

---

Special Field Meeting, 150 Alamos Road, Koch & 140 Russell Drive, Crevelt, and  
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chairperson Chase called the special field meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. at 150 Alamos Road. It was noted that the Koch special site meeting was a joint meeting with the Planning Commission, and Commissioner Breon also called the special planning commission meeting to order.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Eisberg  
ASCC Absent: Gelpi, Schilling  
Planning Commission: Breon, Elkind, Zaffaroni  
Planning Commission Absent: McIntosh, Wengert  
Town Council ASCC Liaison: Davis  
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck.  
Planning Manager Lambert

Others present relative to the Koch project:

Mr. Stewart Koch, applicant  
Carter Warr, CJW Architecture, project architect  
Steve Kellond, CJW Architecture, project architect  
Alex Tzang, CJW Architecture, project architect  
Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect  
George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road  
Beverly Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee

**Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-513, 150 Alamos Road, Koch**

Vlastic briefly presented the comments in the April 22, 2004 staff report. He discussed the issues raised at the February 23 ASCC and March 3, 2004 planning commission meetings on the project and the design changes made to address the issues. The project design team then presented the following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 4/20/04 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

DWG#: T-0.1, Project Information  
Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Professional Land Surveyors, Oct. 2003  
DWG#: A-1.1, Architectural Site Plan  
DWG #:A-1.2, Construction Staging Plan, 1/30/04  
DWG#: L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design, 4/21/04  
DWG#: G-1, Grading Plan, Cleaver Design, 4/21/04  
DWG #:A2.1, Main House Floor Plans  
DWG #:A-3.1, Exterior Elevations  
DWG #:A-3.2, Exterior Elevations and Sections  
DWG #:A3.3, Accessory Building Plans and Elevations, 1/30/04

Vlasic noted that in addition to the revised plans, the following plans and materials from the original submittal remain part of the architectural review application:

Cut-sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures (copies attached)  
Colors Board dated 12/19/03, received by the town 2/4/04

Also referenced at the site meeting were an April 22, 2004 letter from the project architect explaining the plan revisions and a March 23, 2004 letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) approving the project.

The project design team discussed the house plan changes and discussed the story poles with added ridge height strings showing the effects of the lower ridge height proposed with the revised plans. It was noted that the single story area of the house had been lowered by 3.5 feet and the two-story area by 2 feet. It was also noted that the cylindrical roof features had been revised to a more conventional roof form and that this change was desired by the applicant to call less attention to the roof, and maintain a more conventional appearance consistent with neighboring residences in the area.

After considering the presentation by the design team, ASCC and planning commission members walked the site and considered grading and landscape changes in the rear yard terrace area. It was noted that the plans provide for protection of the extensive existing oak grove and much of the grassland environment on the lower portion of the parcel. It was also noted that with the lower ridgelines, views to Felt Lake from Alamos Road were preserved along the full length of the single story portion of the proposed house.

During the site inspection, the project design team offered the additional project clarifications:

- At this time, it appears that the project will be served by the onsite septic tank and leachfield system. It is, however, still a possibility that a connection would be made to the sewer system.
- The existing exotic plantings along the eastern property boundary provide for screening privacy; but the desire is to replace these plantings over time with more native materials. The desired replacement plantings would include native shrubs and trees, and be designed as an extension of the oak and shrub materials that exist in the northeastern portion of the property. The plantings would be placed so as to preserve privacy, but not block more distant views across the property. This replanting is a long-term project and not part of the current proposal.
- The original and revised plans continue to locate improvements in the area that has been disturbed by previous site development efforts. The desire is to not extend development beyond these limits and to preserve as much of the oak and grassland areas of the parcel as possible. This is the key reason for concentrating the improvements to the areas of previous use.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed location for the pool and pool house was previously the location of a sports court.

After discussion, ASCC members indicated that the revised plans appear to address the issues raised at the February 23 meeting. It was noted that the revised grading plans, and modified landscaping plans, in particular, resulted in a better fit to site conditions and improved visual relationships along the Alamos Road frontage.

Planning Commission members also agreed that the plan revisions address the key issues raised at the March 3 commission meeting.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members agreed that discussion of the proposal should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. It was noted that care would need to be exercised in terms of final drainage plans, but that the proposed grading revisions and additional cutting of the house into the site, resolved the main commission concerns.

