

**Architectural and Site Control Commission March 10, 2014  
**Special Site Meeting, 229 Corte Madera Road, Preliminary Architectural Review for  
New Residence with Detached Studio, and Related Site Improvements, and Site  
Development Permit X9H-670****

Chair Koch called the special site meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 229 Corte Madera.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross

ASCC absent: None.

Town Council Liaison: Craig Hughes

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson, Assistant  
Planner Borck

**Others present relative to the proposal for 229 Corte Madera Road:**

Ilja and Sangini Bedner, applicants

Tim Chappelle, project architect

Casey Cramer, project architect

Trevor, project architect intern

Walter Neumeyer, 236 Corte Madera Road

Ajit Shah, 112 Crescent Avenue

Laura Chase, 145 Stonegate Road, representing Mr. and Mrs. Shah

Pat and Mike McGuire, 267 Corte Madera Road

Bob Wrucke, 30 Cima Way (arrived 4:30 p.m.)

Jeff Aalfs, 135 Crescent Drive (arrived toward the end of the meeting)

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

Borck presented the March 10, 2014 staff report on this preliminary review of the proposed new residence and site improvements. As part of the report, she explained that the design team had created a design timeline that outlines the evolution of the proposal to the current plans under review ("Scheme B"), that the design team had specifically been working with the neighbor at 112 Crescent Avenue during the design process, and as a result of this process, an alternate design, "Scheme C," was developed and reflected in the story poles. She stressed that the ASCC would need to consider the design schemes in relation to the Town's design guidelines' objectives of minimizing visual impacts from off site and seeking to prevent the obstruction of views of adjacent property owners. At the same time, she noted that two-story homes were common in this smaller lot area and direction would need to be provided that balanced the need for consistency with the guidelines, achieving privacy, and allowing for appropriate residential uses on a site.

Borck noted that the proposal met all setback and height limits as well as the 85% floor area concentration in the main structure. She explained that the Public Works Director reviewed the site development permit with the condition that the hedge along the street frontage be trimmed back to the property line or removed completely and that the ASCC would want to consider this in order to provide direction on any necessary landscape planting modifications.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following plans, dated 12/20/13 unless otherwise noted:

Civil Plans, Precision Engineering:

Sheet C-0, Title Sheet  
Sheet C-1, Grading Plan  
Sheet C-2, Utility Plan  
Sheet C-3, Erosion Control Plan  
Sheet C-4, Best Management Practices

Survey Plans, BGT Land Surveying, 4/13:

Sheet SU-1, Boundary and Topographic Survey

Landscape Plans, Arterra Landscape Architects:

Sheet L1.0, Landscape Plan (includes lighting)  
Sheet L2.1, Details (includes lighting cut sheets)  
Sheet L3.0, Planting Plan

Architectural Plans, Arcanum Architecture:

Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet  
Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan  
Sheet A0.2, Ground Floor Plans (includes exterior lighting)  
Sheet A0.3, Second Floor Plans  
Sheet A0.4, Main House Exterior Elevations/Sections  
Sheet A0.5, Main House Exterior Elevations/Sections  
Sheet A0.6, Main House Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A0.7, Dance Studio Exterior Elevations/Sections  
Sheet GP-1, Build It Green Checklist

Also available for reference were the following materials submitted in support of the proposed plans:

- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, received 1/3/14
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior lighting, received 1/03/14
- Colors and materials board, received 1/03/14 (to be presented at the 3/10/14 meeting and discussed below)
- Design Timeline, by Arcanum Architecture, dated 3/6/14
- Email from Ticien Sassoubre, 223 Corte Madera, received 3/5/14
- Email from Sangini Bedner, applicant, 229 Corte Madera, received 3/5/14

Tim Chappelle, project architect, presented the project proposal to the ASCC. He provided design boards and explained the process of the project development and advised that the team and applicant had been working with neighbors on their concerns over privacy, potential massing, and potential view impacts. He explained that the alternate design, Scheme C, was developed in response to concerns of the 112 Crescent neighbor and involved shifting the second story wing 10 feet further away from the northern parcel line, compacting and modifying the floor plan, and lowering the ridge height by 30 inches. He stated plate heights for this alternate design would be 9'6" at the ground floor and 8'6" at the second floor. Story poles to reflect Scheme C were installed at the north elevation and

viewed by the ASCC. Mr. Chappelle confirmed that no additional grading would be required with Scheme C.

