
Special Field Meeting, 102 Russell Avenue, and
Regular Evening Meeting 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chairman Pro Temp Schilling called the special field meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. at 102 Russell Avenue.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Gelpi, Schilling

Absent: Chase, Eisberg

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind (arrived but did not stay because of meeting
continuance)

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Others:

John Boice, 16 Tynan Way

Sara and Brian Lamb, 107 Russell Avenue

Sinda Mein, 10 Tynan Way

Leland Tull, 15 LeRoy Avenue

Bill Rehlich, 1 Tynan Way

Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, 102 Russell Avenue, Ford

It was noted that no one present was there to represent the applicant. Vlastic then contacted the project architect by cell phone and advised the ASCC of the following:

- It was assumed by the architect that the applicant did not need to be represented at the site meeting.
- Vlastic advised the architect that it was established practice that an applicant's representative would be present at such a meeting to address concerns ASCC members or neighbors may have with a proposal. It was pointed out that without such representation, project review would typically be continued to the next regular meeting.
- Vlastic also informed the architect that a number of site neighbors were present expressing concerns with the proposed plans.
- The project architect advised Vlastic that he and the applicant would be at the evening ASCC meeting to hear the concerns and provide additional data as might be appropriate. Vlastic noted that the project architect understood that project review would be continued to a site meeting to be rescheduled for July 12, 2004.

ASCC members agreed that appropriate project review could not be conducted without a representative of the applicant present. Vlastic advised that since the review was a noticed meeting, public comment could be received and forwarded to the project representatives for consideration prior to the July 12 continued site meeting. Thereafter, ASCC members requested comments from those present and also noted that comments could be provided by written communication or at the evening ASCC meeting.

The neighbors present offered the following comments relative to the proposal:

- The approach to placement of story poles, with the use of balloons, is not adequate. The wind impacts the effectiveness of the balloons. Further, a better demonstration of the full extent of the proposed garage mass, as well as height, is needed.
- The septic plans appear to conflict with the existing drainage improvements. The septic system plan in the application file at town hall includes a note that the existing drain line along the northeast corner of the site would have to be relocated. What does this mean? It is also understood that septic leach lines should be setback at least 50 feet from a storm drainage line. How can this be accommodated on the site?
- With the expanded roof area, there will be considerable additional run-off. How will this added drainage be handled without impacting the existing drainage system?
- Is it unusual for the ASCC to grant permission to locate more than 85% of the floor area in the main house?
- What will the impact of the project be on the site's significant oak trees? Concern was expressed over not only the house construction, but also the impact of installation of the new septic system.
- With the proposed construction, there will be considerably more house visible on the site. Conditions in the area will change dramatically. The story poles need to accurately demonstrate the potential visual impacts. Even with landscaping, it will be difficult to hide the new house and garage from view. Can the garage be placed under the proposed house and the existing driveway access to the existing carport used for the new project?
- The property is for sale now. What happens if the applicant receives ASCC approval and sells the property?

In response to the comments, Schilling noted that for sites with constraints like those that impact the subject property, it was not uncommon for the ASCC to make findings to allow more than 85% of the floor area to be in the single largest structure. Also, Vlastic noted that many houses and garages in the area are visible from the roadway and that the town's design review guidelines do not mandate that a new structure be fully screened by landscaping or otherwise hidden from view. He did note, however, that typically there would be concerns where a proposed structure blocks a distant view of a neighbor, or if there were sensitive privacy issues. He also pointed out that the existing small house on the site was within the required side yard setback and that it was also low on the property, in an area that appears to receive significant site drainage.

Vlastic then clarified that any ASCC approval is valid for two years and the approval would run with the property, assuming the current owner and architect allow the plans to be used by someone else. Vlastic added that any approval conditions would be part of the record and have to be met prior to issuance of a building permit.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, it was agreed that review of the project would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. It was noted that the evening meeting would be only for the propose of receiving additional comments and that after any comments are offered, project review would be continued to a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on July 12, 2004.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the special site meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. It was noted that the regular evening ASCC meeting would start at approximately 8:00 p.m. in the Historic School House at the town center.

Chairman Pro Temp Schilling called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Gelpi, Schilling

Absent: Chase, Eisberg

Town Council Liaison: None

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-520, 287 Westridge Drive, Lovazzano

Schilling referenced the comments in the June 17, 2004 staff report on this request and noted that the applicant has requested project review be continued to the July 12 meeting. He further advised that staff supports the requested continuance.

After requesting and receiving no public comments, project review was continued to the July 12 ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-519, 35 Golden Oak Drive, Castro

Schilling referenced the comments in the June 17, 2004 staff report on this request and noted that this applicant has also requested project review be continued to the July 12 meeting. He further advised that staff supports the requested continuance.

