

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

**February 11, 2013**

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, Hughes, Koch, Ross  
Absent: None  
Planning Commission liaison: None  
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Interim Planning Manager Padovan,  
Assistant Planner Borck

**Oral Communications**

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

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

Vlastic referenced the February 7, 2013 staff report and noted that on January 28, 2013 the ASCC was scheduled to consider this request for approval of a detached, 504 sf recreation room/studio on the subject 3.7-acre Westridge Subdivision area parcel. He explained that review, however, had to be continued because the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) did not find the studio siting acceptable as proposed and, with the continuance, it was hoped that the applicant and WASC could consider and resolve concerns. Vlastic advised that this process is still underway and, as a result, project consideration should be continued to the February 25, 2013 regular ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the regular February 25, 2013 ASCC meeting.

---

*As the project applicant, Clark left the ASCC meeting room prior to consideration of the following agenda item.*

---

**Follow-up Review – Architectural Review & Site Development Permit X9H-645, new residential development with Guest unit, 10 Sioux Way, Clark**

Padovan presented the February 7, 2013 staff report on this follow-up review of the subject applications conditionally approved by the ASCC on January 14, 2013. He discussed how the following plans, dated “Received February 1, 2013” (unless otherwise noted) and prepared by Jeff Clark Architect, addressed the ASCC approval conditions:

Sheet A-0: Cover Sheet  
Sheet A-1: Impervious Surface and Floor Area Calculations  
Sheet A-2: Site Plan  
Sheet A-3: Main Dwelling; Architectural Floor Plan

- Sheet A-4: Main Dwelling; Architectural 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; Architectural Floor Plan and Elevations
- Sheet A-8: Exterior Lighting Plan
- Sheet L-1: Landscape Plan; Cleaver Design Associates
- 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

The ASCC considered the revised plans, the revised color board, and the 'Response to ASCC Conditions' letter dated February 4, 2013 from the applicant explaining how the clerestory roof was lowered, the wall color darkened and what lighting was removed. Also considered was the February 6, 2013 letter from Mr. Richard Blum, 40 Sioux, seeking basic reconsideration of the project. It was noted that the appeal period relative to the January 14, 2013 approval had passed and there was no basis for such reconsideration unless the applicant elected to pursue significant changes to the approved plans.

**Deirdre Clark** presented the revised plans and materials to the ASCC. She reviewed the comments in the February 4, 2013 letter to the ASCC and confirmed how the plans responded to ASCC conditions. She noted that the work to remove the soil away from the driveway oaks had been completed and that only one of the trees actually had some soil piled at its base. In response to a question, she commented that there was no need for additional pathway lighting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Members discussed the revised plans and found them responsive to the approval conditions. Following discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to add two toyon shrubs for additional building screening and these are to be planted along the blank wall on the west side of the house.
2. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall include and provide for implementation of the recommendations of the project arborist for protection and to ensure the long-term health of the two blue oaks along the driveway.
3. The building permit plans shall demonstrate that there will be no permanent lighting within the clerestory area that would have potential for significant light spill through the clerestory windows.

---

*Following action on the above item, Clark returned to his ASCC position.*

---

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

Padovan presented the February 7, 2013 staff report on this follow-up item. He explained that on January 28, 2013 the ASCC considered and conditionally approved applications for to the main dwelling and garage, a complete interior remodeling, a new detached guest house/cabana, pool, and related landscape improvements for the subject 1.0-acre parcel.

Padovan advised that a condition of the approval provided for a reduction in the floor area of the main dwelling structure by at least 100 square feet to bring it closer to the 85% floor area standard for the single largest structure on a property and other conditions that include provisions for adjustments to proposals for landscaping, lighting, exterior materials and finishes and interior sheds for the guest house skylights. Padovan clarified that in response to a January 28<sup>th</sup> request from the project design team and ASCC agreement to the request, at this time revised plans have been submitted to address only the floor area, exterior materials and finishes, exterior building lighting and skylight shading conditions. It was clarified that the other conditions listed in the 1/28 ASCC action would be addressed at a later time, but that action on the current submittal would permit the design team to proceed with work on the building permit plans.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans dated “Received February 6, 2013” (unless otherwise noted) 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-3a: Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-3b: Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-4: Roof Plan
- Sheet ME-1: Electrical Plan – Main Residence
- Sheet ME-2: Electrical Plan – Cabana and Basement

Mrs. Gurtner and project architect Brian Darnell presented the revised plans to the ASCC and answered questions particularly related to the location of exterior light fixtures relative to building code compliance. They also clarified the plans relative to the proposals for guest house skylight shading and confirmed that they concurred with the exterior colors and finishes recommendations contained in the staff report.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Thereafter, ASCC members discussed the reduction in floor area and Breen and Koch concurred that while they would have preferred a greater reduction with a plan closer to the 85% limit they appreciated the 102 sf reduction made in response to the ASCC action at the January 28, 2013 meeting. Both concurred that the final landscape plan would be important in any case and looked forward to reviewing that plan prior to issuance of building permits.

