

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Davis

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

**Additions to the Agenda**

Vlastic advised that an issue had come up with a project recently approved by the ASCC for 10 Kiowa Court and that he would like to discuss that issue with ASCC members at the end of the meeting. ASCC members were agreeable to this addition to the agenda.

**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 December 9, 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 based on concerns raised in the 11/4/04 staff report and neighbors at 265 Golden Oak Drive, project review was continued to the November 22 meeting and then to the December 13 meeting to allow the applicant sufficient time to address the identified concerns. Vlastic noted that the applicant is still working to address the issues and has asked for another continuance, this time to the January 10, 2005 meeting. Vlastic added that staff supports the requested continuance.

After requesting and receiving no public comments, application review was continued to the regular January 10, 2005 ASCC meeting.

-----  
Prior to consideration of the following request, both Chase and Warr temporarily removed themselves from the ASCC. They explained that they both owned properties within 500 feet of The Sequoias and because of conflict of interest limitations could not participate in ASCC review of requests associated with the facility.  
-----

**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**

Vlasic presented the December 9, 2004 staff report on this request of The Sequoias for follow-up building permit review and for plan modifications. He explained that on September 1, 2004, the planning commission completed action on the conditional use permit amendment and site development permit applications for the health services project and permit conditions require conformity to recommendations and stipulations of the ASCC that were developed during a number of ASCC meetings on the proposal. Vlasic advised that the following building permit plan packages for the approved project were filed on October 22, 2004 and are in the process of staff review:

Building Permit Nos. 11842-11844, Package 1A for replacement parking by the new chillers and new emergency exit ramp.

Building Permit No. 11845, Package 1B for skilled nursing facility exit path and shoring.

Building Permit Nos. 11846-11848, Package 2 for new road along north side of the property.

Building Permit Nos. 11849-11851, Package 3 for new assisted living building and building remodel of memory impairment unit.

Vlasic displayed copies of the plan packages and referenced the October 14, 2004 submittal memorandum from the project architect describing the focus of each of the packages. Vlasic also offered the following comments as to the status of the plans and review for conformity with the ASCC approved plans:

- Town planning staff has conducted a review of the plans and, for the most part, find them fully consistent with the various planning commission and ASCC conditions.
- A November 13 memorandum from Tom Vlasic to Yumiko Westland, The Sequoias director of facilities, addresses a number of issues, including status of compliance with the various conditions of approval. An annotated matrix included with that memo defines the current status of condition compliance. In response to 11/13 memo, the applicant provided the December 2, 2004 submittal that includes Sheet SK-254 dated 11/30/04. This is a new plan for "Proposed Perimeter Retaining Wall" to accommodate needed parking. This plan requires ASCC review and approval. Also, provided with the 12/2 submittal are materials to satisfy conditions 4a and 4b on the condition matrix. These conditions and the 12/2 submittal address the blocks to be used for the chiller enclosure walls.
- Conditions not addressed by the 10/22 and 12/2 submittals are numbers 3, 9, and 14. Condition number 3 calls for a final exterior lighting plan. This is still being worked on and will be submitted to the ASCC for consideration at a future date.

Condition number 9 calls for detailed vegetation protection and construction staging plans. These plans were received on December 10, after preparation of the staff report and are to be discussed by project representatives at the ASCC meeting.

Condition number 14 calls for removal of the existing water tank. A 12/10/04 letter has been received from Ms. Westland advising that the water tank would be removed after

the campus is connected to the California Water Service Company's system and estimating tank removal no later than the second quarter of 2006.

Vlasic pointed out that the four building permit plan packages are extensive. He explained that while staff review has concluded the plans do comply with the conditions of ASCC approval, the ASCC also needs to consider the plan details for conformity with conditions of the approved use permit. Due to the volume of the plan sheets, Vlasic recommended that a member of the ASCC be designated to review them with staff to satisfy the use permit requirements and that the full ASCC not have to go through each plan set.

