

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Davis

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Welcoming of New ASCC member Carter Warr**

Chair Chase and other ASCC members welcomed Carter Warr back to the ASCC. Chase noted Warr's recent reappointment to the ASCC after an absence of over a year. Warr thanked ASCC members for the welcome and stated he was looking forward to serving the town again on the ASCC.

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Architectural Review for Conformity with Conditional Use Permit X7D-136, Water Tank #27, Peak Lane and Golden Oak Drive, California Water Service Company**

Vlastic presented the November 18, 2004 staff report on this request. He noted that on November 8, 2004 the ASCC initiated review of the proposal for addition of a generator and associated electrical panel at the subject water tank facility site. He advised that review was continued to the November 22 meeting to allow time for the applicant to address concerns raised in the 11/4/04 staff report and by the neighbors at 265 Golden Oak Drive. Vlastic further advised that the applicant was still working on possible plan modifications and to develop the additional data requested by the ASCC and, as a result, has requested that project review be continued to the December 13, 2004 ASCC meeting.

After requesting and receiving no public comments, project review was continued to the December 13, 2004 ASCC meeting.

**Follow-up -- Review of Building Permit Plans for The Sequoias Health Services Project, CUP X7D-63 and Site Development Permit X9H-508, 501 Portola Road, The Sequoias**

Vlastic presented the November 18, 2004 staff report and provided a brief review of the status of the Sequoias project and the use permit provisions requiring ASCC consideration of building permit plans. He noted that such building permit plan review had been tentatively scheduled for the November 22 meeting, but that applicant was still developing some additional data to address staff review comments. Vlastic explained that as a result of

the ongoing efforts, the applicant has asked that the ASCC review be rescheduled to the December 13 meeting.

After requesting and receiving no public comments, building permit review was continued to the December 13, 2004 ASCC meeting.

### **Architectural Review for spiral staircase and other deck additions and modifications, 3 Sandstone, Portola Valley Ranch, Kato**

Vlasic presented the November 18, 2004 staff report on this request for approval of building permit plans for the addition of a five (5) foot diameter, metal spiral staircase connecting lower and upper exterior decks on the subject Portola Valley Ranch property. He noted that the plans include a three-foot extension of the upper level deck and railing changes for the upper deck. ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 10/15/04 prepared by William Maston, Architect & Associates:

- Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet, Symbols, Abrev. & Project Data
- Sheet A1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Proposed Main Floor Deck Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Proposed Lower Floor Deck Plan
- Sheet A5.1, South/East Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.2, North/West Exterior Elevations

Vlasic also noted that the proposed improvements were conditionally approved by the Portola Valley Ranch design committee as stated in the 11/8/04 letter from the committee that was included with the 11/18 staff report to the ASCC.

Project architect Bill Maston presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to issues raised in the staff report.

- An November 22, 2004 letter to the ASCC from Mr. Maston was submitted stating that the metal elements of the stairs and stair railings would be painted flat black to match the support posts for the proposed cable rail around the upper deck. He also explained the process for selection of the tile surface to be used for the rebuilt upper level deck. It was clarified that the tile surface, due to it's height would only be visible to those using the deck or from within the applicant's house. He also clarified that the deck "fascia" would be high enough to hide views to the edge of the tile. Two tile samples were presented to the ASCC.
- Attached to the 11/22/04 letter to the ASCC was a cut sheet for the proposed "pin light." Mr. Maston stated the fixture would be "Versa Star" by B-K Lighting and would be used to light the new stairs as shown on the plans.
- The Ranch committee condition addressing the "curve" of the top of the railing actually pertains to the "profile" of the cap for the perimeter deck railing and not the stair railing. It was noted that a more square shaped cap would be selected to address the concerns of the committee and that the cap would be either in a matt black or matt bronze finish.

- The underside, i.e., "soffit," of the rebuilt upper deck will be wood and stained to match the finish to be used on the house.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the plans and clarifications offered by Mr. Maston. Members concurred that either of the tile samples for use on the upper level deck were acceptable.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting.

### **Responses to Communications**

Vlasic presented the comments in the staff report on two communications to the ASCC. He explained that the ASCC received an October 18, 2004 communication from the Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee relative to an exterior lighting issue and the Ranch has asked for ASCC reactions to it. He further explained that the town council received an October 27, 2004 letter from a town resident and referred it to the ASCC for review and response. Both of these communications were discussed and addressed as follows.

