

Chairperson Chase called the special field meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. at 4 Oak Forest Court.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Chase, Schilling, Warr
Absent: Gelpi
Town Council Liaison: Davis
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Others present relative to the Quinn project:

Mr. and Mrs. Quinn, applicants
Charles Salter, Charles Salter Associates, project acoustical consultant
Linn Winterbotham, project landscape architect
Al Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak
Caren Edwards, 12 Valley Oak
Linda Elkind, 14 Hawkview
Mr. and Mrs. Lee, 1 Oak Forest Court
Mrs. Scrivner, 5 Oak Forest Court

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

Vlastic presented the January 20, 2005 staff report and reviewed the events that had occurred relative to the proposal in response to the comments and directions offered at the December 13, 2004 ASCC meeting. Vlastic advised that at the request of the ASCC, Mr. Salter conducted an acoustical evaluation on the afternoon of January 17 and the findings of the analysis were presented in the January 21, 2005 letter from Mr. Salter. Vlastic then reviewed the Portola Glen Estates PUD noise limitations and requirements pertaining to Lot 4. Vlastic also noted that since the staff report was prepared, Mr. and Mrs. Gegaregian and Mr. and Mrs. Edwards had submitted letters to the ASCC relative to the acoustical analysis, both dated 1/23/05. Copies of the letters were made available to commissioners.

Mr. Salter reviewed the acoustical analysis presented in his January 21, 2005 letter. He responded to concerns raised in the January 23, 2005 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Gegaregian regarding the 3-decibel difference between front and rear yard noise measurements. He also reviewed his conclusions that there is "no amphitheater affect" and that the proposed rear yard pool location was reasonable in terms of conformity with the noise provisions of the Portola Glen Estates PUD.

Mr. Gegaregian discussed the comments in his January 23 letter and proposed that the noise measurements in the front yard area set the baseline in terms of any acceptable pool plan for the rear yard. He clarified that this means that plan adjustments should be made to ensure that noise levels generated from the rear yard area would be essentially the same as

for the front yard area because this area was previously found acceptable for a pool by the neighbors.

Vlasic noted that Mr. Gregaregain's comments were similar to those presented in the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Edwards.

Warr indicated that in general the noise evaluation allowed him to conclude that the acoustic conditions in the area were not significantly different than conditions in other areas of the town. He also advised that the data provided in the letter from Mr. Salter was the information he had hoped to get in requesting the evaluation at the December 13 ASCC meeting. He also acknowledged, however, the special noise control provisions in the Portola Glen Estates PUD and noted that these were different than the noise requirements related most other properties in the town.

After discussing the Salter evaluation and concerns of the neighbors, ASCC members and others present viewed front and rear areas on the applicants parcel and then walked to the Gegaregian home and considered the distance and site lines from the deck area on the south side of the house to the proposed pool location. It was noted that a three-foot high berm with five-foot high solid board fence on top of it might actually achieve some break in line of sight from the deck to the proposed rear yard pool location.

During the visit to the Gegaregian deck, Caren Edwards and Mr. Salter remained on the Quinn property in the area of the proposed rear yard pool. Ms. Edwards agreed to "yell" so ASCC members could gain some appreciation of sound transmission in the area. Mr. Salter measured the level of the "yell" at five feet and advised it measured a decibel level of 101.

During the site walk, Mr. Quinn pointed out that other pools in town are actually much closer to neighbors than his proposed pool. He noted that the location was selected to maximize the distance from the pool to the neighbors.

ASCC members questioned Mr. Salter about how the plans for the rear yard pool might be adjusted to achieve a three-decibel reduction in sound level (i.e., so that measured levels would be similar to those in the front yard area with the higher surrounding walls). The following specific items were suggested and discussed:

- Can the low wall on the south side of the pool be reduced in height, partially eliminated and/or designed with sound absorbing materials? It was suggested that a "dry stack" wall and or sound absorbing plaster surface be used to ensure minimum sound reflection. It was also suggested that planting in front of any wall would help mitigate potential sound reflection from wall surfaces.
- Make the solid board fence on top of the proposed berm airtight and with sound absorbing materials on the side facing the pool to help achieve the desired 3-decibel reduction. Add landscaping along the north side of the fence to help screen and soften views from the trail to the fence.

