

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross

ASCC absent: None

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Council Liaison: None

Town Staff: Planning Director Pedro, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson, Assistant Planner Borck, Planning Consultant Vlastic

Others present relative to the proposal for 1260 Westridge Drive:

Tom Klope, landscape architect

Tay Peterson, environmental consultant

Judith Murphy, Conservation Committee

Holly and John Dissmeyer, 20 Possum Drive

Julie and Adam Lautner, 30 Possum Drive

Melissa and Robert Wagner, 40 Possum Drive

Brenda Herrington, 50 Possum Drive

Kristiansson presented the August 22, 2014 staff report. She noted that in late 2013, a fence and redwood plantings had been installed along the property line which did not conform to either the Town regulations and Design Guidelines or the approved PUD statement and Tentative Subdivision Map for the property. Town staff has been working with the property owner and his representatives to resolve these issues, and in July staff reviewed a proposed corrective action plan and shared it with a subcommittee of the ASCC and the Conservation Committee. The plan was revised based on comments from that subcommittee and is now being presented to the ASCC. In particular, the revised plan significantly reduced the number of redwoods that are proposed to remain on the site in response to comments that the only appropriate locations for redwoods would be in or adjacent to established redwood groves already on the property. When the ASCC walks the site today, there are two key items for Commissioners to review: 1) the locations where redwoods are proposed to remain; and 2) the locations where the fence is proposed to remain (a 48' length along the southwest side of the property and two locations on the northeast side of the property, where the new fence would remain and the existing fence would be removed).

The ASCC considered the staff report and the following project plans and supporting materials:

Plans prepared by Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., Landscape Architects, and dated August 12, 2014:

Sheet TSP.1, Tree Status Plan

Sheet TSP.2, Tree Status Plan

Sheet TSP.3, Tree Status Plan

Sheet TSP.4, Tree Status Plan

Sheet TSP.5, Tree Status Plan

Sheet TSP.6, Tree Status Plan

Supporting Materials:

- a letter from Tom Klope, project landscape architect, dated August 11, 2014, which summarizes the plan and responses to the July 18 site visit; and
- a letter from Tay Peterson, project environmental consultant, dated June 18, 2014, which assesses the project's compliance with the conditions of the PUD Statement and the Town's Design Guidelines; and
- a letter from Michael Young, project arborist, dated August 21, 2014, with a summary statement of his analysis of the proposed tree removals other than the new redwoods.

Project landscape architect Tom Klope stated that the situation was unfortunate and was the result of incorrect advice which was given to the property owner, who does want to keep the site in one ownership. The original corrective action plan had proposed to remove 55% of the redwoods, and the revised plan would remove 96% of redwoods. The remaining redwoods would provide maximum screening for the new house site. All of the newly planted redwoods along Corte Madera Creek would be removed, as well as all of the fencing along the creek except for a 48' panel which would be kept for the short term until the screening vegetation matured. The lattice would be removed from the fencing which would remain on the property. Most irrigation would be removed, although some would remain where new plantings would occur. The amount of irrigation has been reduced over the summer, just to the level necessary to keep the trees alive, in order to prevent health impacts to the oaks. Once the new plantings are established, they would be weaned off of the irrigation as well. Mr. Klope also noted that the plan proposes to remove 33 bay trees in locations where they are mixing with the oak canopies. These removals are proposed in order to reduce risk of Sudden Oak Death (SOD) on the property. In response to a question, Mr. Klope clarified that the redwood trees would be relocated to northern California, and that they had consulted with a biologist at U.C. Davis in order to be sure that the relocation would not spread SOD.

Commissioners walked the site and viewed locations where the redwoods would be removed or preserved, where additional plantings are proposed, and where the fence would be kept or removed. During the walk, the following additional facts were provided:

- Screen plantings would be at least 10' from the bases of mature oaks;
- The existing chain link fence was identified as wood rat habitat in the environmental analysis for the subdivision and was recognized as existing fencing at that time. As a result, it would remain on the property.

Public comments were requested. Neighbors from Possum Lane noted that a great deal of underbrush had been removed from the property last summer and fall, which reduced the amount of screening. They asked about the 48' length of fence that was proposed to remain and stated that they would prefer native vegetation for screening rather than the fence.

Commissioners then offered the following comments:

- Redwoods do not provide much screening once they are mature because the branches often do not start until well above ground level. As a result, other types of plantings may provide better screening. For example, willow trees may be more appropriate along the drainage on the northeast property line.

- Redwood trees should not have been planted near heritage oaks, and protection of those oaks needs to be the priority.
- The lighting in the heritage oaks needs to be removed.
- New screen plantings should be located outside of the dripline of the oaks, not just 10' from the base of the oaks.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:05 p.m.