In response to questions concerning the detached studio, Mr. Chappelle advised that the design of the new residence was not affected by the desire to retain the detached structure. He clarified that the accessory structure roof line would remain the same and that the porch area would be retained and not enclosed.

The ASCC then viewed the story poles from Cima Way, and Breen stated the elevation had a substantial presence when viewed from the street and the driveway of 243 Corte Madera Road. Mr. Chappelle indicated that no comments had been received from the neighbors along Cima Way. **Mr. Wrucke**, 30 Cima Way, commented that he could clearly see the poles from his home and questioned whether the roof could be hipped at the ends. **Mr. Shah** provided a photo taken from 150 Crescent (the resident was not present) showing the view to the story poles from the second story.

(Commissioner Clark left the meeting at 4:40 p.m. and did not participate in the visit to the Shah residence.)

The story poles were then viewed by the ASCC from Mr. Shah's home at 112 Crescent Avenue. Mr. Shah provided background on the design of his home and how the primary views are directed through the 229 Corte Madera property to the western hillside. The ASCC viewed the poles from the main living area, back yard, and upper floor, and Mr. Chappelle clarified the two schemes being viewed as reflected in the story poles. He explained that Scheme C, shown with the green tape, was an attempt to bring the mass of the 2-story element back to fit within the canopy of the existing tree so that the new structure would be largely located outside of the existing view corridor. In response to the suggestion of hiping the roof, he explained how that would detract from the farmhouse style architecture. He also indicated that there was no arborist report for the project at this time. In response to a question, he indicated that his understanding was that the applicants desired to keep the existing redwoods at the front of the property.

**Mr. Shah** expressed that his primary concerns were views from the main living areas and suggested the possibility of an L-shaped design or shifting the structure further if possible. **Mr. Neumeyer** questioned how approval of the project could set a precedent for future review of two-story design proposals. Mr. Vlasic clarified that each project is considered individually with respect to the site, particular design characteristics, and neighboring impacts and explained that nothing in the current ordinance prohibits two-story structures.

After the site discussions, ASCC members agreed that they would offer comments on the proposal at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Members thanked the applicants and neighbors for participation in the site meeting. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

## **Adjournment**

The special site meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

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

**March 10, 2014**

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

Absent: None

Planning Commission Liaison: None

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.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Studio, and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-670, 229 Corte Madera Road, Bedner**

Borck presented the March 10, 2014 staff report on this preliminary review of the new residence and proposed site improvements. She reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting and the comments offered at that meeting. (Refer to above site meeting minutes that describe that meeting and include a listing of project plans and application materials.)

Ilja and Sangini Bedner, applicants, and Tim Chappelle and Casey Cramer, project architects, were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Chappelle thanked the ASCC for the site visit process and provided a summary of the evolution of the project design. He explained that in designing the project, the character of the neighborhood, Portola Valley environs, neighbor views and the needs of the applicants were taken into consideration. He stated that after meeting with the neighbors (at 112 Crescent), that the design was further refined to respond to concerns of privacy, massing, and view corridor impacts. He stated while Scheme C appears to be the most appropriate design, the design team would pursue further refinement of the Scheme considering all concerns. He offered that, based on the site meeting, he and his clients would look at additional possible adjustments, including some further lowering of height and modification of the end elevations to address massing concerns.

Clark and Koch asked Borck to clarify which portions of the existing fencing were not in conformance with Town regulations. Borck explained that much of the fencing along the side and rear property lines exceeded the six-foot height limit and that fencing in the front yard setback area exceeded both the height and opacity limits.

In response to a question, Mr. Chappelle clarified that the access to the attic storage space in the detached studio was located inside the structure, off of the entry, and via a drop down ladder.

Mr. Chappelle also confirmed that the cedar siding would be on both the north and south elevations of the home's second story wing. He also clarified to Clark that the first choice of roof material is the corten steel and the alternative is the bronze metal material.

Public comments were then requested.

**Ms. Laura Chase**, 145 Stonegate Road, explained that she has helped the Shah's assess the proposed design. She stated that although she has appreciated the responsiveness of the project team, she still has concerns with the proposal relating to privacy and view impacts. She requested that the ASCC consider the Shah's primary view, and that they have limited options for keeping the view corridor open while the project team has flexibility to make adjustments in the design.

