



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: November 19, 2009
RE: Agenda for November 23, 2009 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: A special ASCC field meeting has been scheduled for the afternoon of Monday, November 23, 2009 for consideration of two proposals. The special meeting will convene at 3:00 p.m. at 40 Antonio Court for *preliminary review* of plans for new residential development of this vacant 4.48-acre Priory subdivision property. This has been noticed as a joint meeting of the planning commission and ASCC, as the planning commission is the approving authority relative to the site development permit component of the proposal. A preliminary review of the project is presented below under agenda item **5b., Larson.**

Following the 40 Antonio Court site review, the special joint field meeting with the planning commission will continue at approximately 4:00 p.m. at the parking lot of the Windy Hill Open Space Preserve located on Portola Road, just to the north of the Sequoias. This site meeting is for “continued” *preliminary review* of conditional use permit (CUP) proposal X7D-169 for floor and impervious surface area additions to the 229-acre Spring Ridge LLC property located at 555 Portola Road. An evaluation of the revised CUP proposal is presented below under agenda item **4c. Spring Ridge LLC (Neely/Myers).**

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the ASCC agenda.

**4a. CONTINUED ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-607,
385 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, ILLICH**

On November 9, 2009, the ASCC completed a preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property. The planning commission has also completed its preliminary review of the proposed site development permit. The attached staff report prepared for the November 9th meeting and enclosed meeting minutes provide an overview of the preliminary reviews by both the planning commission and ASCC.

At the conclusion of the preliminary review, the ASCC found the overall project generally acceptable as designed, but did offer some comments and suggestions for plan modifications as set forth in the November 9th meeting minutes. In response to ASCC comments, project architect F. John Richards has provided the attached November 16, 2009 response statement and following enclosed revised plan sheets prepared, unless otherwise noted, by Mr. Richards:

Sheet A1.01, Site Plan, 11/9/09
Sheet A1.02, House Floor Plan, 11/9/09
Sheet A2.01, Main House Elevations, Guesthouse Plan and Elevations, 11/9/09
Sheet L-2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design Associates, 11/16/09

Still part of the application are the following plans and materials unless otherwise noted, dated September 16, 2009 and prepared by F. John Richards, Architect:

Sheet A0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet A1.03, Construction Staging/Tree Protection
Sheet A1.04, Story Pole Locations
Sheet A1.05, Topo Map/Constraints
Sheet L-1, Site Preparation Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc.
Project binder containing materials and colors samples for the proposed residence and guest house and cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received September 21, 2009
Completed BIG checklist showing a total of 168 Green Rated points for the project

The plans listed immediately above are not enclosed but will be available for reference at Monday's ASCC meeting. In general, the ASCC found these plans and colors and materials acceptable as proposed.

At this point, the ASCC should complete review of the project and take action, as may be appropriate, identifying any approval conditions. This action would then be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the site development permit application.

The following comments discuss how the revised plans respond to input received at the 11/9 ASCC meeting:

1. **Overview of plan modifications.** The revised plans include the siting and landscaping adjustments relative to the guest house as explained would be made at the 11/9 meeting. Further, the spa location has been modified as suggested by the ASCC and fencing, Cherokee Way landscaping, and the "sewer pump" adjustments made in direct response to ASCC input and comments in the original staff report.

To deal with the potential massing of the house and terrace as viewed from Cherokee Way, the plans now call for painting the lower stucco areas in the dark trim color, and additional screen planting is shown on the revised landscape plan.

The desire is to keep the pool trellis in the original design as explained in the 11/16 statement from Mr. Richards. Further, as noted in the statement, an effort will be

made, as possible, to gradually remove the existing non-native vegetation along Cherokee Way.

2. **Exterior Lighting.** Most of the lighting plan changes requested by the ASCC have been included with the revised plans, including a significant reduction in the scope of lighting. The revisions, however, include the request to allow two lights at the garage and front door as originally planned for the reasons noted in the 11/16 statement. The requests seem reasonable and the scope of lighting as currently proposed appears to conform to town lighting standards.

Except for the few items noted above, the plan revisions appear to adequately respond to the key issues of concern to the ASCC at the 11/9 meeting. Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the November 23rd meeting.

