

(1) CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ross called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House Meeting Room, 765 Portola Road.

(2) ROLL CALL

Interim Town Manager Pedro called roll:

Present: ASCC: Commissioners Koch, Sill and Wilson; and Vice Chair Breen, Chair Ross
Absent: None
Planning Commission Liaison: Alex VonFeldt
Town Council Liaison: Craig Hughes
Town Staff: Interim Town Manager Debbie Pedro and Planner Cynthia Richardson

(3) ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

(4) OLD BUSINESS

(a) Continued Architectural Review for replacement landscaping, exterior lighting, koi pond, decking, stone paths, File #21-2015, 30 Zapata Way, Baskett Residence

Interim Town Manager Pedro presented the staff report regarding a revised tree remediation and landscape restoration plan to the property at 30 Zapata Way. The applicants' concurrent request for a new koi pond, exterior lighting, decking, and stone paths were previously approved by the ASCC. Ms. Pedro said the revised plans have been reviewed by the Conservation Committee, who reiterated their concerns about using large oaks on the steep slopes in front of the house and suggested planting smaller trees. Staff received letters in support of the proposed plan from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee and the two affected neighbors.

Because this is a remediation plan for unauthorized tree removal, staff recommended two additional conditions to ensure successful implementation of the planting plan – 1) Submission of an annual monitoring report submitted by a certified arborist, and 2) A performance bond in an amount subject to review and approval by the Town Attorney.

Chair Ross called for questions from the Commission.

In response to Commissioner Koch's question, Ms. Pedro said the neighbors were supportive of the plan as presented tonight to the ASCC.

Commissioner Sill asked if permits for the hardscape projects and other landscaping improvements would be withheld until after the tree work was done. Ms. Pedro said that is correct and Condition #6 applies to all building permits related to the property.

With no further questions from the Commission, Chair Ross asked for comments from the

applicants. The applicant said they feel they have been successful in reaching out to neighbors and have arrived at a satisfactory mitigation solution, as evidenced by the neighbors' letters of support.

Chair Ross called for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Koch asked if the topped redwoods would be removed. The applicant said the redwoods will be removed once the new plantings have grown enough to provide screening.

In response to Vice Chair Breen's question, the applicant confirmed there are only the two path lights as indicated in the plan and no lighting around the koi pond.

With no further questions from the Commission, Chair Ross opened the public hearing.

Judith Murphy, Conservation Committee, said the Committee's major concern is the destabilizing of the hillside due to planting large box trees on the steep slope.

Marge DeStaebler, Conservation Committee, added that the arborist advised a 36" box was the recommended maximum size, with 24" boxes preferred, so as to not destabilize the hillside or disturb the existing manzanitas.

With no further comments, Chair Ross closed the public hearing and brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Sill supported the planting of the Blue Oaks and the improved screening plan. He was in favor of planting smaller trees on the slope.

Vice Chair Breen supported the plan because it uses both larger and smaller trees. She suggested that the ASCC should review the plantings at installation and in year three, the last year of the monitoring program.

Commissioner Koch said she is glad that the applicant has gone to the lengths to work with the neighbors to come up with a satisfactory solution. She said the larger tree plantings will provide more immediate screening.

Chair Ross supported the proposed project. Chair Ross said that while he would normally be in favor of smaller plantings, in this instance, because of the immediate screening they will provide, he supported the placement of the larger box trees.

Commissioner Sill expressed concern of the impact to the manzanitas and surrounding vegetation with the planting of the larger trees. The applicant said the digging performed around the manzanitas would be done by hand. He added that placement of the larger trees is important to their effort to mitigate the screening issue to the neighbors' satisfaction.

Chair Ross asked if it was possible to plant the trees without heavy equipment. The applicant said heavy equipment would not be used on the slope.

Vice Chair Breen moved to approve the project with the staff conditions and the additional condition requiring hand digging around the manzanitas. Seconded by Commissioner Wilson, the motion carried 5-0.

(b) Continued Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for proposed new residence, detached garage, pool and associated site improvements. Request for modifications to the Town's Geologic and Movement Potential Maps. File #30-2015, 127 Ash Lane, Pressman Residence.

Planner Richardson presented the staff report regarding the revised plans for the proposed construction of a 6,201-square-foot main residence with a 5,235-square-foot basement, an 822-square-foot detached garage, and an 822-square-foot swimming pool on a 3-acre property at the end of Ash Lane within the Westridge Subdivision.

