

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

January 28, 2013

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Koch, Ross
Absent: Hughes
Planning Commission liaison: McKitterick
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Interim Planning Manager Padovan,
Acting Planning Assistant Borck

Oral Communications

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Prior to consideration of the following matter, Breen temporarily left the meeting room and turned the chair over to Clark. She advised that she was conflicted in project review due to service she has provided to the applicants.

Continued review for compliance with conditions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-169, greenhouse/pool, guest house and art studio, and concurrence with subcommittee recommendations relative to planting issues, 555 Portola Road, Neely/Myers

Vlasic presented the January 23, 2013 on this review for conformity with provisions of the subject CUP approved the planning commission on January 18, 2012. Vlasic reviewed permit background and the following specific requests now being made of the ASCC:

1. Ratify the decisions reached by the ASCC subcommittee relative to the planting issues along Portola Road and the southern parcel boundary as set forth in the attached letter to the permit holders dated November 5, 2012.
2. Find the following Green House/Pool plans and materials consistent with the provisions of the CUP:

Green House, CJW Architecture, November 6, 2012, unless otherwise dated:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet: T-0.2, Lighting Selections
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
Sheet: A-2.1.B, Main Floor Plan & Elevations

Greenhouse Finish Board, 7/16/12

GreenPoint Rated Checklist, received 11/7/12 and targeting 55 BIG points

3. Find the following guest house/studio plans and materials consistent with the provisions of the CUP:

Guest House/Studio, CJW Architecture, August 1, 2012, unless otherwise dated:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet

Sheet: T-0.2, Lighting Cut Sheets
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plans
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan & Elevations

Guest House/Studio Finish Board, 7/16/12

GreenPoint Rated Checklist, received 11/7/12 and targeting 59 BIG points

Vlasic reviewed the issues with each request as set forth in the staff report and stressed that relative to the Green House and Guest House/Studio plans the applicant is seeking ASCC acceptance of the plan refinement so that formal building permit plans could be prepared. Vlasic clarified that such permit plans would still need to come back to the ASCC for final "sign-off," and that staff continues to work with the permit holder to ensure all CUP conditions are addressed as necessary prior to issuance of any building permits.

Carter Warr, project architect, was present to discuss the current requests with ASCC members. He noted that septic system percolation tests associated with the various building proposals had been completed and were now in the process of review for presentation to the health department. He advised that he would make copies of the tests available to the town. He also offered the following comments in response to comments in the staff report:

- The plans for the proposed green house and pool area windows and skylights will be modified to have bronze frames and eliminate the currently proposed off-white frames and trim. The desire is, however, to use the existing house wall colors for the new stucco walls, and this finish is within the town's light reflectivity limit.
- As noted in the staff report, the details for interior lighting will be provided with building permit plans, and at this point there is no plan for interior shades unless the ASCC finds they are necessary after consideration of interior lighting plans.
- The pool house trellis would match the trellis color on the existing house, which is the off-white trim. This trellis faces the main house, i.e., on the west side of the green house, and would not be visible from off site locations. The overall refinements with the asphalt shingle roofing are to achieve greater compatibility with the existing historic house and also reduce the scope of glazed surfaces.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Nate McKitterick, planning commission liaison, raised concerns over the ASCC consideration and approval of the southern boundary fencing. He commented that he believed the intent of the planning commission was only to authorize meadow fencing as provided for in association with the agricultural uses and that, specifically, the CUP condition relative to the southern boundary called for selective removal of existing vegetation and fence posts. He concluded that the CUP action did not intend to permit any meadow area fencing beyond that associated with the agricultural uses and none was shown along the southern property line on the CUP plans. He noted that the CUP was approved on a 4-1 vote and that then commissioner Zaffaroni was opposed due to issues of clarity relative to general plan meadow preserve provisions and her ability to make findings of general plan conformity.

Judith Murphy, conservation committee, also raised concern with the southern boundary fencing and wondered about the need for more thinning of smaller oaks on the Neely

property along the Portola Road frontage that is called for in the November 5, 2012 subcommittee letter.