Breon noted that while the plans appear to address the key commission concerns, he wondered about the findings the ASCC needed to make to allow the proposed concentration of floor area above the 85% limit. ASCC members indicated they felt the findings could be made for such concentration given site and design considerations and would further articulate these in taking any action on the project at the ASCC's regular evening meeting.

Public comments were requested. **George Comstock** stated that he was very pleased with the plan revisions and thanked the project architects and applicant for their efforts.

After discussion, Chase stated that the Koch project review would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. She also stated that the special ASCC field meeting would continue at 140 Russell Avenue as soon as ASCC members could convene at the site.

Chariman Breon adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 4:55 p.m.

### **Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-515, 140 Russell Avenue, Crevelt**

At approximately 5:10 p.m. ASCC members Chase, Breen and Eisberg convened at the subject site. Also present were Deputy Town Planner Vlasic and Planning Technician Borck as well as the following individuals relative to the Crevelt Project:

Richard Crevelt, applicant  
Roger Kohler, project architect  
Jeff Kuo, project architect  
Sherryl Fowler, 139 Russell Avenue  
John Boice, 16 Tynan Way  
Teresa Godfrey, 20 Tynan Way

Vlasic briefly reviewed the comments in the April 22, 2004 staff report on this proposal for new residential development of the subject .55 acre Woodside Highlands property. He explained that the project includes removal of an existing cottage, and construction of a mostly single-story, 3,378 sf, residence with a full basement that includes the proposed garage. He also explained that the project calls for approximately 550 cubic yards of

grading and that the ASCC is the responsible authority relative to action on the necessary grading permit (i.e., application X9H-515). Vlasic then reviewed the following project plans received March 3, 2004 and, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/1/04 and prepared by Kohler Architects:

- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Lower level Plan, undated
- Sheet A3, Main Level Plan, undated
- Sheet A4, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A6, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A7, Roof Plan
- Sheet A8, Cross Section at Site, Exterior Lighting Plan, Light Fixture Details
- Grading & Drainage Plan, Smith, Randlett, Foulk & Stock, Inc., Feb. 2004
- Sheet L1, Landscape Concept Plan
- Sheet L2, Plant List Options

Also presented was an exterior colors and materials board received March 8, 2004, and cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, received March 8, 2004. In addition, available for reference was an arborist report dated March 2, 2004, prepared by Robert Weatherill addressing the condition of, and tree protection measures proposed for the five "heritage" oaks on the property.

Mr. Crevelt and Roger Kohler presented the project to the ASCC and site neighbors. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Reference was made to the story poles and staking set to demonstrate the siting, heights and massing of the proposed residence.
- It was noted that the project geotechnical consultant had revised the concerns raised by the town geologist relative to placement of fill materials on the site slopes and; based on this review, it appears that the site can accommodate the proposed fill. A letter report is being prepared to forward to the town geologist.
- The health department has tentatively approved the layout for the proposed onsite septic system.
- A revised exterior colors and materials schedule was presented. It was noted that the new schedule conforms to the town's reflectivity limits and responds to the concerns raised in the staff report. It was also noted that consideration is being given to a natural oak finish for the main house entry and garage doors.
- The project includes no fencing plans and no new fencing is proposed at this time.
- The drainage plan has been developed to minimize impacts on site and area conditions. It is possible that it will be modified to connect to the drainage channel just to the west of the site.

- It is recognized that this project would likely proceed at the same time other new construction is ongoing in the area. Mr. Crevelt offered to coordinate the process of construction staging in order to minimize impacts on the neighborhood.

After presentation of the plans, ASCC members walked the site and considered views to the story poles from on and off site locations, including locations along Russell Avenue. Concerns raised in the staff report were considered including the scope of grading, and particularly the proposed fill slopes, as well as the design of the grading and retaining walls for the driveway extension to Russell Avenue. Also reviewed were issues with the formality of the house design, lighting and landscaping.

Public comments were requested. The neighbors present indicated they had no significant issues with the house design, but did express concern with respect to drainage, and construction staging. It was noted that there needs to be limits on the size of construction trucks used and the delivery of materials should not conflict with normal peak traffic periods. It was also emphasized that the applicant's contractor should repair any damage to the street in front of the property at the end of the construction period.

