

Architectural and Site Control Commission **March 11, 2013**
Special Joint Site Meeting with Planning Commission, 6 Buck Meadow Dr., Strick, and Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chairs Breen and Von Feldt called the special site meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at 6 Buck Meadow Drive. (Note: The planning commission meeting did not become formal until 4:12 p.m., i.e., with the arrival of commissioner Gilbert.)

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch, Ross
ASCC absent: None
Planning Commission: Von Feldt, McIntosh, Gilbert (arrived at 4:12 p.m.)
Planning Commission absent: McKitterick, Targ
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Interim Planning Manager Padovan

Others* present relative to the proposal for 6 Buck Meadow Drive:

Roland and Anngi-Kaenon Strick, applicants
Bob Sieger, project architect
Cliff Bechtel, project civil engineer
Corey Mills, project construction consultant (arrived at approximately 4:40 pm)
George Salah, Lot 14 Redberry Ridge, Blue Oaks (arrived at approximately 4:40 p.m.)
Judith Murphy and Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee

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

Architectural Review for new Blue Oaks residence and Site Development Permit X9H-650, 6 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 34), Strick

Vlastic presented the March 8, 2013 staff report to the ASCC and March 11, 2013 staff report to the planning commission on the project. He noted that the ASCC was responsible for consideration of the architectural review part of the request and the planning commission the grading (i.e., site development) component of the project as explained in the staff reports. Vlastic also stressed that the joint site meeting and regular March 11th ASCC evening meeting were for preliminary project consideration and that following preliminary review ASCC consideration would be continued to the regular March 25, 2013 ASCC meeting. Vlastic advised that the planning commission public hearing on the site development permit was tentatively scheduled for the regular April 3, 2013 planning commission meeting.

ASCC members and planning commissioners considered the staff reports and following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated February 10, 2013 and prepared by Bob Sieger Architecture:

Sheet 1, Title Page – Site Property Plan
Sheet C-1.1, Topographic Survey Plan, MacCleod and Associates, 5/11/12
Sheet C-1.2, Partial Topographic Survey, B&H Surveying, Inc., January 2013
Sheet C-2.1, Landscape Plan
Sheet C-2.2, Landscape Specs/Details
Sheet 3.1, Site Lighting Plan
Sheet 2, Enlarged Site Plan/Grading Concepts

Sheet 3, Aerial Photo and Neighborhood Study
Sheet 4, Garage Level Floor Plan
Sheet 5, Main Level Floor Plan
Sheet 6, Upper Loft Plan
Sheet 7, South and East Elevation Views
Sheet 8, West and North Elevation Views
Sheet 9, Site and Building Section Studies
Sheet 10, Site and Neighborhood View Studies
Sheet 11, Study Model Photos

Civil engineering/grading plans dated 2/18/13, prepared by Clifford Bechtel and Associates:

Sheet C-1.0, Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan
Sheet C-1.1, Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan
Sheet C-2.0, Erosion & Sediment Control & Staging Plan

Application supporting materials (available for reference):

Story Pole Plan, Bob Sieger Architect, 2/10/13
Completed Built it Green Checklist, received 2/12/13, targeting 188 BIG points whereas a minimum of 109 points is required.
Completed Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, 2/11/13
Cut sheets for the lights shown on plan Sheet 3.1, for step, pathway, wall, recessed eave and pool lights
Arborist report by Deborah Ellis, MS, December 15, 2012 and request for removal of one double trunk oak
Exterior Colors and Materials Board, received 2/12/13. The board is discussed below and will be available for reference at the March 11, 2013 site and evening meetings.

The applicants and project architect explained the plans and supporting materials and made use of the story poles and building envelope taping set at the site to explain the proposals. Also, a project model was used to clarify site conditions, placement of the house and driveway, guest parking etc. References were provided relative to the Blue Oaks PUD provisions and how the plans were developed consistent with the PUD standards and guidelines. The site neighborhood studies were referenced to explain relationships to adjoining parcels and houses, and it was noted that the plans had been approved by the Blue Oaks homeowners association (HOA) as set forth in the February 26, 2013 letter from the HOA property manager. Also prepared by the applicant and provided for reference was a bound copy of the relevant project materials including the applications, soils report, arborist report, and copies of the town staff and committee review reports.

During the course of the site meeting, the applicants, project architect and project civil engineer explained the considerations given to project design, architecture, grading and tree protection. They also discussed the efforts made to reach out to neighbors and the HOA approval process. It was clarified that the project was concentrated on the westerly side of the building envelope to minimize impacts on site trees and potential for impacts on the houses to the south. It was also explained how the grading cut the proposed house into the site and that the architectural framework provided for the desired private outdoor area and also oriented the main house window areas into the west side of the site and away from most public views.