In response to the comments, Vlasic offered the following:

- The CUP action authorized the ASCC to make fencing decisions relative to the agricultural uses in the meadow area and concerns were raised in the September 2012 staff report to the ASCC regarding the proposed fencing. At that time, the ASCC concluded that the fencing was acceptable as part of the then presented haying operations associated with the agricultural building subject to the work of the vegetation removal subcommittee. He offered, however, if there is any confusion at this time as to the issue, the ASCC should refer the matter to the planning commission for clarification.
- Relative to the thinning of oaks, Vlasic review the comments in the November 5, 2012 letter and noted that after consideration of the location of the small oaks, mainly in the town's Portola Road right of way, and the tree removal agreed to by the applicant, no additional tree thinning would be required.
- The CUP does not state the property owner is prohibited from seeking fencing allowed under the fence ordinance that may not necessarily be related to agricultural uses. If, however, that was the intent of the commission, again, clarification may be needed.

Property owner and permit holder **Dr. Kirk Neely** was present and commented that he has carefully reviewed the CUP provisions and conditions and finds nothing in them that would prohibit him from seeking a fence permit for the southern property line fence. He noted that the fence found acceptable by the ASCC is three feet tall with one rail and within the fence ordinance provisions. He stressed that he would have significant issue if the town concluded that his permit eliminated him from seeking a permit for fencing that is permitted and exists on other larger parcels.

Dr. Neely also advised that he needs some boundary control relative to the MROSD adjoining use. He noted that the MROSD mows on to his property and open space users cross the boundary between "public" and "private" property.

ASCC members discussed the request and fencing issue. **Koch** commented that based on the subcommittee work, she concluded that the low fencing would be subtle and unobtrusive and not obstruct views. **Ross** offered that he found the fence aesthetically acceptable and preferred to see low fence to a mowed boundary.

McKitterick commented that while the fence may be aesthetically acceptable, he still concluded that the CUP action by the commission did not anticipate any fencing along the southern parcel boundary.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Koch and passed 3-0 to take the following actions subject to the qualifications, including those relative to green building compliance, and understandings set forth in the staff report:

1. Approve the November 5, 2012 subcommittee letter.
2. Approve the design refinements for the green house subject to the plans being modified consistent with the changes agreed to by the project architect at the ASCC meeting and

subject to final review of interior lighting plans and controls to determine if any shading system is needed.

3. Approve the design refinements for the guest house/art studio.

Following consideration of the proceeding matter, Breen returned to her ASCC position.

Architectural Review for house and carport additions, and remodeling 357 Westridge Drive, Deem

Vlasic presented the January 23, 2013 staff report on this proposal for approval of the addition of 1,212 sf of countable floor area to the subject 2.7-acre Westridge Subdivision site, increasing total site floor area to 3,790 sf. He explained that the proposal includes a minor main level house addition, a new lower “basement” level, conversion of an existing detached garage to an art studio, and a new carport with new driveway configuration. Vlasic also clarified that the scope of grading suggested by the plan data is approximately 460 cubic yards but that engineered grading plans have not been submitted and, at this time, a site development permit is not requested. Vlasic explained that eventually such a permit would be needed and ASCC consideration and approval of the permit would be required as discussed in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the issues discussed in the report and the following proposed plans unless otherwise noted, revised through 1/23/13 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet 1 of 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, Aug. 2012
Sheet: A1-1.1, Site Plan w/Landscaping (and lighting and fixture cut sheets)
Sheet: A1-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging
Sheet: A1-2.1, Main House Floor Plans
Sheet: A1-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Also considered were the following application materials:

- Completed Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 11/12/12
- Completed GreenPoint Rated Existing Home Checklist, received 11/14/12, targeting 32 BIG points whereas a minimum point total of 25 is required for this “elements” project.

In addition to the above, the ASCC considered the January 9, 2013 approval letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC).

Applicant Laura Deem and project architects Carter Warr and Mark Sutherland presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments, partially to address or clarify questions raised in the staff report.

- The site development permit plans will fully clarify access and final landscape issues. Forester Ralph Osterling has been involved in the project to review potential tree impact and the process of tree removal. He will advise on the matter of driveway grading and potential tree impacts. Also, he has looked at the possibility of moving the line of planted Manzanita at the proposed lower level access and this does not appear practically possible.

- The proposed “new” fence in the front setback discussed in the staff report will be eliminated and the current opening in the front yard horse fence, i.e., at the existing driveway, would be filled in with fencing to match the existing horse fence. The existing north side fence above the pool would be retained but a section opened to accommodate access from the studio trellis area to the pool deck. These changes would be clarified on the site plan provided with the site development permit application.
- As noted in the staff report all new construction will match existing conditions in terms of exterior colors and materials and finishes, except that the existing wood shake roof would be replaced with a new metal standing seam roof. The roof finish would be selected to work with the existing wood siding and a final proposed roof material would be submitted to the ASCC for consideration with the site development permit application.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. **Rusty Day, chair of the WASC**, was, however, asked if the committee had any additional comments at this time and he responded that there were none beyond those in the committee approval letter.