ASCC members concurred with the staff recommendation and Schilling indicated he would be willing to serve as the designated ASCC member for the purpose of reviewing building permit plans with staff.

Yumiko Westland, Tod Zima architect, Tom Klope landscape architect and project contractor Bill Stronck presented the follow-up plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- It was noted that the following 12/9/04 vegetation protection and construction staging plans, prepared by Gonsalves & Stronck Construction Company, Inc., were delivered to the town on December 10, 2004:

- Sheet TP1.0, Tree Protection Plan & Staging Area General Site Plan
  - Sheet TP1.1, Tree Protection Plan & Staging Area Partial Site Plan
  - Sheet TP1.2, Tree Protection Plan & Staging Area Partial Site Plan
  - Sheet TP1.3, Tree Protection Plan & Staging Area Partial Site Plan

- In response to concerns expressed by ASCC members regarding the lack of detail on the tree protection and construction staging plans, Stronck offered the following comments:
  - Most of the construction equipment and materials will be stored in the existing on-site campus corporation yard. Only the construction office "trailer" and one "shipping container" storage unit will be located near the construction area as shown on Sheet TP1.1.
  - A fire access way will be maintained through the area at all times and may need to be over a temporary road bed for a period of time.
  - The utility excavation that extends onto the neighboring properties, including across existing driveways serving the open space district lands and the Neely property will be completed in a relatively short period of time, likely within one week. Nonetheless, steel trench plates will be used to ensure access is maintained and the excavation will be coordinated with the property owners. The plans will be corrected to show that steel trench plates will be used across the driveway serving the Neely property.
  - The utility trenching will be completed, the conduit installed and the trenches backfilled. Later, the utility company will return to pull the lines through the conduit pipes.

- In developing the tree protection plans, site conditions were reviewed with the project arborist Mayne Tree Company. It was determined that in order to avoid potential for impacting redwood tree roots, directional borings would be used near the redwood trees.
- Security fencing will be used to control the site and keep the public away from construction areas. The fencing will, however, be installed so as to ensure provisions for needed emergency access.
- Adequate vehicle turnarounds will be provided at either end of the construction operation to ensure safe flow of access for campus residents and other campus traffic.
- The protective fencing to be installed around the trees will be the "typical" orange "snow" fencing.
- While the utility lines will be placed underground, temporary poles will be maintained for PG&E and Comcast lines. The underground PG&E line will likely be installed prior to the Comcast line and a smaller temporary pole will be used for the Comcast line after the PG&E line is placed in the underground conduit.
- The only change to the chiller enclosure plans is in terms of the blocks to be used for the enclosure walls. Otherwise, the basic design in terms of location, wall heights, landscaping, etc, are all as shown on the plans previously considered and approved by the ASCC.

The approved plan called for a double wall chiller enclosure with the exterior wall to be "Splitface CMU" blocks in a "cedar brown finish." The interior wall material was to be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. The 12/2 submittal details the now proposed single wall construction using "Soundblox." This is a structural material with an "interior" surface that is effective for noise control, achieving the same sound attenuation required with the planning commission use permit approval.

Samples of the Soundblox material were presented, as were alternative color samples. It was noted that none of the samples were exactly like the "Cedar Creek Brown" color originally approved by the ASCC. After review of alternative colors, ASCC members generally agreed that the option identified as S193R would be acceptable.

- The plant materials will be installed so that eventually, they will grow to cover the chiller enclosure walls. The intent is to have the walls disappear into the planting along the landscaped hillside. Initially, the metal doors to the enclosure will be painted to match the approved wall color. After landscaping covers the enclosure walls, the doors would be painted a green color to match the established planting. Prior to such painting, a sample of the proposed color would be submitted to the town for approval.
- The revised plans for the western perimeter retaining wall and parking have been developed to be consistent with zoning requirements as explained in the staff report. The maximum height of the wood lagging walls would be 5'11" and the fence would be

set back at least four feet from the face of the wall. The proposed planting plan has been revised and approved by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD). While some planting will be located on the District lands, both the proposed retaining wall and fencing will be on project property. Further, all excavation will be on The Sequoias property.

