

Special ASCC Site Meeting, 40 Antonio Court, Preliminary Architectural Review for a New Residence with Detached Garage, Detached Guest House, Detached Pool House and Swimming Pool, and Site Development Permit X9H-681

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross (arrived at approximately 4:30 p.m.)

ASCC absent: None

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Council Liaison: None

Town Staff: Planning Director Debbie Pedro, Assistant Planner Carol Borck

Others present relative to the proposal for 40 Antonio Court:

Emily and Brian Melton, applicant

Danielle Wyss, project architect

Kelly Kopelson, project architect

Clinton Prior, project architect

Joni Janecki, landscape architect

Robin and Firouzeh Murray, 30 Antonio Court

Rene Lacerte and Joyce Chung, 35 Antonio Court

Linda Waissar, 7 Veronica Place

Marty Mackowski, 45 Los Charros

Joyce Shefren, 30 Valencia Court

Jane Bourne, Conservation Committee

Judith Murphy, Conservation Committee

Pedro presented a summary of the staff report for the proposed residential development on the 4.48 acre parcel created as part of the 3 lot Priory subdivision. The proposal is for a 5,123 sq. ft. single story home, a 596 sq. ft. detached garage, a 738 sq. ft. guest house, and a 426 sq. ft. pool house on this vacant property.

Danielle Wyss, project architect, presented provided an overview of the project and their design approach. She explained that the L-shaped design of the house is inspired by barn architecture.

Joni Janecki, landscape architect, said the proposed entry gate is needed to establish a sense of symbolic enclosure. The owners have small children and they are concerned about off leash dogs that may run through their property.

The group walked around the building site and asked questions of the project team regarding the design of the house and accessory structures.

Joyce Chung, neighbor, commented on the massiveness of the roof. She asked whether a cathedral ceiling is necessary in the garage and would like to see a lower roof pitch. She also asked how tall the building is compared to the top of the knoll. Pedro responded that at the highest point, the house is 11' taller than the top of the knoll.

Robin Murray, neighbor, has concerns that this large structure would overpower the knoll.

Commissioner Ross arrived at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Wyss provided the Commissioners with a written summary of the neighbor outreach efforts and highlighted changes made to the project including lowering the roof pitch from 9/12 to 8/12, stepping the house down to break up the horizontal mass in the front facing Antonio court, and moving the detached garage 27' to the east to open up the view of the western hillside for the neighbor at 35 Antonio Court. In trying to balance the concerns of the neighbors, the applicant is also trying to keep with the inspiration of barn architecture for the buildings.

Commissioner Breen noted that the Priory PUD statement speaks to the preservation of the basic topographic form of the site. She has concerns that the project may impact the knoll experience. Before ending the meeting, the commissioners walked to the area adjacent to back of 35 Antonio Court to have a broader view of the property including the knoll and the story poles.

Chair Koch thanked the design team and others present for participating in the site meeting. Project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The site meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:10 p.m.

Architectural and Site Control Commission November 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: Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross

Absent: Breen

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Council Liaison: John Richards

Town Staff: Planning Director Pedro, Assistant Planner Borck

Planning Director Pedro called the roll.

Oral Communications

None

4a. Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Garage, Detached Guest House, Detached Pool House and Swimming Pool, and Site Development Permit X9H-681, 40 Antonio Court, Melton Residence, File # 44-2014

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Harrell, Koch, Ross

ASCC absent: Breen

Planning Commission Liaison: None

Town Council Liaison: John Richards

Town Staff: Planning Director Debbie Pedro, Assistant Planner Carol Borck

Pedro presented the staff report and provided a summary of the preliminary site meeting conducted by the ASCC earlier in the day. Danielle Wyss, project architect presented the project to the ASCC and explained that the architectural design of the house is a combination of contemporary and rural barn aesthetics. The home was designed with the intention of respecting the site and its surroundings. The design follows a farm vernacular where the architecture is pulled apart to break up the structure into several buildings.

Joni Janecki, landscape architect, presented the conceptual landscape plan and said the proposed location of the trees would serve to mitigate views to house while maintaining open views for the Antonio Court neighbors. The design goal is of natural landscaping instead of contrived ornamental landscaping.

