Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch

Absent: Ross

Planning Commission liaison: McIntosh

Town Council Liaison: None

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Assistant Planner Borck

Oral Communications

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Architectural Review for conversion of carport to garage and associated entry staircase and landing improvements with adjustments to "accessory Parking Easement," 30 Coyote Hill, Portola Valley Ranch, McClendon

Vlasic presented the April 8, 2013 staff report on this proposal for enclosure of the existing flat roof, detached carport, with adjacent entry area modifications, planned for the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. He explained that the proposed carport enclosure would be accomplished with the installation of glazing in the existing west elevation and rear, i.e., north side, openings and the addition of a horizontal panel double door at the existing carport entry. He also noted that the double door would include upper glass panels and lower level solid panels and that all proposed finishes would match existing conditions. Vlasic clarified that the approach to enclosure was the same as proposed, approved and implemented for the "carport" at 25 Coyote Hill.

ASCC members considered the proposals as presented on the following plans prepared by Harrell Remodeling, Inc. and dated 2/7/13:

Sheet 1, Cover Sheet Sheet 2, (E) Entry Plan Sheet 3, Entry Plan Sheet 4, Garage Elevation

Also considered were the following materials:

- Cut sheets for the proposed wall mounted and step light fixtures, received 2/28/13.
- Photo sample sheet for stone materials to be used for entry landing surface and retaining walls, received 2/28/13.
- Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist dated 2/28/13 identifying a total landscape area of 105 sf.
- Build It Green Checklist, received 2/28/13, targeting a total of 29 BIG points whereas a minimum of 25 points would be needed for the Elements project.
- Proposed plant list received 2/28/13.

Beth McClendon and project designers Iris Harrell and Beth Leibbrandt presented the proposals to the ASCC. They clarified that the survey work for the necessary modifications

to the accessory parking easement, as discussed in the staff report, had been completed and would be recorded once the project plans are approved by the ASCC. They also explained the proposed lighting plans and clarified that the new garage door would be automatically operated.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion of lighting proposals and clarification of comments in the Ranch design committee approval letter, Clark moved, seconded by Hughes, and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as presented subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to release of building permits:

- 1. The plans shall be clarified to show the garage door as having automatic operation.
- 2. Verification shall be provided of the recordation of the necessary modifications to the accessory parking easement.

Prior to consideration of the following project, Hughes temporarily left the meeting room. In

doing so he advised that he would not participate in project consideration as his family had a formal relationship the with project architect.

Architectural Review for House additions and renovations, and landscape modifications, 145 Bear Gulch Drive, Wernikoff

Vlasic presented the staff report on this proposal for architectural review approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing two-story residence on the subject 1.2-acre, Alpine Hills subdivision parcel. He explained that the project includes remodeling of the existing two-story residence, a two-story addition on the north side of the existing house, and minor grading with retaining wall work to develop a level play area on the east side of the house in an area previously disturbed with original site development.

Vlasic advised that the project would increase the floor area of the existing 3,193 sf, two-story house by 1,034 sf for a total house area of 4,227 sf. He noted that this is within the 85% floor area limit of 4,475 sf, and the total area is well under the site's floor area limit of 5,266 sf. Vlasic clarified that an additional area of roughly 590 sf would be excavated into the lower level, and this storage space meets the town's basement standards and, thus, does not count against the floor area limit.

ASCC members considered that staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Feldman Architecture and dated 3/4/13:

Sheet G0.00, Project Info

Sheet G0.01, Build It Green Checklist

Sheet C100, Notes, Sections & Details, Benjamini Associates. Inc.

Sheet C200, Grading & Drainage Plan, Benjamini Associates. Inc.

Sheet C300, Erosion and Sediment Control, Benjamini Associates. Inc.

Sheet SU-1, Survey

Sheet L3.0, Planting Plan, Arterra Landscape Architects

Sheet L5.0, Lighting Plan, Arterra Landscape Architects

Sheet L5.1, Lighting Cut Sheets, Arterra Landscape Architects

Sheet A1.00, Site Plan

```
Sheet A2.00, Existing Garage & Level 1 Plan
```

Sheet A2.01, Existing Level 2 & Roof Plan

Sheet A2.10, Proposed Garage Plan

Sheet A2.11, Proposed Level 1 Plan

Sheet A2.12, Proposed Level 2 Plan

Sheet A2.13, Proposed Roof Plan

Sheet A3.00, Existing Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.01, Existing Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.10, Proposed Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.11, Proposed Exterior Elevations

Sheet A3.12, Proposed Exterior Elevations

Sheet A4.10, Proposed Sections

Also considered were the following application submittal materials:

- Materials Board, dated 3/4/13
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 3/4/13

Vlasic commented that story poles were installed at the site to model the proposed north side two story addition and that the basic building envelope of the existing house structure, while substantially remodeled, would not change.

Sarah and Dan Wernikoff and project architect Elaine Uang presented the project to the ASCC. They explained the lighting plans and noted that arbor lights would be down directed and that the wall "wash" lights were directed at very low walls, maximum of four feet high, and not intended to reflect off of any larger surfaces but to enhance access stair illumination. It was also noted that the deck lights were west of the wall at the fire feature.

