

Architectural and Site Control Commission **October 14, 2013**
Special Site Meeting, 3 Grove Court, Ciancutti and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the special site meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 3 Grove Court.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Ross

Absent: Koch

Planning Commission liaison: McIntosh

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Others* present relative to the 3 Grove Court applications:

Crystal Ciancutti, applicant

Jeffery Mahaney, project architect

Megan Kelley Sweeney, project architect

Nancy Lund, Town Historian

Judith Murphy, conservation committee

Colleen Barton and Larry Tesler, 351 Grove Drive

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

Architectural Review of proposed residential additions, accessory structures, site modifications, Site Development Permit X9H-662, and Variance Request X7E-135, 3 Grove Court, Ciancutti

Vlastic presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this preliminary project review. He explained that the review was on the subject applications that have been submitted in support of the plans for rehabilitation and additions to the historic residence and other property additions and modifications for the subject 1.25-acre Grove Court parcel.

Vlastic advised that due to the variance request associated with the proposals, the planning commission will also be conducting a preliminary review of the project and that the commission's review is scheduled for its October 16th meeting. He added that the ASCC preliminary review comments from the afternoon and evening 10/14 meetings would be provided to the planning commission for consideration at the October 16th meeting.

Vlastic clarified that ASCC project review should be continued from the October 14 meeting to the October 28 meeting, hopefully for action on the architectural review and site development permit requests. He further noted that planning commission public hearing on the variance application would likely be conducted at the regular November 6, 2013 commission meeting, but this would depend on the outcome of the October 16th meeting.

ASCC members considered the following proposed project plans:

Architectural Plans, Jeffery Mahaney, Architect:

Sheet A1.0, Cover Sheet, 9/26/13

Sheet A2.1, Existing Site Plan, 8/27/13

Sheet A2.2, Proposed Site Plan, 9/25/13

Sheet A2.3, Proposed Landscape Plan, 9/29/13

Sheet A2.4, Proposed Irrigation Plan, 8/27/13
Sheet A2.5, Outdoor Lighting Plan, 9/25/13
Sheet A2.6, Tree Removal Plan, 8/27/13
Sheet A2.7, Existing & Proposed Level 1/Lower Floor Plan, 9/26/13
Sheet A2.8, Existing & Proposed Level 2/Ground Floor Floor Plan, 9/26/13
Sheet A2.9, Existing & Proposed Level 3/Upper Floor Plan, 8/27/13
Sheet A2.10, Existing & Proposed Roof Plan, 9/27/13
Sheet A2.11, Existing & Proposed Plans - Garage, 8/26/13
Sheet A2.12, Proposed Plan Guest House, 9/26/13
Sheet A2.13, Proposed Story Pole Plan, 9/25/13
Sheet A3.1, Existing Exterior Elevations, 8/27/13
Sheet A3.2, Existing Exterior Elevations, 8/27/13
Sheet A3.3, Existing Elevations - Garage, 8/27/13
Sheet A3.4, Proposed Exterior Elevations, 9/26/13
Sheet A3.5, Proposed Exterior Elevations, 9/26/13
Sheet A3.6, Proposed Elevations – Garage, 8/27/13
Sheet A3.7, Proposed Elevations – Guest House, 8/27/13

Civil Plans, Flo-Rite Engineers, 9/30/13:

Sheet C-1, Title Sheet
Sheet C-2, Notes
Sheet C-3, Grading Plan
Sheet C-4, Utility Plan
Sheet C-5, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet C-6, Details Sheet
Sheet C-7, Best Management Practices

Topographic and Boundary Survey, B & H Surveying, Inc., June 2013

Also available for consideration were the following application materials:

- Variance Permit Application with “Detailed Description” of requests, 9/30/13.
- Tree Survey Report, Arbor Resources, August 22, 2013. (It was noted that the trees considered in the report are identified by number on plan Sheet A2.6, and that on this sheet tree removal by tree status and condition is identified.)
- Build It Green, GreenPoint Rated Existing Home “Whole House” Checklist, received August 29, 2013.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 9/3/13.
- Analysis of the historic conditions of the property including:
 - October 3, 2013 transmittal to the town of the letter from the current owners to the previous owners of the property.
 - October 3, 2013 letter to the town planner and staff relative to the historic analysis of the property.
 - October 4, 2013 Historic Resource Documentation, including seven images of the residence.
 - September 23, 2013 email from the town historian relative to the project and conclusion that it does “not harm” the “historic integrity.” (It was noted that the town historian has recommended and the applicants agreed to place a plaque at the site relative to the historic conditions.)
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, received August 29, 2013.
- Colors and materials board, received 9/11/13 and modified 10/4/13 for conformity with town Light Reflectivity Value (LRV) limits.

Vlasic referenced the following communications to the town from neighbors in support of the project:

- October 2, 2013 email, Mike and Elisa Fabian, 361 Grove Drive
- September 18, 2013 email, Bradley and Jacqueline Howe, 4 Grove Court
- August 26, 2013 email, Larry Tesler and Colleen Barton, 351 Grove Drive
- August 26, 2013 email, Ken and Susan Reed, 2 Grove Court
- August 27, 2013 email, Hamid and Tina Moghadam, 1 Grove Court
- September 4, 2013 email, Emiko Kim, 5 Grove Court

Vlasic also referenced the email dated October 8, 2013 from David Maahs, DDS, and Rui Hua Yan, 360 Grove Drive, raising concerns over the changes to the site that have opened views from Grove Drive on the north side of the property. He advised that these concerns should be considered by the ASCC during the site meeting.

Vlasic informed those present that since the staff report was prepared, staff had received an 10/14 email from planning commission member Nate McKitterick wondering about the historic significance of the “bunker/wine cellar.” Ms. Ciancutti noted that her research had concluded the “bunker” was an historic cellar and part of the Catoctin estate. Vlasic added that he would seek additional clarification on this matter prior to the 10/16 planning commission meeting.

Ms. Ciancutti and the project architects presented the plans and conducted a tour of the site to explain the proposed house restoration, and the plans for the new driveway access, replacement garage, guest house, pool and yard modifications. They made use of story poles set for the site meeting. They commented on input received from neighbors and the conservation committee noting that they would attempt to save significant trees that, while not in good condition, nonetheless, where not in conflict with project plans.

During the course of the site meeting, the applicant and project architects offered the following project clarifications:

- The historic house has a number of additions and modifications made overtime that are not consistent with its historic character. These will be removed or modified to better conform to the original house design. Further, the foundation of the house is inadequate and must be replaced to ensure a long life for the rehabilitated and added to house.
- The lighting plans will be reconsidered to be more specific and to address concerns of the ASCC relative to potential exposure of light sources to views from Grove Drive and lighting along pathways, particularly the lower path from the house to Grove Drive.
- The “bunker” historic wine cellar will likely have little change and will be used for storage. Vine plantings will be added to cover the structure.
- The proposed flat roof garage will have a living “green” roof. The plantings will likely be grasses to ensure the roof blends into the sites landscape. The roof profile has been kept low to minimize visual intrusion from Grove Court or adjacent Grove Court parcels.
- All existing site pathway and rock materials from the historic Catoctin Estate will be preserved and reused at the site.
- The proposed color palette has been selected to be consistent with the historic character of the house and town policies. It is likely that a solid stain will be used, as the historic

wood siding does not have a consistent character of aging or finish. Further, it is likely that a number of the historic boards will need to be reinstalled with the underside exposed, as the condition of this protected side is better than the side that has been open to the elements.

- The proposed house slate roofing is a recycled material. The proposed metal roofing will only be used on the planned guest house.
- In response to a question from Ms. Barton, it was noted that some historic drainage problems were a reflection of past changes and that these would be corrected with the site development permit drainage plans to the satisfaction of the town engineer.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the plans do show new fencing along the parcel boundary and between the uphill garage and guest house. It was clarified that this would be post and wire fencing at a height of approximately six feet. At the request of the ASCC it was agreed that a modified, more organic design that did not follow property boundaries would be considered.