Meeting attendees were able to consider the established building envelope for the site, the "POSE" open space conditions, and the impacts on the site of fill placed as part of the Blue Oaks subdivision improvement process.

After viewing site conditions, story poles and receiving a detailed presentation from the applicants, architect and civil engineer, Chairs Von Feldt and Breen requested comments from those present. ASCC members agreed they would offer comments at the evening meeting. Others present offered the following comments.

Chip McIntosh commented that since the site had been disturbed by subdivision grading, consideration should be given to distribution on site of the roughly 700 cubic yards of fill now proposed to be off-hauled from the property. This matter was discussed and others concurred that at least the topsoil from the building site could be scraped and deposited on the site keeping the soil and native materials in the soil on the property.

Bechtel advised that the roughly 700 cubic yards of excess material could easily be "lost" over the site. He added that the final grading could take into account changes to the existing drainage features using the additional fill to make the final contours appear more "natural" than is the case with existing conditions.

Judith Murphy concurred with the suggestions for keeping the topsoil on the property and also recommended that madrone at the southwest corner of the building site be preserved. She advised that such native plants are important and difficult if not impossible to transplant.

George Salah sought and received clarification on how the project conformed to the Blue Oaks PUD standards and design guidelines. (Vlasic commented on this specifically referencing the evaluation comments contained in the staff reports.) Mr. Salah also inquired into the sustainable aspects of the plans and offered his experience and assistance relative to enhancing project sustainability.

After the site discussions and sharing of the above preliminary comments, planning commission and ASCC members thanked the applicants, neighbor and others for their participation in the site meeting. Thereafter, ASCC project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Chair Breen called the regular 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: Von Feldt
Town Council Liaison: Aalfs
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Interim Planning Manager Padovan

Oral Communications

Chair Breen advised that discussions were starting on the town budgets for the next fiscal year. She noted that the ASCC should consider any work items committee members feel should be specifically addressed in the planning budget.

Prior to consideration of the following application, Koch temporarily left her ASCC position explaining she, as a site neighbor, was conflicted from participating in project review.

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

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2013 staff report on this request for approval of a new detached recreation room/studio (studio) on the subject 3.7-acre Westridge Subdivision area parcel (see attached vicinity map). He discussed project background and the history of Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) review. He explained that WASC approval has now been received with the March 11, 2013 letter from Rusty Day, WASC Chair.

Vlasic then presented the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, revised through 3/5/13 and prepared by Swatt Miers Architects:

- Sheet A0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet A1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Enlarged Site Plan
- Sheet A1.3, Floor Plan, Lighting Plan & Roof Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations

Colors and materials board received 12/13/12.

Nicole Vidalakis and project architects Bob Swatt and Miya Muraki presented the revised plans and a project model and offered the following project clarifications based on the comments in the WASC approval letter and the staff report issues:

- The project plans are being modified to eliminate the use of exposed cinder block walls and, where these were proposed, they will be poured in place concrete matching the walls used on the main house and other site structures.

- The proposed structure will be located within the approved landscape plan olive grove. This tree cover along with the existing oaks and other plants in the adjacent right of way areas should adequately screen views from the streets to the very low rec/studio building, but if necessary, additional landscape screening can be provided as requested by the WASC. It is requested, however, that the need for landscaping be considered after the building is completed and the olive grove and other approved landscape plan plantings are in place. It was stressed that no existing trees were to be removed for this project and the only tree removal was one or two of the olives shown on the approved landscape plan.
- A revised floor plan sheet dated 3/5/11 was presented that moved the powder room facilities to the northwesterly corner of the proposed building thus providing for only one main room in conformity with town accessory structures policies.

Vlasic advised that the revised floor plan sheet resolved his staff report concerns relative to the building layout. He added that the project as presented does meet the town's floor area limits for the site. He explained that original approval included a pool house that was not implemented and that the WASC concerns over floor area compliance appear to reflect calculations that included the pool house that is no longer part of the project. Nonetheless, Vlasic advised that the final floor area numbers would be checked and compliance verified prior to issuance of a building permit.

Public comments were requested. Rusty Day, WASC thanked the applicant for working with the committee to identify an acceptable site and for the other design clarifications.

ASCC members briefly discussed the revised plans as clarified at the meeting and found them acceptable. Members also concluded that additional screen landscaping was not necessary to satisfy town ASCC review requirements, but acknowledged that such additional planting may be needed relative to WASC approval conditions. Ross commented that the design process while apparently complicated, did result in the most appropriate siting for the proposed building.