Mr. Crevelt again acknowledged the construction staging and access issues and stressed his willingness to work with others building in the area to minimize construction impacts.

After the site visit, ASCC members agreed that the general approach to site improvement was acceptable, but also agreed with the key concerns expressed in the staff report about the proposed front yard fill, modification of the driveway design and formality of the house architecture.

At the end of the site meeting, it was agreed that discussion of the project would continue at the evening ASCC meeting.

#### Adjournment

There being no further business, the special site meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m. It was noted that the regular evening ASCC meeting would start at approximately 8:00 p.m. in the town center historic school house.

Chairperson Chase called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Chase, Eisberg

Absent: Gelpi, Schilling

Town Council Liaison: None

Planning Commission Liaison: Zaffaroni

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-513, 150 Alamos Road, Koch**

Vlastic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on the subject project and reviewed the events of the afternoon joint ASCC/planning commission meeting on the revised plans. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials.) Vlastic noted that based on the staff report review and ASCC and planning commission reactions at the site meeting, the revised plans appear to address the key issues that have been raised on the project. He highlighted the remaining issues discussed in the staff report and suggested these could be handled as conditions of any ASCC action to approve the revised plans.

Vlastic also reviewed the findings the ASCC would need to make to permit the proposed concentration of 91% of the permitted floor area in the main residence. He stated that the findings are set forth in Section 18.48.020 of the zoning ordinance and must be considered and made by the ASCC whenever a project is authorized to exceed the 85% floor area limit. He advised that four findings must be made (i.e., A through D), but of these four, only one of the three options possible under A needs to be made. He pointed out that only one "A" option is practically possible and this is A.1, which states that the project with concentrated floor area will "result in a superior design for the property in terms of grading, tree removal and use of the property than would be possible without the requested increase." Vlastic advised that the proposal uses all available floor area and if the proposed concentration is not approved, then 456 sf would have to be removed from the house and either eliminated from the project or placed elsewhere on the site. With respect to findings B through D, Vlastic noted that these address visual and other potential impacts on neighboring properties.

Mr. Koch, Carter Warr, Steve Kellond and Bob Cleaver were present. They indicated they had no significant additional comments to offer beyond what was presented at the site meeting. Cleaver, however, responded to a question about the proposed pathway light fixture and clarified that a revised path light proposal is identified on the landscape plan

sheet, but that a cut sheet has not been provided for the newly proposed fixture. He added that the new fixture is a hooded path light that directs light to the path surface.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members reviewed the revised plans and agreed they fully addressed the concerns raised at the time of original plan review in February. With respect to the concentration of floor area, the following were noted:

- The proposed improvements are all contained in areas of previous construction.
- Removing the 456 sf from the house and trying to locate it in a different location on the property will likely cause more disturbance in terms of grading and reduction of the grassland area of the site.
- Decreasing the size of the main house and adding another detached accessory structure or increasing the size of the pool house would be a poorer design solution with potentially increased visual impacts. The revised plans have significantly reduced the potential visual impacts from the original design.
- The revised project and concentration of floor area would likely have less neighborhood visual or other impacts than a project that moves the 456 sf of floor area to a detached accessory structure.

Based on the above, members concurred they could make finding A.1 and B through D to permit the proposed concentration of the 91% of the floor area in the main residence.

Following discussion, Eisberg moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0, to make the findings for concentration of floor area and to approve the revised plans and materials subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A photo record of the existing house shall be provided for town archives.
2. A cut sheet for the proposed pathway light fixture shall be provided.
3. A large sample of the proposed metal roof material shall be provided. Further, the photovoltaic panel materials shall be specified and the finish of roof and panel materials coordinated to minimize potential visual impact. Further, the roof materials shall be selected to conform to town reflectivity limits.
4. A comprehensive tree protection and construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. The final landscape plan shall provide for elimination of the oleander plantings along the parcel frontage.

**Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-511, swimming pool, landscaping and related improvements, 125 Fawn Lane, Edwards**

Vlasic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He explained that the project was conditionally approved on January 26, 2004, and that the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Ken Schoppet, Landscape Architect, have been submitted to satisfy the conditions of ASCC approval:

March 9, 2004 letter to ASCC setting forth how the submittal addresses the approval conditions

March 11, 2004 Arbor Preservation Packet, Econo Tree Services, Inc.