Ms. Richardson said the Geologic Map Modification had been further reviewed by the Town Geologist, who determined that there is adequate evidence to remove the fault trace from the Town's Geologic and Movement Potential Map, which will require approval by the Planning Commission.

Chair Ross called for questions from the Commission. With no questions, Chair Ross opened the public hearing.

Sue Chaput, 358 Alamos Road, said she is concerned about the removal of the redwood and other vegetation, considering there have been two significant landslides on their street. Chair Ross said the fill along that hillside in the back of the house was previously not graded properly and the proposed grading process for this project will be a significant improvement. He said the proposed plan includes removing loose soil and replacing it with very carefully engineered "benched compaction" to create a very stable base. He said the exact plans will be prepared by a civil engineer and will go through a stringent review process by the Town geotechnical consultant and engineering staff. He said the resulting slope and restoration of the original grades will be more stable than before.

With no further public comments, Chair Ross closed the public hearing and brought the issue back to the Commissioners for comment.

All of the Commissioners voiced their support of the project.

Vice Chair Breen said she was hopeful the applicants would persevere on the removal of the neighbor's Monterey Pine and acacias, replacing them with more appropriate plantings.

Commissioner Koch moved to approve the proposed project with the staff recommended conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Sill. The motion carried 5-0.

(5) NEW BUSINESS

(a) Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit review for development on three parcels located at 1260 Westridge Drive, Carano Residences.

Parcel A: New residence, pool, detached garage, File #26-2015

Parcel B: New residence, detached garage and second unit, File #27-2015

Parcel C: New residence, detached garage and tennis court, File #28-2015

Chair Ross said there was a joint field meeting this afternoon with the Planning Commission at the subject property.

Planner Richardson presented the staff report regarding the preliminary architectural review of a proposed family compound consisting of three homes to be built on a three-lot subdivision of an 11.6-acre property. She said the subdivision was approved in 2011 with a tentative map, which has not yet been finalized as a final parcel map. She said once the improvement plans are submitted, the parcel map will come before the Planning Commission and Town Council. She said that no formal approvals for the new residences can be made until the final map has been recorded.

Lot A consists of a 4,991-square-foot single-story house with a 1,785-square-foot basement, a detached 2,351-square-foot garage and equipment barn. A new swimming pool is proposed between the two structures, with an auto court located in front of the garage.

Lot B is the center lot and contains the existing residence. All of the current improvements on the site would be removed to construct the main house for this project. The applicant is proposing a 6,553-square-foot one-story Tuscan style residence with a 6,175-square-foot basement, a detached 969-square-foot garage, and a 592-square-foot second unit. Ms. Richardson noted that an historic resource report was prepared for the site and staff is in the process of reviewing revisions requested by the consultant.

Ms. Richardson said staff received revised grading quantities from the civil engineer today and has not yet been thoroughly reviewed; however, she said it appears that grading quantities are minimal and Planning Commission review will not be required for the middle parcel.

Lot C is the home closest to Westridge Drive. The applicant is proposing to construct a new 6,193-square-foot one-story Tuscan style residence which includes a 950-square-foot attached garage with a 2,924-square-foot basement and a 560-square-foot detached garage/equipment building. The subdivision entry gates are on this lot.

Upon completion of the staff's presentation, Chair Ross called for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Koch asked if each of the lots should be discussed as individual properties. Ms. Richardson said they are all currently one property, but upon final approval of the subdivision they will become three separate properties. She said the final approval will not occur until the final map is recorded.

In response to Chair Ross's question, Ms. Pedro said that if the gate is situated more than 50 feet from the road, the 50% opacity requirement does not apply.

Chair Ross called for comments by the applicants.

The project team presented material samples for the Commissioners to view.

In response to Vice Chair Breen's question regarding the similarity of color between the stone and stucco, the project architect said the contrast in the colors will be apparent as the different cuts will create different shading. He added that the detail of the cut stone around the windows and lighter tones for the trim materials will increase the perceived contrast. He said the overhangs will be a dark wood.

Project Architect Tom Taylor said the overall design of the properties is clearly meant for one owner, but the designs must be approved as three separate projects due to the subdivision. He

said the owner's intention is to have one cohesive design of a grand scale with classical proportions suitable to a property of this size. He said the design team wants to preserve as much of the natural features on the site as possible, siting the buildings in areas that were already previously disturbed.

