



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

Meetings of the Architectural Site Control Commission (ASCC) Monday, January 14, 2019 7:00 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting **Historic Schoolhouse** 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028

SPECIAL ASCC FIELD MEETING

4:00 PM 848 Portola Road – Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping

4:00 PM 850 Portola Road – Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

7:00 PM - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Commissioners Breen, Ross, Wilson, Vice Chair Koch and Chair Sill

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Persons wishing to address the Architectural and Site Control Commission on any subject may do so now. Please note however, that the Architectural and Site Control Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion or action tonight on items not on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping, 848 Portola Road, Portola Valley Road LLC Residence, File # PLN_ARCH 07-2018 (C. Richardson)
- 2. Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping, 850 Portola Road, Portola Valley Road LLC Residence, File # PLN ARCH 08-2018 (C. Richardson)

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Annual Election of ASCC Chair and Vice Chair 3.
- Commission Reports 4.
- Staff Report 5.
- News Digest: Planning Issues of the Day

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. ASCC Meeting of December 10, 2018

ADJOURNMENT

AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours. Copies of all agenda reports and supporting data are available for viewing and inspection at Town Hall.

ASSISTANCE FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (650) 851-1700. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge any proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Architectural and Site Control Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY STAFF REPORT

- TO: ASCC
- **FROM:** Cynthia Richardson, Planner
- **DATE:** January 14, 2019
- **RE:** Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping, 848 Portola Road, Portola Valley Road LLC Residence, File # PLN_ARCH 07-2018.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the ASCC offer comments and directions to assist the applicant and project architect to make adjustments or clarifications that members conclude are needed before the commission considers final action on the application.

Lot Size	0.4118 acres (17,936 sf	0.4118 acres (17,936 sf)					
Average Slope	12%	2%					
AP Zone District	Code Requirement	Proposed	Remaining				
Max Floor Area (13%)	2,332	2,331	1				
85% of MFA	NA	NA					
Max Impervious Surface	NA	NA					
Coverage Limit (18.8%) 18.54.040(C)	3,371	1,990	1,381				
Height	28'	28'					
Front Setback	50'	59'					
Side Setbacks	20'	24'					
Rear Setback	20'	56'					
Creek Setback	30' from top of bank	56'					
Parking Spaces	2 spaces	3 spaces					

PROJECT DATA

BACKGROUND

This is one of two properties adjacent to each other seeking ASCC approval. The property is zoned A-P (Administrative Professional) and is located within the Town Center Area Plan that is a sub-area plan within the General Plan. See attached Vicinity Map (Attachment 1). The project includes the construction of one two-story single family residence with associated landscaping and tree removal.

There is a long history of the four parcels known as Sausal Creek. In 1995 the Town adopted an amendment to the zoning map to reclassify the area of the four lots from C-C to A-P. In addition the Town granted a CUP to establish a mixed residential and office use PUD with senior housing. This project was never constructed and all approvals have expired. In 2015, a lot line adjustment was approved to reconfigure the subject parcel along with three other nonconforming lots. (File # 43-214, recorded on July 14, 2016). Thie lot line adjustment allowed for each lot to be developed individually as permitted under the A-P zoning district. Within the A-P Zone District single-family dwellings are listed as principal uses. At the time the lot line adjustment was under review, the Town considered the development of the four individual parcels to be less intense compared to the PUD approved in 1995. The Commission stated that the lot line adjustment resulted in fewer single family residences, more office space, and less total square footage. The Town considered the proposed lot line adjustment to be a less intense use of the parcels and therefore approved the lot line adjustment.

CODE REQUIREMENTS

As required by Portola Valley Municipal Code (PVMC) 18.64.010.A.1 and 15.12.100.A and E of the Municipal Code, this application has been forwarded to the ASCC for review.

DISCUSSION

The relatively flat 17,936 square foot property is accessed through a shared access easement off of Portola Road. Located to the west is 850 Portola Road which is also requesting approval, to the east is Sausal Creek and a commercial building, to the south is a commercial building and to the rear is Sausal Creek and the Town of Woodside beyond. The property shares the access driveway with 844 Portola Road (Hallett Store),846 Portola Road (a vacant property) and 850 Portola Road (separately under consideration by ASCC).

The request includes the construction of a 2,331 square foot two-story house, new driveway, patios, tree removal and landscaping. The proposed two-story home is a modern ranch style. The home would have an attached three car garage and includes a first floor with the main living areas and a guest suite. The second floor contains a master bedroom and two additional bedrooms. The proposed finish treatments for the new home include vertical board and batten natural wood siding with accents of painted stucco. Deck railings will be horizontal wood painted a dark color. Roofing material includes corrugated metal roofing in a weathered copper color. The color palette includes natural wood and warm tan and brown tones with dark metal windows frames. All proposed materials and treatments meet town reflectivity guidelines. Colors and materials are presented in Attachment 9.

The ASCC should discuss if the proposed home is different enough in style and materials than the adjacent 850 Portola Road project. Staff has worked with the applicant to make sure there are differences in the homes, however the ASCC should make sure the applicant has gone far enough in making each home unique.

Landscaping is proposed around the front of the structure only, leaving the area at the rear and near the creek in a natural state. The plan includes the removal of several trees however there is a discrepancy between the Landscape plan and the Arborist report as to which trees are being removed. For instance tree #12 shows removal on the Landscape plan while the Arborist report shows it to remain. The applicants have been asked to flag the trees for removal prior to the site meetig so that the ASCC can understand the tree removal for this lot. The Arborist Report indicates that a majority of the trees are in bad condition with some of the trees being hazardous. The Landscape Plan sheet L1 indicates that there are 4 significant trees being removed within the footprint of the home and six additional trees will be removed due to the condition of the tree. There are 4 replacement oak trees included in the planting plan.

Additional tree removal information can be found on sheet A1.0 and in the Arborist report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services (Attachment 2). Tree replacement planting can be found on sheet L1.

Compliance with floor area, impervious surface, height, and setback standards

As shown in the table on page one of this staff report, all of the measurable aspects of the project are at or below the allowed maximums within the A-P Zoning District, including floor area, height and setbacks. Within the A-P zoning designation floor area that includes vent shafts, courts and floor area permanently allocated for parking or loading do not count towards floor area (PVMC 18.54.050).

The owners of 846, 848 and 850 Portola Road have joined together and have submitted an application for rezoning of these three properties from A-P to R-1/20M. This process is being reviewed simultaneously therefore the project has been reviewed against both zoning designations. The applicant has supplied a zoning compliance sheet for the proposed R-1/20 zoning regulations and can be found in your plan set as sheet R-1/20 for informational purposes only. The current design meets the R-1/20M zoning regulations as described in the table below. However, the current review before the Commission is subject to the A-P standards.

Lot Size	0.4118 acres (17,936 sf)		
Average Slope	12%		
R-1/20M	Code Requirement	Proposed	Remaining
Max Floor Area	3,625	2,985	640
85% of MFA	3,081	2,985	96
Max Impervious Surface	3,886	3,878	8
Height	28'/34'	28'	
Front Setback	20'	59'	
Side Setbacks	10'	24'	
Rear Setback	20'	56'	
Parking Spaces	2 covered	3 covered	

Design Guidelines Review – Siting, Mass/Bulk, Scale, Exterior Materials

The project was reviewed against the Town's Design Guidelines and was found to be substantially in conformance.

- 1. The size, siting and design of buildings, individually and collectively, tend to be subservient to the natural setting and serve to retain and enhance the rural qualities of the town. (Siting and Scale)
- 2. The proposed project will blend in with the natural environment in terms of materials, form and color. (Architectural Design)
- 3. The location, design and construction of the development project will minimize disturbances to the natural terrain and scenic vistas. (Grading)

- 4. The proposed project utilizes minimal lighting so that the presence of development at night is difficult to determine. (Lighting)
- 5. The proposed landscape plan will preserve the qualities of the natural environment through the use of native plant materials and provide a blended transition to adjacent open areas. (Landscaping)

Grading and Drainage

The project's proposed cut, fill and total grading work for the driveway, building pad, and site total are shown in the table below. The table illustrates that the proposed totals are within the amount requiring ASCC review (100-999 cubic yards). Total soil import for the site is 210 cubic yards. The majority of the grading that occurs outside the building footprint is for the driveway and to soften the grading from the raised finished floor. The finished floor elevation is slightly raised to account for any future creek overtopping. Thorough analysis of the creek has been completed by the Town Geologist, Town Engineer and the applicant's consultants. The applicant is proposing 30" concrete stitch piers to be located between the proposed home and the top of the creek bank. The stitch piers will provide stabilization of the creek bank and protect the home in case of any future erosion. Grading and drainage plans can be found on sheet C-1.0.

(in cubic yards)	Cut	Fill	Total
Outside Building Footprint	12	150	162
Within Building Footprint	48	0	48
Site Total	60	150	210
Net Import			90

Landscaping

The site is currently undeveloped with various types of trees that are scattered throughout the site. An Arborist report was prepared for the project by Kielty Arborist Services dated July 27, 2017 (Attachment 2). A tree status plan including tree numbering associated with the Arborist Report can be found on sheet A1.0. The applicant is proposing tree replacement with oaks.

The proposed planting plan can be found on sheet L1 in the plan set package. The project proposal includes a fully landscaped site with all native vegetation. Irrigation notes, calculations and details can be found on sheets L3 and L4.

There are no existing fences located on this property. A three foot tall wire mesh fencing is proposed to connect from the house to the southern property line. No additional fencing is proposed.

Lighting

Exterior house lighting is shown on sheets A2.1 and A 2.2 and cut sheets are provided in Attachment 3. For the most part exterior house lighting has been kept to a minimum. The garage door lights must be reduced to only one light or the two lights combined may not exceed 1,125 lumens.

There are seven landscape path lights proposed. Landscape lighting can be found on sheet L1.

Sustainability Aspects of Project

An Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist can be found on sheet L0; because there is no turf and all plants are native or low water use, the water use efficiency checklist is not required.

The project architect has provided the Green Point checklist (Attachment 4) targeting 78 points for the project.

Committee Recommendations

<u>Town Geologist.</u> The Town Geologist, in his memo dated December 10, 2018 (Attachment 5), recommended approval of the site development permit, with continued involvement of the geotechnical consultant in the planning and building process.

<u>Town Engineer</u>. The Town Engineer, in his memo dated December 19, 2018 (Attachment 6), recommended approval of the project with specific conditions.

<u>Fire Marshal</u>. The Fire Marshal, in his memo dated May 21, 2018 (Attachment 7), included standard conditions. The Fire truck turn around located on either 846 or 848 Portola Road must have a recorded easement for the use of 850 Portola Road.

<u>Conservation Committee.</u> The Conservation Committee reviewed the project on May 18, 2018 and provided a memo (Attachment 8). The Committee was supportive of the project with some augmented tree replacement for the oaks being removed. The applicant has revised the plans to add replacement trees as requested by the Conservation Committee. The Committee also requested the removal of all non-native species like Rubus discolor, Cytisus monspessulanus, Thistles and various other non-natives. This includes removal to the top of the creek bank.

Public Comments

No public comments have been received as of the writing of this report.

Unresolved Issues

There are unresolved issues that the ASCC should consider:

- Style of two homes ASCC should make sure there are unique differences in the two homes proposed.
- Reduction in light fixtures The lighting at the face of the garage must either be reduced in the total lumens or one fixture removed.
- Tree removal Further clarification should be discussed.

ATTACHEMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Arborist Report prepared by Keilty Arborist Services dated August 25, 2017.
- 3. Lighting cut sheet
- 4. Green Point checklist
- 5. Town Geologist memo, dated October 23, 2018.
- 6. Town Engineer memo, dated October 23, 2018.
- 7. Fire Marshal memo, dated May 21, 2018.
- 8. Conservation Committee memo, dated May 18, 2018.
- 9. Colors and materials
- 10. Architectural Plans (ASCC only)

Report approved by: Laura Russell, Planning and Building Director



Attachmnet 2 Page 8

Kielty Arborist Services LLC

Čertified Arborist WE#0476A P.O. Box 6187 San Mateo, CA 94403 650- 515-9783

July 27, 2017

Clarum Homes Attn: John Suppes 412 Olive Avenue PO Box 60970 Palo Alto, CA 94306

Site: 846 Portola Road Parcel #1, Portola Valley, CA

Dear Mr. Suppes,

As requested on Monday, July 24, 2017, I visited the above site for the purpose of inspecting and commenting on the trees. A new home is being designed for this site and your concern as to the future health and safety of the trees has prompted this visit.

Method:

All inspections were made from the ground; the trees were not climbed for this inspection. The trees in question were located on a map provided by you. The trees were then measured for diameter at 48 inches above ground level (DBH or diameter at breast height). The trees were given a condition rating for form and vitality. The trees condition rating is based on 50 percent vitality and 50 percent form, using the following scale.

1 - 29 Very Poor 30 - 49 Poor 50 - 69 Fair 70 - 89 Good 90 - 100 Excellent

The height of the trees were measured using a Nikon Forestry 550 Hypsometer. The spread was paced off. Comments and recommendations for future maintenance are provided.



846 Pc	ortola Road 7/27/17			(2)	
Tree#	Species	DBH	CON	HT/SI	? Comments
1 R	Coast live oak 14 (Quercus agrifolia)	-30.7	45	60/40	Fair vigor at top, poor form, heavy decay in leader at 10 feet, history of large limb loss, heavy amount of interior dead wood, codominant at 3 feet, top heavy.
2 R	Coast live oak 12. (Quercus agrifolia)	7-9.5	65	30/20	Fair vigor, fair to poor form, codominant at 1 foot with fair union.
3 R	Bay 6. (Umbellularia califor	1-8.2 mica)	45	30/18	Fair vigor, poor form, codominant at base, edge of creek, roots undermined, decay on leaders.
4 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	10est	45	50.30	Fair vigor, poor form, on creek slope, roots undermined.
5 R	Plum (Prunus spp.)	12.0	40	20/18	Fair vigor, poor form, multi leader at base, on creek slope, roots undermined.
6 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	10.3	70	35/25	Fair vigor, fair form.
7 R	Plum (Prunus spp.)	14.1	0	40/25	DEAD.
8 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	15.3	40	45/30	Fair vigor, poor form, leans, on creek bank, half of tree is dead.
9 R	Bay (Umbellularia califor	13.0 nica)	45	60/18	Fair vigor, poor form, tall for DBH, suppressed, limb failure at 3 feet in past.
10 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	15.1	40	60/35	Fair vigor, poor form, large failure at 6 feet in past, topped at 15 feet in past.
11 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	6-10	20	45/25	Fair vigor, poor form, extremely decayed trunk, HAZARD.
12	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	19.1	50	40/30	Fair vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed, leans west in grove.
13 R	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	23.5	45	40/40	Fair vigor, poor form, suppressed in grove, decay on trunk at 5 feet, heavy to west.

4

846 Po Survey	ortola Road 7/27/17			(3)	
Tree#	Species	DBH	CON	HT/SI	Comments
14	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	32.3	70	65/50	Fair vigor, fair form, dominant tree.
15 R	Coast live oak 16 (Quercus agrifolia)	.2-13.9	45	40/30	Good vigor, poor form, multi leader at base with poor unions, leans west outside of grove.
16 R	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	17.1	45	60/35	Fair vigor, poor form, leans heavy to the west, suppressed, codominant at 12 feet with included bark, top heavy.
17 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	14.8	40	55/18	Poor vigor, poor form, covered by ivy, heavily suppressed, tall for DBH, leans west.
18	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	29.8	60	60/35	Fair vigor, poor form, bleeding canker at 10 feet, codominant at 5 feet with fair union, dominant tree in grove, suppressed, leans to west.
19	Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>)	13.0	30	50/20	Poor vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed, nearly dead, recommended for removal.
20	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	20.3	65	60/30	Good vigor, fair form, leans slightly west, outside of grove.
21	Coast live oak 14. (Quercus agrifolia)	8-6.1	50	55.20	Fair vigor, fair form, in grove, suppressed, tall for DBH.
22	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	21.3	65	60/35	Fair vigor, fair form, dominant tree.
23	Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>)	12.1	30	35/15	Poor vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed, nearly dead.
24	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	18.1	30	55/35	Poor vigor, poor form, suppressed, nearly dead.
25*	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	18.9	60	50/30	Fair vigor, fair form, suppressed in grove, top heavy, codominant at 8 feet.

846 Po Survey	rtola Road 7/27/17			(4)	
Tree#	Species	DBH	CON	HT/SF	Comments
26*	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	23est	70	55/35	Good vigor, good form, dominant.
27*	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	30est	70	55/40	Good vigor, good form, dominant.
28	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	12.6	45	40/20	Fair vigor, poor form, suppressed, no room for vertical growth.
29	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	10.8	40	35/25	Fair vigor, poor form, suppressed, leans at more than 45 degree angle, decay at base.
30	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	10.0	70	60/40	Fair vigor, fair form, 40% live crown ratio.
31	Black walnut (Juglans hindsii)	7.4	30	35/12	Fair vigor, poor form, no room for vertical growth.
32	Bay (Umbellularia califor	12.5 nica)	70	60/20	Good vigor, fair form, on edge of creek bank.
33	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	20.9	40	55/30	Good vigor, poor form, heavy decay at base, HAZARD.
34	Bay 10.9 (Umbellularia califor	9-8.1 nica)	50	35/25	Fair vigor, poor to fair form, codominant at 2 feet with poor union, on creek bank.
35	Modesto ash 18.9- (Fraxinus velutina 'M	11.8 lodesto'	50 ')	50/40	Good vigor, fair form, leans to west, not native.
36	Plum (Prunus spp.)	6.0	70	20/15	Fair vigor, fair form.

R-Indicates recommended tree removal

Site conditions:

The parcel is located on an undeveloped piece of land. Many large native trees are on site. No care to any of the trees have been applied to the trees in the past. The area in front of the property to the south consist of many oak and walnut trees that make up a large grove of trees. Tree limb failure is abundant on this site.

846 Portola Road 7/27/17

(5)



Summary:

The majority of the trees on site are native oak trees mixed with native black walnut trees. Many of the trees on site are in poor condition from growing in suppressed conditions in combination with limb failure and decay. Building on this site would be impossible without the removal of some of the trees. In the back of the property is an open area that would best fit a new home with the removal of the least amount of trees. When designing a new home on this property the location of the home should be one that interferes the least with the large grove in front of the property, as removing trees from a grove can often lead to future tree failures of the remaining trees from wind throw, as the trees become exposed.

Showing grove of trees



Oak tree #1 likely would need to be removed in order to access the property. This tree has large columns of decay on its trunk from past limb failures that have not been callused over and should be removed if human life is to be present as the tree is hazardous.

Showing oak tree #1

Bay tree #9 and black walnut trees #10 and #11 are in severe decline from heavy decay and limb failure. The only trees in fair condition in the rear of the property is oak tree #2 and black walnut tree #6.

846 Portola Road 7/27/17

With the removal of trees #1, #3-5, #7-11, #13, #15 and #33 that are already in poor condition, a large area is made for the design of a new home. The only trees in fair condition that would need to be removed are oak tree #2 and black walnut tree #6. Out of the trees removed only 5 of them would be native oak trees, with 2 of them in fair condition. Below is a diagram showing the area available if these trees were removed.

(6)



Orange area represents buildable area with trees removed

A driveway would also need to be designed on this site. If possible the driveway should be a shared driveway located on the property line between parcels #1, #3 and #4. Driveway construction would have to be one with the least amount of impact to the trees on site. It is recommended to construct the driveway using Tensar BX-1100 Biaxial Geogrid to minimize required compaction and to relieve the roots from strain caused by passing cars. With Tensar BX-1100 Geogrid, compaction can be limited to 85%, and is more than adequate for future root growth. Along with the Tensar BX-1100 Biaxial Geogrid, Structural soil (CU mix) is recommended to be used for a base rock material. Structural soil shall be packed around roots in the required base rock area eliminating the need to cut roots. All excavation will need to be done by hand leaving all roots intact and damage free when underneath the dripline of a protected tree. The Site Arborist will be required to be on site during all excavation for the driveway underneath the dripline of a protected tree on site. Using this method to construct the driveway will have the least amount of impact when compared to standard driveway construction techniques as the majority of the roots will be saved. Any roots that need to be cut that measure 2 inches in diameter or larger must first be shown to the Site Arborist. Any root cutting will need to be documented so that proper mitigation measures can be applied. The driveway material is recommended to be a pervious material so the trees can receive annual rainfall. If the above recommendations are put into action the impacts from the driveway construction is expected to be minor.

846 Portola Road 7/27/17

Trees #15-17 are all located on the outside of the grove and are heavily suppressed. All 3 of these trees were given poor condition ratings as they have heavy leans to the west at a 45 degree angle. The removal of these trees would help to facilitate the construction of a driveway on the property. Also, Modesto ash tree #35 would need to be removed to facilitate a driveway. This tree is an imported tree not a native tree. Below is a diagram showing the recommended driveway location.

(7)



Blue highlighted area represents recommended driveway location

The remaining trees when possible should be retained as they are a part of a large grove of trees. Trees not discussed for removal above with condition ratings below 50 should receive mitigation or may need to be removed if its conditions cannot be mitigated. The remaining trees should have their surroundings stay unchanged. The only pruning the trees should receive is a crown cleaning of dead wood. The following tree protection plan is a generalized tree protection plan. Once plans are received the tree protection plan is to be amended. The tree protection plan will help to insure the future health of the retained trees on site.