ASCC members also acknowledged that any final plans would need to include the details for overall landscaping, grading, potential tree impacts, information for an appropriate sound controlling pool equipment enclosure, etc.

Mr. Salter indicated that a dry-stack material for the stone wall might be as sound absorbing as an acoustical plaster surface and that this would be considered in developing the final pool plans.

Mr. Quinn indicated that for the solid fence he had hoped to use a more rural material like wood grape stakes. It was suggested that an air-tight, solid board wall or fence could be constructed and faced with grape-stake materials that would have the desired appearance and that such a design might actually help in absorbing some sound.

After the site inspection, it was agreed that project review would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Architectural and Site Control Commission January 24, 2005
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:01 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Schilling, Warr

Absent: Gelpi

Town Council Liaison: None

Planning Commission Liaison: Elkind

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

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

Vlastic presented the comments in the January 20, 2005 staff report and then discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting (refer to above site meeting minutes). He discussed the options that might need to be pursued to achieve sound levels associated with the proposed pool location that would be similar to those measured at the site of the previously approved front yard pool location. Vlastic also stressed that the applicant was seeking ASCC direction so that he could proceed with some confidence to develop the additional data and plan details that would be needed in support of any final action on the proposed pool plans.

Mr. Quinn and project landscape architect Linn Winterbotham were present to discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Quinn advised he would be willing to meet the tentative design objectives discussed at the afternoon site meeting.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Linda Elkind, 14 Hawkview, stated she would likely hear some noise from any pool on the Quinn property, but noted her appreciation for the efforts the applicant has made to

evaluate the noise conditions and define appropriate design responses to meet the intent of the PUD statement. She recognized that some compromises would need to be made, and added that the design approach suggested at the site meeting appeared to be the best way to deal with the problem.

Caren Edwards, 12 Valley Oak, noted the differences in the design philosophies between Portola Valley Ranch and Portola Glen Estates. She discussed some of the background in terms of the noise provisions of the Portola Glen Estates PUD and the intent to minimize noise impacts on the Ranch neighbors. She stated the intent was clear that Portola Glen Estates should be held to higher noise standards in terms of limited impacts on the nearby houses in the Ranch. At the same time, she said that the applicant's efforts to obtain additional noise data, more fully evaluate site and area conditions and consider options were positive. She added that if the design adjustments discussed at the site meeting could be made, i.e., to achieve the noise levels similar to those at the originally approved front yard pool site, she could support the plans.

Al Gegaregian, 14 Valley Oak, shared the comments made by Caren Edwards and noted that the proposed design with adjustments discussed at the site meeting would be an acceptable compromise solution. He stressed however, that every effort should be made to select a sound absorbing wall material, or reduce the scope of walls on the south side of the pool so that the final design would include the 3-decibel reduction generally agreed to as a target at the site meeting. He stressed that Mr. Salter should evaluate any final pool design to ensure it achieves the desired sound control objectives.

David Taran, 3 Oak Forest Court, stated his support for the Quinn plans and that the Quinns were "great" neighbors. He further commented that the fence plans were appropriate for privacy and safety of use of the backyard area on the Quinn property.

ASCC members thanked the applicant and neighbors for making efforts to address the noise issues in a positive manner and to seek an appropriate solution. All members agreed that the plans and applicant's noise control efforts were going in the right direction and that the applicant should move ahead to develop final plans in line with the design adjustments discussed at the site meeting. Further, Chase encouraged the consideration of the use of dry-stack material for the stone wall on the south side of the pool, as she believed this would help in terms of noise absorption and better fit site aesthetics.

Following discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Warr and passed 4-0 to find the general approach to pool location and design acceptable with the understanding that final plans would be developed, prior to issuance of any construction permits, to the satisfaction of the ASCC that would include at least the following details and information:

1. Noise control provisions shall be developed to achieve a "3-decibel noise reduction," i.e., as discussed at the January 24 site and evening meetings. Specifically, the final design of the retaining wall system on the south side of the pool and the solid wood fence and berm on the north side, i.e., along the north property line, shall include noise limiting elements, noise absorbing materials, and other appropriate treatments and adjustments to achieve the desired objective for noise reduction. The final plan shall be presented to the ASCC with an evaluation from Charles Salter Associates, advising on the effectiveness of the noise reducing design adjustments and modifications.