The ASCC site meeting concluded with consideration of views from Grove Drive and, particularly, the view impact concerns of the neighbors at 360 Grove Drive. During this review the applicant clarified that the recent site clean up/vegetation removal had mostly been done by the previous owners prior to sale to the current owners. This was confirmed by Ms. Barton.

Based on site conditions, tree removal plans and neighbor comments, the project design team advised that revisions were being considered to the landscaping plan to provide for a layering approach to screen plantings that would reduce views from Grove Drive, but not overplant the site or block more distant views open to the house and other proposed site use areas.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members offered a generally favorable response to the project, but concurred that they would offer specific comments during the continued review at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Thereafter, Breen thanked all present for the participation in the field meeting and project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

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

October 14, 2013

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, Ross

Absent: Koch

Planning Commission Liaison: Targ

Town Council Liaison: Driscoll

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up review -- Architectural Review for new residence with detached office, pool and pool cabana, and Site Development Permit X9H-657, 5 Naranja way, Maffia

Vlastic presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He explained that on September 27, 2013, the ASCC granted conditional architectural review approval for this project and the planning commission is scheduled to conduct the public hearing on site development permit application at its October 16, 2013 meeting. Vlastic clarified that at this time, the applicant is specifically seeking ASCC follow-up review and approval relative to landscaping, exterior lighting, and fencing plan architectural review conditions prior to the planning commission site development permit hearing.

Vlastic advised that since the staff report had been prepared, the town has received the following communications relative to the project:

- 10/14/13 email from NV5, town consulting engineer, finding the revised drainage narrative and calculations acceptable
- October 11, 2013 letter to the town from Thomas Klope, Landscape Architect
- October 12, 2013 emails from Linda Yates, 170 Mapache Drive with October 11, 2013 comment letter from Bruce King, Structural Engineering and Design

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following revised project plans:

Title Sheet (with northeast side house/garage elevation), BAR Architects, October 2, 2013

Sheet C01, Grading & Drainage Plan, Civil Plans, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., Civil Engineers, 10/2/13

Sheet L1.0, Tree Protection and Removal Plan, Ned Patchett Consulting, 10/2/13

Sheet L3.0, Planting Plan, Arterra Landscape Architecture, 10/2/13

Sheet L5.0, Exterior Lighting Plan, Arterra Landscape Architecture, 10/2/13

Sheet A1.01, Site Plan and Project Information, BAR Architects, 10/2/13

Also considered were the following follow-up submittal materials:

- October 3, 2013 email from project architect Jeremy Butler-Pinkham explaining how the revised plans respond to the ASCC approval conditions.
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures shown on plan sheet L5.0.
- “Drainage Narrative,” Freyer & Laureta, Inc., received by email 10/9/13.
- October 3, 2013 letter from Katherine Strickley, Arterra, discussing the condition of pine #64 and explaining the revised landscape and exterior lighting plan and how they account for ASCC comments and concerns of the neighbors.
- September 25, 2013 “Proposal and Contract,” Ned Patchett Consulting, relative to measures to be taken to support pine tree #64.
- October 3, 2013 “Proposal and Contract,” Ned Patchett Consulting, relative to measures to be taken to support oak #59 and six oaks along the property line common with 170 Mapache Drive.
- October 18, 2013 email from the project architect with an image of the existing fence verifying that the proposed fence extensions would be four-foot high, or lower, horse fencing to match the existing boundary fencing on the site.