Tree Protection Plan:

Tree protection zones should be established and maintained throughout the entire length of the project. Fencing for the protection zones should be 6 foot tall metal chain link type supported my 2 inch metal poles pounded into the ground by no less than 2 feet. The support poles should be spaced no more than 10 feet apart on center. The location for the protection fencing should be as close to the dripline as possible still allowing room for construction to safely continue. Signs should be placed on fencing signifying "Tree Protection Zone - Keep Out". No materials or equipment should be stored or cleaned inside the tree protection zones. Any roots to be cut should be inspected by the site arborist. The site arborist may recommend fertilizing or irrigation if root cutting is significant. Cut all roots clean with a saw or loppers. Roots to be left exposed for a period of time should be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist. The site arborist will be on site for the excavation the driveway.

846 Portola Road 7/27/17 (8)

Trenching for irrigation, electrical, drainage or any other reason should be hand dug when beneath the driplines of protected trees. Hand digging and carefully laying pipes below or beside protected roots will dramatically reduce root loss of desired trees thus reducing trauma to the entire tree. Trenches should be backfilled as soon as possible with native material and compacted to near its original level. Trenches that must be left exposed for a period of time should also be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist. Plywood over the top of the trench will also help protect exposed roots below.

Normal irrigation should be maintained throughout the entire length of the project. The imported trees on this site will require irrigation during the warm season months. Some irrigation may be required during the winter months depending on the seasonal rainfall. During the summer months the trees on this site should receive heavy flood type irrigation 2 times a month. During the fall and winter 1 time a month should suffice. Mulching the root zone of protected trees will help the soil retain moisture, thus reducing water consumption. None of the native trees on this site shall be irrigated unless their root zone is traumatized. This is to be decided by the Site Arborist during inspections.

When installing drainage and utility lines close to or beneath tree protection zones hand digging will be required in order to not injure the trees root system. The site arborist must be on site when work within the tree protection zone takes place in order to inspect, document and to offer mitigation measures.

An inspection of the tree protection fencing may be required. Other inspections will be on an as needed basis. This information should be kept on site at all times. The information included in this report is believed to be true and based on sound arboricultural principles and practices.

Sincerely,

Kevin R. Kielty Certified Arborist WE#0476A David P. Beckham Certified Arborist WE#10724A



HINKLEY & R.

HINKLEY LIGHTING, INC. 33000 PIN OAK PARKWAY I AVON LAKE. OHIO 44012 [PH] 440 653 5500 [F] 440 653 5555 HINKLEYLIGHTING COM I FREDRICKRAMOND COM

KORE 1876BZ				
BRONZE				
WIDTH:	5.3"			
HEIGHT:	7.5"			
WEIGHT:	2.5 LBS			
MATERIAL:	ALUMINUM			
GLASS:	ETCHED LENS			
BACKPLATE WIDTH:	5.3"			
BACKPLATE HEIGHT:	5.3"			
SOCKET:	8W LED "INCLUDED			
LED INFO:				
LUMENS:	600			
COLOR TEMP:	3000k			
CRI:	80			
INCANDESCENT EQUIVALENCY:	2-35W			
DIMMABLE:	Yes, on any Incandescent, MLV, ELV, or C-L dimmer. 277v on 0-10v control.			
NOTES:	WILL CAST LIGHT UP AND DOWN.			
EXTENSION:	4.0"			
TTO:	3.8"			
CERTIFICATION:	C-US WET RATED			
VOLTAGE:	120V			
UPC:	640665187601			



AT HINKLEY, WE EMBRACE THE DESIGN PHILOSOPHY THAT YOU CAN MERGE TOGETHER THE LIGHTING, FURNITURE. ART, COLORS AND ACCESSORIES YOU LOVE INTO A BEAUTIFUL ENVIRONMENT THAT DEFINES YOUR OWN PERSONAL STYLE. WE HOPE YOU WILL BE INSPIRED BY OUR COMMITMENT TO KEEP YOUR 'LIFE AGLOW.'





LEDGE LED PATH LIGHT

6081



PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

Sleek linear design blends seamlessly into pathways while providing soft, directional illumination

WAC

LANDSCAPE LIGHTING

Fixture Type:	
Catalog Number:	
Project:	
Location:	

SPECIFICATIONS

Input:	9-15VAC (Transformer is required)
Power:	3.0W / 4.5VA
Brightness:	Up to 105 lm
CRI:	90
Rated Life:	60,000 hours

FEATURES

- IP66 rated, Protected against powerful water jets
- · Factory sealed water tight fixtures
- · Translucent lens provides uniform light distribution
- · Mounting stake, 6 foot lead wire, and direct burial gel filled wire nuts are included
- · Recommended spacing for installation: Residential: 8 to 10ft; Commercial: 5 to 7ft
- · Maintains constant lumen output against voltage drop
- UL & cUL 1838 Listed

ORDERING NUMBER

		Color T	emp	Finisl	n
6081	Linear Path	27 30	2700K Warm White 3000K Pure White	BK BZ	Black on Aluminum Bronze on Aluminum

6081-___BK

Example: 6081-30BK





waclighting.com Phone (800) 526.2588 Fax (800) 526.2585 Headquarters/Eastern Distribution Center 44 Harbor Park Drive Port Washington, NY 11050 **Central Distribution Center** 1600 Distribution Ct Lithia Springs, GA 30122 Western Distribution Center 1750 Archibald Avenue Ontario, CA 91760

WAC Lighting retains the right to modify the design of our products at any time as part of the company's continuous improvement program.

WAC

LANDSCAPE LIGHTING

Additional Mounting Stake

9000-ST9-BK

Durable PVC stake

LEDGE LED PATH LIGHT

6081



Includes three 7 inch threaded stainless steel stabilizing pins for ground mounting or surface mounts with four screws or over a junction box

5000-SCP-BZ Bronze on Aluminum



Guardian Mount

Heavy duty stainless steel spike to position fixture. Formed from a single piece of metal

9000-SP9-BZ Stainless Steel

Magnetic Transformers

Stainless Steel, 12-15V output, IP65 rated, UL 1838 listed See transformer spec sheet for details and its accessories

9075-TRN-SS 75W Max **9150-TRN-SS** 150W Max **9300-TRN-SS** 300W Max **9600-TRN-SS** 600W Max





waclighting.com Phone (800) 526.2588 Fax (800) 526.2585 Headquarters/Eastern Distribution Center 44 Harbor Park Drive Port Washington, NY 11050 **Central Distribution Center** 1600 Distribution Ct Lithia Springs, GA 30122 Western Distribution Center 1750 Archibald Avenue Ontario, CA 91760

WAC Lighting retains the right to modify the design of our products at any time as part of the company's continuous improvement program.

Attachment 4



NEW HOME RATING SYSTEM, VERSION 7.0 SINGLE FAMILY CHECKLIST

The GreenPoint Rated checklist tracks green festures incorporated into the home. GreenPoint Rated is administered by Build it Green, a non-profit whose mission is to promote healthy, energy and resource efficient buildings in California.

The minimum requirements of GreenPoint Rated are: verification of 50 or more points; Earn the following minimum points per category: Commulity (2) Energy (25), Indoor Air Quality/Health (6), Resources (6), and Water (8); and meet the prerequisites CALGreen Mandatory, E5.2, H6.1, J5.1, O1, O7,

Directions for Use: Column A is a dropdown menu with the options of "Yes", "No", or "TBD" or a range of percentages to eliocate points. Select the appropriate dropdown and the appropriate points will appear in the blue "points achieved" column.

The criteria for the green building practices listed below are described in the GreenFoint Rated New Home Rating Manual. For more information please visit www.builditgreen.org/greenpointrated Build II Green enforcement agency.



*Minimum Points #Achieved Points

Certification Level:

Points Achieved:

Certified

POINTS REQUIRED

International Proof Section Control Section Secti	home is only GreenPoin	t Rated if all features are varified by a Contified GreenPoint Rater and contified by Build it Green.	:	2 8.0	26 18 5	6 13.0	20.0 6	18.5 8 (1996)	
PP According to a second procession of the second second procession of the second	ew Home Single Family	Version 7.0							
All provide and an analysis of the second of the seco	referenting BFB ve referencesenet	Hold Road Road	l P	Ę		£	8		a de la servició de la
All of AC31 bit of Academic Residuation Status (and a status and a status	rentrial Critic Pennelas mileon Zipi (4028	/alley		nuux	lergy	Cittle	LINOS	ater	
CALCINENT Res (PECULIPEC) 4 1 1 S1 A.1. Construction Footplint an Annual the standard of the tax backard of a tax backard of a standard of a st		MEASURES	Č č	<u> </u>	<u>ції</u> Ро	ssible Pol	nts	×	
Number of Characteristic (Characteristic Characteristic Characteristinter Characteristic Characteristic Characteristic Characteristic	ALGreen								
AL Ontitution Poolphild is a house in the serve between the balance of the balan	Yes	CALGreen Res (REQUIRED)	4		1	1	1	1	
No. All - Obstance of the server of the data is a weak of the data is a weak of the data is a weak of the data weak of	SITE		0.000						
No. Output: All 10% Control Control Duration (Laboration (Laboration)) No. 10% Control Duration (Laboration) Advances (Laboration) 2 No. 2 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) Advances (Laboration) No. 2 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) Advances (Laboration) No. 2 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 3 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 3 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 4 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 All 10% Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 Control Duration (Laboration) No. 5 Control Durati	Yes	A2 Joh Sita Construction Mootprint (Site Preservation Plan Bayond Local Ordinance or 40% of Site Undeveloped)	<u>18.18.0</u>		l		1		
No. Al. 2015 CSD Varia Diversion (Excluding Atamativa Daly Court) Image: Courtice of the Strate Variation Model of Walks / Rafty No. A.2 Recycled Controls Image: Courtice of the Strate Variation Model of Walks / Rafty No. A.4 Han Linear Effect Reduction (Model Advance Macdan Variations) Image: Courtice of the Strate Macdan Variation Macdan Variations) Time A.5 Construction Environmental Courtic Macdan Variations) Image: Courtice of the Strate Macdan Variations) Time A.6 Construction Environmental Courtic Macdan Variations) Image: Courtic Variation Macdan Variations) Time A.7 Bernanker Control Parameter Courtic Variation Macdan Variations) Image: Courtic Variation Macdan Variation Variations) Time A.7 Bernanker Courtic Variation Macdan Variation Macdan Variations) Image: Courtic Variation Variations) Image: Courtic Variation Variation Variation Variation Variation Variations) Image: Courtic Variation Variations) Imag		AL JOB Ste Construction Waste Diversion 1 A2 1 75% C&D Waste Diversion (Including Atlemative Daily Cover)	Carl Road / A					I	·····
No. A3 2 Recycling Plase from Thilds Plany Verded Mase Just Water Facility 1 1 No. A3 Recyclic Conferent Base Machael consumplications 1 1 No. A5 Construction Environment Data Machael Consumplications 1 1 No. A5 Construction Environment Data Machael Consumplications 1 1 No. A5 Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Construction Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. A5 Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 1 No. A5 Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 1 No. A5 Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 1 No. A5 Environment Plan Including Fluisi-Out 1 1 No. B	TED	A2.2 65% C&D Weste Diversion (Excluding Alternative Daily Cover)					2		
A3 Recycled Control Base Medical Immonitor And touting Elusib-Out 1 1 TW A4. Heat land Effect Reduction (Non-Root) 1 1 TW A5. Construction Environment Control Preventing Medical Immonitor Preventing Preventing Medical Immonitor Preventing Preventing Medical Immonitor Preventing Preve	Vas	A2.3 Recycling Rates from Third-Party Verified Mixed-Use Waste Facility							anden sin de feren menne bere man bereminen (de sin beginge offen i efen ver nærsenen), som het de here
Yab A4. Here Island Effect Reduction (Mon-Roof) IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Yes	A3. Recycled Content Base Material (Minimum 25% Post-Consumer Content)						······	**************************************
TB A5 Construction Environmental Quality Management Plan Including Flush-Out A A A Summater Control: Prescriptive Pair A A Demonstrating Control Management Plan Including Flush-Out A Demonstrating Control Management Plan A A A Demonstrating Control Management Plant A A A Demonstrating Control Management Plant A A Demonstrating Control Management Plant A A	TBD	A4. Heat Island Effect Reduction (Non-Roof)	and the second		1	*****			9 / / / /
As. Storwards Control: Proceedings Markel Image: Control in Proceedings Advanced Store Sto	TBD	A5. Construction Environmental Quality Management Plan Including Flush-Out			·	1			
MA Permaskie Form Medical Image: Second		A6. Stormwater Control: Prescriptive Path		-			4		۵۰۰۹۹۹۶ که ۱۰۰۹ ۲۰۰۰ ۲۰۰۰ ۲۰۰۰ ۲۰۰۹ ۲۰۰۹ ۲۰۰۹ ۲۰۰۹
Yeo Ad. 2 Ministration moder Bio-Readon Pretures 1 Yeo Ad. 3 Ministration in address of the Balance Street Design 1 Yeo Ad. 5 Ministration in address of the Balance Street Design 1 Yeo Ad. 5 Ministration in address of the Balance Street Design 1 Yeo Ad. 5 Ministration Construction Path threads of the Street	Yes	A6.1 Permeable Paving Material	3 1 20					1	
TDD AA 3 Hor-Lacking Reding Relation Relatin Relatin Relation Relation Relatin Relating Relation Relation R	ТВD	A6.2 Filtration and/or Bio-Retention Features	1. 1. S. C.					1	na - Andréa Carllan da na annsa annsan an annsa a bha dhuair a na anns air i na annsan an annsan ann an an an a I
Top: AA 3 Barn Stommeter Store Delign 1	TBD	A6.3 Non-Leaching Roofing Materials	5.7200					1	
Tab. Ar. Storweider Control: Performance Path Inst twa Amagenature Deepi 1 3 Ibin E1. Fly Ash and/or Sing In Concrete Continued Stoti, 2 - Tab. E3. Resolution Duringe System 2 - Tab. E3. Resolution Duringe System 2 - Tab. E3. Foundation Duringe System 2 - Tab. E3. Foundation Duringe System 2 - Tab. E3. Foundation Duringe System 1 1 - Statistic Statistic and Segurated Exterior Woolds-Concrete Connections 1 - - B5. Structural Nets E3. Tammites Statistic and Segurated Exterior Woolds-Concrete Connections 1 - - Mod. E3. Foundation Controled Crystepsets 1 - - - Mod. E3. Foundation Controled Crystepsets 1 - </td <td>TBD</td> <td>A6.4 Smart Stormwater Street Design</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	TBD	A6.4 Smart Stormwater Street Design		1					
FOUNDATION 1 1 100 13. Fly Ash and/or Slag in Controle taxement total 1 100 13. Foundation Drainage System 2 100 14. Moltance Controlled Crawingace 1 101 1 2 102 1 2 103 10. 2 104 43. Foundation Drainage System 2 105 10. 2 105 10. 2 105 10. 2 105 10. 1 105 10. 1 106 1. 1 107 10. 1 1 108 10. 10. 1 1 108 10. 1 1 1 108 10. 1 1 1 1 109 10. 1 1 1 1 1 100 C3. Flow to Multin Planting Bods 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TBD	A7. Stormwater Control: Performance Path (Treat 97% of Annual Runolf Oneits)					-	3	
181. EPJ Ash midlor Stag in Concrete (usenes stars) 1 1 190. 22. Redon-Resident Construction 2 2 193. B3. Foundation Drainage System 2 2 194. B3. Foundation Drainage System 2 2 194. B3. Foundation Drainage System 2 2 195. Structural Pest Controlled Cravispace 1 1 197. B5. Structural Pest Controlled Cravispace 1 1 198. C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 1 1 198. C2. Three inches of Much in Planting Bods 1 1 1 199. C3. 1b Ansite Space London to Gala Pestocation (Structural Pestocation) 1 1 1 199. C3. The Networks Space Linead No Ovarised Space or Other A space Ansite Provemant Space or Other A space Ansite Provemant Space or Other A space Ansite Provemant Space Ansite Proveman	FOUNDATION	an and the second state of the second state of the second state and the state of the second state of the second	(C.)	i davišti	4. 	and dail	d Berry B		h de Versen Gruppel
H2 H2 H2 Wei B2. Foundation Drainage System 2 B4. Molisture Controlled Crawispace 1 1 B5. Troutinal Fest Control 1 1 B5. Troutinal Fest Control 1 1 B6. Structural Fest Control 1 1 B7. To mile Shike and Spundad Extrino Woodd-Concrete Connections 1 1 B7. To mile Shike and Spundad Extrino Woodd-Concrete Connections 1 1 B7. To mile Shike and Spundad Extrino Woodd-Concrete Connections 1 1 B7. To mile Shike and Spundad Extrino Woodd-Concrete Connections 1 1 B7. To mile Shike and Spundad Extrino Woodd-Concrete Connections 1 1 B7. To mile Induced are providing Point ageod et & the test 15. 1 1 C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 1 1 C2. Three Inches of Mulch in Planting Bods 1 1 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landenges 1 1 1 C3. The Inches of Mulch in Velatural Size takes takenergy 1 1 2 C3. Three Inches Shale Efficient Landenges 1 1 2 C4. Milning Turin Landenge Network Methy Mediate Instancergy 1 1 2 C3. Thin In Conse Bons Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinders I	No	B1. Fly Ash and/or Slag In Concrete (Minimum of 30%)	0				1		
Ves B3. Foundation Uranage system 2 2 Ves B4. Molstrice Controlled Consellators 1 1 B5. Structural Pest Controls 1 1 B6. Structural Pest Controls 1 1 B7. Planting Shinks and Separated Exterior Work-Scorestice Connectione 1 1 B7. Planting Shinks and Separated Exterior Work-Scorestice Connectione 1 1 B7. Planting Grouped by Match Module In Planting Bods 1 1 B7. Planting Grouped by Match Module In Planting Bods 1 1 B7. Planting Grouped by Match Module In Planting Bods 1 1 B7. Planting Grouped by Match Module In Planting Bods 1 1 B7. Construction Score Efficient Landscapes 1 1 B7. Molecure Socies Linder 1 1 B7. Molecure Molecure Socies Linder 1 1 B7. Molecure M	, IBD	B2. Radon-Resistant Construction				2			hais jarawaa ay a
Be. Image: Control of Crawing Jack 1 Be. Structure Peet Controls Structure Peet Controls 1 Structure Peet Cont	Tes Vor	B3. Foundation Drainage System	2				2		
98: 1 98: 88.1 Termits Shields and Soparated Exterior Wood-to-Concrete Cannections 1 780 89.2 Plant Turuks, Bases, or Stens at Least 36 Inches from the Foundation 1 780 12.2 Plant Turuks, Bases, or Stens at Least 36 Inches from the Foundation 1 780 C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 1 780 C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 1 780 C2. Three Inches of Mulch In Planting Bods 1 1 780 C3. Resource Efficient Landscape 1 1 781 C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Matural Statute Instea Materianswith 1 1 782 C3.1 No Invasive Species Listed by Cal-PC 1 1 1 783 C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Matural Statute Instea Materianswith 2 1 2 784 C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Matural Statute Instea Materianswith 2 1 2 785 C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape 2 2 2 2 786 C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape Ana 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	103		9 <u>53</u> 9 1 34 6		L	1	<u> </u>		
TB0 Dis 2 Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Foundation 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Store Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storms at Least 39 Inches from the Store Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, or Storm Plant Base 1 Storm Plant Turke, Base, Turke, Base	Yes	Bit Tamile Shields and Senarated Exterior Mondula, Concrete Connections	77.00 S.K.					1	a 1999 - Marco Manana, anna an an an an an ann an ann an
Windowidd Enter the landscape area protectings. Points append at 6 for less time 19%. 1 TB2 C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 View C2. Three Inches of Multich In Planting Beds 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 1 C3. No Invasive Species Listed by CaliPC 1 1 C3. No Invasive Species Listed by CaliPC 1 1 C3. The Source Efficient Landscapes 1 1 C4. The Induce and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Listes Manteneror) 1 1 C3. 2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Listes Varianse Manteneror) 1 1 C3. 2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Listes Varianse Manteneror) 1 1 C3. 2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Listes Varianse Manteneror) 2 2 2 C3. Three in Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Listes Varianse Manteneror) 2 2 2 C4. Minital Turí in Landscape	TBD	B5.2 Plant Trunks, Bases, or Stems at Least 36 Inches from the Founderlon	1601.000 1240-000						
Enter the indecape area parcentage. Points apped at 8 for less than 15%. 1 TB0 C2. Three incles of Mulch in Planting Bods 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 C3. The secure Efficient Landscape Status Turing Bods 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 C4. Third Intri in Landscape 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 C4. Secure Efficient Landscape 1 C4. Minimum Turin Landscape 1 C4. Minimum Turin Landscape 2 C4. North Turin Shopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Area Lees Tank Eight Fael Water Sector West Factor Glaung and Wate Glaung 759 C4. Turin a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area C7. One Inch of Compositi In the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Soll (set isst reneg) 750 C3. Recycled Watstwater Irrigation System 750 C4. Rainwater Harvesting System 750 C4. Revincentally Preferable Materials for Ste 750 C4. Revincentally Preferable Materials for Ste 750 C4. Revincentally Preferable Materials for Ste 750 C4. Envinformation Efficiency Irrigation System <	LANDSCAPE								
TB0 C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 Yes C2. Three Inches of Muich in Planting Beds 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 C3. Novarios Species Listed by CalPC 1 C3. Plants Chosen end Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linke Mathemory) 1 C3. Drought Toilerant, California Netwer, Mediterransen Species, or Other Appropriate Species 1 Yes C3. Drought Toilerant, California Netwer, Mediterransen Species, or Other Appropriate Species 3 Yes C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape 3 C4. Minimal Turf on Stopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinidere Instailed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 Yes C4. Turf on Stopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinidere Instailed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 Yes C4. Turf on Stopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinidere Instailed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 Yes C4. Turf on Stopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinidere Instailed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 Yes C4. Turf on Stopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinidere Instailed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 Yes C4. Turf on Simal Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 Yes C4. Turf on Simal Percentage Stopes of Landscape Area 2	40,00 %	zalsze szeren elektroniszter i terentette elektronisztere a szere elektronisztere elektronisztere elektroniszte Enter the landscape area percentage. Polnts capped at 6 for less than 15%.]				an in the second	<u></u>	
Yea C2. Three Inches of Mulch in Planting Beds 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 TBD C3.1 No Investve Species Listed by Cal-PC 1 C3.2 Three Inches on and Locate to Grow to Natural Size (Listed by Cal-PC 1 C3.3 Drought Tolerant, California Native, Mediterranean Species, or Other Appropriate Species 1 Yea C3.2 Drought Tolerant, California Native, Mediterranean Species, or Other Appropriate Species 3 Yea C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklere Installed in Arase Less Than Eight Feel Wide 2 C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklere Installed in Arase Less Than Eight Feel Wide 2 2 C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Ladscaped Aras 2 2 2 Yea C7. One Inch of Compost In tho Top Six to Twolve Inches of Soil (with Searce) 1 1 1 Yea C7. One Inch of Compost In tha Top Six to Twolve Inches of Soil (with Searce) 2 2 2 TBD C4. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 2 1 1 1 TBD C1. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 <td< td=""><td>TBD</td><td>C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning)</td><td>5833</td><td> </td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></td<>	TBD	C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning)	5833					1	
C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes 1 1 TBD C3.1 No Invasive Spacies Listed by CaLIPC 1 1 Yes C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Natural Size (Lantes Mathanarov) 1 1 Yes C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Natural Size (Lantes Mathanarov) 1 1 1 Yes C3.2 Plants Chosen and Loaded to Grow to Natural Size (Lantes Mathanarov) 1 1 1 Yes C4.1 Mo Tar Gaspes 1 1 1 1 Yes C4.1 Mo Tar on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 2 2 Yes C4.2 Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 2 2 Yes C4.2 Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Everhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 2 2 Yes C4.2 Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Everhead State	Yes	C2. Three inches of Mulch in Planting Beds	2/47					1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
TBD C3.1 No Investive Species Listed by CaLIPC 1 1 Test C3.2 Flants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linkes Matteranew) 1 1 1 Test C3.2 Flants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linkes Matteranew) 1 1 1 Test C3.2 Flants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linkes Matteranew) 1 1 1 Test C3.2 Flants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linkes Matteranew) 3 3 C3.3 Florid Time Size Size Size Size Size Size Size Siz		C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Yei C3.2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (tanke Manhamou) 1 1 Xei C3.3 Drought Tojerset, California Native, Mediterransan Species, or Other 3 Xei C4.4 Minthial Turf in Landscape 3 C4.4 Minthial Turf in Landscape 2 2 C4.1 No Turf on Species Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Foet Wide 2 2 7B0 C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 2 7B0 C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at less 60% of wet Facing Glazing and Wate Shated) 1 1 Yei C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 2 2 Yei C7. One Inch of Composit In the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Soll (with Seat Temps) 2 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 2 1 1 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Budget or Landscape Irrigation 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 2 2 2 2 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated	TBD	C3,1 No Invasive Species Listed by Cal-IPC					1		
New Cost of Markon Market Species 3 Appropriate Species 3 C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape 2 C4. No Turf on Space Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklere Installed in Areas Less The Eight Freet Wide 2 TBD C4. 2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 TBD C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at least 50% of West Pacing Glazing and Wale Shaded) 1 Yes C6. High-Efftciency Irrigation System 2 C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 3 3 C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 3 1 C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 1 C10. Submeter or Dedicated Neter for Landscape Irrigation 2 1 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 1 TBD C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Esteror tradition function (Esteror tradition function functin functin function functin function function function function fu	Yes	C3.2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Linites Mantenence)		L			1		
C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 2 TBD C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 2 TBD C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 2 TBD C6. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (it least 00% of West Pacing Glazing and Wale Shaded) 1 1 1 Yes C6. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (it least 00% of West Pacing Glazing and Wale Shaded) 2 2 2 Yes C6. Aligh-Effficiency Irrigation System 2 2 2 2 Yes C7. One Inch of Compost In the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Solf (west Pacing) 2 2 2 2 YBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 3 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 2 1 2 1 2 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 2 2 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Yes	Appropriate Species			ļ			з	
Ver C4.1 Mo Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Feet Wide 2 2 TBD C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 2 2 TBD C6. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at least 60% of West Pacing Glazing and Wale Shaded) 1 1 1 Yee C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 2 2 Yee C7. One Inch of Compost In the Top SIx to Twelve Inches of Soll (with Beil Testing) 2 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 1 1 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 2 2 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 1 1 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for SNte 1 1 1 1 1 TBD C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extern tighting floores wielded and directed command) 1 1 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 1		C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape		1	·		•••••••••	******	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
TBD C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 TBD C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at test 50% of West Pacing Glazing and West Shaded) 1 1 1 Yes C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 2 2 Yes C7. One inch of Compost in the Top Six to Twelve inches of Soll (web Shaded) 2 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 3 3 3 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 1 1 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 2 2 2 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 1 1 1 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 1 1 TBD C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 1 1 TBD C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extern Ighting fixures shielded and directed downward) 1 1 1 1 1	Yes	C4.1 No Turt on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Feet Wide							a o nagranjimaju debi nd vlyvance, vrtatnostno konton (ningi jednostkovan vrtavan nagranjima) n
TBD C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at least 50% of West Facing Glazing and Wate Shaded) 1 1 1 Yes C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 2 2 Yes C7. One Inch of Compost In the Top Six to Tweive Inches of Solf (with 6olf Testing) 2 2 2 TBD C6. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 2 2 2 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Inrigation System 3 1 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 1 1 1 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 1 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 1 1 1 Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Exteror tighting features shelded and directed downward) 1 1 1 1 Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Exteror tighting features shelded and directed downward) 1 1 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 1 1 1 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1 1	TBD	C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area	and the second				<u> </u>	2	
Yes C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 1 2 Yes C7. One Inch of Compost In the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Soil (with Goil Testing) 2 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 2 3 3 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 3 1 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 1 1 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 1 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape Elements and Fencing 1 1 1 Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Estent tophing fixoures sbieled and directed downward) 1 1 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 1 1 1 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1 1 1 1 1	TBD	C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at least 50% of West Facing Glazing and Walls Shaded)			1	1		1	
Yee C7. One linch of Compost in the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Solf (with Boil Testing) 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 3 C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 1 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Estenot typing fixoures sbielded and directed downward) 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1	Yes	C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System	2.4.1 2.4.1		<u>-</u>	·		2	
TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 3 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 TBD C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Exterior tiphing fixoures sbielded and directed downward) 1 TBD C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1	Yes	C7. One Inch of Compost In the Top SIx to Twelve Inches of Soil (with Gold Testing)	2					2	
TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape 1 TBD C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Exterior tighting fixtures shielded and directed downward) 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1	TBD	C8. Rainwater Hervesting System						3	
YED C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extensi tighting Induces ableded and directed downwasci) 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1	TBD	C9. Recycled Wastewater Inigation System						1	
CBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site 1 C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extern Lighting Insures shielded and directed downwast) 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 1 C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1 1	TBD	C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation						2	
C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site	TBD	C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget	So de la			L		1	
TBD State interconnection of the process of the presence of the		C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site			r				
Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extensit typing finuties shielded and directed downward) 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1 1 TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification 1 1	TBD	Elements and Fencing					1		
Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification	Yes	C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Extenor lighting fixtures shielded and directed downward)	<u>(</u>	1	Í				
C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification	Yes	C14. Large Stature Tree(s)	1	1					
	TBD	C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification	$f \in \mathcal{N}_{2^{n-1}}$					1	