4b. REQUEST FOR MINOR MODIFICATION OF PREVIOUS APPROVAL -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-603, 50 ALHAMBRA COURT, CHRISTENSEN

On July 13, 2009 the ASCC conditionally approved the subject architectural review and site development permit applications for residential redevelopment of this 1.95-acre Alpine Hills property (see attached vicinity map). Thereafter, building permit plans were submitted and approved and project construction is now underway. At this time the applicant is requesting a modification to the approved site development permit to retain an additional 200 cubic yards of earth on the property. The request is explained in the attached November 10, 2009 letter from Gavin Christensen and described on enclosed **Sheet S1, Grading Study**, received 11/6/09 and prepared by Cleaver Design.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC act on this proposal:

1. **Background and current status of project.** For reference and background, attached are the June 18 and July 9, 2009 staff reports on the original project and the minutes of the July 13, 2009 ASCC approval. At this time, the original house on the site as been removed and the building pad is being readied for the new construction, including approved rough grading. Further, erosion control measures are in place and fire management vegetation treatments have been completed. Also, early planting of materials, as called for in the ASCC approval action, has been completed and inspected by a designated ASCC member.
2. **Proposed additional fill.** The approved site development permit allowed for a total volume of cut and fill of 386 cubic yards. The current request would increase this volume to 586 cubic yards. This volume is still within the grading range where the ASCC has authority on site development permits, i.e., 100 to 1,000 cubic yards.

The request is to place 200 cubic yards of earth removed from the house site on the slope immediately below and south of the established house pad. The site is not steeply sloping and is in the area previously approved for a vegetable garden and children's play area. A copy of the approved site plan for the fill area is attached for reference.

The depths of fill would largely range from two to four feet. The fill would be in an area with no significant vegetation and the plan has been designed to avoid the drip lines of the adjacent small oaks. There is somewhat of a shallow depression in the fill area and the proposal would not dramatically change the character of the slope below the house pad. It would, however, make the area more usable in terms of the planned vegetable garden and play area as shown on the originally approved plans.

Overall, we view this as a minor change to the site plan and site development permit and recommend approval subject to the plans being found acceptable by the public works director and town geologist. In any case, prior to acting on this application, ASCC members should consider the above comments, visit the site again as necessary, and consider any new information presented at the November 23rd meeting.

4c. CONTINUED *PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) APPLICATION X7D-169, REQUEST TO PERMIT ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA AND IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA ON 229-ACRE PARCEL, 555 PORTOLA ROAD, SPRING RIDGE LLC (NEELY/MYERS)*

The attached November 12, 2009 staff report to the planning commission describes the current status of the subject application and lists and discusses the enclosed revised project plans. The primary purpose of the November 23 meeting, as noted at the head of this report, is to conduct a site meeting with the planning commission to consider the additional buildings and uses that are now proposed with the modified CUP request. At the conclusion of the site meeting ASCC members and planning commissioners should offer comments as determined appropriate for the applicant, project design team and staff to consider as processing of the use permit request continues.

The site meeting will provide the opportunity for the design team to, in particular, present the plans for the new buildings that are proposed. These will be modeled with story poles and the project architect will discuss building designs, exterior materials, needs for impervious surface areas, building uses, lighting, etc. While the ASCC should focus on the potential visual impacts of the proposal, it will also need to consider the guest house and accessory structure findings issues discussed in the attached 11/12 report to the planning commission.

The planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the request at its 11/18 meeting and then continued the review to the 11/23 site meeting with the ASCC. During discussion at the 11/18 meeting, planning commissioners raised concerns over, particularly, the proposed agricultural building in the meadow area and also identified access issues, need for a clear overall master plan for the property, and several other matters that need to be clarified relative to intended property "use." The commission also received the attached November 17, 2009 communication from Bill Lane noting concerns with the project and the sensitivity that should be exercised in considering any new structures and uses on the town's western hillsides.

During the course of the 11/18 planning commission discussion, the project architect offered that the proposed agricultural building might be used for storage of hay cut from the meadow area and suggested the possibility that at some point a commercial hay

“agricultural” operation might be considered. In response to concerns over the potential visibility of the “agricultural building” in the Portola Road Scenic Corridor and the “meadow preserve,” he noted that the building would be screened by the “mound” along Portola Road and that the story poles would demonstrate that the building would not interrupt the scenic corridor or open meadow vistas.

As noted in the attached staff report, the proposed 1,880 sf agricultural building would be located in the Pf land movement potential zone. Town geologic policy resolutions set forth specific standards for location of any “buildings” in an active fault zone. The buildings cannot be located across an active fault and if within 100 feet of the potentially active fault trace, site-specific investigations are required to ensure the proposed structure is not “underlain by the suspected fault.” Based on these requirements and concerns relative to potential conflicts with town meadow preserve and Portola Road scenic corridor policies, it is likely that alternative locations for the “future” agricultural building should be considered.

In any case, the ASCC should conduct the 11/23 site meeting with the planning commission and consider the presentation by the project design team and applicant. Further, public input should be received at the site and evening meetings and then ASCC members should offer comments and reactions for consideration by the applicant, project design team and staff as application processing continues.

