

Architectural and Site Control Commission **February 10, 2014**
Special Site Meeting, 302 Portola Road, Priory School Benedictine & Church Squares
and

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

Chair Koch called the special site meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. at Benedictine Square, The Priory School, 302 Portola Road.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross
Town Council Liaison: Hughes
Conservation Committee: Murphy
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Others Present*:

Jim Goring, Architect, Goring & Straja
Theresa Kunardi, Goring & Straja
Michael O'Leary, Landscape Architect
Monica Corman, Priory Trustee
Henry Riggs, Priory Project Manager
Tim Molak, Priory Head of School
Brad Albers, Priory Director of Facilities

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

Preliminary review for conformity with CUP X7D-30 and Site Development Permit X9H-668, Priory Benedictine and Church Squares, 302 Portola Road

Kristiansson presented the February 6, 2014 staff report on this preliminary review, described the project, and discussed similarities to the conceptual plans presented last year at the December 9, 2013 ASCC meeting.

The project team reviewed the proposal and provided the following clarifications:

- The same pavers would be used at both Benedictine and Church Squares. The pavers are not themselves permeable but are part of a system that includes an underlayer of gravel and spacers between the pavers.
- The planter walls would have more wood and stone, rather than being all pressed board concrete.
- A variety of colors are possible for the awnings; samples will be available at the evening meeting.
- This phase of the project would not include awnings on the Student Center, but only on the new structures.
- Improvements to the existing buildings are still being finalized and would be considered separately.

The ASCC walked around Benedictine Square, up to the existing patio west of the Student Center, and then over to Church Square. During the meeting, the following clarifications were provided by the project team:

- The fruiting olives will be moved up on to the hill near the existing vegetable gardens.
- The siding on the existing classroom building which will be demolished is redwood and would be flipped and used to clad the faculty lounge.
- Although some existing pine trees are located within the area of the roof cut-out, these trees are too close to the building and associated stairs, and the project team has proposed removing them.
- The existing stairs from Benedictine Square to the south side of the Student Center will be preserved. The handrail will be replaced with a version that includes lighting so that the pole lights can be removed.
- Portable Building A may be kept on campus during construction of the Science Building which the school is planning, and Portable Building B will be removed as soon as the work in Benedictine Square is complete.

ASCC members discussed the trees which are proposed for removal and suggested that additional pines could be taken out as part of the project. The ASCC also discussed the pavers at Church Square and whether they could be retained or reused on campus. In addition, ASCC members discussed the proposed lighting plan and the Town's policy that trees and other landscaped areas should not be illuminated.

Public comments were requested, and **Judith Murphy** on behalf of the Conservation Committee suggested that the project team reconsider the use of stone pine, ulma parvifolia, and feather grass. In addition, magnolias could work within the courtyard but do not fit with the character of the campus or the town and so would seem problematic if planted in front of the existing classroom building. The project landscape architect offered that these would be small magnolia trees, intended to stay under the roof so that there would be no interference with the solar panels.

ASCC members agreed they would offer additional comments at the regular evening meeting.

Adjournment

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

Architectural and Site Control Commission **February 10, 2014**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Koch 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, Harrell, Koch, Ross
Planning Commission Liaison: McKitterick
Town Council Liaison: Hughes
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson, Assistant Planner Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Continued Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Guest House and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-665, 7 Veronica Place, Waissar

Borck presented the February 10, 2014 staff report on this continued review of the new residence and proposed site improvements. She noted that the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of plans on January 13, 2014 and were generally supportive of the project while directing the project team to work with the immediate neighbors on modifications to the landscape screening plan.

Borck advised that an email from the neighbor at 35 Antonio Court, Mr. Rene LaCerte, was received this morning and emailed to the ASCC. She noted that Mr. LaCerte could not be at the meeting this evening, but wanted to express his concerns regarding the proposed 15-gallon live oaks versus selecting larger specimen trees for adequate screening of the project.