After requesting and receiving no public comments, project review was continued to the July 12 ASCC meeting.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Variance X7E-123, 136 Russell Avenue, McCarthy

Vlastic presented the June 17, 2004 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He advised that on April 8, 2002 the ASCC completed review and conditional approval of the subject application and that the following plans and materials have been submitted to satisfy the approval conditions:

Sheet A0.1, Site Plan, revised through 3/15/04 (enclosed)

Sheet A-2, Exterior Elevations, revised through 4/12/04 (enclosed)

Statement re: tree protection and construction parking, received May 18, 2004
(attached to enclosed plan sheets)

Fii Focus Landscape Lighting "cut sheet" for path light AL-06 (attached)
Colors and Materials Board received 5/17/04 (to be presented at the June 21 ASCC meeting)

Vlasic added that since the staff report was prepared the applicant had advised him of the following additional design clarifications:

- The wall mounted light will be a Craftsman style fixture identified as Mission MW-7GW-VP, 10 inch height. A cut sheet for the fixture was presented and it was noted that it would have "gold-white iridescent glass" with a "verdigris patina finish" on the metal housing.
- The garage and house doors, railing and all other wood elements would be in the same wood finish identified on the colors board for the trim. This is a transparent wood stain with a reflectivity value of between 20 and 25%.
- The stucco surfaces would be finished in a color that is similar to the color shown on the colors board for the trim surfaces. It is intended that the color at least blend well with the trim color.
- The cobblestone driveway will be constructed with "true" cobblestones that were left on the site from the previous site owner. These have irregular shapes and a "stone gray" color.

Mr. McCarthy was present to discuss his follow-up submittal with ASCC members. In response to a question, he clarified that the proposed wall mounted light fixtures would be at the entry doors as noted on the plan elevations and each limited to one bulb with a maximum rating of 40 watts. He also advised that one fixture would be at the front door, but that it is "hidden" from view on the house elevation sheets.

Public comments were requested but none offered.

After brief discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the follow-up submittal as presented subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning and building staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Final construction staging and tree protection plans shall be prepared addressing the concerns, including adequacy of protective tree fencing, raised in the June 17, 2004 staff report. Every reasonable efforts should be made to coordinate construction deliveries, demolition, parking, etc., with the other construction projects anticipated in the area to minimize potential for impacts on neighbors and vehicle circulation.
2. The building permit plans shall define the proposed wall mounted lights as the Mission MW-7GW-VP, 10 inch height, and shall specify that each fixture will be fitted with only one 40 watt bulb.
3. The exterior colors are acceptable as clarified at the ASCC meeting. However, prior to application of the final stucco color, a test sample shall be placed on the house for

inspection by a designated ASCC member. If determined necessary based on this inspection, the final stucco color shall be adjusted to the satisfaction of the designated ASCC member to ensure conformity with the other house colors and finished and the town's policy on color reflectivity.

4. The proposed cobblestone driveway shall extend only to the property line. The driveway surface from the property line to the paved street shall be asphalt.

Architectural Review for Carport Conversion, Window Additions and Replacement, Air Conditioners and Privacy Screens, 2 Woodfern Portola Valley Ranch, McMillen

Vlasic presented the June 17, 2004 staff report on this proposal to enclose an existing detached, flat roof carport, located on the south side of the existing house on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. He explained that the proposal also includes plans for some window additions to the existing house and air conditioners with privacy screen to be located between the house and carport as shown on the five sheet, 8.5" x 11" plan set dated 4/7/04 and received by the town on May 5, 2004.

Vlasic noted that the Portola Valley Ranch Design Review Committee conditionally approved the proposal as stated in the committee's May 7, 2004 approval letter. He clarified that the conditions allow for the garage doors to be either rough sawn cedar or cedar shingles and allow for an "optional" second privacy screen associated with the air conditioner installation.

Vlasic also clarified a note in the Ranch approval letter relative to tree removal. He advised that he had received a transmittal from the Ranch manager showing the plan for removal of several small alders, two small redwoods and trimming of willow tree branches. Vlasic added that the tree removal and trimming had already been completed pursuant to the design committee approval.

Ms. McMillen was present to discuss her plans with ASCC members. She offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Consideration is being given to moving the proposed air conditioner units to the underside of the deck at the northeast corner of the house. It is recognized, however, that such a change would require re-submittal of the application to the Ranch design committee.
- It is understood that an application for only the addition of air conditioning units would not require ASCC approval.
- In response to question, it was clarified that the air conditioning units would be located between the house and carport, i.e., at the southeast corner of the house, and with the privacy screen on the east side of the A.C installation, thus screening views from the pathway along Ohlone.

Public comments were requested. **Linda Elkind, 14 Hawkview**, indicated that if the applicant changed her plans, it was hoped the ASCC would not pre-judge the request, potentially limiting the review options open to the Ranch design committee.