Hughes noted that he was not at the January 28, 2013 meeting and wondered about the factors that supported the ASCC findings to allow the 85% floor area limit to be exceeded. He noted that he did not see them articulated in the meeting materials. Vlasic advised that the site was constrained by large redwood trees, a local drainage channel along the rear of the property and a panhandle feature on an adjoining parcel that resulted in a neighbor's

driveway along two sides of the subject site not including the Shawnee street frontage. He also noted that the site had some slope along the frontage that provided some constraints to driveway access that limited building design responses.

Following discussion, Koch moved, seconded by Ross and passed 5-0 to approve the follow-up submittal subject to the following the color changes recommended in the February 7, 2013 staff report. This action was taken with the understanding that all other ASCC January 28, 2013 approval conditions not addressed at this time would be resolved to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of building permits.

**Follow-up review and modifications to previous approval -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-642, house additions, remodeling and guest house, 55 Stonegate Road, Hughes**

Vlasic presented the February 7, 2013 staff report on the subject follow-up submittal and request for modifications relative to approvals granted to the applicant on November 12, 2012.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans:

Landscape Plans – John Dalrymple, Landscape Architecture, 1/14/13:

Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan  
Sheet L-2, Diagrammatic Lighting Plan  
Sheet L-3, Rear Property Line Screening Plan

Architectural Plans, PPV Associates, revised through 1/21/13:

Page 1, Floor Plan Change, 1/16/13  
Sheet A0, Site Plan, Existing Floor Plan & Notes  
Sheet A2.0, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A2.2, Accessory Structure Elevations, rev. 10/10/12  
Sheet A2.5, Exterior Elevation ASCC Comparisons, 2/11/13

Erik Hughes presented the follow-up submittal and proposed house plan modifications to the ASCC and advised that his only concern with the staff report comments had to do with the proposed limitations on interior lighting within the clerestory area. Vlasic clarified that the objective is to ensure that any lighting be limited, directed down and ensure minimum potential for night spill through the clerestory windows.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. ASCC members briefly discussed the clerestory changes and also the scope of removal of invasive plan materials. Members concurred that while removal of the invasive plants and replanting as called for on the landscape plan was the correct approach, the site would be substantially opened to views until the replacement plantings develop some maturity.

Clark also commented that prior to removal of the invasive materials and the pines and thinning of other materials, the neighbors should be notified that the work is proceeding in line with the approved plans.

Following discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Craig Hughes and passed 5-0, approval of the plan revisions and follow-up submittal 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. All tree thinning work shall be done under the direction of the landscape architect or a qualified arborist and the building permit plans shall include notes verifying this and the specific directions for how the thinning work is to be done. Once approved, and the thinning work is completed, the landscape architect or a qualified arborist shall provide a report that the work has been completed to his or her specifications.
2. Verification shall be provided to the satisfaction of town staff that the site neighbors have been informed of the authorized vegetation removal and thinning work a reasonable period of time prior to the commencement of work.
3. A different exterior light fixture shall be selected for the northerly guest house access door that is shielded and only directs light downward.
4. The building permit plans shall demonstrate that there will be no permanent lighting within the clerestory area that would have potential for significant light spill through the clerestory windows.
5. The placement of the wire trellis features for screening of views from the west side driveway to the guest house windows shall be under the direction of a designated ASCC member. The construction schedule submitted with the building permit application shall provide for this field placement work.

### **Commission and Staff Reports**

Vlasic reported that the town attorney has reviewed the ASCC approval of the southern boundary fence for conditional use permit (CUP) X7D-169, Neely/Myers, and concluded that there is no basis for planning commission reconsideration of the approval. It was, however, noted that it is expected the permit holders would seek a CUP amendment to include vineyard uses and at that time the planning commission could elect to condition any approval of the amendment on additional fencing conditions that could include removal of the southern boundary fence. Vlasic clarified that a decision relative to any CUP amendment would likely be made by the applicants following the joint February 13, 2013 study session of the planning commission and town council on the general plan meadow preserve provisions.

Vlasic and Breen reported on the February 6, 2013 planning commission study session on the draft Portola Road Corridor Plan and noted that, based on the planning commission direction, after some revisions and clarifications are made to the draft plan it will be presented to the ASCC for discussion and recommendations.

Vlasic reported on the status of town review of unauthorized clearing and tree removal that has taken place at 18 Redberry in the Blue Oaks subdivision. He noted that a remediation plan is being developed with input from staff, ASCC member Breen, the Blue Oaks HOA and concerned neighbors. He advised that the plan would eventually be shared with the ASCC for review and approval and that the review would include a site meeting. Vlasic noted that the town council is also considering what actions it may take relative to the unauthorized tree and vegetation removal within the open space easement areas and that the open space easement language does reference actions that could be taken when it is found that easement provisions have been violated.

**Minutes**

Ross moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 4-1 (Hughes) on the full minutes and 3-2 (Hughes, Breen) on the minutes related to conditional use permit X7D-169, Neely/Myers.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

T. Vlastic