GreenPoint Rated New Home Single Family Checklist Version 7.0

Page 21

	The subscription of the su
GreenPointRATED	No.

NEW HOME RATING SYSTEM, VERSION 7.0 SINGLE FAMILY CHECKLIST

The GreenPoint Rated check promote healthy, energy and	dist tracks green features incorporated into the home. GreenPoint Rated is administered by Bulld it Green, a non-profit whose mission is to resource efficient buildings in California.		Polats A	chieved:		78		
The minimum requirements Quality/Health (6), Resource	of GreenPoint Rated are; verification of 50 or more points; Earn the following minimum points per category: Commulty (2) Energy (25), Indoor Air s (6), and Water (5); and meet the prerequisities CAL Green Mandatory, E3.2, 145.1, 15.1, 01, 07.	Certification Level: Certified		đ				
Directions for Use: Column A the appropriate points will ap	Is a dropdown menu with the options of "Yes", "No", or "TBD" or a range of percentages to allocate points. Select the appropriate dropdown and over in the bits "boths achieved" column.							
The criteria for the green bui	In the second second In grand second			POINTS	s requi	RED		∞Minimum Points
Build if Green is not a cod	១ ទាវរូ០៤០០៣ទាររ ទានិតបាត់ក អង្គការអនុវត្តភា			25				[#] Aohlaved Points
A home is only GreenPoint	Rated if all features are verified by a Certified GreenPoint Rater and certified by Build It Green.	:	0.0 iš	19.5	e 13.0	20.0 8	19,5 6	
New Home Single Family	Version 7.0		1,	10000000000000000000000000000000000000		Produce and disc	Manana Serente.	
		i pi	unity	2	alth	licas		
		Achle	G	Energ	IAQH	Resor	Water	we want to an an a star of each street
	NEASURES	novalgen vy	1.4	Po	ossible Po	ints		Notes
oAllereen Nee	CALGreen Res (REQUIRED)				ikar di			
		4	2.52 <u>8</u> 2.54			1 1 1. Set 560	1	
Yes	A1. Construction Footprint (Site Preservation Plan Beyond Local Ordinances or 40% of Site Underploped)	1				1		
	A2. Job Site Construction Waste Diversion			······				
TBD	A2.1 75% C&D Waste Diversion (Including Alternative Dally Cover)				يور هدر الوراد ماريد.	2		NAME ADDRESS OF OUR ADDRESS OF THE RESEARCH OF THE ADDRESS OF A DDRESS OF THE DEFENSION ADDRESS
TBD	A2.2 65% C&D Weste Diversion (Excluding Alternative Daily Cover)	- 6.				2		
Yes	A2.5 Retycled Content Date Binterial at the state to serve the					1		an a
TRO	AG. Heat Island Effect Baduction (Non-Rooft	<u>991/18</u>		<u> </u>		1		
TBD	A5. Construction Environmental Quality Management Plan Including Elistr-Out			1	<u> </u>	}		
inge were geler werken eine allere	A6. Stormwater Control: Prescriptive Path		2*************************************	1	<u>L.1</u>	1		1000 mm 100 km 200 km
Yes	A6.1 Permeable Paving Material	त्र स्टब्स् स्ट	1		Γ		1	a de la comme a montre, na pana, mar parte de la del com antant d'en par par parte de la del a commen com por dyname a man
TBD	A6.2 Filtration and/or Bio-Retention Features						1	ann a heine a faith ann ann an ann an an an ann an tha ann an tha ann an tha an ann an ann an ann an ann an an
TBD	A63 Non-Leaching Roofing Materials						1	
TBD	A6.4 Smart Stormwater Street Design		1					
TBD	A7. Stormwater Control: Performance Path (Trent 25% of Annual Ruroll Onsite)	23-Ce					3	
	R1 Shi dah andar Gapin Capacita ang sang							
TBD	B7. Radon-Resistant Construction	0				1		a la normana (11 de a plana), en remenuen er frad (12 milio), aj agant en jannan menubare n.E. (3 da bij
Yes	53. Foundation Drainage System				2			an the block way (an an any of the set of the state of the state block of particular systems to experiment the state block way in a law, is a law,
Yeş	B4. Moisture Controlled Crawispace	0.0		1	}			a MA bilings i na suma santu antu anga pina (Phatianga anga anga anga anga anga anga anga
	86. Structural Pest Controls	1124103841048			£	1.0 www.burner.org		a na ann an an Anna an Anna ann ann ann
Yes	B5.1 Termite Shields and Separated Exterior Wood-to-Concrete Connections	(1				1	Party & Law Streemson	a na wana a mana na mana kata na manana manana na n
Têd 🚽	85.2 Plant Trunks, Bases, or Sterns at Least 36 Inches from the Foundation	6,83				1		
C. LANDSCAPE								
1000% *****	Enter the landscape area percentage. Points capped at 6 for less than 15%.			r	r	Y		
Yes	C1. Flams brouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning)			-			1	ant ar an
<u>ensta anti-Anti-An</u> ti-An	C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes	<u>ar de l'</u>		l	L	L	1	
TED	C3.1 No Invasive Species Listed by Cal-IPC		· ····			Γ.	-	a na ana any amin'ny fanina amin'ny fanina amin'ny fanina amin'ny fanina amin'ny fanina amin'ny fanina amin'ny
Yes	C3.2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Limited Maintenance)	0. i	-Prost door of the same			1		n en vennen an marina hafna finan har in den skelen an anvanska sjonen på (f.) ogs det løner skille sams sams a
Yes	C3.3 Drought Tolerant, California Native, Mediterranean Species, or Other Appropriate Species							
	C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape					1		
Yes	C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Fight Feet Wirds	S 15 Alles A	Alabahan ya yenan y			}		n ya mangang mangan katala katala katala katala mangan mangan na persaka katala katala katala katala katala ka
TBD	C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area	2. AC 23.0					2	ana an airin taran a sa an airin an an an airin a sina a sina an an ann ann an an an an an an an an
TBO	C6. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at lease 60% of West Facing Glazing and Wells Shaded)	20.374	A deline to and	4			4	alar menangan menangan (manangan ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang
Yes	C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System	2	*****		<u> </u>	<u>}-</u>	2	
Yes	C7. One Inch of Compost in the Top Six to Tweive Inches of Soil (with Soil Testing)	2					2	
TBD	C8. Rainwater Harvesting System	2.4					3	
TBD	C9. Recycled Wastewater Infigation System						1	
твр	C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation	NE NEX.					2	
and the second	un, Lanoscape Meets Water Budget	936) E. K			L		1	
TPD	C12.1 Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape			ł	1		(
	Elements and Fencing				ļ	1		
Yes	C 10. RECUCEO LIGAT MONUTION (Exterior lighting fidures shielded and directed doenvierd) C14. Larma Statura Transice)	1	1	ļ	ļ	ļ		
180	C15. Third Party Landscane Program Certification	- 1 	1					a la de de la calencia de parte de la Calencia de la compositiva de parte de la compositiva de la deve como accency esp
لاحتماقك فكشف فيشت فاستخدمته	· · · · ·	5. 3		1	1	L	L	

GreenFoint Rated New Home Single Family Checklist Version 7.0

New Home Single Family	Version 7.0			REALINE	anak Ebitero . M	MUCCONTRA_S	reffranka kana la kana kana kana kana kana ka	
твр	C16. Maintenance Contract with Certified Professional						1	
D. STRUCTURAL FRAM	EAND BUILDING ENVELOPE		157 MW	,				
Terr and the Additional Territory of the Additional State State State States of the Additional Additional States of the Additional Ad	D1. Optimal Value Engineering	the second second second	an valence 7 in the second					
TBD.	D1 1 Joists. Rafters, and Stude at 24 inches on Center					2		
TBD	D1.2 Non-Load Bearing Door and Window Headers Sized for Load	. بې د مېرو				1		
TBD	D1.3 Advanced Framing Measures	286 M 24 M				2		
Yes	D2. Construction Material Efficiencies (Pre-assembled wall and roof transing for at least 80% of project)					1		Webs to where the formation of the same of the same of the same to the same to the same to the same to the same
	D3. Engineered Lumber	15275078					erelatibile classificers proper	
Yes	D3.1 Engineered Beams and Headers	<u>1</u>				1	alal-base/b ⁻¹ ofic/co-down	
TBD	D3.2 Wood I-Jolets or Web Trusses for Floors					1		and the second
Yes	D3.3 Engineered Lumber for Roof Rafters	1				1		
TBD	D3.4 Engineered of Hinger-Jointed Studs for Vertical Applications					1		MARAN MEN AT INCIDENT AND
TBD	D3.5 OSE for Supplion				riften in de Liter in	0.5		
TBD	D3.6 OSB for Wall and Root Sheathing	the second			al a-1 0-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10	0.5		
180	Los naturated meaders	SURG-		1			L	
TPD	Do. PSU-Defined Wood	-		-		1000-100-00-00-10		
TBD	DS 2 Band Bredute	<u>APPASSON 1</u>				6		
	P. Cold Mal Conterna	<u> 287/00/07</u>	l			3	<u> </u>	
TPD	Do, John Walt Systems	10.278					(
TBD	Do 7 At Least 00% of Extenor Male	100 C						
TBO	D5.3 At Least 90% of Roofs					المرسوم (1994 م		
TBD	D7 Frenzy Heels on Roof Trusses				******	τ		
24 Inches	D8. Overhands and Gutters					10000000000000000000000000000000000000	11110 H 1110000-1.1.1.1.	
Carlow Carlow Providence (Carlow Carlow)	D9. Reduced Pollution Entering the Home from the Garage	<u>948759</u>	ļ	1	L		<u>.</u>	
твр	D9.1 Detached Garage	22576			2		1 1 1	
TBD	D9.2 Mitigation Strategies for Attached Garage				4			
	D10. Structural Pest and Rot Controls	<u>1988-62062</u>			L	lu-manus-sera	l	an a
18D	D10.1 All Wood Located At Least 12 Inches Above the Soll	NOT			alanda Junah (J. Valengio A	1	1	
тво	D10.2 Wood Framing Treated With Borates or Factory-Impregnated, or Wall			······	ar ar a 1746 (m644) "	and a local bar as welling	{	an ang an an ang an an ang ang ang ang a
	Materials Other I han Wood					1	<u> </u>	
Yes	Utility Rooms, and Basements)	2			1	1	[
e extering								
a second to a strategic to a second state to a	n har start der Carle Carles Miller in der Scherker is her der eine eine der Scherker (d. 1995). Die seine der			ér (Chi	y (Asun) (wi - 200	
TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking	an a		71/12		1		
TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified	an ar de Recent				1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System	2012/11/2012 2012/2012 12/12/2012				1 2 2		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Pariy Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials					1 2 2 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials					1 2 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD Yes	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly					1 2 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD Yes TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. I Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof		2	2		1 2 2 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD Yes TBD F INSULATION	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof		2	2		1 2 1 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD Yes TBD F. INSULATION	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content		2	2		1 2 1 1 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD F INSULATION TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Floors E6. Deciman		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD E INSULATION TBD TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Floors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for		2	2		1 2 1 1 1 1 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. J Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walts and Fioors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Envisoins		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walts and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walts and Ficore 		2	2		1 2 2 1 1 1 1 1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Ficors 		2	2				
TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 (NSUEAtion NSUEAtion TB0 TB0 TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. I Walls and Ficors F1. 2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Ficore F2.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants 		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Floors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Floors F2.1 Walls and Floors F3.1 Resultion That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors 		2	2				
TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Ficors F2.1 Walls and Ficors F3.1 Resultion That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings 		2					
TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 NSULATION TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Jourable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walks and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walks and Ficors F2.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walks and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3.3 Interior and Exterior 		2	2				
TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 (NSULAVION TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 (S FLUMENIS)	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Jourable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3.3 Interior and Exterior 		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. J Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Ficors F2.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3.3 Interior and Exterior 		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. J Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walls and Ficors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Walls and Ficors F2.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Ficors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes 		2	2				
TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0 TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Jourable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Valis and Floors F1. Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. I Cavity Walls and Floors F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. I Cavity Walls and Floors F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. I Cavity Walls and Floors F3. Insulated Hot Waller Flow 		2	2				
TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Jourable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Valis and Floors F1. Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. I Cavity Walis and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water G1. Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution 		2	2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Jourable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Valis and Floors F1. Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. Cavity Walis and Floors F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water G1. Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures 			2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E5. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3.3 Interior and Exterior G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install WaterSense Showerheads 1.8gpm with Metching Compensation Valve 			2				
TB0 Yes Yes Yes	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E3. 1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E5. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3. Cavity Walis and Floors F3.2 Callings F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water O1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install WaterSense Toxics I.0 gpm Q2.3 WaterSense Bathroom Faucets I.0 gpm Q2.2 WaterSense Bathroom Faucets I.0 gpm 			2				
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials E3.1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E4. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walks and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walks and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water O1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. WaterSense Showerheads 1.8gpm with Matching Compensation Valve G2. WaterSense Showerheads 1.8gpm with Matching Compensation Valve G2. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G2. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G2. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G3. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures G4. WaterSense Totor Fixtures <th></th><th></th><th>2</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th>			2				
TBD Yes TBD Yes TBD Yes Yes StJ28 gpf TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E5. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 50% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Walks and Floors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions F2.1 Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walks and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation of Domestic Hot Water G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1. Insulated Hot Valer Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Toilets with a Maximum Performance (MaP) Threshold of No Less Than 50 Grams 1.28gpt OR 1.1 gpt G3. Pre-Plumbing for Graywater System 			2				
TB0	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing installation Third-Parity Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof P1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Valls and Floore F1.2 Ceilings P2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Valls and Floore F2.2 Ceilings P3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Valls and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3.3 Interior and Exterior G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1. Insulated Hot Valer Pipes G1.2 Under Sense Deliver in Hot Water Distribution G3. Insulation Showsheads 1.8gpm with Matching Compansation Valve G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install WaterSense Dathroom Faucets 1.0 gpm G3. WaterSense Editions Faucets 1.0 gpm G3. WaterSense Edition Faucets 1.0 gpm G3. WaterSense Edition Faucets 1.0 gpm G4. Operational Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System 			2				
TBD Yes TBD	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing installation Third-Parity Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof P1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Valls and Floore F1.2 Ceilings P2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard MethodResidential for Low Emissions F2.1 Valls and Floore F2.2 Ceilings P3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3.2 Ceilings F3.2 Insulation of Domestic Hot Water G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1. Insulated Hot Waler Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G2. WaterSense Showerheads 1.0 gpm G3. WaterSense Toilets with a Maximum Performance (MaP) Threshold of No Less Than 500 Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System G5. Thermostatic Shower Valve or Auto-Diversion Tub Spout 			2				
TBO TBO TBO TBO TBO TBO TBD TBD TBO Yes TBO Yes TBO Yes TBO Yes TBO TBO Yes TBO TBO Yes TBO TBO YBO Yes HEATING, YENTILAN	 E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking E2. Flashing installation Third-Party Verified E3. Rain Screen Wall System E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials E5. Durable Roofing Materials E5. Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly E6. Vegetated Roof F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content F1.1 Valia and Fiors F1.2 Ceilings F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Entrisoins F2. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors F3.2 Ceilings F3. Insulation and Exterior G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water G1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures G3.1 WaterSense Showerheads 1.3gpm with Metohing Compensation Valve G2.2 WaterSense Showerheads 1.0gpm G3.2 WaterSense Showerheads 1.0gpm G4.3 Pre-Plumbing for Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System G4. Operational Graywater System G5. Thermostatic Shower Valve or Auto-Diversion Tub Spout CNANDAIR CONDITIONINS 			2				