Vlasic clarified that while all building permits are technically required to be considered by the ASCC, building permits for only the addition of A.C. units have typically been handled at the staff level. He explained that this approach has been taken based on the delegation of review authority to staff by the ASCC for minor additions at the Ranch. He commented, however, that an application for a more significant change, e.g., carport conversion, that includes other improvements, would be forwarded to the ASCC for consideration as called for in the provisions of the Ranch's PUD.

After discussion, Ms. McMillen indicated she would not seek any changes in the proposal and asked for ASCC consideration of it as submitted.

After discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi to approve the request as submitted subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans shall conform to the conditions set by the Ranch design committee as stated in the committee's May 7, 2004 approval letter.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the site/floor plan shall be revised to the satisfaction of planning staff to accurately show the location for the proposed A.C. units at the southeast corner of the house and the louvered privacy screen to the east of the A.C. units. The privacy screen louvers shall be oriented so that views through them from the east shall be to the back of the enclosed carport. Further, the revised site/floor plan for the enclosed carport shall clearly show the location of the window and the door proposed on the west side of the structure.

Architectural Review for residential Redevelopment, 102 Russell Avenue, Ford

Vlasic presented the June 17, 2004 staff report on this proposal for construction of a new multi-level, contemporary Ranch style residence on the subject .50 acre, Woodside Highlands site. He explained that a brief site meeting had been conducted at the site earlier in the day at which time several neighbors shared comments and concerns with ASCC members (see above minutes of the site meeting). Vlasic further explained that since no one representing the applicant was present at the site meeting, an effective meeting could not be held and ASCC members agreed that project review should continue at a July 12 site meeting.

Vlasic reviewed the concerns offered at the site meeting and shared a copy of the proposed septic system plan he located in the applicant's file at town hall. He noted that the plan did include a note that the new system would require relocation of the existing storm drain line along the northeast corner of the property. He advised that the scope of this relocation should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC and Woodside Highland homeowners association prior to action on the plans.

Russell Ford and Craig Stark, project architect, were present to discuss the proposal with ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- There was a misunderstanding as to site meeting attendance and someone will be present at the July 12 site meeting on behalf of the applicant.

- The proposed septic system plan has been approved by the health department. This was a first and essential step in pursuing alternative plans for the site. The approval includes two options relative to the existing storm drain line. First, the line could be relocated further toward the northeast corner of the property, but would not have to maintain a 50-foot separation from the leach lines. The ends of the leach lines would, however, have to be capped and "tight lines" for a certain distance. The second option would be for "tight line" leach lines to extend across the existing storm drain line. With this option, the storm drain line would not have to be relocated. The health department would review the selected option at the building permit stage and act on it.

In response to a question, the applicant advised he did not remember the health department officer who reviewed and conditionally approved the plan, but would obtain the name and forward it to planning staff for follow-up verification of the above comments.

- The plans have been carefully adjusted to be sensitive to tree and view impacts and also reflect economic limitations of the applicant. It has, however, been determined that the project will cost more than the applicants can afford to devote to it and, for this reason, they are considering selling the property with the plans. The desire is to, hopefully, protect some of the value of the design efforts that have been pursued for the passed year.
- The applicant is prepared to address the concerns raised in the staff report, but understands this would likely best be deferred to the July 12 site meeting.
- The concerns raised at today's site meeting will be addressed in preparation for the July 12 meeting.
- The proposed garage is located in the paved area currently used for parking of vehicles. The garage is desired in part to hide views to parked vehicles.

Public comments were requested. **John Boice, 16 Tynan Way**, spoke on behalf of the Woodside Highlands homeowners association. He stressed that the existing storm drain on the site is a very important part of the local drainage system and that any change to it would only be possible if approved by the homeowners association.

Mr. Ford acknowledged Mr. Boice's comments and stated he would confer with him on the drainage matter prior to the next ASCC meeting.

Following brief discussion ASCC members agreed that project review should be continued to a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on July 12. For the next meeting, the applicant was asked to correct the story pole problems noted at the site meeting earlier in the day and to fully define the outline of the proposed garage with story poles at the four corners and for the ridge. It was also agreed that tape should be added to the story poles defining the garage and two other important house ridgelines, so the scope of the proposed ridgelines could be fully appreciated. It was further agreed, however, that story poles were not needed for the house corners as long as the corners were staked and identifiable at the site.

Staff Reports -- June 30 Town Council Meeting regarding the Town Center Project

Vlasic reminded ASCC members that the town council has asked the ASCC to attend the June 30, 2004 meeting where the town center project architects will present the results of the recent charrette process.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Gelpi and passed 3-0, approval of the 6/7/04 meeting minutes with the following correction to page 12: in the first bullet at the top of the page, change "exiting" to "existing."

Schilling also wondered about the Wong matter discussed in the minutes, i.e., 90 Iroquois Trail, and if a letter was to be sent to Mr. Wong advising him of the need to address the concerns with the parking "tent" on his property. Vlasic advised that staff would be forwarding a letter to Mr. Wong and pursuing correction of the parking problems on the site.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

T. Vlasic