Mike Maffia, applicant, and Kate Stickley, project landscape architect, presented the revised plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Sheets A1.0 (two sheets) Spring Equinox at Noon and Fall Equinox at Noon, showing shadow patterns from a 40-foot tall tree to demonstrate that after 20 years of growth the neighbor’s organic garden would not be impacted by shadows. (*Vlasic commented that the neighbor had advised that theirs is a 100-year site and that within that time frame there would be shadows from a coast live oak extending across the organic garden area.*)
- The revised landscape plan has been modified to address neighbor concerns and the intent is to take all actions needed to save pine tree #64, as having to remove it later in the process, i.e., after house construction, would be complicated and unreasonably costly. All of the incentives are there for the owner to protect and preserve this tree for as long as possible.
- The applicant is willing to make the planting changes at the pool house requested by Mr. Klope, but wishes to keep the oak in the plans at the garage for screening and because it is consistent with other oaks in the immediate area. As noted in the shadow study, it would take at least 20 years of growth for any shading to fall on the neighbors’ property. Also, he prefers the mix of trees and tree sizes shown on the revised plan to avoid a more uniform planting mass condition along the common property line.
- The applicant is willing to eliminate the lower driveway lights as recommended in the staff report. He prefers to keep the proposed eight pool lights for even pool lighting to avoid “hot spots” of lights.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Tom Klope, representing the owners of 170 Mapache Drive, reviewed the requests made in his October 11, 2013 letter to the ASCC. He emphasized the reasons for the different plant sizes and materials.

Linda Yates, 170 Mapache Drive, reviewed the comments and concerns in her emails to the town and, particularly, her concern with the impacts of shading and lack of a bond or other surety to guarantee replacement planting if pine #64 does not survive.

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the staff report relative to the bonding and penalty measures available to and applied by the town.

ASCC members considered the staff report and input received at the ASCC meeting. Members concurred that the follow-up submittal was generally consistent with the intent of the architectural review approval conditions. Members also concurred that some of the neighbor concerns relative to potential for shading and view protection, as well as Breen's concern for preserving a more open meadow condition between the subject site and the "Wells" property to the east, could be handled with careful final placement of the materials shown on the landscape plan. (Breen offered her willingness to participate on behalf of the ASCC in the site placement of materials.)

Mr. Maffia commented that he wanted the plans as specific as possible and did not feel comfortable with leaving much open relative to site placement of trees or other plants. While ASCC members and staff understood his comments, Vlasic advised that specific site placement of plantings, under ASCC direction, to deal with sensitive neighbor screening issues was a relatively common ASCC condition and that there needed to be flexibility, within reason, to allow the ASCC to guide placement to ensure intended screening is achieved.

After consideration of landscaping, fencing and lighting proposals, Ross moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0 to approve the 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. The exterior lighting plan shall be modified as follows:
 - a. The number of pool lights shall be no more than four (4) and shall be dimmer controlled.
 - b. The number of driveway lights shall be reduced from five to a maximum of three, with removal of the two lower lights shown immediately to the south of the auto court. Further, the upper three lights shall be located as recommended in the staff report and may have vehicle "loop" triggers for both ingress and egress but, in any case, any vehicle trigger shall include provision for turn off after 5 minutes. These lights may also have a manual on switch for pedestrian/bicycle use and this manual system shall also include turn off after five minutes.
 - c. The lighting system for the pathway to the office shall ensure that the pathway lights are only on for a maximum of 5 minutes to allow for access to and from the office to the house.
2. The landscape plan Sheet L3.0 shall be modified as follows:
 - a. The notation "Myrtus understory" shall be corrected to "Myrica" understory.
 - b. The proposed 24-inch box Dogwood at the back, north side, of the pool house shall be changed to three 24-inch box *Prunus Illicifolia*.
 - c. Provisions for temporary fencing to protect the north side landscaping once installed from both construction and deer impacts shall be specified including any additional time fencing is expected to be needed for tree protection after the end of construction.
3. The note relative to pine tree #64 on Sheet L1.0 shall be corrected to state that the tree shall be protected and that all of the measures recommended by the project arborist in the proposals for protection and preservation of this tree ("Proposal and Contract," 9/25/13), as well as the north side oaks ("Proposal and Contract," 10/3/13), shall be implemented.