2. The final pool plans shall include details for the following:
 - a. Substantial landscaping to screen the solid board fence from the public trail.
 - b. Accurate grading plan for the pool and berm.
 - c. Arborist's evaluation to ensure the berm is properly placed with respect to the large oak tree.
 - d. Final plan for all rear yard landscaping and fencing.
 - e. Final lighting plan.
 - f. Sound controlling pool equipment enclosure.
3. The final plan for the solid board fence and berm along the northern property line shall also be adjusted as called for in the December 9, 2004 staff report to the ASCC prepared for the December 13, 2004 ASCC meeting.

Architectural Review for House Additions, 243 Canyon Drive, Kosling

Vlasic presented the January 20, 2005 staff report on this proposal for ASCC approval of plans for the addition of 1,463 sf of new living space to an existing 1,701 sf residence on the subject .26 acre Canyon Drive property. He advised that the proposal would concentrate most of the permitted site floor area, approximately 94%, in the main house and, therefore require special evaluation and findings by the ASCC, as discussed in the staff report. Vlasic then reviewed the following project plans dated 12/3/04 prepared by Tobin Architects PA and noted issues discussed in the staff report relative to the proposed rear elevation, two-story patio cover, trim color and deck railing design:

Sheet CS.1, Project Information and Vicinity Map
Sheet A2.1, Site Plan
Sheet A2.2, Construction Staging Plan
Sheet A3.1, Existing Floor Plan
Sheet A4.1, New Floor Plan
Sheet A4.2, New Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A5.1, New Roof Plan
Sheet A6.1, Exterior Elevations & Section
Sheet A6.2, Exterior Elevations

Mr. Kosling and Tobin Dougherty presented their plans to the ASCC. The offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The open fencing along the parcel boundary to the south has been there and there are no plans for replacing it at this time. Further, there are no plans for any new fencing with this project.
- The railing to be used on the new deck areas will match the wood post and wood rail design of the existing deck railings on the site. The railing will not be post and cabling as suggested by the details on the project plans.

- The tall patio roof proposed on the rear side of the house is desired for weather protection. It should have less impact on views from neighboring properties than a lower roof to cover only the new lower patio area.
- All efforts will be made to protect the large oak tree on to the south of the addition area as it is important to the privacy and visual quality of the area for both the applicants and the neighbors to the south.

Public comments were requested and the following were offered:

Julian Roth, 308 Canyon Drive raised concern over construction access and staging, noting the constraints imposed by the narrow and winding street system in the area. He stressed the need for the town's limits on construction hours to be observed and that there should be no week end work. He asked that the applicant be sensitive to the neighbors and cooperate with them to ensure minimum impacts from the construction process.

Dean Asborno, 265 Canyon Drive, noted he was located just to the south and somewhat uphill of the subject property. He expressed concern over the potential impact on the large oak between his house and the site of the proposed addition and also the visual impacts of the addition on the views from the upper level of his house. He supported the request for an arborist's report on the potential impacts on the oak. He wondered about the need for story poles and the ASCC's consideration of the 85% floor area limitation. He asked that the ASCC consider the need for requiring story poles before completing action on the request.

ASCC members discussed the project and agreed they could make the findings to permit the proposed concentration of floor area, generally as evaluated in the staff report. In this case, it was determined that story poles were not needed and it was noted placement of story poles for such a project would be at the discretion of the ASCC. It was also noted that the design approach was very similar to the approach used for development of the house on the property to the south. ASCC members did agree that detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plans were needed.

Considerable discussion followed on the proposed 10 foot deep, two story "covered porch" extension proposed along the rear side of the addition. Members wondered about the need for it, and potential visual impacts. It was stressed that it should never be enclosed and remain open to minimize potential impacts on views from neighboring properties, particularly the property to the south. Warr encouraged use of a deed restriction to ensure that if the feature remained in the plans, it would never be enclosed and the applicant advised that such a restriction would be acceptable to him. Warr advised that with such a deed limitation, he could support the two-story design proposed for the covered porch, but also noted the applicant could modify the plan to eliminate the two-story feature.

Vlasic noted that he was concerned with the visual impact of the porch extension, even if it was not enclosed. He advised it was an unusual feature and that use of a deed restriction to ensure it is never enclosed was a very unusual requirement. He indicated a staff preference for modification of the design to eliminate the two-story porch cover, but said he would pursue the deed restriction if that is what the ASCC desires.