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: Derwin

Town Staff: Planning Director Pedro, Deputy Town Planner Krisitansson, Assistant Planner Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Architectural Review for Modifications to Previous Approval for Detached Studio and Detached Guest House, 465 Golden Oak Drive, Hicks

Borck presented the August 21, 2014 staff report on this request for modifications to the previously approved detached studio and detached guest house. She explained that the proposed project had been conditionally approved by the ASCC on July 14th, and that following the meeting, the applicants contacted staff to discuss concerns that two of the required conditions of approval in particular would be difficult to implement as written. She noted that the applicants were concerned about the conditions requiring that 1) the studio be moved at least four feet closer to the existing residence, and 2) the highest ridge of the guest house be lowered by two feet.

Borck advised that on August 11, Commissioners Ross and Clark met at the site with staff and the applicants to discuss their concerns and proposed options for modifications to the original proposal. She stated that Ross and Clark provided feedback at the site, and that the plans were modified accordingly for reconsideration. She noted that, in regard to the studio, the conditions of ASCC approval were intended to decrease the apparent height and mass of the structure from the east side of the property and to better comply with the Town's Design Guidelines that call for structures to be sited and designed with respect to the natural environment and minimize visual impacts when viewed from off-site. Borck advised that a number of changes were proposed to the design of the studio, including:

- Moving the proposed studio one foot closer to the existing residence
- Lowering the roof pitch and height so that the maximum height of the structure is reduced from 16'4" to 14'3" and the plate height is reduced from 8'1" to 7'6".
- Reducing the east elevation wall by seven inches to a height of approximately 11'6" and reducing the west elevation wall by 18 inches to a height of approximately 9'11", which required eliminating the clerestory windows in this elevation.

- Creating a two-foot wide notch in the east elevation wall by removing 11 sf of floor area. This notch not only provides an off-set of the wall elevation, but also allows for preservation of one of the 5" oaks.

She stated that the proposed modifications appeared to lessen the apparent massing and visual prominence of the structure from off-site views and that the preservation of the adjacent oak tree integrated the structure with existing vegetation. She noted that the modifications appeared to address the ASCC's concerns and bring the studio into reasonable compliance with the Design Guidelines.

Regarding lowering the guest house by two feet, Borck stated that the condition of approval was intended to address concerns that the structure was not appropriately integrated into the topography of the site, as called for in the Design Guidelines. She stated that the proposed modified plans lowered the guest house by one foot and that grading around the structure had been adjusted accordingly. She advised that, in order to better integrate the guest house into the site, the project team agreed to maintain the existing grade along the east elevation by installing a low retaining wall. She also stated that another low retaining wall would be used along the north elevation. Borck advised that the revisions to the height and grading appeared to help the structure integrate better into the site and bring it into compliance with the Town's Design Guidelines.

Finally, Borck advised that the modified plans addressed many of the other conditions of approval from July 14th, including elimination of downlights on the pedestrian gate, provision of a comprehensive site lighting plan with nonconforming lighting identified for removal, and a screen planting plan for the guest house along the fence with vegetation to be planted this fall.

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

Architectural Plans by Metropolis Architecture, stamped 8/13/14 unless otherwise noted:

- Sheet A1, Proposed Site Plan/Project Info
- Sheet A2, Proposed Guest House Floor Plan, Elevations and Section (includes exterior lighting), stamped received on August 21, 2014
- Sheet A3, Proposed Studio Floor Plan, Elevations, and Section (includes exterior lighting)

Landscape Plans by Ransohoff, Blanchfield, and Jones, dated 8/15/14:

- Sheet L1, Landscape Master Plan
- Sheet L2, Revised Grading Plan
- Sheet L3, Coverage Calculations
- Sheet L4, Revised Site Lighting Plan

In addition to the plans, the submittal included the information listed below:

- Exterior lighting fixture cut sheet, received 5/20/14

Megan Michaels, applicant, Larry Kahle, project architect, and Paula Blanchfield, project landscape architect, were present to discuss the modified project with ASCC members. Ms. Michaels explained the process of developing the initially proposed design and how feedback from Commissioners Ross and Clark was taken into consideration in designing the proposed

modifications. She stated that Mr. Leckonby, the uphill neighbor at 455 Golden Oak Drive, had seen the plans and found them acceptable. She also stated that she had shared the modified plans with the downhill neighbors, the Thomas's at 475 Golden Oak Drive, and that it was a "positive" interaction. Ms. Michaels shared a 3D rendering of the view to the studio's east elevation from the perspective of the Thomas's entry porch.