Sheet L.1, Landscape Plan, 12/30/03

Sheet L.1, Tree Protection and Construction Staging Plan, 12/30/03

Sheet L.4c, Planting Plan, 2/27/04

Sheet L.5, Lighting Planting, 2/15/04

Ken Schoppet, landscape architect, presented the proposal to ASCC members. He requested some clarification as to the process of completing responses to staff comments and then briefly discussed the revised plans. He noted the changes made and clarified the upper lawn area was to be preserved in meadow grass and not to be an irrigated lawn. He also acknowledged some misunderstanding as to town lighting requirements and willingness to revise the plans to conform to town lighting guidelines and regulations.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the follow-up submittal and found it generally acceptable. ASCC members shared concerns raised in the staff report and additional comments were offered regarding some of the proposed plant materials. Following discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Eisberg and passed 3-0, approval of the revised plans and materials subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of an ASCC member prior to issuance of construction permits:

1. The proposed lighting plan shall be revised to address the concerns raised in the staff report and to conform to town lighting guidelines and regulations. In particular, pool terrace lighting along the southern edge of the terrace shall be shielded, or otherwise designed to direct light to the terrace and minimize potential for view of lights from the Fawn Lane frontage.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for restoration of the proposed "construction access" from Fawn Lane. Further, tree protection and erosion control measures shall be identified and implemented to minimize impacts of the construction access.
3. The upper "meadow lawn area" as shown on Sheet L.1, i.e., between the house and northern parcel boundary, shall only be meadow grasses, essentially as currently exists, and the meadow shall not be irrigated.
4. The landscape plan shall be revised to eliminate the line of Podocarpus along the western parcel boundary. An alternative native plant or plants shall be selected and the plants installed in a more random, non-linear manner. The plantings should be "staggered" along the property line.

5. The landscape plan shall be revised to modify the plan for planting below the pool terrace wall. There shall be less use of the ferns, and other native plants shall be selected to reduce potential for a consistent line of "green" along the terrace wall. Consideration should be given to the use of a native vine and native shrubs in addition to the proposed native ferns.

**Modification of Previous Approval, addition of Photovoltaic panels – Architectural Review for New Residence, 500 Westridge Drive, Madavi**

Vlasic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on subject request for modification of previously approved plans. He noted that construction of the new house and accessory structures, as well as site landscape grading, is now well underway at the site in accord with the ASCC conditional approval. He explained the current request to modify the project with the addition of ground mounted photovoltaic panels to be located to the west of the pool house, i.e., between the pool house and required 20 foot sideyard setback line, parallel to the western parcel boundary. He clarified that there would be a total of 100 panels in four arrays of 25 each, for a total panel surface area of just over 1,400 sf and revised the following materials describing the proposal:

Partial site plan annotated by the deputy town planner, 4/21/04  
Panel Array provided by Sunlit Systems  
Excerpt from Portion of Revised Landscape Plan with legend (3 sheets)  
Sharp Photovoltaic Panel Specifications -- ND-167U1, (2 sheets)  
UnRac Solar Mount specifications (6 sheets)  
Sharp Multi-String Inverter Specifications – JH-3500U (2 sheets)  
Sunlit System Specifications (4 sheets)

Mr. Madavi, Mike Tebb, landscape architect, and Bill Bach, Sunlit Systems presented the proposal to ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Several alternatives were considered for the proposed photovoltaic installation and the ground-mounted proposal was found to be the least intrusive in terms of site and area impacts.
- The plans have been shared with the neighbor to the west, i.e., Rob Young, and he indicated no concern with the proposed installation.
- Landscape plans have been developed to provide for tree and shrub screening of views from Westridge Drive and the trail along Westridge. It is believed that the planting will adequately screen views and the mounding suggested in the staff report is not necessary. It is estimated that with two years of growth the plantings will screen views.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the height of the proposed panel installation as shown on the application plans could be lowered by six inches without impacting the overall project design or function.
- In response to a question, the project landscape architect advised that the berm that has been installed along the Westridge Drive has only been rough graded and that finish

grading still needs to be completed. He stated that this grading would result in a more natural from to the berm and blend it better with existing site contours.

Public comments were requested. **Beverly Lipman**, representing the Westridge Architectural Supervising committee asked about the dimensions of the panel site. She was advised that the area measures approximately 60 feet by 26 feet.