5a. PROPOSED LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT X6D-206, 160 CHEROKEE COURT AND 99 IROQUOIS TRAIL, *SHUSTEK-DUBINSKY/WONG*

The attached November 12, 2009 staff report to the planning commission describes this proposal for lot line adjustment and includes the documents proposed to support eventual recording of the boundaries of the modified parcels. The ASCC should consider the matter and offer any recommendations to the planning commission relative to the proposal. No formal action, however, is required by the ASCC on the application. The planning commission is the approving authority and, as noted in the attached staff report, there are limits on what can be considered relative to such an application.

On November 18th the planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the request and received input from two of the neighbors who are party to the “lake” agreement discussed in the staff report. The primary concern of the neighbors was that allowing one or more additional parcels to have lake frontage could result in damaging the sensitive environmental qualities of the lake. It was acknowledged that any new party with frontage on the lake would be bound by the provisions of the lake agreement, but it was also acknowledged that the existing agreement likely is not as restrictive as may be necessary to ensure protection of the lake. At the same time, the owners of 160 Cherokee Way have stated they would be agreeable to a “more” restrictive covenant over the area they desire to obtain for access to the lake to ensure the “transfer area” is preserved and that its use would be fully in line with protection of the environmental qualities of the lake.

Planning commissioners suggested that the current parties to the lake agreement might want to consider revisions to ensure it contains all of the provisions they deem necessary for lake protection. It is noted that this would involve the town, as the town is

also party to the agreement. A possible limitation, however, has to do with the fact that the “Wong” parcel is currently for sale and has septic problems. The owner hopes to sell the transfer piece to the owners of 160 Cherokee Way and use the proceeds to address septic/sewer issues.

Prior to forwarding comments to the planning commission on this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments, visit the project site, and receive public input as may be offered at the November 23rd meeting.

5b. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-609, 40 ANTONIO COURT, LARSON

This is a preliminary review of the subject applications for new residential development of this 4.48-acre vacant Woodside Priory subdivision property. The parcel was created with the 1999 approval of the three-lot “Priory” Subdivision, town file X6D-180. Parcel development is regulated under the specific provisions set forth in the “Woodside Priory” **Planned Development Statement**, approved concurrently with the subdivision, and modified through June 2000. This is the first of the three vacant parcels for which formal applications have been filed for project approval.

This site development permit application calls for 7,600 cubic yards of grading, counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance. The large volume of the proposed grading is a reflection of the efforts that are being made for conformity to the PUD provisions that pertain to the subject property.

The planning commission is the approving authority for all site development permits where grading exceeds 1,000 cubic yards. On November 18, 2009 the planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the application and then continued the preliminary review to a joint site meeting with the ASCC. As noted at the head of this memorandum, the joint site meeting is scheduled to take place at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, November 23, 2009.

A preliminary review of the project, including project description focusing on grading, is set forth in the attached November 11, 2009 report to the planning commission. The report was prepared for the commission’s 11/18 preliminary review meeting. Included with the report are vicinity maps, PUD provisions that pertain to the property, and data on the site development permit committee review that has been completed to date. The report also includes a complete listing of the enclosed project plans prepared by the project design team including Aidlin Darling Design and Lea & Braze, Engineering, Inc. Attached to this report are the cut sheets for the proposed exterior lights that were received on October 23, 2009. Also provided is a materials and colors board dated 10/23/09 that is discussed below and will be available for reference at Monday’s meetings.

As noted in the report to the planning commission, story poles have been installed to facilitate the town review process. These are located as shown on the enclosed story pole plan, prepared by the project architect and revised through November 3, 2009. The site has also been staked to show the centerline of the planned driveway and outline of the proposed swimming pool.

The project review comments that follow are in addition to those presented in the November 11th report to the planning commission. Thus, in preparation for the 11/23 preliminary review, ASCC members should consider the 11/11 report and the comments presented below.

1. **Planning Commission November 18, 2009 Preliminary Review.** A project model was presented at the November 18th planning commission meeting and will be available for reference at the 11/23 site and evening meetings. The model demonstrates how the proposed contemporary house will be cut into the site, in line with PUD provisions, and how the design helps to preserve the “knoll” on the property and ensure privacy for the planned outdoor areas relative to views to and from the project site.

The 11/18 planning commission review did not identify any significant concerns with the grading proposals, but comments were offered suggesting that consideration be given to some reduction in the scope of cutting to, in particular, reduce the number of truck trips needed to “export” materials from the site. Further, neighbor Craig Brown, 30 Antonia Court (i.e., the parcel immediately northeast of the site), while generally accepting of the project did express concern over potential impacts from the currently proposed “off-haul” of 2,460 cubic yards of dirt.