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

1. The necessary site development permit application shall have been processed and approved by the ASCC. The permit application shall include a detailed construction staging and tree protection plan. The construction staging plan shall be shared with the WASC for comment prior to being presented to the ASCC for action.
2. The new driveway plan shall be modified to conform to the town’s 12-foot width standard, and the final driveway grading plans shall be evaluated by the project arborist to ensure the front yard oaks are not adversely impacted by the proposed grading.
3. A final, detailed front yard landscaping plan shall be provided that addresses the concerns discussed in the staff report and is consistent with the final grading plans.
4. The fencing plans shall be modified to address the concerns noted in the staff report in line with the clarifications provided at the ASCC meeting.
5. Building permit plans for interior changes to the garage studio conversion shall be subjected to staff review to ensure full compliance with the town’s accessory structures policies and zoning standards.
6. Final materials and finishes for the metal roof shall be provided.
7. A final, comprehensive exterior lighting plan shall be provided on one plan sheet showing both house and yard lighting. The plan shall identify all existing lighting to be retained and removed and all new lighting, including changes that would reflect final plans for fencing and access from the studio to the pool area. The plan shall also identify light switching areas and controls.

Architectural Review for addition of detached accessory structure “recreation room/studio,” 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis

Vlasic referenced the January 23, 2013 staff report on this matter and noted that project consideration needs to be continued to the February 11, 2013 ASCC meeting to permit time for the applicant to address concerns of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) relative to the siting of the proposed studio. No public comments were offered and project consideration was continued to the regular February 11, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling and addition of detached accessory structure “Cabana” Guest House,” 230 Shawnee Pass, Gurtner

Padovan presented the January 28, 2013 staff report on this request for approval of plans for a 1,448 sf single-story addition to an existing 2,784 sf, single-story dwelling, an 82 sf addition to the garage and a new detached 581 sf pool cabana/guest house on the subject 1.007 acre Arrowhead Meadows parcel. He clarified that the expansion of the dwelling results in the removal of an existing detached garage structure and includes a new 1,025 sf basement that would be located directly under the main dwelling.

Padovan clarified that the plans propose to concentrate 89% of the floor area in the main house, exceeding the 85% floor area limit. He explained that to permit this concentration of floor area in the main house, the ASCC must make special findings as noted in the staff report. Padovan also noted that the applicant has contacted the West Bay Sanitary District about potentially connecting to the force main sewer in the street but the Town does not require that the dwelling be connected to sewer unless the existing septic system is not functioning adequately and needs repair.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans, unless otherwise noted, dated “Received January 17, 2013,” and prepared by Masterwork Definitive Architecture and Construction:

Sheet A-1:	Architectural Site Plan (and Landscaping)
Sheet A-2a:	Floor Plan, Main Residence
Sheet A-2b:	Floor Plan Basement and Cabana
Sheet A-2c:	Basement Section
Sheet A-3a:	Exterior Elevations, 11/17/12
Sheet A-3all:	Exterior Elevations
Sheet A-3b:	Exterior Elevations, 11/17/12
Sheet A-4:	Roof Plan, 11/17/12

Also considered were the following application materials:

- Color Board “Received 01/25/13,” which includes exterior wall colors, cedar siding stain colors, windowpane colors and stone veneer.
- Exterior Material Specifications and lighting fixture types including “cut sheets” on the light fixtures.
- Completed “Build-It-Green Green Point Rated Project Checklist” with 116 points for the dwelling (target of 50). (It was noted that a checklist was not yet completed for the cabana.)

In addition to the issues discussed in the staff report, Mr. Padovan noted that the plans needed to be clarified relative to:

- Fencing for pool security

- Screening planting to address concerns of the neighbors at 234 Shawnee, i.e., Mr. and Mrs. Krausz, relative to the concerns noted in their January 17, 2013 email.
- Comprehensive lighting including pool lighting.
- Plans for the existing hardscape on the west side of the house that extends to the garage to be demolished.
- The differences on the plan elevation renderings and the materials board relative to window finishes.