Vlasic advised that ASCC member Schilling, who could not be at the meeting, had asked him to share some comments with the ASCC on this project. Specifically, Mr. Schilling supported staff's staff report recommendation that some additional mounding be added along the south side of the panel site to screen views to the panel. In addition, Mr. Schilling suggested that the panel site actually be lowered through grading and the cut materials used for the additional berming.

Following discussion, Eisberg moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0, approval of the modified plans for the addition of photovoltaic panels subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a the permits required for panel installation:

1. The maximum height of the panels shall be six inches lower than shown on the proposed plans.
2. The plans shall be modified to incorporate a low berm on the south side of the panel site as recommended in the staff report.
3. The landscape plan shall be revised to include native shrubs along the berm called for in condition 2. The plants should be sufficient to, with the berm, screen views from the Westridge Drive frontage, but not to create a solid line of taller trees as suggested the currently proposed landscape plan.

### **Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-515, 140 Russell Avenue, Crevelt**

Vlasic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on this proposal for new residential development of the subject .55 acre Woodside Highlands property. He reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the proposal and the concerns raised by ASCC members and site neighbors. (Refer to above site meeting minutes for a summary of site meeting discussion and a complete listing of project plans and materials.)

Mr. And Mrs. Crevelt and Roger Kohler, project architect, were present to discuss the plans with ASCC members. They offered the following clarifications:

- The plans have been shared with several site neighbors who have indicated support for the proposal. Also, the neighbors were very supportive to the actions to remove the old eucalyptus trees on the site as they presented a fire hazard in the area.
- After the site meeting, the matter of adjusting the driveway access was discussed with the neighbor across the street. Mr. Fowler, 139 Russell Avenue, indicted that he was

concerned with widening the driveway access because of the potential of more visible asphalt.

- The lighting plans will be adjusted to address the concerns raised in the staff report. In particular, the one "B" light shown at the northeast corner will be eliminated. It was placed at this location to light the path to the location where garbage cans would need to be moved for service by the garage disposal company.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and concluded that the general approach to site development was acceptable, but a number of concerns were expressed as to details of the proposed improvements. Members agreed that the proposed house siting, location of access, and general approach to site use were appropriate. Further, it was concluded that the layout for the house, basement, garage and overall three-dimensional size of the house appeared acceptable. It was also noted that the revised color scheme presented at the site meeting, with some modification would be acceptable. Concern remained, however, over the formality of the house architecture and some aspects of the proposed house massing.

After considerable discussion, it was agreed that project review should be continued to the May 10 meeting to permit time for the project architect to address the concerns over the formality of the house design. In addition, comments were offered on adjustments to the grading and landscaping plans that appear needed. The following specific comments were offered:

1. Consideration should be given to lowering the height of the roof ridge; however, it was acknowledged that the change in colors and other adjustments might resolve concerns over height.
2. The roof form over the garage should be modified to reduce the visual presence along Russell Avenue. Consideration should be given to a hip rather than gable form.
3. There should be more use of natural wood elements. For example, the main house door and garage doors should be in a natural wood finish. Also the corbels under the bay window over the garage door should have a natural wood finish.
4. Alternative chimney caps should be used that are smaller and less formal in design. (The applicant also suggested the use of copper gutters to add some additional texture and rural character.)
5. Consider the use of wood rather than metal railings, and trellis features at the house entry and over the garage doors. Also consider the use of some stone elements to break up the mass of the stucco walls. Perhaps the chimney forms could be clad in a stone material.
6. Modify the grading plan for the garage access and entry to the house as recommended in the staff report and discussed at the site meeting. Create a less formal and more natural pathway to the front door of the house. As necessary use lower retaining walls and landscaping to soften the graded slope between the street and house entry.

With respect to the revised driveway plan, the applicant was encouraged to use gravel and other surface materials to reduce the apparent width of the driveway and maintain a more rural character along the street frontage.

7. Scale back the fill along the front elevation of the house. Provide for a more natural slope transition between the house and street. Further, reduce the scope of lawn area, and provide for a more random approach to planting, making use largely of native materials along the street frontage.

These comments were presented in addition to the construction staging, lighting and other issues discussed at the site meeting. It was agreed that the project design team would focus on the house formality and driveway/entry design issues at this time and that other concerns could be handled as conditions of approval if the ASCC concluded the house and driveway adjustments addressed the above listed concerns.