Breen asked Clark how he felt about the proposed one-foot shift of the studio rather than the conditioned four-foot shift. Clark clarified that the intent of the condition was to move the studio away from the downhill neighbor. He stated that in the field it was easier to make assessment of the options as to how the studio could be modified and moved away from the neighbor without changing the relationship the structure would have to the applicant's existing home.

Harrell stated that lowering the roof of the studio made a significant difference.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Ross noted that the site visit was very helpful to explain the rationale of the conditions to the applicants. He stated they did a good job in responding to his and Clark's feedback. Harrell stated that the 3D rendering was helpful and was in support of the modifications.

Breen expressed her support of removal of the pines located at the front of the property, and Ms. Michaels stated that they were considering that. She said that they had removed eight black pines and wanted to continue the removals in a thoughtful way. Clark stated that an arborist should be consulted to inspect during foundation construction to ensure that the oak tree roots are not impacted. Koch supported the project and agreed with Breen's and Clark's comments.

Following discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Harrell, and passed (5-0) to approve the modified plans with the following conditions:

1. Any lighting proposed in the area of the guest house skylight shall be downward-directed and mounted below the skylight.
2. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.
3. An arborist shall be consulted to inspect during foundation excavation for the studio to ensure protection of the existing oak tree's root system. Results of this inspection shall be submitted in writing to Planning staff.

Prior to consideration of the following request, Harrell recused herself, explaining that one of her designers may have designed the proposed garage door.

Architectural Review for Carport Enclosure, 10 Franciscan Ridge, Clarkson

Borck presented the August 21, 2014 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for a carport enclosure on the subject Portola Valley Ranch property. She stated that the project had been approved by the Ranch design committee and appeared to meet the requirements for enclosures under the PUD design guidelines. She advised that a letter from a Ranch resident

had been received that afternoon requesting that, if the ASCC approve the project, it do so with a condition that the project conform with the Ranch Guidelines. Borck clarified that any project approval for the Ranch is subject to these guidelines and that a special condition is not necessary.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project materials, received 7/18/14:

- Drawing of proposed garage door by applicant
- Garage door estimate by Sousa's Garage Doors
- Photo of existing front elevation of the carport
- Photo of garage door on Coyote Hill Court that is similar to the proposed door
- Glass installation estimate by Palo Alto Glass
- Photo of existing north elevation of the carport where glass will be installed
- Photo of Sunhill garage with similar glass installed
- Ranch Design Committee conditional approval letter dated 7/10/14

Robert Clarkson, applicant, was present to discuss the project with ASCC members. He explained that the glass panels within the proposed garage door were chosen to maintain views through the structure and over the tops of the cars parked within.

Clark asked Borck about statements in the letter from the Ranch resident concerning a parking issue at another Ranch property. Borck stated that the Town had not received any information concerning issues mentioned in the letter with another property's garage/parking issues. Breen clarified that if there were complaints or problems at another property, that the resident would need to contact the Ranch. Borck confirmed that such a complaint would go to the Ranch.

Public comments were then requested, but none were offered.

Following a brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed (4-0) to approve the project as submitted.

Commissioner Harrell returned to the dais.

Architectural Review for Corrective Fencing and Tree Plan, 1260 Westridge Drive, Carano

Kristiansson presented the August 22, 2014 staff report on this review of a corrective fencing and tree plan to address fences and redwood tree planting which were inconsistent with Town regulations and the subdivision approvals for this property. 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.) In particular, Kristiansson advised that the three main issues discussed were the redwood trees, the fencing, and the proposed new screen plantings. She noted that neighbors along Possum Lane had expressed concern about the loss of screening when the dense underbrush which had previously existed on the property was removed, and they had said they would prefer to have new vegetative screening in lieu of the 48' fence panel. Kristiansson also summarized the concerns expressed by Commissioners at the field meeting, including the number and locations of redwood trees proposed to remain, the proximity of screen plantings to

mature oaks, and potential health impacts on the heritage oak trees on the property from watering underneath them.

Project landscape architect Tom Klope was present representing the property owner. In response to a question from Commissioner Koch about the 48' panel of fencing along the southwest property line, Mr. Klope responded that the plans had suggested leaving that portion of fence because they had thought the neighbors wanted it for screening.

Public comments were requested.

Jim Herrington, 50 Possum Lane, said that the neighbors on Possum Lane do not want that fence and so he hoped the fence panel could be removed. If the fence panel comes down, that would address his main issues. He does not believe that removing only part of the fence along the creek is really solving the problem. Otherwise, more people may be tempted to ask forgiveness rather than permission, and they should instead be encouraged to go through the permit process. Commissioner Clark clarified that the 48' fence panel would be allowed under the Town's regulations.