Project Landscape Architect Tom Klope said the design team is working together in an effort to maintain the beautiful nature features of the site and to implement a sustainable approach to the landscaping with minimal lighting. He offered to meet with all the neighbors to discuss visual impacts to their properties and their screening needs now that the story poles are up.

Chair Ross called for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Koch said that today at the site visit it was indicated that all of the light fixtures are down-facing, but the majority of the lights shown in the plans are sconces and hanging lights. The architect said the light sources would be screened with opaque materials.

Commissioner Koch asked if there would be a center hub of lighting control located in the main house. The architect said that each building would be able to function on its own with a master overlay in the main house that can override the entire property.

Commissioner Wilson asked how the driveways would work for access to Lots A and B should the homes ever be sold as separate residences. The architect explained that the driveway is shared with an easement.

Vice Chair Breen said the proposed leymus canyon prince is an invasive. The landscape architect said they would not use the plant.

Commissioner Wilson asked Ms. Richardson regarding the 13-foot gates at Lot A. Ms. Richardson said there are two 13-foot ornamental gates proposed at the front of the detached garage at the auto court.

In response to Chair Ross's question, the architect said the stone trim around doors and windows would protrude less than 2 inches from the stucco.

With no further questions from the Commission, Chair Ross opened the public hearing.

Laure Woods, 1240 Westridge, asked about the lights that radiate from the tops of the trees at the end of the driveway. The landscape architect said all of that lighting has already been removed.

Judith Murphy, Conservation Committee, said the Committee's main concern is the location of the driveway and its proximity to the creek. She said it is important to protect the creek during construction of the driveway.

John Dissmeyer, 20 Possum Lane, said he sees cars coming down the perimeter driveway. He said he understands that the owners intend to provide screening; however, he is concerned that the road at the top of the creek bed is very narrow in spots. He suggested the perimeter screening be dealt with at the beginning of the project instead of when the project is completed in 2-1/2 years.

Chair Ross said the screening between the creek and the driveway is part of the tentative subdivision map and those improvements will be completed before the houses are constructed.

Ms. Pedro added that the subdivision improvement plan has already been approved by the ASCC. She said once the improvements are installed, it will go to Council for the final map approval. She said there will be additional opportunities for screening for the individual homes.

Chair Ross said there will be no additional fencing built, with the exception of the driveway gate. He said there may be the possibility of removing some chain link as long as it does not disturb any protected species.

With no further comments from the public, Chair Ross closed the public hearing and brought the topic back to the Commission for comments.

Commissioner Sill said he was pleased to see the landscaping would be more natural but would prefer no lawns, particularly in Lot B. He said the lighting and size of the buildings will have significant impact on the neighbors and there are too many outside lights, and the buildings are too high, will be too visible, and will not blend in well.

Vice Chair Breen said she was disheartened that the applicant was not present and had not participated in any of the meetings. She said Portola Valley is a rural community and this was not a rural project, although there was potential for this to be a good project. She supported the siting of the buildings. She said the height of the building on Lot A should be lowered. She was concerned about acoustic ramifications to the neighbors across the creek due to the wall in the garage area. She said there should be no hedging, but rather thickets along the property. She said there should be more invasive removals at the top of the bank – the Algerian ivy, broom, eucalyptus – in order for the rest of the landscaping to be successful. She suggested some restoration at the creek with invasives removed. She said the roof tiles should be mottled colors to break up the massing. She said the light fixtures emanated too much light, and all the light fixtures should be removed except at doors. She said the pond light must be eliminated. She said the size of the property contained too much habitat to fence off and may, in fact, need to be opened up more. She was supportive of earlier, rather than later, staging of the planting. She suggested the applicant consider a darker color for the stucco. She said she was supportive of the direction the applicant is headed, but said the buildings need to be lowered and the lighting needs to be reworked.

Commissioner Wilson agreed that the applicants should have been present during the site visit to meet the neighbors who have concerns regarding the impact of this project on their properties. She said she was happy to hear that materials from the existing building would be recycled and reused. She said she was overwhelmed by the height of the buildings, pointing out that the chimneys would add even more height. She said there was too much lighting. She did not understand why there were 13-foot gates/doors at the auto court. She said it was not aesthetically pleasing to see the tennis court and pavilion first thing as you come in from the driveway.