**Portola Valley Ranch 10/18/04 communication.** Vlasic advised that this letter from the Ranch Design Committee addresses use of motion sensors for control of exterior lighting at the Ranch and asks that the ASCC allow the Ranch to continue its recent practice of requiring motion sensor controlled house entrance pathway and carport lights. Vlasic noted that the letter explains the reasons for the request and that these are consistent with Ranch concerns expressed over a project recently reviewed by the ASCC for a Ranch property where the ASCC did permit limited use of motion sensors. Vlasic stated that the ASCC has the authority to grant the relief asked for as the use of motion sensors while discouraged, is not prohibited in the town.

ASCC members discussed the request and received input from Linda Elkind supporting the need for specific guidelines for use of motion sensors as suggested in the staff report.

After brief discussion, it was agreed that the deputy town planner should draft a letter to the Ranch design committee for signature by the ASCC chair stating that the ASCC would be willing to allow for the use of motion sensors at the Ranch, as desired by the committee, if adequate guidelines are defined and found acceptable by the ASCC. Members specifically suggested that the guidelines should ensure at least the following:

- Motion trigger lights in carports should be within the structures, with fixtures directed to light only inside areas. Further, lights in carports should be triggered only as the vehicle enters the structure not as it approaches it. Sensors should be located so that animals or passersby cannot easily trigger them. Also, full illumination of the carport interiors should not be necessary or permitted.
- The maximum time period such lights are on should be limited to perhaps no more than 10 minutes.

- Exterior motion controlled lights should only be for safe pathway use. They should be located along the edge of the entry pathway and there should be no direct view to the light source. Further, the pathway lights should be relatively low and directed to the pathway surface. Every effort should be made in fixture location and design to limit the extent of light spill beyond the areas where light is needed for safe nighttime passage. Also, pathway light motion sensors should be located to minimize potential for chance triggering by animals or passersby.

ASCC members noted that it is understood that the use of motion sensors is for safe access in the covered parking areas and from these areas to and from the front entry of the house. It was also understood that motion controlled light fixtures were not to be mounted on exterior walls or located for general out door use, e.g., lighting on decks for evening use.

Schilling expressed reservations about the use of motion sensors and encouraged the Ranch design committee to consider manual overrides that would allow resetting of the lights, i.e., turning them off before the end of the normal on cycle, when their use is no longer needed.

Vlasic advised that he would draft the requested letter and present it to Chair Chase for review and then the final version would be forwarded to the Ranch design committee.

**October 27, 2004 letter from David Beugelmans, 34 Grove Drive.** Vlasic reviewed this letter and the November 18, 2004 staff report comments on it. He advised that the letter was sent to the mayor and discussed by the town council and that the council has referred the letter to the ASCC for review and for preparation of a response to Dr. Dr. Beugelmans.

ASCC members discussed the matter and considered photos and plan data on the house under construction at one Grove Court that is the subject of the concerns expressed by Dr. Beugelmans. Breen stated she was not on the ASCC at the time the project was approved and visited the site in preparation for discussion at the ASCC meeting. She stated she was very surprised to see the size of the house and scope of the project after first reading the concerns expressed in the 10/27 letter. She noted that the house did not seem particularly large or inconsistent with town design guidelines.

Warr commented that he was on the ASCC at the time the project was approved and that considerable attention was then given to the neighbors concerns and that the project was modified in a number of ways to address them. He advised that at this point in the construction process the site and work probably look the worst; and, that when the project is finished consistent with the ASCC approval, including required landscaping, it will fit the site well and be compatible with neighborhood conditions.

Council liaison Davis asked if those members on the ASCC at the time of the original approval "had it to do again" would they find the approved project acceptable and in conformity with town design guidelines. Members concurred they would with the adjustments required with the ASCC review process.

Warr suggested that a letter be drafted by the deputy town planner for consideration by ASCC members at the next meeting simply summarizing the reactions offered at the ASCC

meeting. He recommended that this letter be forwarded to town council and that the Mayor then forward it to Dr. Beugelmans. He indicated that in his relatively long, previous tenure on the ASCC he did not recall that the ASCC ever sent a letter directly to an individual on such a matter and offered that it would be more appropriate to come from the Mayor especially since the original letter was to the mayor.

Other ASCC members concurred with Warr's suggestions. Council liaison Davis advised that he would inform the council of the ASCC discussion.

Vlasic advised he would draft a letter for ASCC consideration at the December 13 meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the 11/8/04 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

T. Vlasic