Public comments were requested. **Claire Jernick, 33 Grove Drive**, raised concern over the location of the fence along the western perimeter parking area and also noise impacts associated with the chiller enclosure. She also wondered about the sound from what she believed was an existing generator.

No other public comments were offered. The Sequoias representatives responded to the comments from Ms. Jernick. They noted that the "Soundblox" would achieve the level of attenuation required by the planning commission action on the use permit. It was also noted that the new chillers would actually be set back at least 30 to 40 feet further away from the Portola Road right of way line than the existing chillers. The representatives also pointed out that the proposed four foot high fence along the western boundary would be on the project property, and of the same post and rail design, with wire mesh, previously approved by the town and used further south on the property. It was also noted that the new generator, also installed with town approval, is in a fully enclosed structure and if it were causing noise issues, such issues would be of concern to adjacent campus residents. It was noted that there have been no concerns expressed with the generator and that it was installed in conformity with state code requirements for such improvements.

ASCC members considered the revised chiller enclosure and western perimeter parking area plans and found them generally acceptable as proposed. Concern was expressed, however, over the use of rosemary along the top of the western perimeter parking area retaining wall as this is a planting not recommended by the town's conservation committee. Also, concern was expressed with the lack of detailed data on the tree protection and construction staging plans.

In response to the concern with the use of rosemary, Tom Klope stated that while the planting plan had been approved by the MROSD, he would consider an alternative plant for use along the top of the retaining wall.

After discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 approval of the revised plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of any building permits:

1. The tree protection and construction staging plans shall be modified and annotated to include all of the clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting and to ensure a full understanding of the management of the construction project. This shall be completed to the satisfaction of planning and building staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The use of "Soundblox" is approved for the chiller enclosure. The color of the block finish shall be S193R.
3. The planting plan for the western perimeter parking area shall be revised to include an alternative for the use of rosemary. This alternative plan shall be to the satisfaction of a

designated ASCC member. (Breen offered to review the revised plan on behalf of the ASCC.)

The above action was taken with the understanding that there would be a final review of the building permit plans for general conformity with ASCC approval conditions by a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of any building permits.

---

Following action on the Sequoias request, Chase and Warr returned to their positions on the ASCC.

---

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

Vlasic presented the December 9, 2004 staff report on this request for approval of swimming pool plans for the subject Portola Glen Estates property. He noted that the proposal now before the ASCC for consideration is the single sheet plan dated November 8, 2004, prepared by Winterbotham Partnership, ASLA

Vlasic explained that on April 26, 2004, the ASCC considered an earlier version of the proposal and was only able to conditionally approve fence plans, but did provide direction relative to the pool proposal and need for further acoustical evaluation. Vlasic then reviewed the applicant's efforts in follow-up to the April 26 meeting, including retaining the services of an acoustical professional; and, based the acoustical evaluation and recommendations, the preparation and submittal of the 11/8/04 plan by the Winterbotham Partnership.

Vlasic noted that since the 12/9 staff report was prepared the town received the following three letters from site neighbors raising concerns with the current proposal:

December 12, 2004, Charles Engles, 5 Wintercreek  
December 13, 2004, Sam and Caren Edwards, 12 Valley Oak  
December 11, 2004, Al and Sylvia Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak

Vlasic clarified that the "previously approved" pool plans for the parcel (i.e., plans approved in 1989 for a different property owner) referenced in the letters from neighbors have expired and the applicant has advised staff he has no interest in these earlier pool plans. Vlasic also stated that the plans considered in 1989 were not specifically approved as part of the Portola Glen Estates PUD, but an option that the ASCC found met the requirements of the PUD. Vlasic noted that these requirements are reviewed in the 12/9/04 staff report. He added, that a pool in an alternative location is possible subject to ASCC findings of conformity with the PUD provisions.