``

New Home Single Family Version 7.0		10.49%法。39	Secons. 7			1 998-853194.	
Yes H1.1 Sealed Combustion Furnace			71 JHL & UPHAN BLU'	1			
Yes H1.2 Sealed Combustion Water Heater	2			2			
TBD H2. High Performing Zoned Hydronic Radiant Heating System	Same		1	1			Feld Birnelik (Feldis Gaussinanian propiy) 1999/1099 WEBS-30000/celik/deliky/seliky/sendayaaniny yanay yang ya
H3, Effective Ductwork	1				Produkt - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		
Yes H3.1 Duct Mastic on Duct Joints and Seams			1				Mar Mandeyen (1979) WAR WAR WAR DE HET Mandelande (nederne vers ber einer die programmen Antonio Addelande Hade
TBD H3.2 Pressure Balance the Ductwork System			1				
Yes H4. ENERGY STAR® Bathroom Fans Per HVI Standards with Air Flow Verified				1			
H5. Advanced Practices for Cooling	[(spanningin kannakan	***********	
TBD H5.1 ENERGY STAR Ceiling Fans in Living Areas and Bedrooms			1				
H8, Whole House Mechanical Ventilation Practices to Improve Indoor Air Quality							
TBD H6.1 Meet ASHRAE 62.2-2010 Ventilation Residential Standards	N	R	Ŕ	8	R	R	
TBD H6.2 Advanced Ventilation Standards				2			
H6 3 Outdoor Air is Filtered and Tempered	965 ASS 174			1			
H7. Effective Range Hood Design and Installation	1						
T6D H7.1 Effective Range Hood Duoting and Design	6488		~	1			
TBD H7.2 Autometic Range Hood Control	A March			1			
H8. High Efficiency HVAC Filter (MERV 13+)	1984 B.C.			1			
TBD H9 Advanced Refrigerants	A BARA	ald and Direct Ingel and a		1			
Yes H10. No Fireplace or Sealed Gas Fireplace				1			
Yes [H11. Humidity Control Systems	1			1			
teo Teo H12. Register Oesign Per ACCA Manual T	17.2 JA (12. 3 - 3 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 -		1				
I. RENEWABLE ENERGY					(Sec.	6 (1997)	
180 180 19 II. Pre-Plumbing for Solar Water Heating			1	- 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10			
120 12. Preparation for Future Photovoltaic Installation			1				
600 a Consile Renewable Generation (Solar PV, Solar Thermal, and Wind)	<u> </u>	-0-04001004014	25				-
4. Net Zero Energy Home	17 CHICKNESS		******			·····	
TBD 14.1 Near Zero Energy Home			2				
14.2 Net Zero Electric	1997 - 19		4				
780 IS. Energy Storage System			1				
V. BUILDING PERFORMANCE AND TESTING							
J1. Third-Party Verification of Quality of Insulation Installation			-	1		<u> </u>	
JZ. Supply and Return Air Flow Testing			1	1	<u> </u>		
JBD J3. Mechanical Ventilation Testing			rear she was a way	1			and a second
J4. Computation Appliance Safety lesting	0.000			1	<u> </u>		
Js. suitang Energy Performance				[1		
30.1 Home meets of Exceeds Energy Complaints Panway	9		25+		antitudio din' Mirodonina ni		
TOD. THE 24 Prepared and Signed by a CABED Certified Energy Adaptst	<u></u>		1				a na a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a
180 IN ENERGY STAP for Lamor			1				
No. 10 GDA indeer size Cartification			1				
TBD MO Blower Deer Terting	<u> </u>		~ #KBV 05546-15570	2			
				3	a si ta s		
K1. Entroweys Designed to Reduce Tracked-in Contaminants				é minud		2 - 1 - 7 - 2	
TBD K1.1 Individual EntryWays (Defisivate hard surface at entrances and permanent associaty for shoe elorable				1	}		
Yes K2, Zero-VOC Interior Wall and Ceiling Paints	1			2		h	**************************************
Yes K3. Low-VOC Caulks and Adhesives	2.10		lyiine tikel at and a y	1			
K4. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Interior Finish	an a Maria and	1	l	L		J	
TBD K4.1 Cabinets	State.	İ			2	1	
TBD K4.2 Interior Trim	1.00				2	1	
TBD K4.3 Shelving					2		
TBD K4.4 Doors	tan sa				2	1)*EUTH GB ELL-44,444-	
TBD K4.5 Countertops	Constant of	1			1		
K5. Formaldehyde Emissions in Interior Finish Exceed CARB					and a class of the bootstands		
TED K5.1 Doors		1		1	1	-	
7BD K5.2 Cabinets and Countertops				2	1		and an an an a fair and a start a fair and a start a start and a start and a start and a start a start and a st
7BD K5.3 Interior Trim and Shelving]		2	1		
TBD K6. Products That Comply With the Health Product Declaration Open Standard		1		2			y of the second for the Belle could also be administrative per specific and a format (API) is a could be addressed and a subdimensed
TBD K7. Indoor Air Formaldehyde Level Less Than 27 Parts Per Billion				2			
No K8. Comprehensive inclusion of Low Emitting Finishes	0	1		1		19400-1920-1920-1920-1920-1920-1920-1920-19	
LIFLOORING				jā. (2000)			
L1. Environmentally Preferable Flooring	6. 18 N	1			3		
TBD L2. Low-Emitting Flooring Meets CDPH 2010 Standard Method—Residential		1		3			
L3. Durable Flooring us fooring is hard surface)		1			1		
180 L4. Thermal Mass Flooring			1]	
M-APPLIANCES AND LIGHTING			\mathbb{Z}_{2}				

۰.

New Home Single Family Ve				······	and shifters the	THE STRUCT	*****	
Yes	1. ENERGY STAR® Dishwasher	読みたる。					1	
N	2. Efficient Laundry Appliances							
Tan	MO 1 CEE Bated Clother Meeher	1722 W	40-/ ALII (ALII (ALI		T	1		
		<u>- 27052</u> 45						
Yes	M2.2 Energy Star Layer	2		2		~~~~~		an a sea an
TBD	M2.3 Solar Dryer/ Laundry Lines			0.5		****		
TBD	3. Size-Efficient ENERGY STAR Refrigerator	感激的		2				
1. 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 19	4. Permanent Centers for Waste Reduction Strategies			······	h			
	M 1 Duils in Wassetinn Contor			1				
<u>P 18 60 % 50 % </u>	NH, F Builein Recycling Center		*****			1		
JBD	M4.2 Built-in Compositing Center					1 1		
N	5. Lighting Efficiency							
Yes (Sec. 9	M5.1 High-Efficacy Lighting	2		2				
New States and States	M5.2 Lighting System Designed to IESNA Footcandle Standards or Designed by				No. No. of Concession, Name	10 Total 10		na o la manager de la construction provinsi et al provinsi provensi en de proprio provinsi de la constructione de anco
2. 10. 100 States	Lighting Consultant	- A Same		2				
TBD	6. Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Infrastructure		1					
N-COMMUNITY		1.		. 3 ⁴	5-14-18	1.3		
No. of the second s	1 Smart Development					فويدين مريس		
Constant accesses of a		GOLENS	·	1		. 1	Beats weighten dae	
Tes	M F. T. RADI CHES	<u>, 2</u> ,,				1		
TBD	N1.2 Designated Brownfield Site		1			1		
TBD	N1.3 Conserve Resources by Increasing Density			z		2		
TBD	N 1.4 Cluster Homes for Land Preservation		1			1		
a south and a start of the second start of the	N1.5 Home Size Efficiency			I	*****			na Lair ng pangang mangang mang
	Enter the and of the base in an are feet	and the second		Lanna an		3		
	Care area of the porte, in square reet	[·*	a mark time to be a state of the state of the state is the state of the state of the state of the state of the
4	Enter the number of bedrooms	<u></u>						
N	2. Home(s)/Development Located Near Transit							
TBD	N2 1 Within 1 Mile of a Mejor Transit Stop		1					anna Canad Canada a Sanana a Sanana a Canada a C
Preside Styles and Store	N 2.2 Within 1/2 mile of a Major Transit Stop		3		************	a Vannin and a familie da	- 1 0-10-00 - 10-12 dia mandritra dia fi	n na ann an Ar Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna an an an an a
<u>es Participal e certitora</u>	Protection and Biovan Annon			L				
N N	a, redesinal) and bicycle Access	a na an					4 mi, mi a a da magha a ar ar ar a	anan manimiza yang ing mang mang mang mang mang mang mang ma
	N3.1 Pedestrian Access to Services Within 172 Mile of Community Services	1991 AV	2	l				A TERMENTER SAME AND A MARKET AND
	Enter the number of Tier 1 services							
	Enter the number of Tier 2 services							
TBD	N3.2 Connection to Pedestrian Pathways	C. Com	1	1		ll-later all des later and a		an bara munimentu na muta a muta pagina ja a ja a yan muta muta a sa su su su su su su sa sa sa sa sa sa sa sa
TPD	N/2 9 Traifie Calming Strategies	1.110	<u>}-</u> ,	<u>}</u>				
<u></u>	Wato Harre Celining Strategies	1000	- <u>-</u>	L				
N	4. Outdoor Gathering Places		-					an density has a particular. I general comparison construction to match a despective de la construction de la c
TED	N4,1 Public or Semi-Public Outdoor Gathering Places for Residents		1					
TBD	N4.2 Public Ouldoor Gathering Places with Direct Access to Tier 1 Community							
	Services	20202	1					nan a sana a
N	5. Social Interaction	and the second second					(******* Konona andre inde	
Yeş	N5.1 Residence Entries with Views to Callers	1 1	1					
Yes	N5.2 Entrances Visible from Street and/or Other Front Doors	1	1					
Yes	N5.3 Porches Oriented to Street and Public Space	1	1			646-180000-2.3000- 101		
Chelle Called State (State State State)		an Malaura	to the second design of the second	and or concerned	L			a fall (hangan canang), kanyanyaya (umpo pipeni teel pol pol hali caba a dala ujaharmahan ka (nob) pina ang
N Marine South and an and a south	e, rassive solar pesign	la se	<u> </u>	<u>.</u>	r	·		۲۰۰۹۰ (۱۹۹۷) (۱۹۷۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ ۱۹۹۹ - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱۹۹۷) - ۲۰۰۹ (۱
TBD	N6.1 Heating Load	N.S.		2				an a
TBD	N6.2 Cooling Load	5.75		2				
A	I7. Adaptable Bullding	1					n	
TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units	MARK	1	ľ	1			
Ten	N7 2 Eult-Function Independent Reptal Lipit		h				-	an a baile and a barren of the rest of the rest of the second of the second of the second second second second
No. Control Control Control		1 Second Col	+		Lannar	Lannana	L	
1 <u>200-02000-0200</u> 0	is, resiliency	Cognition of the		····	F	I		
CALCED STREET	NS: 1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal Adopt Fordied Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P56, or Sciencic Evolution)	CONT OF	1		1	1		
TBD	N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings	*	1	1	1	1	[
	19. Social Equity in Community	[1	1		- Interdevelopment		
Ten	NR 1. Diverse Worldorge (Sumilar Diversity of Local Hing)	1.012100		1		<u></u>	<u> </u>	
The second second second		1000						
180	(NS.2) COMMUNICATION (Disadvanteged Community)	Section 5	i 1		1			
O.OTHER		(22. E. S	and the second second	ar air i	6 3 - Li		<u>(1997)</u>	
Yes	01. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints	Y	R	R	R	R	R	
Yes.	2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors	2	1	0.5	}	1	0.5	
TBD	3. Orientation and Training to Occupants-Conduct Educational Walkthroughs	Cost	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7.
How Frank	14. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building		ł			0.3	0.0	<u> </u>
ТВО	Professionals		1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	
() ()	05. Home System Monitors	-			****			
A STATES TARGET ST 1	05 1 Energy Home System Monitors	15 20 0					}	a Serve MS Classification (Mallor (Mallor (Caracteria and Car
		35.9619.79 863.9778		1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
TBD	OD.2. Water Home System Monitors	JE COM		Lunnan]	j	1	a na mana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana an
4	96. Green Building Education	L	ļ	• • • • • • •	~	····	T	
180	O6.1 Marketing Green Building		2					
T&D	O6.2 Green Building Signage		1	0.5	-		0.5	
TBD)7. Green Appraisal Addendum	ang dalaman M	10		6			1
	n new war nyprinnen river and third there the Branch at Plan has been to the		<u>K</u>	- ^{rr}		1		
Reference (service) (service)	is, because butability rian and third-rarry vehication of rian implementation	199	a	I	I	1 1	1	

.

۰,

New Home Single Family Version 7.0	-812	n-raikiter 28			enneseres. 1		
Summary	1.1	- CF - M	géén de	to the			
Total Available Sont Conservation Co		H WOUNDOWNER		and a second second	COUPER VIEW	Complex Statistics of the	
	301.5	31	74.5	60	87	49	
Minimum Points Required in Specific Categories	50	2	25	6	8	6	TX 1465000 A Science of Company reports a second biological basis of the second second second second second sec
Total Points Achieved	77.7		新学校			音樂	
		1997 An 1997	1999 - Color 10	Section Addition	Charles and the second	的的现在分词中的	

۰.

۰.

Attachment 5 Page 26



December 10, 2018 V5128B

TO: Carol Borck Planning Technician TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY 765 Portola Road Portola Valley, California 94028

SUBJECT:Supplemental Geotechnical Peer ReviewRE:New Residence, 848 Portola Road, Willow Grove – Lot 1PLN_ARCH 08-2018

At your request, we have completed a supplemental geotechnical peer review of the Site Development Permit application for the proposed residential development using the following documents:

- Supplemental Geotechnical Design Parameters (letter), prepared by Earth Systems Pacific, dated November 26, 2018;
- Civil Plans; including: Grading and Drainage Plan, Utility Plan, Erosion Control Plan, and Details (5 Sheets, 10-scale), prepared by Clifford Bechtel and Associates, dated November 30, 2018; and
- Third Submittal, Grading, Drainage and Utilities (letter), prepared by Cliff Bechtel and Associates, dated November 30, 2018.

In addition, we have reviewed pertinent technical documents from our office files.

DISCUSSION

The applicant is proposing construction of a new, 2,331 square-foot, two-story residence on a previously undeveloped lot within the 4-Lot Willow Grove development. In previous geotechnical reviews of a prior subdivision layout, and associated issues related to neighboring Sausal Creek, we recommended that an updated topographic survey of the site be performed and the Project Geotechnical Consultant consider the effects of ongoing active erosion of the creek bank. We also recommended that the geotechnical/civil consultants consider the potential for localized flooding of proposed

Central California Office 6417 Dogtown Road San Andreas, CA 95249-9640 (209) 736-4252 • Fax (209) 736-1212

www.cottonshires.com

Carol Borck Page 2

future residences within the subdivision. We understand that issues of potential site flooding are to be addressed to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

In our most recent geotechnical peer review letter, dated October 22, 2018, we recommended that supplemental geotechnical and civil engineering criteria be submitted, including design criteria for mitigating the potential for creek bank instability to encroach upon the proposed residential development. We noted that the existing creek bank, even if determined to be stable under the current conditions, is susceptible to vertical incision and lateral migration which could decrease the stability of the bank over time.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED ACTION

The referenced documents reveal that engineered mitigation elements in the form of buried reinforced concrete stitch piers have been proposed between the top of the creek bank and the proposed residential development. The piers are to be minimum 30-inch diameter reinforced concrete stitch piers, designed for a retained height of 17 feet, with a concrete grade beam along the top of the piers. The buried wall will be approximately 20 to 30 feet from the top of bank along the western portion of the property, and 5 to 15 feet from the top of bank in the northeastern portion of the property. The proposed detention tank will be inside the 30-foot creek setback, but protected by the stitch piers. We do not have geotechnical objections to the proposed buried stitch pier wall and recommend approval of the Site Development permit application from a geotechnical standpoint. The following should be performed prior to approval of building permits:

- **1.** <u>**Development Plans</u>** Structural plans should be generated that reflect the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Engineer.</u>
- 2. <u>Geotechnical Plan Review</u> The applicant's geotechnical consultant should review and approve all geotechnical aspects of the development plans (i.e., site preparation and grading, site drainage improvements and design parameters for foundations and retaining walls) to ensure that their recommendations have been properly incorporated.

The Development Plans and Geotechnical Plan Review letter should be submitted to the Town Geotechnical Consultant and Town Engineer for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The following should be performed prior to final (as-built) project approval:

3. <u>Geotechnical Construction Inspections</u> - The geotechnical consultant should inspect, test (as needed), and approve all geotechnical aspects of the project construction. The inspections should include, but not

necessarily be limited to: site preparation and grading, site surface and subsurface drainage improvements, and excavations for foundations and retaining walls prior to placement of steel and concrete. These inspections should be performed in general conformance with the Town construction inspection guidelines titled: *Requirements for Geotechnical Construction Inspection and Testing*.

The results of these inspections and the as-built conditions of the project should be described by the geotechnical consultant in a letter and submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval prior to final (as-built) project approval.

LIMITATIONS

This geotechnical peer review has been performed to provide technical advice to assist the Town with discretionary permit decisions. Our services have been limited to review of the documents previously identified, and a visual review of the property. Our opinions and conclusions are made in accordance with generally accepted principles and practices of the geotechnical profession. This warranty is in lieu of all other warranties, either expressed or implied.

Respectfully submitted,

COTTON, SHIRES AND ASSOCIATES, INC. TOWN GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT

John M. Wallace Principal Engineering Geologist CEG 1923

Patrick O. Shires Senior Principal Geotechnical Engineer GE 770

JMW:POS:st





MEMORANDUM

DATE:December 19, 2018TO:Howard Young and Cynthia Richardson, Town of Portola ValleyFROM:Jeff Nelson & Nona Espinosa, NV5PROJECT:848 Portola Rd. # PLN_ARCH 07--2018PROJECT #s:SJ00717-131 &172SUBJECT:Review of Applicant Documents for 848 Portola Road

At your request, NV5 has completed the review of the following documents provided by the applicant for the Site Development Application at 848 Portola Road and has the following comments:

- Earth Systems Pacific REVISED Supplemental Geotechnical Design Parameters dated 11/26/18
- Clifford Bechtel Planning Set-848_Portola_Road dated 11/30/18
- Clifford Bechtel Planning Resubmittal 848 Portola Civil Letter dated 12/3/18

A. <u>GENERAL</u>

- 1. All items listed in the most current "Public Works and & Engineering Department Site Development Standard guidelines and Checklist" shall be reviewed and met. A completed and signed checklist by the project architect or engineer must be submitted with the building plans. This Document is available on the Town website.
- 2. All items listed in the most current "Public Works & engineering Department Pre-Construction Meeting for Site Development" shall be reviewed and understood. This document is available on the Town website.
- 3. CKA Architects Civil Sheet C-1.0 dated 9/14/18 indicate that the RSP ends at an area where that creek bottom has a relatively steep slope. Unless additional creek stabilization measures are taken, the toe of the RSP will eventually be undermined by scour and both vertical and lateral erosion will occur in the streambed.
- 4. Cliff Bechtel's Bank Stabilization memo states that the flow velocities cited in the Schaaf and Wheeler (S&W) report apply to a future channel geometry described in Lea & Sung's Creek Restoration Plan, and do not apply to the existing conditions. Based on the existing condition hydraulic model results cited in the S&W report, the flow velocities in the creek are expected to be below 20 feet per second. Therefore, it is our opinion that the recently placed 24-inch-diameter rock slope protection (RSP) is acceptable for the current Sausal Creek flow conditions.
- 5. Based on the S&W flow analysis, the creek channel will not be able to contain the 100-year flow event under existing conditions. S&W's HECRAS model predicts that approximately 200 cubic feet per second (CFS) of flow will spill over Portola Road and sheet flow through the project site and is expected to be contained within the access driveway for both properties. In addition, approximately 100 CFS of flow will overtop the west bank of the creek downstream of the culvert, near the existing wall, and sheet flow

across the project site; this flow is expected to flow along the 30-foot setback of the property. As long as these overland flow paths are not blocked, this flow pattern should have minimal effect upstream.

6. The Limited Geotechnical Engineering Study and Limited Geologic Hazards evaluation report submitted by the applicant included an analysis of the slope stability of the creek bank as it relates to the location of the proposed homes. This study indicates that the setbacks as presented in the current plans are adequate; we agree with this conclusion.