4. Prior to final sign off on the building permit for house occupancy, the project arborist shall provide an evaluation of pine #64 and if, despite all efforts consistent with the arborists protection and preservation plan, there has been continuing deterioration to the point that the tree needs to be replaced, a replacement screening plan shall be prepared and implemented prior to permit sign off or house occupancy. The conservation committee shall be involved in this review and if there is any debate as to tree condition, the town shall seek and receive independent, third party review of the tree condition and this shall be at the cost of the applicant. *(Note: If pine tree replacement is determined necessary, the plan for such replacement screening may include planting on the neighboring property if such plan includes agreements with the neighbor to the satisfaction of the town attorney for installation and maintenance of planting off site.)*
5. A final, detailed construction staging plan and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plan shall incorporate all recommendations of the project arborist and shall ensure that all construction parking and staging is contained on the site and that there is no construction parking on neighborhood streets. With the staging plan, a detailed project construction schedule shall be provided and shall include provision for planting of north side screen landscaping as soon as possible. Once installed, the plantings shall be maintained and protected from construction impacts.
6. The north side screen landscaping shall be installed under the direction of a designated ASCC member and the town planner, as provided for in the final approved construction schedule (see condition 5 above). To facilitate placement of materials, there shall be sufficient "mock-up" of the garage and north side house elevations to ensure that the new trees and plantings are located for maximum screening of sensitive view relationships and to the extent reasonably possible to avoid shading of the organic garden area on the neighboring parcel to the north. Further, the mock-up shall include identification of the east side great room clerestory windows so these too can be considered for screening with the new planting. The north side neighbors shall be informed of the plant installation process and given an opportunity to offer input on it, although final oversight of plant installation shall be the responsibility of the designated ASCC member.

The approval was granted with the understanding that the planning commission still needed to complete action on the site development permit. The ASCC recommended permit approval subject to the architectural review conditions set by the ASCC for the project.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for house additions & driveway modifications and Site Development Permit X9H-656, 468 Westridge Drive, Crouse/Dorahy

Vlasic presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this follow-up review. He explained that on July 22, 2013 the ASCC completed review and conditional approval of this project and, to satisfy the eight approval conditions, the following enclosed plans have been submitted and, unless otherwise noted, have been prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet, 8/28/13

Sheet: T-0.2, Geotechnical Report, 8/9/13

Sheet: T-0.4, Build it Green Checklist, 8/9/13

Boundary and Topographic Survey, B&H Surveying, Inc., February 2013

Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan, 7/31/13 (County Health clarifications)

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, Lighting/Landscaping (grading and drainage), 8/28/13

Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging, Tree Protection, 8/28/13

Sheet: A-2.0.1, Existing Floor Plan, 5/20/13
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan, 7/31/13 (County Health Clarifications)
Sheet: A-2.4, Roof Plan, 5/20/13
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
Sheet: EM-2, Bedroom Wing E/M (Electrical/Mechanical) plan, 5/20/13
Sheet: EM-3, Main Living E/M (Electrical/Mechanical) plan, 5/20/13
Civil/Site Development Permit Plans, Flo-Rite Engineering, 8/30/2013:
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet
Sheet C-2, Notes
Sheet C-3, Grading Plan
Sheet C-4, Details Sheet

Vlasic commented that while the plans address a number of the conditions, issues remain relative to the landscape plan, lighting plans, and some public works director concerns over the driveway plans and trail protection provisions. Vlasic also noted that the proposed expanded gravel parking area has not been reviewed by the project arborist and that this should occur prior to permit issuance.

Geoffrey Crouse, applicant, and project architect Carter Warr presented the follow-up submittal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The landscape plan will be modified to address the concerns noted in the staff report, but given the need to coordinate with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) and the desire to ensure that planting is best located to screen views to traffic, particularly the intersection of Westridge Drive and Cervantes Road, it is requested that development of the landscape plan be delayed and be a condition to be met prior to completion and sign off of the rough framing inspection for the house additions. It is also understood that the landscaping would need to be installed prior to final inspection and sign off of the house addition project.
- The plans will be clarified to satisfy public works director concerns over the sight distance at the new driveway intersection and also the matter of the horse trail crossing of the new driveway.
- In response to a question, it was noted that after removal of the redwood trees there will be ample room on site for construction staging and parking. Further, it was noted that the project would not require the use of heavy equipment.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Ross and passed 4-0, approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of building or site development permits:

1. The final landscape plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to building official sign off of the rough framing inspection for the house addition project. The final landscape plan shall address the comments noted in the October 10, 2013 staff report and shall also reflect the final plans for driveway sight distance clearing and grading found acceptable by the public works director.
2. Details for trail improvements associated with the driveway access changes shall be provided as required by the public works director and to his satisfaction.