**Mr. Ajit Shah**, 112 Crescent Avenue, invited Commissioner Clark to visit his home to view the story poles. He stated that he is protective of his views and that once built, the house will always be there. He said he would like to continue working with the project team to further adjust the design and asked for continued modifications to move the mass further back from the currently proposed alternate location (Scheme C).

ASCC members then discussed the proposal and offered the following preliminary comments:

- Members concurred that the proposed colors, materials, house design, and siting were acceptable, and some preference was expressed for use of the corten steel roofing.
- Members were very appreciative of the continued communication and interactions with the neighbors in the evolution of the project design. Breen stressed, however, that the owner of 243 Corte Madera Road needs to be contacted and notified of the design, or at least that the possible concerns of this neighbor should be considered as part of further plan development.
- It was generally agreed that alternate design, Scheme C, is the appropriate direction for the project with continued refinements. Solutions for reducing the massing at the north and south elevations, breaking up the vertical mass with horizontal elements, or reducing the floor area need to be considered. As Scheme C develops, it will also be important to address the massing on the south elevation facing Cima Way. Harrell suggested that shifting the two-story wing to be parallel with the one-story might reduce its visual dominance.
- The landscape plan needs to be reconsidered as Scheme C is modified and finalized. The chosen plant materials should provide for screening of the structure at the north elevation and yet not become obstructions to the view corridor as they mature in height. Planting at the south elevation facing Cima Way also needs to be considered. Commissioners generally supported the removal of the hedge along the front of the property and that any planting in this area to provide some screening and privacy should be randomly placed. Ross suggested that consideration also be given to selecting a grass species that requires less water than standard turf. Removal of the Italian cypress was supported by Breen and Harrell.

- Clark stated that the existing fencing should be modified to move towards conformance with Town regulations, but that fencing in the area of the north elevation that was benefiting the screening for the Shah property might remain in place. Breen supported elimination of the proposed driveway entry gate, commenting that gates change the feel and character of the neighborhood.
- Clark supported the attic storage space in the detached studio, and Koch stated that she did not feel a deed restriction would be necessary.

Breen questioned whether the existing home had some historical significance and suggested that photo documentation of the home be provided to the Town.

The project team was directed to continue communications with neighbors and further refine the alternate design Scheme C. Commissioners affirmed that revised story poles will need to be installed based on the modifications and that a second field meeting would be needed.

After briefly discussing time frames for processing the resubmittal for ASCC review, project consideration was continued to a special field meeting to take place on the afternoon of the regular April 14, 2014 meeting date.

### **Architectural Review for Additions and Remodeling, 440 Golden Oak Drive, Green**

Borck presented the March 10, 2014 staff report on this proposal for a 169 sf residential addition and remodeling. She noted that the existing house with attached garage has a floor area concentration of 92.7%, and that the project proposes to increase the concentration to 95.8%. Although the current floor area of the main structure exceeds the 85% limit, she explained that any further increase is only possible subject to the ASCC making specific findings.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans:

Civil Plans, Lea & Braze Engineering, 2/1/14:

Sheet: C-1, Title Sheet  
 Sheet: C-2, Grading & Drainage Plan  
 Sheet: C-3, Grading Specifications  
 Sheet: C-4, Details  
 Sheet: C-5, Details  
 Sheet: ER-1, Erosion Control Plan  
 Sheet: ER-2, Erosion Control Details  
 Sheet: SU1, Topographic Survey, dated 11/20/13

Architectural Plans, Duxbury Architects, 2/4/14:

Sheet: G-001, Cover Sheet & General Notes  
 Sheet: X-001, Area Analysis Plan  
 Sheet: AS-101, Site Plan  
 Sheet: AS-102, Site Work/Exterior Lighting/Landscape Plan  
 Sheet: AD-101, Demolition Floor Plan  
 Sheet: A-101, First Floor Plan  
 Sheet: A-102, Roof Plan  
 Sheet: A-201, Sections

Sheet: A-301, Sections

Also considered were the following application materials:

- Transmittal Letter from project architect, Peter Duxbury, dated 2/10/14
- Arborist Letter from Joe Bathhurst, dated 1/27/14
- Exterior Lighting cut sheets, received 2/11/14
- Completed Build It Green Checklist, received 2/20/14 with 54 points proposed
- Colors/Materials Board