B. <u>SPECIFC (to be resolved before Planning approval)</u>

1. Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. Supplemental Geotechnical Peer Review letter dated October 22nd, 2018 recommends "the artificial portion of the creek either be stabilized, or the residence be protected from future erosion of this portion of Sausal Creek." We agree with this recommendation. All appropriate permits from agencies having jurisdiction over the creek, such as the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be obtained before any construction activities are performed in the creek bed. (We agree with the recommendation by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc dated December 10th, 2018. The proposed buried stitch pier wall layout is acceptable.)

C. <u>SPECIFIC (for consideration during building plan submittal)</u>

- 1. The plans dated 11/30/18 have been modified to add the proposed stitch pier and no other changes has been made per last NV5 review dated October 23rd, 2018. Therefore, the following items listed below should be performed prior to approval of building permit.
- 2. The proposed detention basin should be relocated outside of the 30-foot setback zone away from the creek top of bank. (Location of detention basin was not relocated outside of the 30-foot setback zone but the proposed installation of the buried stitch pier wall will protect the detention system at its present location, this is acceptable.)
- 3. Provide updated documentation describing the size of the out flow pipes from the sump pump and stormwater retention system. Demonstrate that the storm flow from the site does not exceed that of the pre-existing conditions.
- 4. Show 100-year flow arrows on building plans, especially at the end of the gravel driveway near the creek.
- 5. Civil and Landscape plans should show the stormwater overland flow path beyond the gravel driveway. Add a note to the drawings that says the overland flow path should remain clear and have no obstructions that impede overland flow at any time.
- 6. Any fencing along the 100-year storm flow path should have openings at the bottom to provide passage for 100-year flow event. The spillover area at the left top of bank and overland flow path area must be maintained by the property owner to be free of obstructions such as solid fences, elevated pads or berms. If any flow path obstructions are constructed, additional hydraulic analysis shall be required to determine if these blockages will create an increase in 100-year flood elevations upstream of the project. Any future improvements within the 30-foot setback must be approved by the Town Engineer prior to construction.
- 7. Per calculations provided in the previous submittal, please revise Detail 1 on Sheet C-3.0 to show that a minimum of a 20-foot-long detention pipe is required. The dimensions shown in the current detail show a 20-foot-long trench, but not a 20-foot-long pipe.

- 8. Provide adequate cover for all utilities along the gravel driveway. The 4-inch storm drain in front of the garage has less than 2 feet of cover, please indicate in the plans that storm drain pipe needs at least three feet of cover or call for the pipe to be encased in concrete.
- 9. Confirm that the Fire Marshall has approved the gravel firetruck turnaround.
- 10. Show all existing utilities and provide details for all proposed utilities in the building permit submittal.
- 11. Please install erosion mats or similar erosion control material around the perimeter of the bubbler box river cobble, and extend to the top of bank.

WOODSIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Prevention Division

808 Portola Rd. Portola Valley, CA ~ www.woodsidefire.org ~ Fire Marshal Denise Enea 650-851-6206 ALL CONDITIONS MUST MEET WFPD SPECIFICATIONS – go to www.woodsidefire.org for more info

BDLG & SPRINKLER PLAN CHECK AND INSPECTIONS

OJECT LOCATION:848 Portola Rd Jurisdiction: PV										
Owner/Architect/Project Manager:	Permit#:									
Sausal Creek Assoc	PLN 07-2018									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: New House										
Fees Paid: XYES X See Fee Comments Date: 5/3/18										
Fee Comments: CH#6735\$90.00 (plan review fee) paid by: Byldan Corp 5/21/18 MH CH#\$180.00 (plan check fee) paid by: not yet paid										
BUILDING PLAN CHECK COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:										
THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET IN ORDER TO PASS FINAL FIRE INSPECTION:										
1. At start of construction a 2' x 3' address sign will be posted in front of project.										
contrasting background.	2. At time of final the permanent address will be mounted and clearly visible from street w/minimum of 4" numbers on contrasting background.									
3. 100' defensible space required prior to start of construction	3. 100' defensible space required prior to start of construction.									
4. Upon final inspection 30' perimeter defensible space will be required per WFPD ordinance section 304.1.2.A										
5. Approved spark arrestor will be required on all installed chimneys including outside fireplaces. 6. Install Smoke and CO detectors per 2016 CBC.										
7. NFPA 13D Fire Sprinkler System to be installed. Sprinkler plans/calculations to be submitted under separate cover to										
WFPD. (www.woodsidefire.org)	WFPD. (www.woodsidefire.org)									
compliance with WFPD standards.	y dimensions are rev	ised during construction, it must maintain								
9. Driveway over 150' required to have fire truck turnaround	. Confirmed on plan	A1.0 located on 846 properties								
10. Fire Hydrant- Less than 238' to nearest fire hydrant.		M								
hydrant within 500' from the building capable of the rec	. A water supply for the supple for the super	fire protection shall mean a fire								
	landa now.									
RESUBMIT										
Provide easements documents describing the turnaround situ	ation on other proper	rty.								
Reviewed by:M. Hird	Date: 5/21/18	·								
Resubmit Approved wit	h Conditions	Approved without conditions								
Sprinkler Plans Approved: NO	Date:	Fees Paid: \$390 See Fee Comments								
As Built Submitted:	Date:	As Builts Approved Date:								
Fee Comments: CH#\$390.00 (fire sprinkler plan review) paid by: Not vet paid										
Rough/Hydro Sprinkler Inspection By:	Date:									
Sprinkler Inspection Comments:										
and a second										
$\mathbf{E}_{i} = 1 \mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}_{i} = -1 \mathbf{I}_{i} = \mathbf{Q}_{i} + 1 \mathbf{I}_{i} = \mathbf{D}_{i}$										
Final Bldg and/or Sprinkler Insp Bv:	Date:									
Comments:	Date:									
Comments:	Date:									

848 Portola Road Conservation Committee Comments

Committee members at site visit on May 18, 2018: Judith Murphy, Donald Eckstrom, and Dieter Walz

The drawing package shows a proposed future two story residence on a level lot, also identified as Parcel I. The lot size is 17,936 SF, and the prosed residence floor area is 2331SF, of which he first floor is 1336 SF.

Impervious Surfaces

The actual square footage of impervious surface beyond the ground floor area of the residence was not evident from the materials supplied to us by the Town. However, since the driveway is shared with that of the proposed residence on 850 Portola Road, and since the residence will be near the entrance to the property, it seems very modest relative to the lot size.

Landscape Plan

We thoroughly inspected the complete property for existing plant cover, and had the arborist's report for guidance on the trees.

We mostly concurred with this report, but we would like to either augment this report, or take exception in in some instances.

Trees # 1R & 2R are Quercus agrifolia (Coast Live Oak). We request that their removal be mitigated by planting two new Q. agrifolia in the area N/E of the new residence and Sausal Creek.

Tree # 3R is an Umbellularia californica (Bay Laurel). Despite its poor form and fair vigor, we question the wisdom of its removal on account of it partially stabilizing the creek bank. Eliminating one of its codominant leaders at the base and pruning/shaping the remaining one would not create a hazard; it might be a less costly alternative to creek stabilization than say Gabian revetments or similar.

Tree # 12, a Q. agrifolia, is not shown to be removed in the arborist's report, but on Drawing A 1.0, it is. We think it should be removed.

Trees # 10, # 21, and # 25 are not shown to be removed. The committee thinks they are not an asset to the property, but rather a liability; they should be removed, and mitigated by planting two new Q. agrifolia in appropriate locations relative to the new residence.

Tree # 29 was not found marked on the map. If it is the 10.8 inch diameter Q. agrifolia in the arborist's report, it probably should also be removed.

Tree # 33, a Q. agrifolia, maybe a hazard, and should be removed.

Trees # 35 (a Modesto Ash) & 36 (a Plum Tree) are not native and should be removed.

At ground level, at least half of this parcel is heavily overgrown and infested by non-native species like Rubus discolor (Himalayan Blackberry), Cytisus monspessulanus (French Broom), Thistles, various, etc. All of these should be removed, sooner rather than later, clear to the top of the creek embankment. We did not find any natives that are worth saving. Some of these will most likely reappear after clean-out and will require vigilance to prevent re-infestation.

Future planting should ideally be done from mid October to the end of November. A 5 gal size plant will always, in a very few years, outperform larger ones.

We appreciate that no irrigated turf is proposed. The plans show some drip irrigation next to the residence and along the driveway.

Plant List

Landscape Plans and related documents are shown on drawings L1 through L4. All proposed plants are native, require little water once established, and we second their selection.

Fencing

There is no fencing now, and none is shown on the documents supplied.

Exterior Lighting

Lighting is very modest. All light are directed downward. They should not present any issues to neighbors.

Submitted by Dieter Walz

Attachment 9 Page 36

cka









ROOF: CORRUGATED METAL WEATHERED COPPER




TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY STAFF REPORT

- TO: ASCC
- **FROM:** Cynthia Richardson, Planner
- **DATE:** January 14, 2019
- **RE:** Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a Two-Story Residence with Attached Garage, Tree Removal and New Landscaping, 850 Portola Road, Portola Valley Road LLC Residence, File # PLN_ARCH 08-2018.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the ASCC offer comments and directions to assist the applicant and project architect to make adjustments or clarifications that members conclude are needed before the commission considers final action on the application.

Lot Size	0.4118 acres (17,936 sf)	
Average Slope	12%		
AP Zone District	Code Requirement	Proposed	Remaining
Max Floor Area (13%)	2,332	2,331	1
85% of MFA	NA	NA	
Max Impervious Surface	NA	NA	
Coverage Limit (18.8%) 18.54.040(C)	3,371	2,314	1,057
Height	28'	28'	
Front Setback	50'	52'	
Side Setbacks	20'	17'	
Rear Setback	20'	64'	
Creek Setback	30' from top of bank	49'	
Parking Spaces	2 spaces	3 spaces	

PROJECT DATA

BACKGROUND

This is one of two properties adjacent to each other seeking ASCC approval. The property is zoned A-P (Administrative Professional) and is located within the Town Center Area Plan that is a sub-area plan within the General Plan. See attached Vicinity Map (Attachment 1). The project

includes the construction of one two-story single family residence with associated landscaping and tree removal.

There is a long history of the four parcels known as Sausal Creek. In 1995 the Town adopted an amendment to the zoning map to reclassify the area of the four lots from C-C to A-P. In addition the Town granted a CUP to establish a mixed residential and office use PUD with senior housing. This project was never constructed and all approvals have expired. In 2015, a lot line adjustment was approved to reconfigure the subject parcel along with three other nonconforming lots. (File # 43-214, recorded on July 14, 2016). The lot line adjustment allowed for each lot to be developed individually as permitted under the A-P zoning district. Within the A-P Zone District single-family dwellings are listed as principal uses. At the time the lot line adjustment was under review, the Town considered the development of the four individual parcels to be less intense compared to the PUD approved in 1995. The Commission stated that the lot line adjustment resulted in fewer single family residences, more office space, and less total square footage. The Town considered the proposed lot line adjustment to be a less intense use of the parcels and therefore approved the lot line adjustment.

CODE REQUIREMENTS

As required by Portola Valley Municipal Code (PVMC) 18.64.010.A.1 and 15.12.100.A and E of the Municipal Code, this application has been forwarded to the ASCC for review.

DISCUSSION

The 17,936 square foot property is accessed through a shared access easement off of Portola Road. Located to the west is Village Square Shopping Center, to the east and south are vacant parcels, to the rear are Sausal Creek and the Town of Woodside beyond. The property shares the access driveway with 844 Portola Road (Hallett Store), 846 Portola Road (a vacant property) and 848 Portola Road (separately under consideration by ASCC).

The request includes the construction of a 2,331 square foot two-story house new driveway, patios, tree removal and landscaping. The relatively flat lot would contain the new two-story home in a modern ranch style. The home would have an attached three car garage. The home includes a first floor with the main living areas and a guest suite. The second floor contains a master bedroom and two additional bedrooms. The proposed finish treatments for the new home include vertical board and batten natural wood siding with accents of painted stucco and horizontal wood siding. Roofing material includes corrugated metal roofing in a dark gray color. The color palette includes natural wood and warm gray and brown tones with dark metal windows frames and railings. All proposed materials and treatments meet town reflectivity guidelines. Colors and materials are presented in Attachment 9.

The ASCC should discuss if the proposed home is different enough in style and materials than the adjacent 848 Portola Road project. Staff has worked with the applicant to make sure there are differences in the homes, however the ASCC should make sure the applicant has gone far enough in making each home unique.

Landscaping is proposed around the structures and outdoor living areas. The plan includes the removal of 4 significant oaks which are located within the new house footprint. An additional 5 oaks will be removed due to the condition of the tree. There will be 10 replacement oak trees. Additional tree removal information can be found on sheet A1.0 and in the Arborist report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services (Attachment 2). Tree replacement planting can be found on sheet L1.

Compliance with floor area, impervious surface, height, and setback standards

As shown in the table on page one of this staff report, all of the measurable aspects of the project are at or below the allowed maximums within the A-P Zoning District, including floor area, height and setbacks. Within the A-P zoning designation floor area that includes vent shafts, courts and floor area permanently allocated for parking or loading do not count towards floor area (PVMC 18.54.050).

The owners of 846, 848 and 850 Portola Road have joined together and have submitted an application for rezoning of these three properties from A-P to R-1/20M. This process is being reviewed simultaneously therefore the project has been reviewed against both zoning designations. The applicant has supplied a zoning compliance sheet for the proposed R-1/20 zoning regulations and can be found in your plan set as sheet R-1/20 for informational purposes only. The current design meets the R-1/20M zoning regulations as described in the table below. However, the current review before the Commission is subject to the A-P standards.

Lot Size	0.4118 acres (17,936 sf)		
Average Slope	12%		
R-1/20M	Code Requirement	Proposed	Remaining
Max Floor Area	3,701	2,984	717
85% of MFA	3,146	2,984	162
Max Impervious Surface	4,209	3,959	250
Height	28'/34'	28'	
Front Setback	20'	52'	
Side Setbacks	10'	17'	
Rear Setback	20'	64'	
Parking Spaces	2 covered	3 covered	

Design Guidelines Review – Siting, Mass/Bulk, Scale, Exterior Materials

The project was reviewed against the Town's Design Guidelines and was found to be substantially in conformance.

- 1. The size, siting and design of buildings, individually and collectively, tend to be subservient to the natural setting and serve to retain and enhance the rural qualities of the town. (Siting and Scale)
- 2. The proposed project will blend in with the natural environment in terms of materials, form and color. (Architectural Design)
- 3. The location, design and construction of the development project will minimize disturbances to the natural terrain and scenic vistas. (Grading)
- 4. The proposed project utilizes minimal lighting so that the presence of development at night is difficult to determine. (Lighting)

5. The proposed landscape plan will preserve the qualities of the natural environment through the use of native plant materials and provide a blended transition to adjacent open areas. (Landscaping)

Grading and Drainage

The project's proposed cut, fill and total grading work for the driveway, building pad, and site total are shown in the table below. The table illustrates that the proposed totals are within the amount requiring ASCC review (100-999 cubic yards). Total soil import for the site is 190 cubic yards. The majority of the grading that occurs outside the building footprint is for the driveway and to soften the grading from the raised finished floor. The finished floor elevation is slightly raised to account for any future creek overtopping. Thorough analysis of the creek has been completed by the Town Geologist, Town Engineer and the applicant's consultants. Grading and drainage plans can be found on sheet C-1.0.

(in cubic yards)	Cut	Fill	Total
Outside Building Footprint	15	220	235
Within Building Footprint	15	0	15
Site Total	30	220	250
Net Import			190

Landscaping

The site is currently undeveloped. Various types of Oak trees are scattered throughout the site. There are also a few Black walnut and Acacia trees on the property. An Arborist report was prepared for the project by Kielty Arborist Services dated August 25, 2017 (Attachment 2). A tree status plan including tree numbering associated with the Arborist Report can be found on sheet A1.0. The applicant is proposing tree replacement with oaks

The proposed planting plan can be found on sheet L1 in the plan set package. The project proposal includes a fully landscaped site with all native vegetation. Irrigation notes, calculations and details can be found on sheets L3 and L4.

Existing fencing is located along the common property line with Village Square. Three foot tall wire mesh fencing is proposed to connect from the house to the southern property line and then run along the southern property line in a western direction. One additional three foot tall wire mesh fence is proposed to connect from the existing fence on the western property line to the house at the north western corner. No additional fencing is proposed.

Lighting

Exterior house lighting is shown on sheets A2.1 and A 2.2 and cut sheets are provided in Attachment 3. For the most part exterior house lighting has been kept to a minimum. The garage door lights must be reduced to only one light or the two lights combined may not exceed 1,125 lumens.

There are five landscape path lights proposed. Three fixtures are located along the driveway and two at the western side of the home.

Sustainability Aspects of Project

An Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist can be found on sheet L0; because there is no turf and all plants are native or low water use, the water use efficiency checklist is not required. The project architect has provided the Green Point checklist (Attachment 4) targeting 78 points for the project.

Committee Recommendations

<u>Town Geologist.</u> The Town Geologist, in his memo dated October 23, 2018 (Attachment 5), recommended approval of the site development permit, with continued involvement of the geotechnical consultant in the planning and building process.

<u>Town Engineer</u>. The Town Engineer, in his memo dated October 23, 2018 (Attachment 6), recommended approval of the project with specific conditions.

<u>Fire Marshal</u>. The Fire Marshal, in his memo dated May 21, 2018 (Attachment 7), included standard conditions. The Fire truck turn around located on either 846 or 848 Portola Road must have a recorded easement for the use of 850 Portola Road.

<u>Conservation Committee.</u> The Conservation Committee reviewed the project on May 18, 2018 and provided a memo (Attachment 8). The Committee was supportive of the project with some augmented tree replacement for the oaks being removed. The applicant has revised the plans to add replacement trees as requested by the Conservation Committee. The Committee also requested the removal of all non-native species like Rubus discolor, Cytisus monspessulanus, Thistles and various other non-natives. This includes removal to the top of the creek bank.

Public Comments

No public comments have been received as of the writing of this report.

Unresolved Issues

There are unresolved issues that the ASCC should consider:

- Style of two homes ASCC should make sure there are unique differences in the two homes proposed.
- Reduction in light fixtures The lighting at the face of the garage must either be reduced in the total lumens or one fixture removed.
- Tree removal Further clarification should be discussed.

ATTACHEMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Arborist Report prepared by Keilty Arborist Services dated August 25, 2017.
- 3. Lighting cut sheet
- 4. Green Point checklist
- 5. Town Geologist memo, dated October 23, 2018.
- 6. Town Engineer memo, dated October 23, 2018.
- 7. Fire Marshal memo, dated May 21, 2018.
- 8. Conservation Committee memo, dated May 18, 2018.
- 9. Colors and materials
- 10. Architectural Plans (ASCC only)

Report approved by: Laura Russell, Planning and Building Director



Attachment 2 Page 43

Kielty Arborist Services LLC Certified Arborist WE#0476A P.O. Box 6187 San Mateo, CA 94403 650- 515-9783

August 25, 2017

Clarum Homes Attn: John Suppes 412 Olive Avenue PO Box 60970 Palo Alto, CA 94306



Site: 846 Portola Road Parcel #3, Portola Valley, CA

Dear Mr. Suppes,

As requested on Wednesday, August 9, 2017, I visited the above site for the purpose of inspecting and commenting on the trees. A new home is being designed for this site and your concern as to the future health and safety of the trees has prompted this visit.

Method:

All inspections were made from the ground; the trees were not climbed for this inspection. The trees in question were located on a map provided by you. The trees were then measured for diameter at 48 inches above ground level (DBH or diameter at breast height). The trees were given a condition rating for form and vitality. The trees condition rating is based on 50 percent vitality and 50 percent form, using the following scale.

1	-	29	Very Poor
30	-	49	Poor
50	-	69	Fair
70	-	89	Good
90	-	100	Excellent

The height of the trees were measured using a Nikon Forestry 550 Hypsometer. The spread was paced off. Comments and recommendations for future maintenance are provided.

846 Po Survey	ortola Road 8/25/17			(2)	
Tree# 1R	Species Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	DBH 17.1	CON 60	HT/SP 50/35	Comments Fair vigor, poor to fair form, leans south, suppressed.
2 R	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	9.3	45	35/20	Poor vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed.
3 R	Coast live oak 13.6- (Quercus agrifolia)	17.8	60	60/35	Fair vigor, poor form, codominant at 2 feet, recently exposed tree due to failure.
4 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	12.1	45	35/20	Fair vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed.
5 R	Black walnut (Juglans nigra)	14.9	45	70/35	Fair vigor, fair form, history of limb loss.
6 R	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	26.1	45	55/50	Fair vigor, poor form, heavy lean at 45 degrees to south.
7 R	Acacia (Acacia dealbata)	13.8	40	45/40	Good vigor, poor form, heavy lean at 45 degrees, invasive species.
8 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	10.3	50	30/20	Fair vigor, fair form, heavily suppressed.
9 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	32.0	50	60/50	Good vigor, poor form, heavy lean to south, needs high level of maintenance, near eroding creek bank, creek eroding tension side of tree lean, hazard.
10 R	Black walnut (Juglans nigra)	9.2	40	25/25	Poor vigor, poor form, heavily suppressed on creek bank.
11 R	Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>)	30est	80	70/55	Good vigor, good form, on eroding creek bank, heavier towards creek area.
12*	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	38est	65	70/50	Good vigor, fair form, near recent tree failure, heavier into neighbor's property, aesthetically pleasing, large limb failure at 25 feet in past with a good amount of reaction wood formed, recommended to prune and to expose root crown.