Mr. and Mrs. Gurtner and project architect Brian Darnell presented the plans to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarification relative to issues noted in the staff report and questions from ASCC members:

- The pool security would be by fencing extensions from the side property line fencing and walls and details will be added to the plans.
- The west side concrete surface extension to the existing garage would be removed and the area landscaped.
- Additional screening can be added to address the neighbor concerns.
- The desire is to maintain the loop driveway as it ensures safety, particularly with the number of children that walk in the neighborhood. *(After discussion, it was noted that while the driveway could be reconfigured to accommodate guest parking and vehicle "heads out" departure from the site, more grading and vegetation removal would be necessary and ASCC members concurred that the existing driveway configuration was acceptable.)*
- The rendering sheets are generally correct relative to the proposed materials and finishes, however, the plan is to use the off-white vinyl windows to match existing windows. The plans, however, can be clarified to ensure that the trim color used around the windows would be consistent with town light reflectivity standards.
- New doors would be installed and they would have the stained wood frame finish indicated on the plans.
- The new clerestory windows would be wood framed and trimmed as presented on the rendering sheets. There will be no lighting installed within the clerestory area.
- All basement excavation materials would be hauled off site. This would be clarified in the final construction staging plan.
- No solar system is planned at this time, but consideration to this will be given as plans are finalized for building permit submittal.
- The proposed "fire ribbon" is a trough of glass beads with a linear gas burner with low flames.
- The intent is to keep the existing east side gravel pathway for rear yard access and maintenance. *(Note: This matter was discussed and it was agreed that the plans needed to clarify any changes to grade to accommodate preservation of access around the east side additions and also that the surface needed to be detailed to determine if it was pervious or impervious.)*

- The existing lawn area is under 1,000 sf and the final landscape plan will detail irrigated grass areas.
- The guest unit skylight plans will be modified to add shades to control light spill at night. The skylights are desired, however, to experience the view out to the redwood trees and sky from inside the guest unit during the day.
- The proposed wall mounted fixture will be custom designed and will have one six watt bulb that is positioned to direct light down and not wash the walls. The front yard driveway lighting will be reduced as requested by the ASCC.
- The pool equipment would be located in a sound controlling "vault" located generally in the area of the existing garage to be demolished.

In addition to the above, the ASCC questioned the commission's ability to make findings to support the proposal to concentrate 89% of the permitted floor area in the main house. After discussion, it was agreed that the design should be modified reduce the east side addition by at least 100 sf, pulling the addition away from the east side property line and reducing the overall house width as viewed from Shawnee Pass.

Public comments were requested and **Mr. and Mrs. Krausz** reiterated their desire for additional screen planting along the rear of the subject property.

Following discussion of floor area, access, lighting and landscaping issues, as referenced above, Clark moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the proposal as clarified at the ASCC meeting, subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The proposed house floor area shall be lowered by at least 100 sf by reducing the scope of the east side addition.
2. A detailed site landscape plan shall be provided addressing the issues discussed at the ASCC meeting (as listed above) and, particularly, clarifying proposals for fencing, the gravel pathway access around the east side of the house, any changes to front yard landscaping, and the removal of the concrete area on the west side of the house. Further, the plans shall identify the pool equipment proposals.
3. The plans shall be revised to include interior skylight shades for the guest house, and the plans shall also clarify that there will be no lighting in the skylight areas.
4. A detailed construction-staging plan shall be provided and shall include a schedule for off-haul of excavated materials that avoids conflict with the daily arrival and departure of children from Ormondale School.
5. A final, comprehensive exterior lighting plan shall be provided on one plan sheet showing house, yard and pool lighting. The plan shall identify all existing lighting to be retained and removed and all new lighting, but currently proposed driveway lighting shall be eliminated. The plan shall also identify light switching areas and controls.
6. Details for window trim finish and treatments and final door details shall be provided.

Mr. Darnell asked if it was possible to begin work on the building permit plan while, for example, the landscape plan, construction staging, sewer issue and other conditions were being worked on. It was suggested that the plans for reducing the house floor area be returned to the ASCC at the next meeting so those could be acted on to permit the house building permit plan work to proceed.

Annual Election of ASCC Chair and Vice Chair

Clark moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 election of Breen as Chair and Koch as Vice Chair for the calendar year of 2013.

Commission and Staff Reports

There were no commission or staff reports.

Minutes

Ross moved, seconded by Koch, and passed 4-0 approval of the January 14, 2013 meeting minutes, excluding those related to the Clark application, with the following addition provided by Breen to her comments on the Priory artificial turf discussion on page 8:

“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.”

Ross moved, seconded by Koch and passed 3-0-1 (Clark), approval of the January 14, minutes relative to the Clark application.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

T. Vlasic