  
Sheets A1.1 & 1.2, Build It Green Checklist  
Sheet A2.0, Basement Plan  
Sheet A2.1, Main Floor Plan  
Sheet A2.2, Roof Plan  
Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A4.1, Partial Elevations  
Sheet AA2.1, Tractor Barn Floor Plan & Exterior Elevations, 1/7/13  
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet (engineering plans), Lea & Braze Engineering  
Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering  
Sheet SP1.0, Story Pole Plan, 1/4/13

Also considered were the following application materials:

- Exterior Materials image, 12/12/12. It was noted that the image sheet states that all exterior materials proposed for the main house additions would match those used on the existing house as approved by the ASCC at the time the house was rebuilt in 2005-2006.
- Color sample board for IPE decking and standing seam copper roofing proposed for main house, 12/12/12.
- Exterior Materials Barn image, 12/12/12. It was noted that the sheet proposes that the modified barn would be finished to match the materials used on the existing project room building located next to the existing main Jelich Ranch apple barn, that the materials and finishes are also as approved by the ASCC in 2005-2006 and include horizontal board siding and metal roofing.
- Lighting image sheet, 12/12/12. It was noted that the sheet shows existing wall, trellis and path fixtures that would be used on the proposed improvements, and that these fixtures were also previously approved by the town for use at the site. Cut sheets for the fixtures were also available for reference and it was noted that proposed "new" fixtures are to be located as shown on the floor plan Sheets A2.0, A2.1 and AA2.1.

Vlasic clarified that in addition to the plans and materials, story poles had been installed at the site to model the proposed main house addition consistent with the layout shown on Sheet SP1.0. He also noted that town historian Nancy Lund, pursuant to CUP conditions, had reviewed the plans and found them acceptable.

Cindie and Phil White, applicants, and project architects Kevin Casey and Kathy Scott presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- As noted in the staff report, the main residence is intended to be expanded to accommodate full time residence by the White family. To date it has been used as a weekend and summer home.
- An arborist is reviewing the plans relative to the potential impacts of the house and basement construction on the multi-trunk oak that is immediately east of the proposed addition. The plans will be modified as necessary to ensure that the tree is protected and preserved.

- In response to a question, it was noted that the copper roof material would be untreated and allowed to weather naturally. It will likely be brought to the site early on and allowed to weather during the early stages of construction.
- In response to a question, it was noted that there were no plans for removal of the large eucalyptus tree between the house addition and Portola Road and that it was to be preserved to screen views to and from the road.
- At this time there are no plans for any thinning of vegetation along the street frontage, mainly north of the main entrance. The CUP calls for review of the vegetation if there are any proposals for fencing changes. It was agreed that if there were any plans for thinning of vegetation they would be shared with town for review. (The ASCC encouraged thinning but did not find that this was an issue related to the current proposals.)

Following the above presentations, some discussion took place on the current status of the Woodchoppers house. Vlasic advised of the wording of the current CUP condition and noted that the wording was left vague with options on how the house might be treated.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 5-0 to find the proposal consistent with the CUP conditions and to approve the plans as clarified subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plans shall be modified as necessary to ensure that house and basement construction does not adversely impact the multi-trunk oak that is immediately east of the proposed addition. The plan modifications shall be to the satisfaction of a certified arborist and arborist review and approval shall be provided in writing with the building permit submittal.
2. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. The project applicant and plans shall be revised to make the basement floor area corrections described in the January 10, 2013 staff report.

## **Minutes**

Breen moved, seconded by Koch, and passed 4-0-1 (Ross) approval of the December 10, 2012 meeting minutes with the following corrections:

Page 5. In the fourth bullet item from the bottom of the page, correct the spelling of "pistache."

Page 9. Correct the roll call list for the ASCC to identify Warr as being present at the evening meeting.

### **Miscellaneous comments**

Breen noted that in her follow-up review as the designated ASCC member relative to conditions on the recent Priory garden addition approval, there was a greenhouse proposed that was not on the ASCC approved plans. She expressed surprise that this was added and wanted to share her concerns with the ASCC. Vlastic noted that the applicant was informed that the greenhouse could only be considered by the full ASCC and that the plans were then modified to remove the greenhouse so that Breen could complete her follow-up review.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

T. Vlastic