After discussion and with the applicants concurrence, project review was continued to the May 10, 2004 regular ASCC meeting.

### **Architectural Review for Carport Conversion, 25 Coyote hill, Portola Valley Ranch, Maroney**

Vlasic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on this proposal to enclose an existing detached, flat roof carport, located to the south of the existing "downhill" house on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. Vlasic advised that the is carport located on an extension of the Coyote Hill cul-de-sac and revised the following project plans prepared by Joram S. Altman, Architect and revised through 4/1/04:

- Sheet A1, Existing and Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Remodeled Garage Level and Roof Plan
- Sheet A3, Exterior Elevations

Vlasic noted that the project submittal includes the cut sheet for the proposed entry trellis light fixture, i.e., Shaper Lighting 685, Shield Downlight and photographs of the existing carport and a photo simulation of the front elevation with the proposed garage doors. The photos and cut sheets were circulated for consideration by ASCC members.

Vlasic referenced the March 8, 2004 project approval letter from the Portola Valley Ranch Design Review Committee. He advised while the letter does not specifically mention the carport enclosure plans, the Ranch Manager confirmed Design Committee approval of the proposed enclosure. Vlasic concluded that the proposed design was one of the best solutions he had seen thus far for carport enclosures, found it fully in conformity with the carport enclosure guidelines for the Ranch and recommended approval as proposed.

Joram Altman presented the plans to the ASCC and advised that the design solution was possible because of recent options that have become available for construction of garage doors with glazing.

Public comments were requested, but none offered. There after, Eisberg moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the request as proposed.

**Architectural Review for swimming pool/spa, fencing, and lighting, 4 Oak Forest Court, Portola Glen Estates PUD, Quinn**

Vlasic presented the April 22, 2004 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for the addition of a swimming pool, fencing, landscaping and lighting on the subject 1.3 acre, Portola Glen Estates parcel. The revised proposed project design is shown on the single sheet plan dated March 8, 2004, prepared by Wineterbotham Partnership. Vlasic noted that the plan includes the design for the proposed fencing as well as the cut sheets for the proposed path and wall light fixtures.

Vlasic summarized the staff report issues and referenced the following two letters received with regard to the proposal since the staff report was prepared:

April 23, 2004 comments from Leitha and Carl Spetzler, 2 Oak Forest Court  
April 26, 2004 letter from Al and Sylvia Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak

Vlasic explained some of the background relative to the Portola Glen Estates PUD and discussed the PUD issues raised in the comments from Mr. and Mrs. Spetzler. He noted that the town attorney had advised that even though there may be issues with the PUD, the subject applicant should be considered by the ASCC on its own merits in terms of conformity with the PUD. With respect to the perimeter fencing issue, Vlasic noted that the proposed fencing was not located on a property line and would only surround the existing "backyard" use area, approximately only the northwest quadrant of the parcel. He also noted that the proposed post and wire fence was a design the ASCC previously determined would be consistent with the PUD provisions as long as it did not outline the parcel and was to secure specific activity areas.

Vlasic also noted that as correctly pointed out in the 4/26 letter from the Gegaregians, the Portola Glen Estates PUD calls for a swimming pool on Lot 4 to be surrounded by a eight (8) foot high wall for sound control. He stated that this matter was discussed with the applicant. Vlasic noted that the PUD provision as stated is somewhat inconsistent with current town and ASCC guidelines for fencing and walls. He further suggested that an eight-foot wall in this case may not provide for noise control and could actually make matters worse. Vlasic also noted that while the originally approved house and site plans for Lot 4 identified a pool location near the front door entry to the house, the approval had expired many years ago and that the PUD allowed for the applicant to pursue alternative locations in the building envelope as long as other PUD provisions were adhered to.

Vlasic distributed copies of two vicinity maps for the site dated 4/26/04. He stated the maps show the building envelope on the Quinn property, the proposed fence alignment and the distance to nearby houses, including those in Portola Valley Ranch. He also noted that the existing play structure and trampoline on the Quinn property discussed in the letter from the neighbors at 14 Valley Oak do not require building permit and could be placed on the property without the need for town review.

Vlasic also reviewed the provisions of the noise element of the general plan and the town's noise ordinance. He stated that the noise ordinance addresses power tools and mechanical equipment and that the general plan assumes that noise issue between neighbors related to normal residential uses would be worked out between neighbors and not regulated by the town.