4

846 Po Survey	rtola Road 8/25/17			(3)	
Tree# 13R	Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	DBH 30est	CON 0	HT/SP 0	Comments DEAD FAILED TREE.
14 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	15.6	45	60/30	Fair vigor, poor form, top heavy, recently exposed due to tree failure, poor live crown ratio, suppressed.
15 R	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	18.4	50	70/35	Fair vigor, fair form, top heavy, recently exposed due to tree failure, poor live crown ratio, suppressed.
16 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	7.6	50	20/15	Fair vigor, fair form, heavily suppressed. recently exposed due to tree failure.
17 R	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	28.1	40	70/45	Fair vigor, poor form, large limb failure at 5 feet has created large scar open to decay, decay on tension side of tree lean, HAZARD.
18 R	Valley oak (Quercus lobata)	21.2	50	50/35	Fair vigor, poor to fair form, leans to south suppressed, abundance of lower dead wood.
19*	Redwood 20-20- (Sequoia semperviren	10est s)	65	100/40	Fair vigor, fair form, drought stressed.
20	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	18.5	50	50/40	Fair vigor, poor form, suppressed, leans into property.
21	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	34.3	65	65/45	Good vigor, fair form, decay at base, recommended to explore extend of decay, this may warrant removal of the tree, aesthetically pleasing.
22	Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)	26.6	60	65/45	Fair to poor vigor, fair form, dieback, recommended to inspect for root crown rot.
23 R	English walnut (Juglans regia)	7.5	45	20/15	Fair to poor vigor, poor form, suppressed.
24 R.	English walnut (Juglans regia)	8.8	40	20/15	Fair to poor vigor, poor form, suppressed.

846 Pc	ortola Road 8/25/17			(4)
Tree#	y: Species	DBH	CON	HT/SP Cor
25*	Redwood	30est	70	100/35 Fair
	(Sequota sempervire	ns)		sym
26*	Redwood	30est	70	100/35 Fair
	(Sequoia sempervire	ens)		sym

27* Redwood 30-25est 70 (Sequoia sempervirens)

*-Indicates tree on neighboring property **R-**Indicates recommended tree removal



(Λ)

mments

- r vigor, fair form, minor drought stressed nptoms.
- r vigor, fair form, minor drought stressed ptoms.
- 100/35 Fair vigor, fair to poor form, minor drought stress symptoms, codominant at base.

Site conditions:

The parcel is located on an undeveloped piece of land. Many large native trees are on site. No care to any of the trees have been applied to the trees in the past. The largest oak tree on site(#13) has recently failed leaving remaining trees open to prevailing winds. This tree likely used to lean heavily into the property as the neighboring oak tree #12 is a large upright tree. The creek bank at the rear of the property has been slowly eroding. Two large oak trees are on the eroding creek bank.

Showing large failed oak tree laying on ground in center of lot

Summary:

The majority of the trees on site are native oak trees mixed with black walnut trees, an acacia and two English walnut trees. Redwood trees were also surveyed on the neighboring properties. Many of the trees on site are in poor condition from growing in suppressed conditions. Building on this site would be impossible without the removal of some of the trees.

846 Portola Road 8/25/17



Trees #1-6 are all located in close proximity to each other. All of these trees are leaning heavily to the south as a result of growing in suppressed conditions. These trees all are tall for their diameter measurement as they are in a grove. Trees that are grown in a grove often have poor taper and develop leans as they are in competition with one another for sunlight. Failed oak tree #13 once protected these trees from prevailing winds. Since oak tree #13 has failed this grove of trees is now at high risk of tree failures as they are now open to prevailing winds, therefore these trees are recommended for removal.

Showing exposed trees

Acacia tree #7 is an extremely invasive species that should be removed regardless of any proposed plans to develop the lot. The tree is growing at a 45 degree lean to the south.

Trees #8-11 are all located at the back of the property on the eroding creek bank. Oak tree #8 a smaller oak tree when compared to the surrounding oak trees and is heavily suppressed. Oak tree #9 has a heavy lean to the south. The eroding creek bank is on the tension side of the tree's lean making this tree a hazard to the property. Black walnut tree #10 is located on the edge of the eroding creek bank. Oak tree #11 is in good condition despite being on the edge of the eroding creek bank. All of these trees are compromised as the creek bank will continue to erode raising the risk of a tree failure, therefore removal is recommended.



Oak tree #12 is located on the property line near the rear of the property and is considered a shared tree with the neighbor. This tree is one of the largest trees on site. The tree is aesthetically pleasing and is heavier into the neighbor's property. A large limb failure at 25 feet has occurred in the past and a good amount of reaction wood has formed to seal off the wound. It is recommended to prune this tree for end weight reduction to reduce the risk of a limb failure. Also, it is recommended to expose the tree's root crown as the crown appears to be buried. A drill test should be performed at 25 feet where the limb has failed to explore the extent of decay. This will give a better understanding on the tree's risk of failure at this location.

Showing area of past failure at 25 feet

846 Portola Road 8/25/17

(6)

Trees #14-16 are located in close proximity to one another. These trees were once suppressed by the large oak tree #13 that has recently failed. These trees are now exposed to prevailing winds raising their risk of failing as they all have poor taper therefore removal is recommended.



Oak tree #17 has lost a large leader at its base creating a large scar on the tension side of the tree's lean. This tree is a hazard to the property as the tree will never be able to seal off the large wound.

Showing large limb failure of tree #17

Oak tree #18 is poorly located in the center of the lot. This tree also leans to the south as a result of growing in suppressed conditions. This tree will likely need to be removed as it restricts the buildable area.

Redwood trees #19 and 25-17 are all located on the neighbor's property. These trees are all exhibiting some minor drought stressed symptoms as a result of being grown outside of their native range. All proposed site plans must take these trees roots into account. Buildings shall stay at least 25 feet from these trees.

Oak trees 20-22 are located in the corner of the property to the west. These trees are in a good location away from the buildable area and can be retained. Oak tree #21 has a decayed area at its base. A drill test is recommended at the base of this tree to explore the extent of decay. This may or may not warrant removal of this tree. English walnut trees #23 and #24 are both in decline and should be removed. The following tree protection plan is a generalized tree protection plan. Once plans are received the tree protection plan is to be amended. The tree protection plan will help to insure the future health of the retained trees on site.

Tree Protection Plan:

Tree protection zones should be established and maintained throughout the entire length of the project. Fencing for the protection zones should be 6 foot tall metal chain link type supported my 2 inch metal poles pounded into the ground by no less than 2 feet. The support poles should be spaced no more than 10 feet apart on center. The location for the protection fencing should be as close to the dripline as possible still allowing room for construction to safely continue. Signs should be placed on fencing signifying "Tree Protection Zone - Keep Out". No materials or equipment should be stored or cleaned inside the tree protection zones. Any roots to be cut should be inspected by the site arborist. The site arborist may recommend fertilizing or irrigation if root cutting is significant. Cut all roots clean with a saw or loppers. Roots to be left exposed for a period of time should be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist. The site arborist will be on site for the excavation the driveway.

846 Portola Road 8/25/17 (7)

Trenching for irrigation, electrical, drainage or any other reason should be hand dug when beneath the driplines of protected trees. Hand digging and carefully laying pipes below or beside protected roots will dramatically reduce root loss of desired trees thus reducing trauma to the entire tree. Trenches should be backfilled as soon as possible with native material and compacted to near its original level. Trenches that must be left exposed for a period of time should also be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist. Plywood over the top of the trench will also help protect exposed roots below.

Normal irrigation should be maintained throughout the entire length of the project for the imported trees. The only retained imported trees will be the neighbor's redwood trees. These trees will require irrigation during the warm season months. Some irrigation may be required during the winter months depending on the seasonal rainfall. During the summer months the redwood trees should receive heavy flood type irrigation 2 times a month. During the fall and winter 1 time a month should suffice. Mulching the root zone of protected trees will help the soil retain moisture, thus reducing water consumption. None of the native trees on this site shall be irrigated unless their root zone are traumatized. This is to be decided by the Site Arborist during inspections.

When installing drainage and utility lines close to or beneath tree protection zones hand digging will be required in order to not injure the trees root system. The site arborist must be on site when work within the tree protection zone takes place in order to inspect, document and to offer mitigation measures.

An inspection of the tree protection fencing may be required. Other inspections will be on an as needed basis. This information should be kept on site at all times. The information included in this report is believed to be true and based on sound arboricultural principles and practices.

Sincerely,

Kevin R. Kielty Certified Arborist WE#0476A David P. Beckham Certified Arborist WE#10724A



Attachment 3

HINKLEY & R.



HINKLEY LIGHTING. INC. 33000 PIN OAK PARKWAY I AVON LAKE OHIO 440'2 [PH] 440.653.5500 [F] 440.653.5555 HINKLEYLIGHTING COM I FREDRICKRAMOND COM

BRONZE	
WIDTH:	6.0"
HEIGHT:	6.0"
WEIGHT:	3.5 LBS
MATERIAL:	EXTRUDED ALUMINUM
GLASS:	ETCHED LENS
BACKPLATE WIDTH:	4.5"
BACKPLATE HEIGHT:	4.5"
SOCKET:	8W LED
	*INCLUDED
DARK SKY:	YES
LED INFO:	
LUMENS:	600
COLOR TEMP:	3000k
CRI:	96
INCANDESCENT EQUIVALENCY:	1 x 50W
DIMMABLE:	Yes, on any Incandescent, MLV, ELV, or C-L dimmer.
EXTENSION:	6.8"
TTO:	3.0"
CERTIFICATION:	C-US WET RATED
VOLTAGE:	120V
UPC:	640665176889

AT HINKLEY, WE EMBRACE THE DESIGN PHILOSOPHY THAT YOU CAN MERGE TOGETHER THE LIGHTING, FURNITURE. ART, COLORS AND ACCESSORIES YOU LOVE INTO A BEAUTIFUL ENVIRONMENT THAT DEFINES YOUR OWN PERSONAL STYLE. WE HOPE YOU WILL BE INSPIRED BY OUR COMMITMENT TO KEEP YOUR 'LIFE AGLOW.'





Page 52

LEDGE LED PATH LIGHT

6081



PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

Sleek linear design blends seamlessly into pathways while providing soft, directional illumination



LANDSCAPE LIGHTING

Fixture Type:
Catalog Number:
Project:
location:

SPECIFICATIONS

Input:	9-15VAC (Transformer is required)
Power:	3.0W / 4.5VA
Brightness:	Up to 105 lm
CRI:	90
Rated Life:	60,000 hours

FEATURES

- IP66 rated, Protected against powerful water jets
- · Factory sealed water tight fixtures
- · Translucent lens provides uniform light distribution
- · Mounting stake, 6 foot lead wire, and direct burial gel filled wire nuts are included
- · Recommended spacing for installation: Residential: 8 to 10ft; Commercial: 5 to 7ft
- Maintains constant lumen output against voltage drop
- UL & cUL 1838 Listed

ORDERING NUMBER

		Color T	emp	Finis	1
6081	Linear Path	27 30	2700K Warm White 3000K Pure White	BK BZ	Black on Aluminum Bronze on Aluminum

6081-___BK

Example: 6081-30BK





waclighting.com Phone (800) 526.2588 Fax (800) 526.2585 Headquarters/Eastern Distribution Center 44 Harbor Park Drive Port Washington, NY 11050 Central Distribution Center 1600 Distribution Ct Lithia Springs, GA 30122 Western Distribution Center 1750 Archibald Avenue Ontario, CA 91760

WAC Lighting retains the right to modify the design of our products at any time as part of the company's continuous improvement program.

NAC

LANDSCAPE LIGHTING

Additional Mounting Stake

9000-ST9-BK

Durable PVC stake

LEDGE LED PATH LIGHT

6081

Surface Mount Flange/Stake

Includes three 7 inch threaded stainless steel stabilizing pins for ground mounting or surface mounts with four screws or over a junction box

5000-SCP-BZ Bronze on Aluminum

Guardian Mount

Heavy duty stainless steel spike to position fixture. Formed from a single piece of metal

9000-SP9-BZ Stainless Steel

Magnetic Transformers

Stainless Steel, 12-15V output, IP65 rated, UL 1838 listed See transformer spec sheet for details and its accessories

9075-TRN-SS 75W Max **9150-TRN-SS** 150W Max **9300-TRN-SS** 300W Max **9600-TRN-SS** 600W Max



DECEIVED JAN 04 2019 TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

waclighting.com Phone (800) 526.2588 Fax (800) 526.2585 Headquarters/Eastern Distribution Center 44 Harbor Park Drive Port Washington, NY 11050 **Central Distribution Center** 1600 Distribution Ct Lithia Springs, GA 30122 Western Distribution Center 1750 Archibald Avenue Ontario, CA 91760

WAC Lighting retains the right to modify the design of our products at any time as part of the company's continuous improvement program.

Page 54

1.43

	whether w
the	1000
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	100
	1.6
CroonDointDATCA	1000
in convuntant eis	
A PRODUCT OF DUILD IT OFFERN	

## **NEW HOME RATING SYSTEM, VERSION 7.0**

SINGLE FAMILY CHECKLIST

The GreenPoint Rated checklist tracks green features incorporated into the home. GreenPoint Rated is administered by Build It Green, a non-profit whose mission is to promote healthy, energy and resource efficient buildings in California.

The minimum requirements of GreenPoint Rated are: verification of 50 or more points; Earn the following minimum points per category: Commulty (2) Energy (25), Indoor Air Quality/Health (6), Resources (6), and Water (6); and meet the prerequisites CALGreen Mandatory, E5.2, H6.1, J5.1, O1, O7.

Directions for Use: Column A is a dropdown menu with the options of "Yes", "No", or "TBD" or a range of percentages to allocate points. Select the appropriate dropdown and the appropriate points will appear in the blue "points achieved" column.

The criteria for the green building practices listed below are described in the Green Point Rated New Home Rating Manual. For more information please visit www.buildifgreen.org/greenpointrated Build It Green Is not a code enforcement agency.

Poinis Achieved:	MAY 02 2018	
Certification Level:	Certified	
	TOWN OF PORTOLA VALU	Ξγ
POINTS REQU	RED	
	#Minimum Points	
	MAchieved Points	

25

LL I () U (LIL) 

18.5 20.0 18,5 13.0 ne is only GreenPoint Rated if all features are verified by a Certified GreenPoint Rater and certified by Build it Green. 8.0 6 New Home Single Family Version 7.0 ject Name: 850 Portola Road ject Street: Portola Road ject Crty: Portola Valley ject Zio: 94028 Points Achier E C MEASURES ALGreen CALGreen Res (REQUIRED) 4 1 Yes SITE A1. Construction Footprint (Site Preservation Plan Beyond Local Ordinance or 40% of Site Undeveloped) Yes 1 1 A2. Job Site Construction Waste Diversion A2.1 75% C&D Waste Diversion (Including Alternative Daily Cover) 2 TBD A2.2 65% C&D Waste Diversion (Excluding Alternative Daily Cover) TBD 2 A2.3 Recycling Rates from Third-Party Verified Mixed-Use Waste Facility Yes 1 A3. Recycled Content Base Material (Minimum 25% Post-Consumer Content) Yes 1 1 A4. Heat Island Effect Reduction (Non-Roof) TBD 1 TBD A5. Construction Environmental Quality Management Plan Including Flush-Out A6. Stormwater Control: Prescriptive Path A6.1 Permeable Paving Material Yes A6.2 Filtration and/or Bio-Retention Features 1 TBD A6.3 Non-Leaching Roofing Materials TBD 1 A6 4 Smart Stormwater Street Design TBD A7. Stormwater Control: Performance Path (Treat 85% of Annual Runolf Onsite 2 TBD FOUNDATION No B1. Fly Ash and/or Slag in Concrete (Minimum of 30%) 0 1 TBD B2. Radon-Resistant Construction 2 Yes **B3.** Foundation Drainage System 2 2 Yes B4. Moisture Controlled Crawlspace 1 1 **B5. Structural Pest Controls** Yes B5.1 Termite Shields and Separated Exterior Wood-to-Concrete Connections 4 1 B5.2 Plant Trunks, Bases, or Stems at Least 36 inches from the Foundation TBD LANDSCAPE Enter the landscape area percentage. Points capped at 6 for less than 15%. 40.00% TBD C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning) 1 C2. Three Inches of Mulch in Planting Beds Yes 1 1 C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes TBD C3.1 No Invasive Species Listed by Cal-IPC 1 Yes C3.2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size (Limited Maintenance) 1 1 C3.3 Drought Tolerant, California Native, Mediterranean Species, or Other Yes Appropriate Species .3 3 C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Yes Areas Less Than Eight Feet Wide 2 2 TBD C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area 2 C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature (at least 50% of West Facing Glazing and Wells Shaded) TRD 1 1 Yes C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System 2 2 Yes C7. One Inch of Compost in the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Soil (with Soil Testing 2 2 TBD C8. Rainwater Harvesting System 3 TBD C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System 1 TBD C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation 2 TBD C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget 1 C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site C12.1 Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape Elements and Fencing TBD 1 Yes C13. Reduced Light Pollution (Exterior lighting fixtures shielded and directed downward) 1 1 Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s) 1

C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification

TBD

@ Build It Green

x	Page 55
1	Tage 00
New Home Sindle Family Version 7.0	_accessed_2555760302476445257661304246457625205044464545938646354244495886525762
TBD C16. Maintenance Contract with Certified Professional	
D. STRUCTURAL FRAME AND BUILDING ENVELOPE	
TBD D1.1 Joists, Rafters, and Studs at 24 Inches on Center	1 2
TBD D1.2 Non-Load Bearing Door and Window Headers Sized for Load	
TBD D1.3 Advanced Framing Measures	2
D3. Engineered Lumber	
Yes D3.1 Engineered Beams and Headers	3
TB0 D3.2 Wood I-Joists or Web Trusses for Floors	
TBD D3.4 Engineered or Finger-Jointed Studs for Vertical Applications	
TBD D3.5 OSB for Subfloor	0.5
TBD D3.6 OSB for Wall and Roof Sheathing	0.5
D5. FSC-Certified Wood	
TBD D5.1 Dimensional Lumber, Studs, and Timber	6
TBD D5.2 Panel Products	3
D6. Solid Wall Systems	
TBD D6.2 At Least 90% of Exterior Walls	
TBD D6.3 At Least 90% of Roofs	
TBD D7. Energy Heels on Roof Trusses	
D9. Reduced Pollution Entering the Home from the Garage	
TBD D9.1 Detached Garage	2
TBD D9.2 Mitigation Strategies for Attached Garage	
D10. Structural Pest and Rot Controls D10.1 All Wood Located At Least 12 Inches Above the Soil	
TBD D10.2 Wood Framing Treated With Borates or Factory-Impregnated, or Wall Materials Other Than Wood	
D11. Moisture-Resistant Materials in Wet Areas (such as Kitchen, Bathrooms,	
E EXTERIOR	
TBD E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking	1
TBD E2. Flashing installation Third-Party Verified	2
TBD E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials	
E5. Durable Roofing Materials	
Yes E5.1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly	1
F INSULATION	
F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content	
TBD F1.1 Walls and Floors	
F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for	
Low Emissions F2 1 Walls and Floors	
TBD F2.2 Ceilings	
F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants	
TBD F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors	
TBD F3.2 Interior and Exterior	
G. PLUMBING	
G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water	
TBD G1.2 Water Sense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution	
TBD G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution	2
G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures	
yes     G2.1 vvalerSense Showerneads 1.8gpm with Matching Compensation Valve     G2.2 WaterSense Bathroom Faucets 1.0 gpm	
G2.3 WaterSense Toilets with a Maximum Performance (MaP) Threshold of No Less Than 500 Grams 1.28gpf OR 1.1 gpf	
TBD G3. Pre-Plumbing for Graywater System	
TBD G4. Operational Graywater System	3
IG6. Thermostatic Shower Valve or Auto-Diversion Tub Spout	
H1. Sealed Combustion Units	