Breen advised that she understood from the applicant that the plans had been shared with the neighbors and that the neighbors have indicated they are generally supportive of the plans. She stressed the need to protect the large oak and take precautions for construction access.

Members concurred that in this case continued use of the existing color scheme, including roof material, was acceptable.

Following discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Breen to make the findings to permit the proposed concentration of floor area as requested by the applicant, and to approve the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Detailed construction access and tree/vegetation protection plans shall be prepared and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The plans shall include the recommendations of an arborist to ensure protection of the large oak on the south side of the addition site. The protection efforts shall include, but not be limited to, a well-defined construction access pathway, including chain link fencing with metal posts, and protective boards banned to the oak tree.
2. A detailed construction staging plan, including provisions for parking of construction vehicles, shall be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. The staging plan shall include provisions for posting a sign on the site reminding construction operators of the town's limitations on construction days and hours.
3. The plans shall be modified to eliminate the two-story porch feature proposed on the rear elevation. However, it may remain if a deed restriction is imposed on the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney, ensuring that the feature will never be enclosed.
4. The plans shall be modified to correctly describe the proposed design for the new deck railings, i.e., that they will match the design of the existing railings.

Architectural Review for House Additions, 5 Bear Paw, Zussman

Vlasic presented the January 20, 2005 staff report on this proposal to add 1,496 sf to the existing single story flat roof, 2,296 sf Portola Valley Ranch house. He noted that all additions would be single story, but have been designed to adjust to the more subtle variations in site topographic conditions. He added that the project includes enclosure of the existing detached carport and development of a new entry, at an elevation close to street level. Vlasic then reviewed the following project plans revised through 1/10/05 prepared by Joram S. Altman, Architect:

Sheet A1, Floor Plan, Site Plan
Sheet A2, Existing Elevations and Details
Sheet A3, (Proposed) Elevations
Sheet A4, Roof Plan, Sections

Vlasic pointed out that in addition to the plans, the applicant submitted a statement to the ASCC that includes a brief description of the project, outlines green building features

included in the design, and explains adjustments made to the plans to partially respond to the conditions of approval set by the Ranch design committee on January 6, 2005. Vlastic added that provided with the statement were a copy of the January 7, 2005 letter from Ranch manager Janene Wallace, setting forth the conditions of Ranch design committee approval and the following data:

- Cut sheets for the proposed shielded downlight (Cooper Lighting #685-WP), product data on the proposed Velux skylights, and data on the proposed Sharpe 167 Watt photovoltaic system roof panels.
- Photos of existing conditions and a rendering of the proposed front elevation superimposed on a photo.

Vlastic also advised that story poles and taping had been installed at the site to facilitate both Ranch design committee and ASCC application reviews.

Joram Altman, project architect, was present to discuss the project plans with ASCC members. He offered the following comments and clarifications:

- The plans, as currently presented, include the location of the proposed solar panels approved by the Ranch design committee. The location was selected to ensure minimum potential for off site visual impacts.
- The roof material is to be a recycled rubber shingle.
- The planned house wall color is to be more a "taupe" than a "beige."
- The "structural deck" issue raised by the Ranch design committee has been corrected with the revised plans. The supports now do not extend out from the beneath the deck like they did on the plans originally presented to the Ranch design committee.
- The new garage door will be faced with wood shingles to match the shingle siding of the house.
- The exterior lighting plan will be modified as recommended in the staff report. Specifically, only one of the proposed two, wall mounted lights at the main entry door will be kept in the plan.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members found the plans generally acceptable and after brief discussion, Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 4-0 approval of the plans as clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A final landscape plan shall be presented that includes any proposal for tree removal.
2. The final exterior colors and roof material shall be specified. A sample of the proposed roof material shall be provided.

3. All final details for the roof mounted solar panel system shall be specified including the method of mounting of roof panels and location and screening of necessary accessory equipment.
4. The exterior lighting plans shall be modified to include provisions for only one wall mounted light at the main entry door. Further, the proposed light fixture is acceptable with the design option that includes the closed top so there would be no "uplight" spill.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Schilling and passed 3-0-1 (Breen) approval of the January 10, 2005 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

T. Vlastic