Commissioner Koch was supportive of the color board and suggested a little variation would help with the massing. She was supportive of the roof tile color. She requested to view samples of the driveway materials. She said her biggest concern was the exterior lighting, and said that screening will be important. She said Lot A had excessive lighting and the garage and auto court needed to be reworked. She said the neighbors on Possum were very exposed. She

requested to view samples of all of the hanging sconces. She said the height of the entertainment house on Lot C seemed to be excessive and had too much lighting.

Chair Ross was supportive of the Tuscan villa concept; however, he said the project is overly massive. He said in the context of each parcel being sold separately, he could be more supportive of building out each parcel to the extent allowed. He pointed out, however, that the described use and small number of people living there does not support building out each parcel to the maximum extent allowed. He expressed concern regarding light spill, particularly in the future with possibly more people living in the homes. He was supportive of the material choices. He requested a larger mock-up of the material mix. He was supportive of the oil rubbed bronze windows. He suggested a slight tint to the glazing to cut down on light transmittance. He said the outdoor lighting could be greatly reduced. He suggested having some of the fixtures decorative only and not illuminated at all. He was supportive of the siting of the houses and structures. He said the scale of the garage could be smaller to help the neighbors' view and they may be able to find a screening solution. He was supportive of the garden gates. He noted that although the main structure is massive, the view of the front of the main house is a view that only the owners and their guests will have due to the siting of the building. He suggested that the desired authenticity could be better achieved by reducing the scale slightly. He said the construction logistics plan is important as it will be a very disruptive project for the neighbors.

The project team thanked the commission for their comments and said they would update the plans according to the feedback.

(b) Architectural Review for Driveway Entry Gate, File #: 04-2016, 381 Portola Road, Mysen Residence

Interim Town Manager Debbie Pedro presented the staff report regarding the plans for a double swing-in style driveway entry gate measuring 4 feet tall and 12 feet wide at 381 Portola Road.

Chair Ross called for questions from the Commission.

Vice Chair Breen asked if the applicants had thought about the potential implications of the placement of the gate. She said if a car is pulled up to the gate, or people are approaching the residence, they have to park outside or in the driveway. Bicyclists and pedestrians would be forced into the road. She expressed concern regarding the visibility and the site access.

The representative from A&D Gate said he is comfortable with the 24-foot setback and, because it is a funnel shaped driveway, there is actually a little more than 24 feet. He said the owners' intent for having the gate is to keep their children from running into the street.

Commissioner Koch asked Vice Chair Breen if she would be more comfortable if the gate was set back another couple of feet. Vice Chair Breen said she didn't know the sizes of the various delivery or garbage trucks and her concern is that people walking along Portola Road would have to walk into the street to get around those vehicles, perhaps being unaware of how dangerous that corner is.

The applicant said currently, because the access is not great into the driveway and people have to back out, mail carriers and delivery trucks tend to park across the driveway parallel to the road, even though there is no gate.

Commissioner Wilson asked if children would find it easy to climb over the gate. The applicant said the gate is a deterrent only and is intended to protect the children from chasing a ball and running out into the street accidentally.

With no further questions from the Commission, Chair Ross opened the public hearing. Hearing no comments from the public, Chair Ross brought the topic back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Koch supported the project.

Commissioner Wilson supported the project.

Vice Chair Breen said she was not comfortable moving forward with the project without further study and exploration of the potential safety issue that may be caused by the gate.

Commissioner Sill supported the project.

Chair Ross said he understood Vice Chair Breen's concern. He said that between the creek near the subject property and the fire station, there are regularly speeding vehicles. He did not think the gate would worsen that situation. He said the gate meets all the Town requirements and does not require a variance or policy exception. He said, while he is also concerned about safety along that corridor and that particular location, he would not support conditioning the project on a traffic study. He said maybe the Planning Commission and Town Council might take up the issue and study the safety of that stretch of Portola Road Corridor.

Commissioner Sill moved to approve the project with the recommended staff conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Koch. The motion carried 4-1 with Vice Chair Breen voting no.

(6) COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS:

Chair Ross and Vice Chair Breen reported that they visited 40 Antonio to check the siting of screen trees at the southern side of the driveway.

(7) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 8, 2016. Vice Chair Breen moved to approve the February 8, 2016, minutes as submitted. Seconded by Commissioner Sill, the motion passed 5-0.

(8) ADJOURNMENT [8:53 p.m.]