#### Page 56

New Home Single Family	Version 7.0			ARTING AND	N. ARRING	R. MILLION ROMA	NAMES OF COLOR	
Yes	H1 1 Sealed Combustion Furnace			T	4			
Yes	H12 Sealed Combustion Water Heater							
TRD	11.2 Outed Competentine Tensor Hoden Barbank Barting System	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		*****	
150	H2. High Performing Zoned Hydronic Radiant Heating System	CONSIGNATION OF		1 [	1			
<u>.</u>	H3. Ellective Ductivork			1			Course I made a verse	
res	H3.1 Educi Mastic on Educi Joints and Seams	1		-1-+	~~~~~		****	
TBD	H3.2 Pressure Balance the Luctwork System			1				
Yes	H4. ENERGY STAR® Bathroom Fans Per HVI Standards with Air Flow Verified				1			
	H5. Advanced Practices for Cooling	CI 1003/2008/2009						
TBD	H5.1 ENERGY STAR Ceiling Fans in Living Areas and Bedrooms			1			*****	
	H6. Whole House Mechanical Ventilation Practices to Improve Indoor Air Quality							
TBD	H6.1 Meet ASHRAE 62.2-2010 Ventilation Residential Standards	14	R	R	R	R	R	
TBD	H6.2 Advanced Ventilation Standards				2			
TBD	H6 3 Outdoor Air is Filtered and Tempered				1			
	H7. Effective Range Hood Design and Installation							
TBD	H7.1 Effective Range Hood Ducting and Design				1			
TBD	H7.2 Automatic Range Hood Control				1			
Yes	H8. High Efficiency HVAC Filter (MERV 13+)	1			1			
TBD	H9 Advanced Refrigerants				1			
Yes	H10. No Fireplace or Sealed Gas Fireplace	1			1			
Yes	H11. Humidity Control Systems	1			1			
TBD	H12 Register Design Per ACCA Manual T			4	1.0101000000000000000000000000000000000			
D REMEWARI E ENFORM								
TBD	14 Pre-Plumbing for Solar Water Heating			4				
TBD	10. Propagation for Suture Photovoltais Installation				OPWOMMUNIC		**********	
0.005	12. Operation for Factor Factor (Seler DV, Seier Thermal, and Wind)							
	A Met Zere Freeren Home	U State		25 [	*****			
	14. Net Zero Energy Home	6109608505		1		1		
TBD	14.1 Near Zero Energy Home	<u></u>		2	*****			
TBD	14.2 Net Zero Electric			4	****			
TBD	15. Energy Storage System			1				
J EUILDING PERFORM	ANCE AND TESTING							
TBD	J1. Third-Party Verification of Quality of Insulation Installation				1			
TBD	J2. Supply and Return Air Flow Testing			1	1			
TBD	J3. Mechanical Ventilation Testing				1			
TBD	J4. Combustion Appliance Safety Testing	<u></u>			1	<u> </u>		
	J5. Building Energy Performance	L			****		pusasana	
2.00%	J5.1 Home Meets or Exceeds Energy Compliance Pathway	9		25+				
Yes	J6. Title 24 Prepared and Signed by a CABEC Certified Energy Analyst	1		1				
TBD	J7. Participation in Utility Program with Third-Party Plan Review			1				
TBD	J8. ENERGY STAR for Homes			1				
No	J9. EPA Indoor airPlus Certification	0			2			
TBD	J10. Blower Door Testing				3			
K. FINISHES								
	K1. Entryways Designed to Reduce Tracked-In Contaminants	1						
TBD	K1.1 Individual Entryways (Deliberate hard surface at entrances and permanent assembly for shoe storage)				1			
Yes	K2. Zero-VOC Interior Wall and Ceiling Paints	2			2			
Yes	K3. Low-VOC Caulks and Adhesives	1	T	*******	1		1	
	K4. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Interior Finish							
TBD	K4.1 Cabinets		T	**************		2	I	
TBD	K4.2 Interior Trim					2	1	
TBD	K4.3 Shelving	1				2		
TBD	K4.4 Doors			********		2	1	
TBD	K4.5 Countertops		11			1	1	
	K5. Formaldehyde Emissions in Interior Finish Exceed CAR8				4	dummentan	1	
TBD	K5 1 Doors		<del> </del>			1	1	
TBD	K5.2 Cabinete and Countertone		<u>}</u>			+	-	
TOD	K5.2 Countries and Countertups				2	+	<u> </u>	
180	No. 5 menuri fini dhu ohewhy		├		2		<u> </u>	
TBD	K6. Products That Comply with the Health Product Declaration Open Standard				2	+		
rBD	K/. Indoor Air Formaldehyde Level Less Than 27 Parts Per Billion		┝		2			
No	K8. Comprehensive Inclusion of Low Emitting Finishes	0			1			
L. FLOORING		the second second						
TBD	L1. Environmentally Preferable Flooring		<u>                                     </u>		ļ	3	<u> </u>	
TBD	L2. Low-Emitting Flooring Meets CDPH 2010 Standard Method—Residential		ļļ	******	3	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Yes	L3. Durable Flooring (Ak flooring is therd surface)	1_1_	ļļ		ļ	1	<b>ļ</b>	
TBD	L4. Thermal Mass Flooring	di nama		1				
M. APPLIANCES AND L	IGHTING							

`

New Home Single Family	Version 7.0	-2010		的形式和自己。如果		anna anna anna anna anna anna anna ann	ana	
Yes	M1. ENERGY STAR® Dishwasher	1					1	
	M2. Efficient Laundry Appliances			mananananah			*****	
TBD	M2 1 CFF-Rated Clothes Washer				T	1		
Vac	M2.7 Eperan Star Dover						2	
res	1912.2 Ellelgy Stal Divel	2		2				
TBD	M2.3 Solar Dryer/ Laundry Lines	<u> </u>		0.5				
TBD	M3. Size-Efficient ENERGY STAR Refrigerator			2				
	M4. Permanent Centers for Waste Reduction Strategies							
Yes	M4.1 Built-In Recycling Center	1				1	MPEH COLMING	
TBD	M4.2 Built-In Compositing Center							
	Mis Lighting Efficiency						*****	
14	MC / Contractory	100000						
165	NO. I High-Enicacy Lighting M5.2 Lighting System Designed to JESNA Ecotoandie Standards or Designed by	2		2			*****	
TBD	Lighting Consultant			2				
TBD	M6 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Infrastructure		4					
N. COMMUNITY		-		l Line and line				
	M. Annai Davidani at							
	N1. Smart Development							
Yes	N1.1 Infill Site	2	1			1		
TBD	N1.2 Designated Brownfield Site		1			1		
TBD	N1.3 Conserve Resources by increasing Density			2		2		
TBD	N1.4 Cluster Homes for Land Preservation		4			4	****************	
	N1 5 Homa Siza Efficiency				******			
3494		<u> </u>			l	9 1		
2001	Enter the area of the nome, in square reet							
4	Enter the number of bedrooms							
	N2. Home(s)/Development Located Near Transit							
TBD	N2.1 Within 1 Mile of a Major Transit Stop		1					
Yes	N 2.2. Within 1/2 mile of a Major Transit Stop		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	N2 Dedectrian and Disuela Access			l				
	No. Fedesitian and Broycle Access							
	N3.1 Pedestrian Access to Services Within 1/2 Mile of Community Services		2				description and a company	
	Enter the number of Tier 1 services							
	Enter the number of Tier 2 services							
TBD	N3.2 Connection to Pedestrian Pathways		1					
TBD	N3 3 Traffic Calming Strategies		· · · ·					
			2	l	l			
	N4. Outdoor Gathennig Maces						passon	
TBD	N4.1 Public or Semi-Public Outdoor Gathering Places for Residents		1					
TBD	N4.2 Public Outdoor Gathering Places with Direct Access to Tier 1 Community Services	a fan de ser						
			1			, and the second		
	No. Social Interaction	CARGON SPACES						
Yes	N5.1 Residence Entries with Views to Callers	1	1					
Yes	N5.2 Entrances Visible from Street and/or Other Front Doors	1	1					
Yes	N5.3 Porches Oriented to Street and Public Space	1	1					
	N6. Passive Solar Design			kanananan	annunnan			
TED	NR1 Heating Load				7	1		
100				2				
IBD	NG.2 Cooling Load			2	]			
	N7. Adaptable Building	1						
TBD		The second secon						
and the second se	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units		1		1			
TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit		1		1			
TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency		1		1			
TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.4 Unipershills Assessment (or later Future Stated UNIUS FULL PS and include)		1		1			
TBD TBD	N 7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (cat-Adapt, Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Sejamic Evaluation)		1		1			
TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings		1 1 1 1		1	1 1		
TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1	1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt. Fartified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire)		1 1 1 1 1 1		1	1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	N 7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P58, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community)		1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1 1 1	1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD Q. OTHER	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P58, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community)		1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1	1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD C. OTHER Yes	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P66, or Seismic Evaluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2. Community Location (Disadventaged Community)				1	1		
TBD TBD TBD TBD OI OTHER Yes Yes	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt, Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evaluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (disadventaged community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints	<u>ү</u>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8	R	1 1 1 1 R	1 1 1 R	R	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O. OTHER Yes Yes	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5	1 1 1 1 R	1 1 1 1 R 1	R 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O. OTHER Yes Yes TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seiantic Evoluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2. Community Location (Disadvantaged Community) 01. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints 02. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors 03. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs	<u>ү</u>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0.5	1 1 1 R R 1 0.5	R 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O. OTHER Yes Yes TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community) 01. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints 02. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors 03. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs 04. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Perforement	<u>ү</u> 2	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0.5	1 1 1 R 1 0.5	R 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O. OTHER Yes Yes TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt, Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD Q.OTHEN Yes Yes TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evaluation) N8.2. Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2. Community Location (Disadventaged Community) N9.2. Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 8 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O OTHER Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt, Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evaluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5. 1 Energy Home System Monitors		1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 8 8 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O OTHER Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Divadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors		1 1 1 1 1 1 8	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0,5 0,5	1 1 1 R 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O OTHER Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community (Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community (D		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 R	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD C. OTHER Yes Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seiantic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors O6.2. Water Home System Monitors O6. Green Building Education	×	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 R 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 1	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O. OTHER Yes Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fortified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadvantaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O6. Green Building Education O6.1 Marketing Green Building	<u>ү</u> 22	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 8	R 0.5 0.5 1	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 8 8 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	
TBD           TBD      TBD      TB	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt, Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P66, or Seismic Evaluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (supplier diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.2 Green Building Education		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 8	R 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5 1	
TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD O: OTHES Yes Yes Yes TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cal-Adapt, Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Saismic Evaluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O6.3. Water Home System Monitors O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.2 Green Building Education O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.2 Green Building Signage O7. Green Appraisal Addendum		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 8	R 0.5 0.5 0.5 1 1 	1 1 1 0.5 0.5 R	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5 R	R 0.5 0.5 0.5 1 1	
TBD           TBD      TBD	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit N8. Resiliency N8.1 Vulnerability Assessment (Cat-Adapt. Fertified Standard, HAZUS, FEMA P68, or Seismic Evoluation) N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings N9. Social Equity in Community N9.1 Diverse Workforce (Supplier Diversity or Local Hire) N9.2 Community Location (Disadventaged Community) O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals O5. Home System Monitors O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O5.2. Water Home System Monitors O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.2 Green Building Education O6.1 Marketing Green Building O6.2 Green Building Signage O7. Green Appraisal Addendum O8. Detailed Durability Plan and Third-Party Verification of Plan Implementation		1 1 1 1 1 1 7 8	R 0.5 0.5 0.5 1 0.5 R	1 1 1 R 0.5 0.5	1 1 1 1 0.5 0.5 0.5	R 0.5 0.5 0.5 1 1 0.5 R	

New Home Single Family Version 7.0	y Version 7.0						
Summary		1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -		Querra de la			
Total Available Points in Specific Categories	301.5	31	74.5	60	87	49	
Minimum Points Required in Specific Categories	50	2	25	6	6	6	
Total Points Achieved	78.0	3.6	18.5	13.0	20.0	18.5	

Pattachment 5



October 23, 2018 V5138A

TO: Carol Borck Planning Technician TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY 765 Portola Road Portola Valley, California 94028

SUBJECT: Supplemental Geotechnical Peer Review RE: New Residence 850 Portola Road, Willow Grove – Lot 3 PLN_ARCH 08-2018

At your request, we have completed a supplemental geotechnical peer review of the Site Development Permit application for the proposed residential development using the following documents

- Architectural Plans; including: Site Floor and Roof Plans and Elevations (11 sheets, various scales), by CKA Architects, dated September 14, 2018;
- Topographic Survey (1 sheet, 20-scale), prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, dated January 27, 2015; updated August 3, 2017;
- Civil Plans; including: Grading and Drainage Plan, Utility Plan, Erosion Control Plan, Impervious Surface Plan, and Details (6 Sheets, 10-scale), prepared by Clifford Bechtel and Associates, dated September 17, 2018;
- Second Submittal, Grading, Drainage and Utilities (letter), prepared by Cliff Bechtel and Associates, dated September 19, 2018;
- Sausal Creek Bank Stabilization (letter), prepared by Cliff Bechtel, dated September 18, 2018;
- Limited Geotechnical Engineering Study and Limited Geologic Hazards Evaluation, Proposed New Residence 850 Portola Road (report), prepared by Earth Systems Pacific, dated September 12, 2018; and
- Landscape Plans; including: Planting and Irrigation Plans, Details, and Specifications (5 Sheets, 10-scale), prepared by Gregory Lewis Landscape Architect, dated August 10, 2018.

www.cottonshires.com

Ms. Carol Borck Page 2

In addition, we reviewed pertinent technical documents from our office files and performed a recent site reconnaissance.

#### DISCUSSION

The applicant is proposing construction of a new, 2,331 square-foot, two-story residence on a previously undeveloped lot within the 4-Lot Willow Grove development. In previous geotechnical reviews of a prior subdivision layout and associated issues related to neighboring Sausal Creek, we recommended that an updated topographic survey of the site be performed and the Project Geotechnical Consultant consider the effects of ongoing active erosion of the creek bank. We also recommended that the geotechnical/civil consultants consider the potential for localized flooding of proposed future residences within the subdivision. We understand that issues of potential site flooding are to be addressed to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

In our most recent geotechnical peer review letter, dated June 4, 2018, we recommended that a Lot-Specific Geotechnical Investigation be performed since previous geotechnical investigations were performed over 10 years ago. We recommended that the investigation address, at a minimum, the following items:

- Compilation and review of past geotechnical investigations;
- The impact of active creek erosion on creek bank stability;
- Potential seismic hazards should be evaluated in relation to proposed site development;
- The impact of shallow groundwater should be evaluated with respect to the proposed development.

#### SITE CONDITIONS

The subject property is characterized by mostly level to gently inclined, alluvial floodplain topography associated with ancestral Sausal Creek. Sausal Creek flows north-northwestward along the eastern portion of the property. This alignment is a natural portion of Sausal Creek that aligns with the San Andreas rift zone, and has a gradient of approximately 3%. To the south, and off of the 850 Portola Road property, the creek channel makes an abrupt westward bend and extends westward toward Portola Road. This alignment is artificial and stems from realignment of the creek in the early portion of the 1900s, and has a gradient of approximately 6.5%. The artificial channel of Sausal Creek appears to be a dynamic erosional environment where the depth and width of the channel have changed significantly over the last 20 years, with large scour holes, migrating headcuts

#### COTTON, SHIRES AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

up to 8 feet deep, and large-scale bank undercuts and slump failures. Creek banks along this portion of Sausal Creek are commonly very steep, and locally vertical or undercut, and vary from 10 to 15 feet in height. The steeper gradient along this channel reach reflects the artificial nature of the alignment, and the potential for additional scour.

The Town Geologic Map reveals that the site is underlain by alluvial soils associated with Sausal Creek. The Town Movement Potential Map indicates that the site is within the mapped boundaries of a "Sun" zone, which is defined as "unconsolidated granular material (alluvium, slope wash, and thick soil), on level ground and gentle slopes, subject to settlement and soil creep; liquefaction possible at valley floor sites during strong earthquakes." Subsurface exploration encountered mostly silty clay alluvial deposits to the explored depth of 50 feet. These deposits exhibited a penetration resistance of less than 12 blows per foot (and commonly less than 10 blows per foot). Groundwater was encountered between 7 and 12 feet below the ground surface in borings advanced at the subject site and adjacent lots. The closest active trace of the San Andreas fault is the well-constrained 1906 trace of the fault mapped approximately 65 feet east of the proposed residence.

#### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The proposed residential development is constrained by the potential for active erosion of the Sausal Creek bank and channel, potential for bank instability under static or seismic conditions, localized flooding, potentially expansive and weak alluvial soils, the potential for secondary ground cracking during a large earthquake on the San Andreas fault, shallow groundwater, and the potential for violent seismic ground shaking. The geotechnical consultant performed an investigation of the site, and provided geotechnical design recommendations for the proposed residential development that, in general, appear to be consistent with industry standards. These recommendations include supporting the residence on a rigid mat or post-tensioned slab, and maintaining a minimum 30-foot setback from the top of the creek bank. The referenced plans reveal that the residence is to be located at least 50 feet from the top of bank. The proposed detention/infiltration chamber location is to be placed near the 30-foot setback line from the top of bank.

The geotechnical investigation report indicates that the creek embankment slopes are stable with respect to large-scale slump and slide failures, and that the minimum 30-foot setback is adequate to address the long-term incremental retreat of the oversteepened embankment. We note that this conclusion assumes that the elevation of the creek channel does not erode, and that the location of the creek does not migrate laterally. Should largescale changes to the creek alignment or elevation occur in the future, a geotechnical consultant should be retained to re-evaluate the site conditions. Therefore, we recommend approval of the Site Development Permit application from a geotechnical standpoint. The following should be performed prior to approval of Building Permits:

- 1. <u>Development Plans</u> Structural Design Plans for the site specific development should be generated that incorporate the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Consultant.
- 2. <u>Geotechnical Plan Review</u> The applicant's geotechnical consultant should review and approve all geotechnical aspects of the development plans (i.e., including site preparation and grading, site drainage improvements and design parameters for building foundations and retaining walls) to ensure that their recommendations have been properly incorporated.

The Development Plans and Geotechnical Plan Review should be submitted to the Town for review by Town Staff and Town Geotechnical Consultant prior to issuance of building permits.

#### **LIMITATIONS**

This geotechnical peer review has been performed to provide technical advice to assist the Town with discretionary permit decisions. Our services have been limited to review of the documents previously identified, and a visual review of the property. Our opinions and conclusions are made in accordance with generally accepted principles and practices of the geotechnical profession. This warranty is in lieu of all other warranties, either expressed or implied.

Respectfully submitted,

COTTON, SHIRES AND ASSOCIATES, INC. TOWN GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT

John M. Wallace Principal Engineering Geologist CEG 1923

Patrick O. Shires Senior Principal Geotechnical Engineer GE 770

JMW:POS:st



#### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** October 23, 2018

**TO:** Howard Young and Cynthia Richardson, Town of Portola Valley

**FROM:** Jeff Nelson & Nona Espinosa, NV5

**PROJECT:** 850 Portola Rd. # PLN_ARCH 07—2018

**PROJECT #s:** SJ00717-132 &173

**SUBJECT:** Review of Applicant Documents for 850 Portola Road

NV5 has completed the review of the following documents provided by the applicant for the Site Development Application at 848 Portola Road and has the following comments:

- Review of CKA Architects plans dated 9/14/18
- Clifford Bechtel Second Submittal Grading, Drainage and Utilities for 850 Portola memo dated 9/19/18
- Clifford Bechtel Sausal Creek Bank Stabilization memo dated 9/18/18
- Gregory Lewis landscaping plans dated 8/10/18
- Earth Systems Pacific's Limited Geotechnical Engineering Study & Geologic Hazards Evaluation dated 9/12/18.

#### A. <u>GENERAL</u>

- 1. All items listed in the most current "Public Works and & Engineering Department Site Development Standard guidelines and Checklist" shall be reviewed and met. A completed and signed checklist by the project architect or engineer must be submitted with the building plans. This Document is available on the Town website.
- 2. All items listed in the most current "Public Works & engineering Department Pre-Construction Meeting for Site Development" shall be reviewed and understood. This document is available on the Town website.
- 3. Bechtel's Bank Stabilization memo states that the flow velocities cited in the Schaaf and Wheeler (S&W) report apply to a future channel geometry described in Lea & Sung's Creek Restoration Plan, and do not apply to the existing conditions. Based on the existing condition hydraulic model results cited in the S&W report, the flow velocities in the creek are expected to be below 20 feet per second. Therefore, it is our opinion that the recently placed 24-inch-diameter rock slope protection (RSP) is acceptable for the current Sausal Creek flow conditions.
- 4. Based on the S&W flow analysis, the creek channel will not be able to contain the 100-year flow event under existing conditions. S&W's HECRAS model predicts that approximately 200 cubic feet per second (CFS) of flow will spill over Portola Road and sheet flow through the project site and is expected to be contained within the access driveway for both properties and discharge into the creek from the Northeast side of the parcel.

5. The Limited Geotechnical Engineering Study and Limited Geologic Hazards evaluation report submitted by the applicant included an analysis of the slope stability of the creek bank as it relates to the location of the proposed homes. This study indicates that the setbacks as presented in the current plans are adequate; we agree with this conclusion.

#### B. <u>SPECIFIC (for consideration during Building Plan Submittal)</u>

- 1. Provide updated documentation describing the size of the out flow pipes from the sump pump and stormwater retention system. Demonstrate that the storm flow from the site does not exceed that of the pre-existing conditions.
- 2. Show 100-year flow arrows on Architectural, Civil and Landscape plans, especially at the end of the gravel driveway near the creek. Civil and Landscape plans should show the stormwater overland flow path beyond the gravel driveway.
- 3. Add a note to the drawings that says the overland flow path shall remain clear and have no obstructions that impede overland flow at any time.
- 4. Any fencing along the 100-year storm flow path shall have openings at the bottom to provide passage for 100-year flow event. If any flow path obstructions are constructed, additional hydraulic analysis shall be required to determine if these blockages will create an increase in 100-year flood elevations upstream of the project. Any future improvements within the 30-foot setback must be approved by the Town Engineer prior to construction.
- 5. Per calculations provided in the previous submittal, please revise Detail 1 on Sheet C-3.0 to show that a minimum of a 20-foot-long detention pipe is required. The dimensions shown in the current detail show a 20-foot-long trench, but not a 20-foot-long pipe.
- 6. Provide adequate cover for all utilities along the gravel driveway. The 4-inch storm drain in front of the garage has less than 2 feet of cover, please indicate in the plans that storm drain pipe needs at least 3 feet of cover or call for the pipe to be encased in concrete.
- 7. Sheet C-1.0 Detention system does not have adequate cover per Detail 1 sheet C-3.0. Please move the detention system completely outside the 30 feet set back.
- 8. Show all existing utilities and provide details for all proposed utilities in the building permit submittal.