Following discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Clark to approve the revised plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit to the satisfaction of planning staff:

1. A deed restriction shall be recorded to the satisfaction of the town attorney providing that the new structure shall not be used as a second unit and shall only be used in conformity with town accessory unit zoning standards and policies.
2. The plans shall be modified to include the revised floor plan sheet presented at the ASCC meeting.
3. The plans shall be corrected to show the CMU walls replaced with poured in place concrete.
4. Final floor area calculations shall be provided verifying conformity with town floor area standards.

Following action on the above application Koch returned to her ASCC position.

Continued Consideration of Staff Referral for Architectural Review -- Fence Permit Application, 295 Golden Oak Drive, Keamy

Padovan presented the March 8, 2013 staff report on the continuing review of this request. He noted the changes made to the plans since the last ASCC review and the issues that still needed ASCC consideration. He commented that the conditions associated with the side and rear yard fencing approved at the February 25th meeting still needed to be addressed, but that the focus of the current review is on the plans for the desired front yard ornamental metal fencing.

Sunnie Bertolucci, All Fence Company, Inc., presented the proposal to the ASCC. In response to comments in the staff report, she provided the following revised materials, unless otherwise noted, dated March 8, 2013:

Memorandum from All Fence Company, Inc. on proposed changes
Aerial Site Fencing Plan
Ornamental Iron Fence, Front and Top View Diagram, March 1, 2013
Ornamental Iron Fence Elevation Detail, March 1, 2013
Color Image of Existing Ornamental Iron Gate at Parking Court, March 1, 2013
Color Image of Existing Conditions, View from the Street
Color Image of Existing Conditions, View from Inside Property
Wood and Wire Fence Detail (with posts located on the inside as requested by the ASCC)
Sheet L.1, Front Fence and Landscape Plan
Sheet L.2, Plant Key
Sheet L.3, Photo of Proposed Boulders

Ms. Bertolucci clarified that the revised site plan included the fence alignment change in front of the guest house recommended in the staff report and that the plans also included boulders and additional landscaping to help screen views to the fencing.

In response to a question, staff verified that the plans did place the fence at the required 25-foot setback line and that accurate building file data was available to ensure the fence would be placed at the site in conformity with the required setback.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, ASCC members discussed the project and continued to struggle to make findings in conformity with the purpose statements of the fence ordinance for the proposed front yard fencing. After considerable discussion and consideration of options, Hughes moved, seconded by Ross to approve the revised front yard fencing plan subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and planning staff prior to issuance of a permit for the front yard fencing:

1. A detailed, professionally prepared landscaped plan shall be prepared for the front yard area that ensures minimum views from the public right of way to the front yard fencing. The plan shall be consistent with town landscape standards and guidelines and the intent is to make the fence, in time, disappear into native plant materials.
2. The use of boulders shall be eliminated from the final landscape plan.

It was noted that the above conditional approval was in addition to the approval actions taken at the February 25th ASCC meeting.

Continued Architectural Review – Residential Redevelopment with swimming pool and related site improvements, 420 Golden Oak Drive, Woods

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2013 staff report on the ASCC's continued review of the subject proposal for residential redevelopment of this 1.1-acre Alpine Hills subdivision parcel. He discussed the preliminary review process and considerations and ASCC reactions as recorded in the draft minutes of the February 25, 2013 meeting. He emphasized that the applicant is still requesting that the ASCC make the necessary findings to permit 100% of the floor area to be concentrated in the new house and also referenced the March 10, 2013 email from Deborah Romani relative to the project received since the staff report was prepared.

ASCC members considered the staff report, neighbor email and the following project plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, revised through 3/4/13, and prepared by CJW Architecture:

March 6, 2013 letter from the project architect explaining the changes made to the project in response to preliminary review comments

Sheet: T-01, Title Sheet

Sheet: T-0.2, Exterior Lighting Selections, 1/29/13

Sheet SU1, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 6/13/12

Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Site Plan

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan

Sheet: A-1.2, Site Sections & Grading, 2/22/13

Sheet: L-1, Landscape Plan, Williams Brothers, Landscapes, 1/29/13

Sheet: A-2.1, Main Floor Plan

Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Revised BIG Checklist received 2/15/13 targeting 229 BIG points whereas a minimum of 228 points is mandated for this project.

Finish Board, 1/30/13, CJW Architecture (to be presented at continued ASCC meeting).

Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 2/4/13 (**no** irrigated turf proposed).

Arborist report for the site dated March 1, 2013, prepared by McClenahan Consulting

Vlasic reminded ASCC members that a site development permit would still be required after any action to approve the subject architectural review request and that the applicant is aware that there is some risk in pursuing architectural review approval without detailed, civil engineered grading plans.