Judith Murphy, Portola Green Circle, said that all of the redwoods furthest away from the house should come out; they are not near other redwoods and are located in and around heritage oak trees. New plantings should generally also be located outside of the driplines of the oaks. She also noted that if a goal is to protect the heritage oaks, the soggy rear lawn under the oaks should be addressed.

Commissioners then discussed the project and agreed that more redwoods needed to be removed, especially those near oak trees, and that removing the 48' panel of fencing would be a positive change to the plans. ASCC members also noted that the amount of water in the lawn under the heritage oaks on the rear of the property was excessive and could affect the health of the oaks, which could in turn jeopardize the subdivision approvals.

Breen stated that she had seen seven locations where redwood trees could remain: three on the front portion of the property, and four near the existing redwood grove by the garden. Other Commissioners agreed with this statement.

Koch noted that she wanted to be sure that the project did not end up leading to a wall of native plantings either. Instead, new plantings should be outside the driplines and should be grouped in "islands." In some cases, adjustments could be made to address neighbor concerns.

Ross said that he would like to clarify recommended condition #9 so that would require removal of uplighting of trees as well as lighting in trees.

Following the discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Breen and passed (5-0) to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Within 15 days of the ASCC's decision, the applicant shall provide a plan and schedule for compliance. The schedule shall prioritize removal of the irrigation and new redwood trees so that this work will begin no later than 20 days after submittal of the plan and will be completed within 60 days of the start of work. The plan for compliance shall include a tree protection and staging plan and shall specify tree protection measures for significant trees.

2. In addition to the redwood trees shown for removal on the corrective fencing and tree plan, the new redwood tree shown on Sheet TSP.4 which is located in the right of way for Westridge Drive shall also be removed.
3. Prior to removal of the trees, nesting bird and bat surveys shall be conducted in accordance with California regulations and best practices.
4. All irrigation that was installed to serve the new redwood trees other than that which directly serves the plantings approved as part of the corrective fencing and tree plan shall be removed. All irrigation under the driplines of significant oaks, as defined in Section 15.12.060.28a, shall be removed.
5. In the areas where new vegetation is proposed, all ivy, vinca, and other invasive plants shall be removed.
6. Prior to removal of any fencing, a San Francisco Dusky Footed Woodrat nest survey and protection plan prepared in compliance with California regulations and best practices shall be prepared and submitted.
7. All fencing shall be removed by hand, and fence post footings shall not be removed as required by the PUD Statement.
8. Where the new fence will be allowed to remain on the property, the fence shall be reduced in height to conform to the six foot height limit in required yard setback areas. In addition, the fence shall be modified as needed to avoid impacts on nearby trees. These modifications shall be based on the recommendations of the project arborist, landscape architect and environmental consultant and shall be reported to the Town.
9. All nonconforming lighting in and illuminating trees shall be removed.
10. The plans shall be revised a) to remove all fencing along the southwest property line and instead provide native vegetative screening where needed, b) to remove all new redwood trees from the property other than three of the redwoods east of the entry drive shown on Sheet TSP.4 and four of the redwoods near the planters shown on Sheet TSP.6, and c) to eliminate planting of new screening vegetation from within the driplines of significant oak trees and ensure that new screening vegetation conforms to Town Design Guidelines calling for plants to be grouped in "islands" rather than linear "walls." The revised plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of two designated members of the ASCC.

Commission and Staff Reports

Koch and Clark reported that they had reviewed changes to the lighting plan for 5 Naranja and approved two additional lights after determining that they would not be visible to the neighbor.

Harrell noted that the Ranch is looking closely at wildlife-urban interface requirements and fire prevention and guidelines, and asked about Town efforts. Clark provided information about Building Code requirements, and Kristiansson advised that the Town had prepared a fire map and fire guidelines a number of years ago, along with a biological resources study. Murphy noted that the Conservation Committee sponsored an evening event focused on balancing fire prevention and biological resources three years ago and suggested that it could be repeated if desired.

Breen reported that the fire station had installed native landscaping to replace the lawn out front, and they should be commended. She also noted that utility lines now appear to have

visually intrusive covers along Willowbrook and in other locations, and that the Town should discourage these whenever possible.

Pedro updated the ASCC on discussions between Town staff and the owner and neighbors of the observatory building on Minoca, noting that the owner and neighbors were discussing voluntary mitigation measures. She clarified that the observatory could not be painted a darker color because the finish of the observatory was baked-on enamel, and paint would not work on that surface.

Minutes

Breen moved and Clark seconded to approve the July 28, 2014 minutes. The motion passed 4-0-1, with Harrell abstaining.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.