# **WOODSIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

**Prevention Division** 

808 Portola Rd. Portola Valley, CA ~ www.woodsidefire.org ~ Fire Marshal Denise Enea 650-851-6206 ALL CONDITIONS MUST MEET WFPD SPECIFICATIONS – go to www.woodsidefire.org for more info

# **BDLG & SPRINKLER PLAN CHECK AND INSPECTIONS**

PROJECT LOCATION:850 Portola Rd	Jurisdiction: PV						
Owner/Architect/Project Manager:	hitect/Project Manager: Permit#:						
Sausal Creek Assoc	PLN 08-2018						
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: New House							
Fees Paid: XSYES See Fee Comments Date: 5/3	3/18						
Fee Comments: CH#6736\$90.00 (plan review fee) paid CH#\$180.00 (plan check fee) paid by:	d by: Byldan Corp 5 not yet paid	/21/18 MH					
BUILDING PLAN CHECK COMMENTS/CONDITIONS: THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET IN ORDER TO PASS FINAL FIRE INSPECTION: 1. At start of construction a 2' x 3' address sign will be posted in front of project.							
2. At time of final the permanent address will be mounted an contrasting background.	id clearly visible from	n street w/minimum of 4" numbers on					
3. 100' defensible space required prior to start of construction	n.						
4. Upon final inspection 30' perimeter defensible space will 5. Approved spark arrestor will be required on all installed c	be required per WFP himneys including or	D ordinance section 304.1.2.A utside fireplaces.					
6. Install Smoke and CO detectors per 2016 CBC.							
WFPD. ( www.woodsidefire.org)	er prans/calculations t	to be submitted under separate cover to					
8. Driveway as proposed meets WFPD standards. If drivewa compliance with WFPD standards	y dimensions are rev	ised during construction it must maintain					
9. Driveway over 150' required to have fire truck turnaround	l. Confirmed on plan	A1.0.					
located on 846 properties 10 Fire Hydrant, Plans state 234 feet to nearest fire hydrant	t .						
The minimum fire flow shall be 1000 gallons per minute	A water supply for :	fire protection shall mean a fire hydrant within					
500' from the building, capable of the required flow.							
***RESUBMIT***							
Provide easements documents describing the turnaround situ Reviewed by: M. Hird	Date: 5/21/18	rty.					
Resubmit Approved with							
Sprinkler Plans Approved: NO	Date:	Fees Paid: \$390 See Fee Comments					
As Built Submitted:	Date:	As Builts Approved Date:					
Fee Comments: CH#\$390.00 (fire sprinkler plan review	w) paid by: Not yet p	aid					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Rough/Hydro Sprinkler Inspection By:	Date:						
Sprinkler Inspection Comments:							
		Job Copy					
Final Bldg and/or Sprinkler Insp By:	Date:						
Comments:		D E C E I V E M					
		™™ MAY & I/8.0 ""]					

850 Portola Road Conservation Committee Comments

Committee members at site visit on May 18, 2018: Judith Murphy, Donald Eckstrom, and Dieter Walz

The drawing package shows a proposed future two story residence on a level lot, also identified as Parcel I. The lot size is 17,936 SF, and the prosed residence floor area is 2331SF, of which he first floor is 1336 SF.

#### **Impervious Surfaces**

The actual square footage of impervious surface beyond the ground floor area of the residence was not evident from the materials supplied to us by the Town. However, since the driveway is shared with that of the proposed residence on 848 Portola Road, and since the residence will be near the entrance to the property, it seems very modest relative to the lot size.

#### Landscape Plan

We thoroughly inspected the complete property for existing plant cover, and had the arborist's report for guidance on the trees.

We mostly concurred with this report, but we would like to either augment this report, or take exception in in some instances.

Trees # 1R to #6R are to be removed to allow placement of the new residence. The committee suggests mitigating this by new planting of either Quercus agrifolia (Coast Live Oak) and/or Q. lobata (Valley Oak) to the N/E of the new residence. Fewer than 6 trees would suffice, appropriately spaced to reflect the expected future lateral canopy size of these species.

Tree # 11R, a Q. agrifolia, is located on the top of a section of eroding bank of Sausal Creek. It is on the inside of the creek bend and thus not subject to the same water erosion forces as the opposite outer creek bend. We think the tree's extensive root system is a major stabilizing asset. It also is a beautiful tree and, with some judicious pruning, it might be there for many years, perhaps decades to come. We think it could be an asset in the rear part of the property.

Trees # 13 (the large dead oak on the ground), and #14R to #18R destined to be removed as needed for the new residence should be mitigated by new plantings of either Q. agrifolia and/or Q.lobata to the north of the new residence.

Tree # 20, a Q. agrifolia is not an asset to the property. The committee suggests that it be removed. This would allow Tree # 21 to develop and show its full potential (after some shaping and clean out of its canopy, as well as arborist recommended clean-up mitigation at ground level near the trunk. Tree # 21 may well be the most significant tree asset on both Parcel I and Parcel II.

As with Parcel I, the north half of Parcel II, at ground level, is also heavily overgrown and infested by non-native species like Rubus discolor (Himalayan Blackberry), Cytisus monspessulanus (French Broom), Thistles, various, etc. All of these should be removed, sooner rather than later, clear to the top of the creek embankment. We did not find any natives that are worth saving. Some of these will most likely reappear after clean-out and will require vigilance to prevent re-infestation.

Future planting should ideally be done from mid October to the end of November. A 5 gal size plant will always, in a very few years, outperform larger sizes.

We appreciate that no irrigated turf is proposed. The plans show some drip irrigation next to the residence and along the driveway.

#### Plant List

Landscape Plans and related documents are shown on drawings L1 through L4. All proposed plants are native, require little water once established, and we second their selection. We appreciate a planting plan so appropriate for its site.

#### Fencing

There is a wood fence along the N/W property line. The committee recommends that the long, linear appearance of this fence be mitigated by judicious planting of lower height native species, such as Heteromeles arbutifolia (Toyon), Prunus illicifolia (Hollyleaf Cherry), Rhus

iIntegrifolia (Lemonadeberry Bush), perhaps other natives, using clusters rather than linear plantings.

#### **Exterior Lighting**

Lighting is very modest. All light are directed downward. They should not present any issues to neighbors.

Submitted by Dieter Walz

## Attachment 9 Page 69



# BOARD AND BATTERN: NATURAL WOOD





(C

[L.J]

50

Lng 25 ഹ

0

21

JAN 04 2019

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY





cka | ARCHITECTS

850 PORTOLA ROAD COLORS/MATERIALS

LOCAL // BAY AREA & STATE

# SF to developer who tore down landmark house: Rebuild it exactly as it was

#### J.K. Dineen

Dec. 15, 2018 Updated: Dec. 17, 2018 11:59 a.m.



 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ 

A developer who illegally demolished a 1935 house at 49 Hopkins St. has been ordered to build an exact replica of the original house rather than the much larger home he had proposed for the space.

Photo: Santiago Mejia / The Chronicle

A property owner who illegally demolished a 1936 Twin Peaks house designed by a renowned modernist must rebuild an exact replica of the home rather than the much larger structure the property owner had proposed replacing it with, the City Planning Commission ruled this week.

In a unanimous 5-0 vote late Thursday night, the commission also ordered that the property owner — Ross Johnston, through his 49 Hopkins LLC — include a sidewalk plaque telling the story of the original house designed by architect Richard Neutra, the demolition and the replica.

The commission directive, unprecedented in San Francisco, comes more than a year after the home at 49 Hopkins Ave., known as the Largent House, was <u>almost entirely knocked down</u>. All that remained of the white, two-story redwood-and-concrete-block home was a garage door and frame.

# Unlimited Digital Access for 99¢

SUBSCRIBE

Read more articles like this by subscribing to the San Francisco Chronicle

Johnston had received planning permission only to remodel with a design that would have largely kept the first floor of the existing home intact.

Two months after the demolition, Johnston applied for a retroactive demolition permit and for permission to construct a new home that would increase the size from about 1,300 square feet to nearly 4,000 square feet.

The case attracted attention because Neutra is considered one of the most important modern architects and because it highlighted the trend of speculators illegally razing modest homes with the intention of replacing them with mega-homes. The new houses can fetch upward of \$5 million, double or triple the price of an average house in already expensive San Francisco.

SF to developer who tore down landmark house: Rebuild it exactly as it was - SFChronicle.com



Google street view of the Largent House designed by Richard Neutra at 49 Hopkins Avenue from 2014 Photo: Google Street View 2014

Planning Commissioner Dennis Richards said he hopes the commission's action in the 49 Hopkins case will send a message to speculators accustomed to ignoring city planning and building laws with few or no repercussions.

"We are tired of seeing this happening in the city and are drawing a line in the sand," said Richards. "You can have all the rules in the world, but if you don't enforce them, the rules are worthless."

Justin Zucker, attorney for the property owner, said that 49 Hopkins LLC is not a real estate speculation group but an entity solely owned by Johnston, who had hoped to move his family into the larger home. Johnston's LLC bought the home for \$1.7 million in 2017.

Johnston briefly addressed the commission, saying that he had bought the property "as a family home that would enable my family of six to move back to San Francisco," he said.

"I have been stuck in limbo for over a year," he said.
Zucker argued that the historic integrity of the Neutra design had been erased over time first in a 1968 fire and later in a series of remodels in the 1980s and 1990s. The approved 2014 plan — proposed by a previous owner — allowed for the removal of most of the existing structure, he said. "We acknowledge and apologize for the fact that a small portion of the work exceeded the scope in the approved plans," he said, adding that the decision was made "for life-safety reasons."

The decision comes a few days after Supervisor Aaron Peskin introduced legislation designed to crack down on illegal demolitions. That bill, the Housing Preservation and Expansion Reform Act, increases fines for illegal demolitions and requires a conditional use authorization for any home expansion that increases the square footage by more than 10 percent.

Peskin said that he was "very impressed" by the Planning Commission's vote.

"The fact that it was a unanimous vote should send a message to everyone that is playing fast and loose that the game is over," said Peskin. "We want to preserve iconic, historic structures, but even more important, we want to protect our reservoir of more affordable housing stock. You want a 1,300-square-foot house to be worth what a 1,300-square-foot house is worth, rather than a mega-mansion."

While replicas are controversial among architectural historians, the Planning Commission decision was applauded by historic preservationists. In a statement read at the commission meeting, SF Heritage Executive Director Michael Buhler said that approving the proposed project would have "sent a strong message that existing planning and building laws can be ignored and there will be no repercussions."

"The question before you once again is whether a person can demolish existing housing stock with impunity and then be rewarded," said Buhler.

Planning Commissioner Kathrin Moore said she is confident that a replica could be "executed beautifully in a way that would be consistent with the home's original expression."

Neutra, who did most of his work in Southern California, designed five San Francisco homes. The Largent House was designed for a husband and wife who were teachers and artists. Neutra was known for his obsessive attention to the needs of his clients, whether it was a multimillion-dollar home or a modest structure like the one in Twin Peaks.

# ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION

December 10, 2018

ASCC Field Meeting, 25 Kiowa Court, Architectural and Site Development Review for an ADU and tree removal.

Vice Chair Koch called the field meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

## ROLL CALL:

ASCC: Vice-Chair Koch, Ross, and Wilson. Chair Sill and Breen were absent. Town Staff: Laura Russell, Building and Planning Director and Planner Cynthia Richardson Planning Commissioner: None

## Others present

Lorin Hill, Architect Cagatay Goksel, Architect Connie Lin, applicant MaryAnn Plunder and Peter Boot, 35 Kiowa Court Shahid Choudhry, 311 Cervantes

Planner Cynthia Richardson presented the project which consists of Architectural Review for a new 1,000 square foot one-story Accessory Dwelling Unit that exceeds a vertical building height of 18 feet and does not have architectural style or materials similar to the main residence. The project includes the removal of two significant trees.

Following Planner Richardson's presentation, Architect Hill offered information regarding the project and that they would be matching the main house with a remodel in the future.

The group then walked to the back of the existing home to see the story poles for the new ADU. Mr. Hill explained that the reason for the height being over 18 feet was due to the guard rail that is required for the roof top deck.

Peter Boot of 35 Kiowa Court asked if there could be an antenna constructed on the deck of the new ADU. Laura Russell indicated that some types would need a building permit. She indicated that furniture could be placed on the roof top deck.

Maryann Plunder asked about the drainage and if additional drainage would be directed toward the creek. Mr. Hill indicated that a grading and drainage plan would be finalized for the project prior to the building permit approval.

Shahid Choudhry of 311 Cervantes asked if anything else would be constructed farther up the gulch. The owner Connie Lin indicated that it would be left open and natural.

Vice Chair Koch stated that Commissioners would offer further comments on the proposal at the regular evening meeting that evening. Members thanked architect for participation in the site meeting. The field meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

#### ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road

#### CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Planning & Building Director Laura Russell called roll:

Present: ASCC: Commissioners Dave Ross and Jane Wilson; Vice Chair Megan Koch; Chair Al Sill Absent: Commissioner Danna Breen Planning Commission Liaison: Nicholas Targ Town Council Liaison: Councilmember Wengert Town Staff: Planning & Building Director Laura Russell; Associate Planner Cassidy; Planner Cynthia Richardson

#### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

#### OLD BUSINESS

(1) <u>Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a New Residence, Removal of Significant Trees, and Landscaping, 42 Santa Maria, Bylund Residence, File # PLN_ARCH 41-2017</u>

Planner Richardson described the background of the project and the applicant's revised plans addressing previous ASCC comments and neighborhood concerns. Staff recommended that the ASCC approve the new residence, landscaping and tree removal, subject to the conditions of approval in Attachment 1, as detailed in the staff report.

Chair Sill invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Ross asked if the property could have been accessed from Louise Lane. Planner Richardson said it could have in theory, but would have required significant retaining walls which would have gone through the middle of Louise Lane making it more difficult to construct a road in the future.

Chair Sill invited comment by the applicant. The applicant described the project revisions.

Chair Sill invited questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Chair Sill invited public comment.

Andy Brown, a member of the road committee, said they've reviewed the project and are supportive. They want to ensure that Louise Lane remains as is, as an easement. He said there is some concern that oaks not be in the easement.

Bart Dolmatch, 16 Santa Maria. Mr. Dolmatch complemented the design and siting of the house. He said the applicant has done a phenomenal job mitigating the comments and suggestions made. He said he has the same landscape architect as the applicant. He said they are supportive of adding oaks on the upside of the hill, with shared responsibility for privacy for both residences. He would like to review the plan for those trees. The landscape architect said the trees would be sited on both properties to accommodate the screening.

Ken Singleton, 40 Santa Maria. Mr. Singleton expressed appreciation for the effort put in by the applicant and the designers to modify the driveway. He said he did not feel strongly about Louise Lane. He said he appreciated the neighborhood's desire to retain the easement, but also appealed to the Commission to give them maximum flexibility and leniency to integrate that space into their yards because there's not going to be a road there in any foreseeable future. In response to Chair Sill's question, Planning & Building Director Russell said the condition is drafted retaining 24 feet unplanted. She said the concerns they received were about larger trees so it would be appropriate for smaller plantings to be located in that area as long as they are minimal and can be removed easily. Vice Chair Koch said it appears the neighbor would like to see a softening of that area.

Bart Dolmatch said Louise Lane is a paper street, but the hill is engineered. He hoped there was something that could be done to repopulate that hill in some way and suggested that planting things on it would stabilize the soil. He supported Mr. Singleton's comments.

With no additional public comment, Chair Sill brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Vice Chair Koch said the applicant did a great job of addressing all of the suggestions and comments made regarding the project. She said she could make the findings for exceeding 85%. She was supportive of the changes for the driveway access. She was supportive of the planting plan, but thought it might be almost too much. She suggested it be conditioned that a Commissioner be present for the siting of screening trees.

Commissioner Wilson thanked the applicant for all of the work done to mitigate the lighting and light spill concerns. She said she could make the findings for exceeding 85% because of the need to compact the building onto the available space. She said it was good they were sharing the landscape architect. She was supportive of the color board and design.

Commissioner Ross said the applicants did a great job hitting every mark. He said it was easy to make the finding for exceeding 85%. He said, with regard to Louise Lane, while he was not suggesting a change in the condition, he pointed out that the cost of removing a mature oak tree in the middle of Louise Lane would be negligible compared to what it would cost to develop Louise Lane. He supported the recommended condition that an ASCC member be present for the final siting of the trees when the home at 42 Santa Maria has been framed.

Chair Sill was supportive of the project. He said the architecture, materials, and design are great. He said he is comfortable seeing both landscaping plans merged together and did not think screening would be an issue. He could make the findings for exceeding 85%.

Commissioner Ross moved to approve the Architectural Review and Site Development Permit for a New Residence, Removal of Significant Trees, and Landscaping at 42 Santa Maria, including staff's conditions, and the additional condition that an ASCC member participate in the final siting of the screening trees. Seconded by Commissioner Wilson; the motion carried 4-0.

#### NEW BUSINESS

# (2) <u>Architectural Review for a new 1,000 sq. ft. one-story Accessory Dwelling Unit</u> (ADU) that exceeds a vertical building height of 18 feet and does not have architectural style or materials similar to the main residence. The project includes the removal of two significant trees, 25 Kiowa Court, Lin Residence, File # PLN_ARCH 19-2018

Planner Richardson described the proposed project and discussion items as detailed in the staff report. Staff recommended the ASCC review the proposed plans, consider the comments in the staff report and any additional comments which may be offered tonight, and approve the proposed ADU subject to the conditions in Attachment 1. A field visit was held at the site earlier this afternoon.

Chair Sill invited questions from the Commission.

Vice Chair Koch asked if the multi-trunk tree would be removed. Lorin Hill, the architect, apologized for an AutoCAD layering mistake that led the arborist to misidentify the trees that are proposed for removal. Mr. Hill said the leaning large two-trunk tree is close to the proposed footprint of the building, and the arborist has recommended they both be removed.

Vice Chair Koch said the leaning tree is dangerous and must be removed. She asked if the other trunk, which looks strong and viable with a nice canopy, was viable. Ms. Lin said there used to be a children's play structure right inside of where the ADU will be. She said one night, a large tree that she thought was healthy fell and destroyed the play structure, so she has concern about that. Mr. Hill said they are amenable to working with the arborist and staff to determine what is appropriate for those trees. Planning & Building Director Russell referenced the Arborist Report and said it does not sound like either tree is viable.

With no further questions, Chair Sill invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Hill discussed the height issue. He said the relatively transparent cable railings protrude above to enable the roof terrace to have a usable open space. He said the larger area is more suitable to outdoor living and reduces the impact on the surrounding landscape, and they feel the protrusion is a reasonable accommodation that should be allowed.

Mr. Hill said, with regard to the style issue, the ADU is being somewhat reverse engineered for what the future new home may be. They made no effort to match the existing ranch style of the main structure and said this design will be a cohesive ensemble of buildings someday.

Mr. Hill said they would like the option of including perimeter low-impact rail lighting on the roof deck.

Chair Sill invited questions from the Commission. Hearing none, Chair Sill invited public comment.

Shahid Choudry, 311 Cervantes Road. He said he works from home, and the reason he lives in Portola Valley are the trees and atmosphere. He said he has a love affair with each tree just as with any human neighbor. He said he sits on his hill and reads books and looks into the trees. He said he hopes there is a way to artistically integrate nature with housing and ADUs. He said he does not want to cause any problems for neighbors, and he respects and loves them all. He said the design is beautiful, and he has no problem with the height. He said it is beautifully integrated into the hill.

With no further public comment, Chair Sill brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Ross said the applicants have done an excellent job of citing and massing the structure. He appreciated that they were doing no landscaping or hardscaping around it. He said there is a very deep slope, and water control will be critical. He said it is an appropriate place for roof decks as open space. He was supportive of allowing the guard rail to extend above the height limitation. He suggested using a medium or dark bronze instead of black anodized aluminum for the stanchions. He said the ADU is invisible except to the residents of the front house and will not be offensive even if it takes some time to remodel the front house to match the style of the ADU. Commissioner Ross said Tree #7 is very close to the site of the building, and he is not troubled by the removal. He was supportive of the light fixtures. He would be supportive of the option to add rail lighting, but only on the long rail that is opposite the deck from the structure.

Commissioner Wilson was supportive of the design and appreciated it was built into the hillside subservient to the landscape. She liked the color palate and agreed she would prefer a bronze railing. She supported removing the bifurcated tree. She supported removing the bay trees which are unwanted in Portola Valley anyway. She was supportive of the project.

Vice Chair Koch supported the variance for the height because the railing is a very creative use of space, will have no impact on any neighbors, and will in fact make the ADU more enjoyable. She was supportive of the design being different from the existing structure because it makes sense in the program of this property. She said if there will be any lighting in the railings, she would want to see the detailed lighting plan. She said a construction staging plan is important in this small cul-de-sac. She said Tree #7 is not viable, and she supported its removal.

Chair Sill was supportive of the design, the siting, and the materials. He was supportive of the 20'6" height because the roof deck makes a lot of sense and impacts no neighbors. He was supportive of using a different style for the ADU since the direction is to change the style of the main house later. He was supportive of the removal of Tree #7. He was supportive of the project.

Vice Chair Koch moved to approve the Architectural Review for a new 1,000 sq. ft. one-story Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); approve the height of 20'6" feet; approve the removal of the two significant trees; and approve the significantly different design of the ADU; with staff conditions and the additional condition to provide a final lighting plan for review by one ASCC member. Seconded by Commissioner Ross; the motion carried 4-0.

# COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# (3) <u>Commission Reports</u>

Planning & Building Director Russell did a site inspection at 15 Sausal with Commissioner Breen, looking at tree removal. She said the Fire District also got involved because some of the trees are now declining. She said phased removal of the trees may be considered, making sure that any trees representing a fire danger will be immediately removed. She said based on the results of the Fire District inspection, the property owner may request a phased removal, and it may be possible that an alteration of the condition might be brought back to the Commission.

Planning & Building Director Russell said staff has been working hard with the Planning Commission on the ADU work. She thanked the ASCC for the feedback they provided. She said, at the request of the Planning Commission, she and Associate Planner Cassidy will meet with Chair Sill to ask some follow-up questions to keep the process moving. She said the next Planning Commission meeting will be December 19, with a public hearing early in the new year, with a target of getting it to the Town Council in late February.

## (4) <u>News Digest: Planning Issues of the Day</u>

Staff shared an article of interest with the Commissioners – "What's behind the dramatic rise in 3-generation households?"

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

## (5) ASCC Meeting of November 12, 2018

Commissioner Ross moved to approve the November 12, 2018, minutes as submitted. Seconded by Vice Chair Koch, the motion passed 3-0-1, with Commissioner Wilson abstaining.

## ADJOURNMENT [8:00 p.m.]