Borck then reviewed the following materials submitted to address the preliminary review comments:

Civil Plans, BKF Engineers, 1/21/14:

Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan
Sheet C3.1, Utility Plan

Landscape Plans, Lutsko Associates, 1/21/14:

Sheet L2.1, Materials Plan and Lighting Diagram
Sheet L2.2, Impervious Surface Diagram
Sheet L5.1, Planting Diagram
Sheet L6.1, Irrigation Diagram

Architectural Plans, Feldman Architecture, 1/21/14:

Sheet G0.00, Cover Sheet
Sheet A1.00, Site Plan
Sheet A1.01, Enlarged Site Plan (with exterior lighting)

- Transmittal letter from Feldman Architecture, response to ASCC and neighbor comments from 1/13/14
- Email received 1/21/14 from Mr. Dick Foley of 75 Hillbrook Drive

Linda Waissar, applicant, Caroline Arpa, project architect, and Laura Jerrard, project landscape architect were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. As Commissioners Harrell and Ross had not been present for the preliminary review, Ms. Arpa presented colored renderings and color boards for the project.

In response to a question concerning potential clerestory lightspill, Ms. Arpa indicated that once designed, the interior lighting would be below the clerestory and that shades could be considered.

Breen indicated that she had visited the Foley property to consider potential view obstruction and inquired if the project team had considered lowering plate heights. Ms. Arpa clarified that they did consider lowering both the main building height and lowering the building further into the ground. She stated that further lowering the building into the slope would require additional grading and she didn't see that as appropriate for the site. When considering lowering the building, she indicated that losing the clerestory element was not preferred in the design scheme both to maintain both the character of the building and to allow for cross ventilation. She advised that the project team had made efforts to be sensitive to the neighbors' concerns, the character of the site, and the needs of the client.

In response to a question, Ms. Arpa stated that the story poles were relatively accurate in height. She indicated that the roofs will be built somewhat differently than the poles are able to show.

Public comments were then requested.

Mr. Tom Moran, 85 Hillbrook Drive, stated that his main concern was visibility of the auto court and that he would like screening for it. He also expressed concern that there may be too many trees proposed for the site. Ms. Jerrard confirmed that shrubs were to be planted in the landscape area beyond the auto court and would be part of the field placement site meeting. She also advised that developing the landscape screening plan has been challenging in finding a balance of plant materials that will be optimal for everyone.

Mr. Dan Abrams, 5 Veronica Place, inquired if consideration had been given to selecting other species of trees that would ultimately not be as high as mature oaks. Ms. Jerrard advised that she was not too concerned about the oaks becoming extremely tall and stressed that they will spread outward. She also offered that other faster growing trees would require significantly more water and would not be appropriate for the site.

An unknown meeting attendee inquired about the initial height of a 15-gallon oak and how fast it would grow. Ms. Jerrard advised that a 15-gallon specimen would be about seven feet tall and would grow about one foot per year.

ASCC members considered the revised plans and supporting materials and offered that they were very supportive of the project design and scale. Clark indicated that the timing of the

landscape planting was the key issue and that the size of the oaks and shrubs should not dominate the site over time. Breen suggested that the applicant consider fewer oaks and a mix of sizes, as well as including some Dr. Hurd manzanita. She also stated that individual property owners could also provide their own screening. Ross and Koch supported the idea of fewer trees. As commissioners discussed the optimal timing of the field placement of screen plantings, Vlastic advised that the objectives should first be stated to provide clear direction to the project team. He offered that the applicants' needs, neighbor concerns for screening, and not over-planting the site were items of focus. Harrell reiterated these three areas of focus for the project team, offered that fewer trees would be desired, and that the timing of the in-field placement meeting would be more appropriate nearer to the end of construction.

In addition to the above, Breen inquired about the additional exterior lighting that will be required per building code. Ms. Arpa advised that additional sconces were not added to the exterior lighting plan as the project team is evaluating possible use of downlights.

Following discussion, Ross moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with conditions set forth in the December 17, 2013 memo from the Public Works Director
2. Compliance with conditions set forth in the November 19, 2013 letter from the Town Geologist (Cotton, Shires, and Associates)
3. Compliance with conditions set forth in the November 14, 2013 memo from Woodside Fire Protection District
4. A final detailed construction staging/access and tree protection plan shall be submitted and approved by Town staff prior to building permit issuance.
5. A construction schedule shall be submitted by the general contractor prior to building permit issuance to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. The landscape screening plan shall be revised to include fewer trees, a variety of sizes for the trees proposed, and selection of a lower-height species for the west elevation so as to not obscure future ridge views, to the satisfaction of a two-member ASCC subcommittee.
7. The applicant shall hold a site meeting with a two-member ASCC subcommittee for field placement of the screen planting, and the landscape screening plan may be adjusted during the field placement meeting to the satisfaction of the ASCC subcommittee. The timing of this meeting shall be indicated on the construction schedule. The applicant shall notify neighbors at least ten days in advance of the time and place for this meeting.
8. A final, detailed exterior lighting plan and switching plan shall be submitted with the building permit to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
9. A detailed interior lighting plan with lighting cut sheets shall be provided that identifies all proposed lighting (and clerestory shades, if applicable) in the area around the clerestory to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

Breen seconded the motion, and the motion passed, 5-0.