Mr. Quinn and Linn Winterbotham presented the revised plans to the ASCC. Mr. Quinn offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Up to 20 different plan options were considered to meet the concerns expressed by neighbors, conform to the PUD noise provisions and provide for a reasonable pool plan.

The neighbors were consulted and informed that anything reasonable would be done to respond to their concerns.

- The use of the backyard area is desired and this is the location that is most suitable for a family pool. The proposed pool location is as far from the neighbors as possible and the current design has been developed to meet the noise control intents of the PUD as explained in the October 15 and November 11, 2004 letters from acoustical consultant Charles Salter.
- The feeling was expressed that the neighbors were attempting to prevent the Quinn family from normal use of it's "backyard" area.
- A pool at the house entry is not desired nor is it appropriate for a family pool.
- It is recognized that a number of plan details still need to be developed, i.e., as stated in the staff report. However, before this work proceeds, the desire is to gain at least ASCC conceptual approval, as costs would need to be incurred for detailed grading and drainage plans as well as final pool, fencing and landscaping specifications.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

**Al Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak**, reviewed the comments in his 12/11/04 letter to the ASCC. He stressed that he had no desire to prevent the Quinns from using their "backyard," but did want the noise conditions called for in the PUD properly complied with. He commented that he agreed with the Salter analysis that it would be difficult for any fence or wall to break the line of site from the pool to his residence without being a very high structure. He also concurred that a wall on the south side of the pool would reflect noise back to his side of the small valley area were the properties are located. He stressed that this is not a "personal" issue with the neighbors and that he is only seeking protection of reasonable noise levels as called for in the Portola Glen Estates PUD.

**Caren Edwards, 12 Valley Oak**, reviewed the comments in her 12/13/04 letter to the ASCC. She advised that this is the first time she has heard of the plans. She noted that she had no issues with the Quinns or their use of the property, but only wanted to ensure that the objectives of the PUD conditions were achieved in terms of noise control relative to any new pool.

**Sam Edwards, 12 Valley Oak**, supported the comments offered by Caren Edwards and the other neighbors and stressed the noise sensitivity of the area.

ASCC members considered the request, comments in the staff report and comments presented by neighbors. Eventually, it was agreed that a site meeting would be needed to better appreciate the situation and to properly judge potential noise impacts and options to satisfy the noise conditions set forth in the PUD statement. In reaching this decision, ASCC members offered the comments and reactions set forth below.

**Schilling** indicated that at the time of his October site meeting with the applicant he and Laura Chase did visit one of the Portola Valley Ranch properties along lower Valley Oak and believed that distance, screening and the solid board fencing would provide for the

noise reduction. He also agreed that given the input received at the ASCC meeting, a site meeting with the full ASCC would be appropriate. He added that substantially more landscaping would be needed than indicated on the current site plan to mitigate for the fence design, but believed such a planting plan could be developed.

**Warr** commented that he had recently returned to the ASCC and was not involved in the April review of the project. He noted that when he first reviewed the plans he concluded the pool siting was appropriate for the site and sensitive to neighbor relationships. After reviewing the staff report and PUD provisions he was surprised at the level of detail in terms of noise evaluation. He offered the following additional comments:

- Noise associated with normal residential use of properties by families is a part of life in Portola Valley and recognized as such in the noise element of the general plan. This element and the noise ordinance do not regulate noise associated with normal residential uses on properties and a pool is a common use on properties in Portola Valley.
- The PUD provisions do, however, recognize the somewhat unique setting of the Portola Glen Estates properties in terms of their relationship to parcels in the Ranch and call for specific ASCC review and actions to address potential noise transmission. The provision for a surrounding eight-foot high wall does not seem to properly address the matter and a site meeting where noise levels can be heard and measured for reference appears appropriate. The judgment the ASCC will need to make is to ensure that the noise levels from the proposed pool are within the normal limits expected on properties in town and if any specific, special measures are needed to ensure the anticipated noise levels are within such normal limits. The general plan provides a guide for such acceptable noise levels and some sound level measurements at the site would benefit the judgments the ASCC will need to make for conformity with the PUD provisions.
- It is clear from the data provided that a taller wall on the south side of the pool would not have an overall beneficial impact on noise control. Due to line of site conditions, it is also questionable as to the beneficial impact of a wall on the north side of the pool. It is likely that to break the line of site, a wall much higher than eight feet would be needed and the aesthetic impacts of such a wall would not be acceptable.
- The high house walls on the east side of the pool appear to satisfy the PUD provisions, but likely would reflect noise to the neighbors. Some treatments along this side of the pool to address this reflectively might be beneficial.

Other ASCC members concurred with the comments offered by Schilling and Warr. Following discussion, review of the project was continued to the January 10, 2005 regular ASCC. It was agreed that review on January 10, would begin with a 3:30 site meeting. It was requested that the project noise consultant or applicant have a noise meter available so that some information could be developed on actual noise levels transmitted from the site to the neighboring residences in Portola Valley Ranch. It was also acknowledged by ASCC members that they would need to make a value judgment on the issue of potential noise impacts taking into account the PUD provisions, specific conditions in the area and the policies and principals contained in the general plan.



## **Architectural Review of modifications to previously approved house addition and renovation plans, 10 Kiowa Court, Turner**

Vlasic advised that on October 25, 2004, the ASCC conditionally approved plans for additions and remodeling on the subject property and that when building permit plans were filed, they were not fully consistent the ASCC approval. He further explained that pursuant to earlier permits issued by the town for the project, foundation work was well underway and that the contractor was hoping to pour concrete for the foundation as soon as possible before additional winter storms. Vlasic advised that the extent of the foundation is very similar to the plans approved by the ASCC in October.

It was noted that the staff held a meeting with the applicants and contractor earlier in the day and agreed to share the situation with the ASCC to determine if the changes were of a level that ASCC members would want a full revision review. After considerable discussion, it was agreed that the foundation work could continue, but that a complete revision application would need to be presented to the ASCC for consideration and approval before the building permit for the remainder of house construction could be issued. Chase and Gelpi approved this action, with Schilling voting no, and Warr abstaining. Schilling noted that he preferred the ASCC consider the proposed revised project prior to allowing the foundation work to proceed. Breen did not participate in the action or discussion because of the fact that she had provided landscaping services to the applicants.

Vlasic stated he would advise the applicants of the ASCC action.

### **Responses to Communications**

Vlasic advised that at its November 22, 2004 meeting, ASCC members considered two communications and offered reactions to them and directions for preparation of responses. Vlasic then briefly reviewed the following draft responses prepared based on ASCC directions.

December 16, 2004 draft letter to David Polkinhorne, Chair Person, Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee. Vlasic noted that this letter responds to the October 18, 2004 request from the Ranch Design Committee relative to use of motion sensors for control of carport and entry pathway lighting. After brief review of the letter, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the letter as drafted for signature by Chair Chase and forwarding to the Portola Valley Ranch design committee.

December 14, 2004 draft memorandum from ASCC to Town Council re: October 27, 2004 letter from Dr. David Beugelmans, 34 Grove Drive. ASCC members considered the draft memorandum and after brief discussion, Warr moved seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the memo for forwarding to the town council as drafted. It was noted, however, that there was a typographical error in the last paragraph on page one that needed correction. Specifically, in the fifth line from the bottom of the page, "form" should be changed to "from." Vlasic advised that the correction would be made before the memo was sent to the town council.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Warr moved, seconded by Chase and passed 5-0 approval of the November 22, 2004 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

T. Vlastic