Mr. Quinn and Mr. Winterbothem were present to discuss their plans with ASCC members. They offered the following comments:

- The provision for eight foot high walls around a pool was noted in the parcel file prior to purchase of the property, but there was some indication that it was an old provision and not consistent with current standards.
- The proposed pool and fencing are in the actual rear yard area of the parcel and fully within the building envelope established by the PUD. The fencing and added landscaping is desired to secure the yard area from animals, particularly coyotes, and to provide privacy and security in terms of the public trail that passes along the northern parcel boundary of the property.
- The neighbors in Portola Valley Ranch have expressed concern over noise from children using the back yard area. This is viewed as normal noise from children's play, but that the Quinn family is sensitive to the concerns and, within reason, has attempted to control noise. At the same time the applicant stated his family wants to enjoy and make normal use of their backyard area.
- An eight foot pool wall would be aesthetically unacceptable and likely make the noise situation worse and not better. This is a provision that is not clearly based on good noise data or consistent with current design concerns.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**David Taran, 3 Oak Forest Court**, stated his support for the application, shared concerns re: the coyote problem and need for some safety fencing.

**Carl Spetzler, 2 Oak Forest Court**, reviewed the concerns stated in his 4/23/04 statement. He offered however, that he felt the proposed pool location was appropriate and the fencing plan might be acceptable if it did not violate the natural character of the area and was not placed on any property line.

**Mrs. Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak**, reviewed the concerns stated in her April 26, 2004 letter and the background to the noise issues that led to the Portola Glen Estates PUD provisions for noise control. She stated her appreciation that children will be using the backyard area, but stated that there needed to be some sensitivity to the impacts of noise given the nature of the area and the manner in which noise seems to travel from property to property.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and agreed that with certain provisions the fencing plan would be acceptable. They further agreed that an eight-foot wall surrounding the pool as called for in PUD may well not address the noise impact issue as anticipated in the PUD and could actually make the noise situation relative to pool use worse. It was agreed that

some contemporary evaluation of the noise conditions should be completed and possible options for noise control identified.

Eisberg, cautioned that he did not want to set a precedent for requiring noise studies for normal residential uses like swimming pools, but recognized that this was an unusual situation.

After discussion, it was agreed that review of the swimming pool proposal should be continued until such time as the applicant had an opportunity to consider the noise issues further and consult with an appropriate acoustical professional. Vlastic advised that if data supports a solution other than a surrounding wall, he would share this with the town attorney to determine the best manner to address the PUD requirements. He also stressed that any revised plan would be presented to the ASCC and likely the planning commission for consideration, depending on the recommendations of the town attorney, and that neighbors would be given notice of any such future consideration.

Following discussion, Eisberg moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of only the proposed fencing plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to installation of any fencing:

1. A survey shall be completed of the northern and western parcel boundary in the area of the proposed fence. The survey shall be to the satisfaction of the public works director.
2. Based on the survey called for in condition 1, the fence shall be realigned to be setback from the parcel line and to meander through the existing and proposed vegetation and landscaping. The intent of the realignment is to avoid any boundary definition and provide for as unobtrusive views to fencing as reasonably possible.
3. Existing woodpiles placed to create a boundary along the public trail shall be removed prior to installation of new fencing. These woodpiles are deemed inconsistent with the open space character of the trail and PUD common parcel area.

In taking the above action, the ASCC concluded that the proposed fence plan provides for safety around only approximately one fourth of the building envelope area, that the fencing serves to secure the active "backyard" and, with the approval conditions, it can be assured that the fence will not be located on any parcel line.

### **Miscellaneous Comments**

Breen stated that she had been contacted by Mark Weiland, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC), who expressed his concerns to her over the ASCC's action on the Kastanis project at 1240 Westridge Drive. She and other ASCC members and staff discussed the concerns and agreed that a meeting between the ASCC and WASC was in order. Staff agreed to contact Mr. Weiland and see if such a meeting could be set.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Eisberg moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0, approval of the 4/12/04 meeting minutes with the following correction to page 6:

In the second line of the second full paragraph containing comments by Planning Commission Liaison Zaffaroni change "electrical permits" to "mechanical permits."

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

T. Vlastic