Douglas Woods, Barina Hawes and Carter Warr presented the revised plans to the ASCC. Warr reviewed the plan changes as discussed in his letter to the ASCC and thanked ASCC members and neighbors for their participation in the February 25th site meeting. Warr also presented a 2/11/13 binder of images showing the pattern of development in the Golden Oak Drive area. He noted that many of the existing houses were two-story and that he was aware that many were over the current 85% floor area limit. He acknowledge that some likely predated the town's 85% floor area standard, but offered that conditions in the area did support floor area concentrations and that the neighbors of the subject site were reached out to and generally preferred a concentration of floor area rather than detached structures.

In response to questions from ASCC members, the applicants and Mr. Warr offered the following comments:

- The proposed main level plate height is 10 feet and the plate height in the upper level is 8.5 feet.
- The total BIG target points as proposed is 229 whereas the minimum mandated by the town ordinance is 228.
- The applicant is fully willing to have a deed restriction recorded against the property that would ensure future buyers are made aware that the roofed porch areas cannot be enclosed to create additional living/floor area space.
- The lighting in the upper gallery area would be located along the exterior wall and directed back into the house in a manner minimizing potential for light spill through the gallery windows.
- Small size samples of the proposed barrel tile roofing were provided and it was emphasized that the final mix would be in the darker hues.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and the clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting. All concluded that the revised plans addressed the key design issues, subject to conditions, that were identified at the February 25th preliminary review meetings. Members also concurred that the eucalyptus tree should be retained for now and that lighting and other specific design issues should be addressed as noted in the staff report. Additional discussion focused on lighting and interior lighting in the gallery area.

In summary, all ASCC members concurred that there was a basis for the findings to concentrate floor area and noted that slope, conditions of original site grading, tree cover and relationship to house siting and views on adjacent and neighboring sites supported findings for floor area concentration. Further, it was noted that the site landscape design efforts were to remove invasive materials and replace these with materials consistent with town landscape standards and objectives.

Members, however, differed on the extent of appropriate concentration. Hughes, in particular, concluded that with the large basement area and 100% floor area mostly above the lower "basement" level, he could not make the finding that the project fit the neighborhood. He offered that, perhaps, with more specific data on the actual amount of floor area on other properties in the area his position might be different.

While Breen shared the basic concerns of Hughes, she commented that in this case she was persuaded by the comments of others and neighbors' reactions that the floor area concentration was appropriate. She commented that the approach to landscaping with the commitment for large oaks and removal of the non-natives, and the changes associated with the house design and driveway access, allowed her to support the plans.

Hughes advised that while he struggled with the required floor area concentration findings, he did support the project design changes and, were it not for the principles of the findings, he could support the design. He noted that, in particular, he found that the height reduction was a good response and that the landscaping would likely address the key potential visual impact matters discussed at the preliminary review meetings.

Following discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-1 (Hughes) to make the necessary findings, as discussed at the ASCC meeting, to allow 100% of the floor area to be concentrated in the proposed house and to approve the architectural review proposal

as presented on the revised plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to release of a building permit:

1. A site development permit shall be applied for and approved by the town.
2. The final grading plans shall, as possible, provide for more backfilling of soil against the lower swimming pool wall as discussed in the record of the February 25, 2013 preliminary project review. Further, the final grading plans shall resolve the inconsistencies between the site and landscape plans relative to the driveway retaining walls and fencing as discussed in the February 21, 2013 staff report.
3. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided that implements the concepts set forth on the conceptual plan and includes provisions for the larger screen trees at critical view locations particularly from the intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Bear Gulch Road and from the Golden Oak Drive frontage. The landscape plan shall also provide for installation of key new screen trees as soon after rough grading of the site as possible.
4. The final landscape plan shall provide for removal of all acacia, but the large eucalyptus west of the intersection of Golden Oak Drive shall be preserved.
5. A final, detailed lighting plan shall be provided that addresses the lighting concerns in the staff report and also provides for removal of all existing lighting in site trees.
6. The plans for lighting within the upper level gallery area shall be presented to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and shall be consistent with the clarifications provided at the ASCC meeting.
7. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property that would ensure future buyers are made aware that the roofed porch areas cannot be enclosed to create additional living/floor area space.
8. A final materials and finishes palette shall be provided responding to the comments set forth in the March 8, 2013 staff report.
9. A final tree protection and construction staging plan should be provided with the site development permit application and should include the recommendations of the project arborist.

It was clarified that the revised, detailed lighting and landscape plans should be provided to the ASCC with the site development permit application.