3. The proposed gravel parking area shall be evaluated by the project arborist to ensure no potential for impacts on the existing front yard oak trees to be preserved. Further, the proposed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be modified to incorporate any arborist recommendations for oak tree protection.
4. The proposed exterior lighting plan shall be modified to identify switching patterns and zones consistent with town and ASCC project review policies and standards.

Architectural Review for residential additions, 110 Tan Oak Avenue, Gebhart

Kristiansson presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this proposal for a 257 sf addition to the existing residence on the subject .23-acre Brookside Park property. She explained that while the proposal is a minor change, it is before the ASCC because the floor area addition increases the floor area in the main house to 96% and well over the 85% limit that can only be exceeded based on the ASCC making special findings. She noted that these findings are discussed and reviewed in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 8/30/13 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet: T-02, Build It Green, Exterior Lighting
Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan
Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Also considered was the proposed "Finish Board," prepared by CJW Architecture with a picture of the existing house and a statement that the project does "propose to match all (existing) finishes."

Mr. Gebhart, applicant, and project architect Carter Warr were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. They thanked Ms. Kristiansson for the review and were looking forward to ASCC acceptance of the project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0 to make the necessary findings, as evaluated in the staff report, to allow 96% of the permitted floor area to be in the main house and to approve the project subject to the condition that all exterior lighting not in conformity with town standards be removed to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Architectural Review of proposed residential addition and deck expansion, 2 Ohlone Portola Valley Ranch, Down

Borck presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this proposal for the approval of plans for a 223 square foot addition to the existing 2,263 square foot residence and a 181 square foot expansion to the existing rear deck on the subject 20,990 square foot Portola Valley Ranch parcel. She explained that the addition and deck extension represent very minor changes to the current house design, scale and massing.

Borck advised that since the staff report was distributed, the applicant has provided an arborist report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, dated October 9, 2013. She stated that copies of the report were distributed electronically to ASCC members and that the report includes recommendations for oak tree protection and removal of Bay trees near the deck extension. She clarified that the two Bays have structural problems and that removal appears appropriate as long as it is also approved by the Portola Valley Ranch design committee.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans prepared by Jonathan Jang, Architect, dated September 10, 2013:

Sheet: A1.0, Title Sheet & Site Plan

Sheet: A2.1A, Elevations & Floor Plan

In addition to the plans, the following project submittal materials were considered:

- Light fixture cut sheet for proposed wall-mounted lights at the deck (attached). Fixture finish is bronze.
- Color image of existing house (to be available at ASCC meeting). The photograph shows the existing house frontage along Ohlone and an image of the side of the house where the addition is proposed.
- Ranch Design Committee conditional approval letter dated 9/6/13.
- Completed Build It Green Checklist with 19 points proposed (no minimum required point threshold for this smaller project).

Ms. Mary Down and project architect Jonathan Jang were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. In response to a question relative to light fixture wattage, it was noted that the proposed new lights were down directed, dark sky compliant fixtures and that, while capable of containing 100-watt bulbs, the intent was to use lower wattage bulbs.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following brief discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Ross and passed 4-0 approval of the project as proposed. It was noted that approval included removal of the Bay trees as long as it is verified that the Ranch design committee has also approved their removal.