Commissioner Clark noted that a roof plan should be included. He also suggested that a rendering for driveway approach be prepared.

Commissioner Harrell asked for clarification on the roof material and entry gate material. The architect responded that the roof will be metal and unstained wood will be used on the entry gate.

Commissioner Ross asked about the height of lights outside of the living room. The architect responded that the lights will be about 4.5 feet from the ground and recessed in the concrete foundation wall.

Chair Koch questioned the need for three windows in the garage as the glow will affect the neighbors. She also asked whether the detached garage structure can be moved closed to the house. The architect responded that because of the fire truck turnaround requirement, moving the garage to the west would result in more retaining walls and grading. The building envelope also limited where the garage can be located.

Chair Koch opened the public hearing.

Marty Mackowski, 45 Los Charros said he can see the detached garage from his house. He thought the structure would be used for storage and not required.

Mrs. Mackowski, 45 Los Charros, said there are too many structures on this site and preferred to see fewer structures. She proposed eliminating the garage and wouldn't mind seeing more oaks.

Robin Murray, 30 Antonio Court, said that the structure should not overpower the site according to the Priority PUD statement. He mentioned the previously approved project on this property which followed the guidelines of the PUD. He believed that the sheer mass of the structure and its location over the knoll is not in conformance with the PUD. He suggested ways to reduce the physical mass including digging it lower, changing roof line, and relocating the structures.

Joyce Chung, 35 Antonio Court, thanked the owner for making some adjustments to the project to address their concerns. However, the orientation and mass of the building would dominate the land and change the feel of the area. She still had concerns about the detached garage and would like to see it lowered. She questioned the need of the entry gate and is open to discussing installing signage in the driveway easement for the purpose of property identification.

Chair Koch closed the public hearing and summarized Commissioner Breen's email comments for the project. Breen said the building forms, simplicity of the design, and the palette of materials are lovely. She appreciated the thoughtful approach to siting but also suggested lowering the roof or plate height and possibly moving or eliminating the detached garage. She preferred fewer oaks to be planted on the property as they may block the Mackowski's view of the meadow.

Commissioner Clark said the Priory PUD does not exclude development near the knoll and he liked the way this home sits around the knoll and the multiple structures design. He noted that there are views from other vantage point including the Priory and areas off-site that should be considered. He made several suggestions including rotating the main house counter clockwise to the north or change the roof form over the outdoor room to a flat roof to lessen the massing and overall scale of the house. He had reservations about the entry gate and recommended adding shrubs to the area near 35 Antonio Court to provide immediate screening. He noted that the proposed exterior plaster color should be a darker shade, particularly on the western side of the house.

Commissioner Harrell commended the design team for working with the neighbors. She noted the need for something at the bottom of driveway to indicate the boundaries of the private property. She commented on the continuous ridge line of the roof and encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of varying the roof lines or lowering the house. She agreed with Commissioner Clark that a darker plaster color would be desirable so there is less contrast.

Commissioner Ross said that the proposed project is well balanced and respects the site. There is tremendous amount of activities at the Priory school and the owner is using the knoll as a buffer to protect themselves from the school site below. He liked the campus effect of splitting up the structures on the property and the lighter color palette is better because a darker color would make the house look like a large boulder. While the linear roof line concerns him, lowering the house by a foot or two will have no effect on the neighbors as they will not see knoll. He questioned the need for a gate. He had no concerns about the lighting plan.

Chair Koch said the project is attractive and thoughtfully designed according to the requirements of the PUD. She had no concerns about the colors and materials but the number of lights should be reduced. She believed that the linearity of the house is causing concerns for the neighbors but lowering house is not going to make much of a difference. She questioned the need for the number of windows at the garage as well as the gate at the entrance to the property. She said the flat roof concept over the outdoor room would break up the continuous roof line and cause a design issue. She had no concerns with the landscape plan but suggested that the applicant work closely with the neighbors on adding significant trees for screening.

The project is tentatively scheduled for the ASCC meeting on November 24, 2014.