In response to comments in the staff report, Ms. Uang advised that she is working with the fire marshal to address her review comment, that an arborist would be involved in the project ,and that if any fencing were planned it would be presented to the town for approval. It was also noted that the proposed lighter gray trim color would be modified to be consistent with town light reflectivity value policies as recommended in the staff report.

Ms. Uang also advised that a detailed construction staging plan would be provided with building permit plans as called for in the staff report. Sarah Wernikoff noted that a number of construction projects had recently taken place in the neighborhood and that construction related parking was directed to Valencia Court.

In response to a question from Jane Bourne of the conservation committee, the applicants clarified that all exterior lights would be manually controlled.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, and receiving the clarifications from the applicants and project architect, ASCC members concluded support for the proposal. Thereafter, Koch moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 3-0 approval of the proposal as presented and clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated ASCC member prior to release of any building permits:

- 1. The site development permit shall have been approved by the public works director and this shall include necessary provisions for compliance with requirements of the fire marshal and health officer, among other site development committee members.
- 2. The final landscape plan plant selections shall be modified as necessary to respond to any conservation committee review comments.
- 3. Any proposed fencing shall be presented to the town for review and approval by staff and a designated ASCC member.
- 4. An arborist report shall be provided that addresses protection of oaks and other significant trees from construction impacts, including drainage. These recommendations shall be included in any construction proposals and the final construction staging and vegetation protection plans for the project.
- 5. A detailed construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
- 6. Complete impervious surface calculations shall be provided.
- 7. The light gray finish proposed for the smooth plaster surface shall be modified to a darker color consistent with town light reflectivity value policies.

ASCC members also noted that, while not required as project conditions, the applicants should consider comments in the staff report relative to the location and scope of deck lighting relative to nighttime views out from the house and the removal of the redwood trees along the driveway.

.....

Following action on the above project, Hughes returned to his ASCC position.

Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached Pool house, swimming pool and horse keeping facilities, and Site Development Permit X9H-649, 117 Pinon Drive. Divita

Vlasic presented the April 8, 2013 staff report on the status of this application. He explained that project consideration needs to be continued to the April 22, 2013 ASCC meeting to allow time for some issues to be addressed that have been raised by the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee and staff as part of the continuing project review process.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on Monday, April 22, 2013.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling, 65 Prado Court, Hutchinson/Fann

Borck presented the April 8, 2013 staff report on this proposal for the approval of plans to demolish an existing master bedroom deck and expand the master bedroom through an office addition in the previous deck location on the upper level of the existing 3,395 square foot, two-story residence. She explained the project and structural issues that have been encountered at the house that have been, in part, the reason for the proposed house

modifications. Borck also reviewed the floor area conditions and the request to concentrate additional floor area in the main house as explained in the staff report and the application letter provided by project architect Lisa Conrad and received 3/12/13

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Lisa Conrad and dated March 5, 2013:

Sheet: A-1, Site Plan

Sheet: A-2, Floor Plans and Elevation

Ms. Conrad was present and briefly reviewed the comments in her letter and the project proposals. In response to a question, she advised that she was not aware of any non compliant lighting, but if any exist, such as spots lights, they would be removed with this project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 to make the necessary findings, as evaluated in the staff report, to permit the proposed concentration of floor area and to approve the proposed plans as presented. The action was taken subject to the condition that any existing exterior lighting not in compliance with current town standards be removed with the project with condition compliance to be to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Commission and Staff Reports

Vlasic reported that the town council has elected to review the planning commissioners March 20, 2013 approval of the Woodside Priory School's conditional use permit amendment. He noted that the review would take place at the April 24, 2013 regular council meeting and that at the meeting the council would decide to either uphold the commission decision or set the matter for public hearing before the council. Vlasic explained that if a decision were made to set a pubic hearing, then the town council had options to deny the request, approve it as approved by the commission or modify the commission approval action.

Vlasic reported on the status of the implementation of the 18 Redberry habitat restoration plan approved by the ASCC at the March 25, 2013 meeting. He noted that the plan is being revised as required by the ASCC and that he would be meeting with the town attorney relative to the necessary documents to guarantee project implementation.

Vlasic reported that on March 25, 2013 when the ASCC approved the Priory School classroom renovation plans, the applicant neglected to inform the town and ASCC of the need for temporary structures relative to activities during the renovation process. Vlasic shared the plans for the two temporary buildings to be located immediately east of the "library/media" building and noted that they would only be in place during the construction period. ASCC members concluded that use of the temporary buildings for the renovation project was acceptable and no further ASCC review was needed.

Breen commented on the process for setting the planning and ASCC budgets for the next fiscal year. Vlasic advised that he would be meeting with the town manager on the budget and that ASCC items of concern, like surface materials for driveway sections in the public right of way, would be part of the discussion.

Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Koch, and passed 4-0 approval of the March 25, 2013 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

T. Vlasic