Architectural Review of proposed residential additions, accessory structures, site modifications, Site Development Permit X9H-662, and Variance Request X7E-135, 3 Grove Court, Ciancutti

Vlasic presented the October 10, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject applications that have been submitted in support of the plans for rehabilitation and additions to the historic residence and other property additions and modifications for the subject 1.25-acre Grove Court parcel. Vlasic explained the status of application processing and reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project. (Refer to above site meeting minutes that include application processing information and a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Vlasic noted that any ASCC preliminary review comments would be presented to the planning commission at its October 16th preliminary review meeting and that after offering of preliminary comments, ASCC project review should be continued to the regular October 28, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Crystal Ciancutti, applicant, and project architects Jeffery Mahaney and Megan Kelley Sweeney were present to discuss the project further with ASCC members. They noted that they would be addressing fencing, landscaping and tree removal issues as discussed at the site meeting and, particularly, the comments of the conservation committee relative to trees and landscaping clearing and maintenance. The following clarifications were also offered:

- The final fence plan will likely have a fence no higher than 5 feet, mainly to keep dogs on the site, and will be of a post and wire design. The plan will also be reconsidered to have a more organic fence alignment.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the driveway plans had been reviewed and found acceptable by the fire marshal.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the parking area trellis would have a height of 12 feet and that this was to match the height of the proposed flat roof trellis. It was noted that the “green” roof on the garage would have simple grasses and that, overall, the garage and trellis were located and designed to minimize view impacts from both on and off site locations.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed exterior light fixtures were not selected because of any historic character, but basically to make them disappear into the project and not interrupt the historic character of the house elevations.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. *(Note: Site neighbor Larry Tesler, 351 Grove Drive, arrived after the request for public comments and was asked if he had any comments to offer. He advised that he had come only to be supportive of the project.)*

ASCC members discussed the plans and offered the following additional preliminary comments to those discussed at the site meeting:

- Generally supportive of this “ambitious” project as proposed and also the variance requests. Clark did, however, note some concern over the factors needed to support the floor area part of the variance request.
- Lighting plan needs to be detailed and reconsidered, particularly with respect to driveway lighting and path and wall mounted lighting on the downhill, Grove Drive, side of the house. Members concurred that any driveway lighting should be minimized and that there did not appear to be the need for lighting on the pathway between the house and Grove Drive. Also plans for pool lighting need to be detailed. Overall, the objective should be to control light so it is at the central core of the site and does not spill out from the property.
- The fencing plans need to be detailed and reconsidered as discussed at the site meeting.
- The tree removal plans need to be reconsidered as discussed at the site meeting.
- The landscape plan needs to be reconsidered relative to screening on the Grove Drive side of the parcel and also continued cleaning up of old materials around the pool/guest house site. Breen commented that the landscape plan seemed more chaotic and needed to be more responsive to more natural site and area conditions. She noted

screening needs and also suggested that consideration be given to preserving the Buckeye on the lower portion of the site.

- A detailed, comprehensive construction staging plan will be critical as the site has limited space for parking or materials storage. In particular, there is limited space for parking on Grove Court.

Vlasic advised he would share ASCC preliminary input with the planning commission at the October 16th commission meeting. Thereafter, ASCC project review was continued to the regular October 28, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Commission and Staff Reports

Vlasic reported that the next few ASCC meetings have fairly full agendas. He also provided an update on the status of the site restoration work at 18 Redberry and noted that a follow-up review, including site meeting, would be on the ASCC October 28th meeting agenda.

Kristiansson advised that if ASCC members wish to stay informed on the progress of the Housing Element update work, including town council and planning commission study sessions, members could sign up to receive email notifications on the town's web site.

Kristiansson asked if ASCC members had any concern with posting of draft meeting minutes with the agenda and staff report on the town's website. All members concurred that such posting was acceptable.

Ross reported on his follow-up review and approval of final lighting and fencing plans for the project at 140 Corte Madera Road.

Clark inquired about construction parking issues relative to the project under construction at 308 Canyon Drive. He also updated the ASCC on the status of the Ford Field project and his review of proposals for "re-skinning" of the existing batting cage, development of picnic area, and old signage posted on trees.

Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Ross, and passed 3-0-1 (Hughes) approval of the September 23, 2013 meeting as drafted. In response to a question from Breen, Vlasic clarified that there was nothing in the 9/23/13 minutes about Mr. Maffia's return to the meeting room at the end of the meeting to request further discussion of his application as there was no place on the agenda for such discussion or even consideration of the request. Vlasic added that Mr. Maffia was so advised and he then left the meeting room.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

T. Vlasic