4b. Architectural Review for Residential Addition and Remodeling, 125 Fawn Lane, Huffman Residence, File # 45-2014

Borck presented the November 10, 2014 staff report for this proposal for approval of plans for a residential addition and remodel to the existing partial two-story residence. She advised that the area of the addition was currently uninhabitable attic storage space, and that the project would convert that space into a 205 square foot music room. She stated that the footprint and maximum height of the house would not change. She also noted that the project included

remodeling of the master bedroom that would involve adding a fireplace, raising the ceiling height, and altering the roof line above to a flat roof form.

Borck advised that the existing floor area concentration in the main structures was 86% of the maximum floor area permitted for the site. She stated that the proposed addition would bring the floor area concentration to approximately 89.3%. 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.

Virginia Huffman, applicant, and Janet Chuang, project architect, were present to discuss the project with ASCC members.

In response to a question concerning the proposed exterior lighting at the master bedroom decks, Ms. Chuang explained that the door at the rear deck was very wide, and that sconces on either side seemed appropriate. Regarding the proposed lighting on the east elevation deck, Ms. Chuang explained that the deck did lead to grade and was often accessed by the owner from the front yard, and that some lighting was necessary. Koch stated that the amount of proposed lighting seemed excessive. Ms. Chuang also confirmed that there was an existing light at the attic balcony.

Public comments were then requested, and none were offered. ASCC members then briefly discussed the proposal.

Commissioners expressed general support for the project and agreed that:

- The findings per Section 18.48.020 of the Portola Valley Municipal Code could be made to allow the 89.3% concentration of floor area in the main structures;
- The proposed exterior lighting at the master bedroom decks should be reduced;
- Proposed interior lighting in the new music room should be downward directed, and no lights should be placed within the skylights.

Following discussion, Harrell moved, seconded by Ross, and passed (4-0) approve the proposed plans with the following conditions:

1. No other modifications to the approved plans are allowed except as otherwise first reviewed and approved by the Planning Director or the ASCC, depending on the scope of the changes.
2. The material for the new flat roof over the master bedroom shall be specified to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.
3. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.
4. There shall be no uplighting of trees and no lights are allowed within the skylight wells.
5. The proposed exterior lighting at the master bedroom deck shall be reduced and a revised lighting plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.

4c. Architectural Review for Garage Addition, 191 Ramoso Road, Mumford Residence, File # 42-2014

Borck presented the October 27, 2014 staff report for this proposal for approval of plans for a 1,471 square foot addition to the existing garage on the 2.6-acre property. She stated that the addition would be constructed in the same style, colors, and materials as the existing garage and that no new lighting was proposed. She advised that the addition met all zoning regulations and had been approved by the Westridge Homeowner's Association.

John Mumford, applicant, and Carter Warr, project architect, were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Warr confirmed that the applicant had verified that he can access the proposed garage addition by driving under the existing breezeway and over the pool patio.

In response to questions, Mr. Warr stated that:

- There is no required separation of the structure and the pool by the Building Code
- The metal roof will be painted steel

Public comments were then requested, and none were offered. ASCC members then discussed the proposal.

Following discussion, Ross moved, seconded by Harrell, and passed (4-0) to approve the proposed plans with the following conditions:

1. No other modifications to the approved plans are allowed except as otherwise first reviewed and approved by the Planning Director or the ASCC, depending on the scope of the changes.
2. A cut sheet for the proposed garage doors shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.
3. A detailed construction staging and tree protection plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Planning staff prior to building permit issuance.

Commission and Staff Reports

Commissioner Harrell reported that the Portola Valley Ranch HOA would like to update the PVR Design Guidelines because many of the building materials and colors specified are either no longer manufactured or do not comply with State fire safety standards. She asked whether the ASCC would accept a multi-step process where amendments are made to the most outdated sections first or would they prefer to review the entire document. The Commission discussed various options and directed staff to work with Commissioner Harrell and PV Ranch representatives to discuss the update process and next steps.

Minutes

Ross moved, Clark seconded to approve the October 27, 2014 minutes as submitted. The motion passed 4-0.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.