Continued preliminary review for conformity with CUP X7D-30 and of Site Development Permit X9H-668, Priory Benedictine and Church Squares, 302 Portola Road

Kristiansson presented the February 6, 2014 staff report on this continuing project review and discussed the afternoon site meeting on the project (refer to above site meeting minutes).

The project team presented a model and drawings of the project, and answered questions from ASCC members about the project design and landscaping. The team explained that the intent was to reflect the themes of simplicity, craftsmanship and thoughtfulness. As a result, more wood and stone will likely be incorporated into the finishes and furnishings for the squares, rather than concrete as currently indicated. In terms of the landscaping, the intent for the slope below the Student Center is to preserve and nurture the oaks in that area and to keep the landscaping sparse. Some plants would be added for erosion control, however, as well as some toyon. The only lawn area would be 500 sf within the Benedictine Square itself, which would be planted with a dwarf fescue.

Public comments were then requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and provided the following comments:

- As many of the declining trees on the site as possible should be removed.
- The olive trees that are being moved should be either harvested or treated to prevent fruiting.
- The magnolias along the entrance road in front of the existing classroom building should be replaced with something more indigenous.
- The existing pavers at Church Square could be retained or reused, as they appear to be in good condition.
- The awnings on the new buildings will not be very visible from off-site, so the color could provide more of an accent. This would be different for awnings on the Student Center, however.
- The tree lighting needs to be removed.

Review for conformity with Portola Valley Ranch PUD X7D-74, Ranch Design Committee Proposed Revisions to Solar Panel Design Guidelines

Kristiansson presented the February 6, 2014 staff report, described the scope of the proposed changes, and discussed the consistency of the proposed changes with the Ranch PUD and the Town's Design Guidelines.

Carol Grundfest and Olivier Pieron from the Ranch Design Committee were present to discuss the solar panel design guidelines with ASCC members. In response to questions from the Commissioners, they provided the following information:

- The 36" perimeter specified in the guidelines is required by code.
- The 18" height is not required by code, but is based on a calculation of the angle for efficiency.

- The height restriction is intended to mitigate the visibility of the panels from the ground.

Public comments were then requested, and Planning Commission Liaison **Nate McKitterick** asked the Design Committee members to comment on how the revised guidelines conform to the Solar Rights Act (Civil Code Section 714), which does not allow homeowners' associations or jurisdictions to require changes that would reduce efficiency by more than 20% or increase cost by more than \$2,000.

Olivier Pieron responded that the guidelines were intended to put the expectations up front so that these could be discussed when a homeowner first starts to contact potential solar installers. Carol Grundfest added that the Design Committee was trying to provide guidance to homeowners. The solar panel guidelines do currently reference the Solar Rights Act, and the Committee had considered attaching the Solar Rights Act to the guidelines but were concerned about keeping it updated if the code changed. After some discussion, the Design Committee agreed to add either a hyperlink to the Solar Rights Act or to attach the Act to the solar panel guidelines.

ASCC members expressed support for the guidelines and reiterated the goal of encouraging solar panels with reasonable restrictions.

Breen moved to find the revised solar panels in conformity with PUD X7D-74, and Ross seconded the motion; the motion passed 5-0.

Commission and Staff Reports

Kristiansson advised the ASCC that staff had discussed the restoration planting plan for Villa Lauriston with the applicant. The applicant has hired Rana Creek to provide assistance with the plan, and a revised plan is being developed for consideration by the ASCC subcommittee.

Town Council Liaison Hughes provided an update relative to the Town Council's meeting with Woodside Fire and the Woodside Town Council concerning wood roofs. The Council decided that they do not want to second-guess the State's fire ratings, and therefore wood roofs that meet the Class A standards will continue to be allowed.

Minutes

Clark moved and Breen seconded approval of the January 27, 2014 minutes as drafted. The motion passed 4-0-1, with Harrell abstaining.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.