Architectural Review for new Blue Oaks residence and Site Development Permit X9H-650, 6 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 34), Strick

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report on the preliminary review of this proposal for new residential development of the subject vacant, 2.9-acre Blue Oaks subdivision property. He discussed the events of the special afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. (Refer to the above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Vlasic advised that at the site meeting, reactions appeared generally positive to the presentation and plan proposals and the main reaction had to do with the desire to reduce

the scope of dirt removed from the site and, particularly, preserve the existing top soil in the building area. He also noted that the conservation committee representatives encouraged changes to ensure that the existing madrone located at the southwest corner of the building envelope would be preserved.

Roland and Anngi-Kaenon Strick, applicants, Bob Sieger, project architect, Cliff Bechtel, project civil engineer and Corey Mills, project construction consultant, were present to discuss the plans with ASCC members. Mr. Sieger presented the background on the project design process and reviewed the process of interaction with neighbors and the Blue Oaks homeowners association (HOA). During the course of the presentation and discussion, the following clarifications were offered:

- The address design presented on the plans will be revised to be consistent with the requirements of the HOA for address signage.
- The grading plans will be revised to keep the top soil on site and, hopefully, result in a total balancing for cut and fill for the project.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that the pool/spa trellis was not an “A” frame form, but a more of low pitch shed form.
- No fencing is proposed at this time. If any fencing were to be considered it would be a very short run at the south end of the pool terrace closing off this end of the terrace area. This, however, is not really desired at this time.
- The boulders identifying the utility lines would be moved during construction as necessary but replaced to continue to mark the north side utility right of way.
- The metal roof is proposed to have a matte finish.
- Interior window shades are being considered for the larger western exposure window areas.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members then all concurred that the overall design was well suited to the site and responsive to the Blue Oak PUD standards and guidelines. Members all also found the specific architecture correct for the site and concluded that it elicited nothing but their positive reactions. The following individual ASCC comments were offered for consideration by the project design team. These were noted as being in addition to the matters of soil retention on site, preservation of the madrone tree, and the comments in the staff report relative to the need for a deed restriction and lighting plan adjustments. Relative to soil retention, members agreed that the added soil should be on the west uphill side of the proposed driveway alignment.

Clark: Consider modifications to the north side, “linear” wall element. Perhaps some landscaping in the adjacent POSE area or even a wall offset would help soften the strong line of the wall. Another option might be more dirt backfilling against the wall. (The model of the project was considered at this point to further appreciate the wall height relative to the final grading and also view considerations from Buck Meadow Drive.)

Koch:

- Support roof garden area and this will at least partially help mitigate for the linearity of the north side wall.
- Concur with the comments in the staff report relative to changes to the lighting plans, particularly removal of the bollard lights at the guest parking spaces.

Hughes:

- Appreciate Clark's comments on the north side wall and some consideration could be given to possible design modifications, but it is also acceptable as presented given site conditions.
- The photocell light at the garage should have a timer to ensure it is off at a certain time and not on all night.
- The "A" fixture wattage needs to be reduced. The lighting plan sheet also needs to be corrected to show the "C" fixture as having a 7.8-watt bulb and not "78" watt.

Ross:

- The north wall is fine as proposed, but if changes are found necessary by others perhaps color or texture variations might be explored.
- Consider some sun screen treatments for the exposed west facing large window areas.
- Consider elimination of the pool/spa trellis to open views to the sky, particularly the night sky.

Breen:

- Find the north side wall design fully acceptable as presented. Would not encourage any change in design.
- Take all precautions to protect Trees 1 and 2 and follow arborist recommendations.
- Prefer not to see parking in the "meadow" POSE area, but understand that options are limited to satisfy unique standards for Blue Oaks. Instead, however, of the use of a gravel surface, consider turf block or geo cells, so that the dominant view is of grass.

Following sharing of the above comments project review was continued to the regular March 25, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Commission and Staff Reports

Vlasic reported on the status of actions being taken by the town relative to the unauthorized tree cutting and vegetation removal at 18 Redberry Ridge in the Blue Oaks subdivision. He advised that a formal notice of violation has been sent to the property owner and that habitat restoration and site remediation plans are being prepared by the owners' consultants. He clarified that these plans are being readied for ASCC consideration at the March 25 meeting and that the plan review would include an afternoon site meeting.

Breen reported on her follow-up review associated with the McAdam project on Stonegate Road. She advised that there had been some additional planting of oaks beyond those called out on the landscape plan and of her efforts to encourage less tree planting.

Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Hughes, and passed 4-0-1 (Koch) approval of the February 25, 2013 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

T. Vlasic