William and Michelle Green, applicants, and project architect, Peter Duxbury, were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Duxbury explained that in 1992, the house was remodeled, but did not include the project area. He stated that the proposed addition would retain all the existing colors and materials of the existing house, and that due to site constraints, the proposed area of work was generally the only feasible area for an addition to the home.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project and agreed that the design was appropriate and that findings A.1, A.2, B, C, and D could be made for the reasons set forth in the staff report. Breen moved, seconded by Harrell and passed (5-0) to make the necessary findings to permit the proposed concentration of floor area and approved the proposed plans as presented. The action was taken subject to the following conditions to be met to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to building permit issuance unless otherwise noted:

1. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be provided. Particular care shall be taken with the plan relative to the three-stemmed oak in the western side yard setback area.
2. All existing flood-type lighting shall be removed prior to building permit final inspections.

### **Architectural Review of As-Built Grading and Landscaping Improvements, Site Development Permit X9H-673, 30 Cheyenne Point**

Borck presented the March 10, 2014 staff report on this review for as-built grading and landscaping improvements. She explained that a stop work notice had been issued to the applicant in July 2008. She stressed that the town geologist, Public Works Director, and health officer had reviewed the plans, supporting documents, and site evaluations and had approved the site development permit.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans:

- Sheet C-1.0, Plot Plan and Technical Data
- Sheet C-1.1, Topographic Survey of Existing Conditions
- Sheet C-2.0, As-Built Grading and Drainage Plan
- Sheet EC-1, As-Built Erosion Control Plan
- Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan, by W.E.S. Landscape Architecture, dated 2/8/14

Also considered were the following application materials:

- Limited Geotechnical Investigation by Murray Engineers, dated 11/12/13
- Limited Drainage Assessment by CFS Engineering, dated 2/24/14

Soheil Eizadi was present to discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Eizadi clarified that once the stop work notice was issued, he did not do further grading, but did complete planting of the terraces. He explained that the delay in his applying for the as-built site development permit was related to his job loss in 2009. He noted that the conservation committee offered several positive comments regarding his site. He clarified that the oleanders at the deck were existing when he purchased the house. He also volunteered to remove all of the solar pathlights that had been installed in the driveway, autocourt, and terrace area.

Clark asked Borck for clarification on the work that had occurred uphill of the existing home. Borck stated that the entry walk, fountain, and grass area were pre-existing and that, although no grading had been conducted uphill of the house, the landscape planting plan indicated that plants had been installed on the uphill slope.

In response to Mr. Eizadi stating he was proposing to replace the existing sod on the terraces with a no-mow variety, Clark commented that he has native no-mow grass on his property, and while it does turn brown in the summer, it also provides a level and functional area.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and the clarifications offered at the meeting. Commissioners were generally supportive of allowing the terraces to remain provided that the sod lawn was replaced with a native no-mow grass. Submittal of a landscape lighting plan with switching plan was supported, and it was agreed that all plants, irrigation, and other materials installed within the public right-of-way needed to be removed. Clark also expressed a preference for no lighting on the terraces. Ross noted that the conservation committee had expressed concerns over water impacting the existing oak trees, and Mr. Eizadi clarified that he was already addressing those comments and making corrections on site.

Following discussion, Ross moved to approve the as-built project with the following conditions to be met, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of staff:

1. All trees, plants, irrigation, lighting, and stonework placed in the public right of way shall be removed. Applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit and complete the removals to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.
2. A landscape lighting and switching plan and fixture cut sheet shall be submitted to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
3. Updated impervious surface calculations for the site that includes the new flagstone patio shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff.
4. The existing sod on the two terraces shall be replaced with a native no-mow variety.



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

### **Commission and Staff Reports**

Koch said that she had reviewed proposed changes to the driveway at 45 Tagus Court with Town Planner Vlasic. These were minor adjustments to improve functionality of the driveway and provide easier ingress and egress, and she approved the changes as being in substantial compliance with the project plans approved by the ASCC.

Breen and Clark reported that they received the revised planting plans for 5050 Alpine Road (Villa Lauriston) and would be reviewing those plans and providing comments to Kristiansson.

Kristiansson reminded the ASCC of the joint field meeting with the Planning Commission at 18 Redberry Ridge on March 19<sup>th</sup>. She also reminded commissioners that their Form 700s were due to Town Clerk Sharon Hanlon.

### **Minutes**

Breen moved, Ross seconded to approve the February 24, 2014 minutes as submitted. The motion passed 5-0.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.