At the 11/18 commission meeting, the commission received and considered the attached 11/18/09 email from Margaret Schink, the owner of the property immediately north of the site, i.e., 41 Los Charros Lane. The commissioners noted they would consider the concerns in the email at the site meeting.

Mr. Larson, applicant, advised that he had attempted to share the project plans with Ms. Schink, but had yet to be successful in meeting with her. He noted that he had purchased the subject property from her and believed that her concerns would be relieved when she had a more complete appreciation of the proposed plans.

2. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height, and setback limit compliance.** The plans propose a total floor area of 6,131 sf and this is well within the 6,820 sf floor area limit for the site. The floor area proposed in the single largest building, i.e., the new main house with attached garage is 5,344 sf. This is 78% of the total allowed floor area and 453 sf under the 85% single building limit of 5,797 sf. Thus, the ASCC does not need to make any special ordinance findings relative to the floor area proposed in the main house. A basement area of 1,448 sf is proposed and, as designed, is exempt from the floor area limits.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area of 8,940 sf is well below to the total permitted IS area limit of 12,093 sf. The sections and elevations on Sheet A5.1, demonstrate compliance with the height provisions of the PUD. Further, the design approach has been to minimize the extent of the house forms/heights that would be over the site elevations that currently exist.

The site plan demonstrates that the proposal conforms to required PUD setbacks and actually the house and most other improvements are far removed from setback lines. The plan sheets, however, do not consistently show the correct required PUD

building envelopes and we have advised the project design team that the inconsistencies will eventually need to be resolved with revised plan sheets.

The proposed west side bocce court extends into the western yard area. It averages the required 20 foot setback from the western property line, but at its closest point is within 13 feet of the parcel boundary. To comply with the zoning ordinance averaging provisions, a minimum setback of 16-feet is necessary. Thus, the bocce court siting would require a minor adjustment for compliance with the averaging provisions. We, however, recommend that given the size of the building envelope, an effort be made to place the court fully within the building envelope. This would offer some response to one of the concerns raised by Ms. Schink.

3. **Compliance with Second Unit and Accessory Structures Policies and Regulations.** This matter is discussed in the 11/11/09 report to the planning commission. Only one compliance issue was identified and that is that the proposed guest unit/pool house is 37 sf over the 750 sf limit. Thus, a small plan adjustment will be needed for conformity to town second unit standards.
4. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed architecture is a contemporary style with low profile and strong horizontal forms. It includes mostly flat roof elements that would be surfaced with medium tan colored gravel ballast. The southeasterly roof extension, however, is to have a green roof with some mounding for harmony with the adjacent knoll top.

Exterior materials include rough sawn cedar and reclaimed redwood siding, with the garage doors matching the redwood. Some walls would be of board or smooth formed concrete. Fascia material is to be exterior sheet metal in a dark bronze finish. The window and doorframes would be aluminum with a very dark, almost flat black finish. Dark wood screens are proposed for control of sun and potential for light spill. Landscape walls would be of Cor-ten steel. The material colors are in conformity with town light reflectivity guidelines.

Overall, the design and materials should further enhance the manner in which the house is pulled into the site and harmonizes with site colors and conditions. In addition, the longer northern elevation, facing the Schink property, is significantly varied with different planes, materials and finishes and the sunscreens should be effective in limiting light spill from the house window areas.

5. **Landscaping and Fencing.** No fencing or site gates are proposed and we understand that pool security will be achieved with a cover. The concepts for landscaping are presented on Sheet L1.0. The plans included primarily native materials and, in particular, California natives would be used to screen gaps along the northerly property line. Most all planting would be random in character, in line with town design guidelines. The concept plan includes native grasses for the "lawn" area and overall, appears to be in harmony with the site and town landscape guidelines. It is, however, noted that we have yet to receive conservation committee comments on the project.
6. **Exterior lighting.** Sheet A2.1 shows the locations for the proposed house recessed "pinhole" downlights and the cut sheet for the planned fixture is attached.

L2.0 shows the locations for the proposed yard light fixtures and cut sheets for these fixtures are also attached.

The house lights include a diffusing lens and the angle of the light source can be adjusted. The fixtures are located at passageways, the house entry and over key door-accessed outdoor terrace spaces. In general the scope of the recessed lighting does not appear excessive, but we do wonder about the need for seven (7) such lights over the living room terrace on the west side of the house.

The scope of yard and pathway lighting does not appear excessive and the main pathway fixture is a very thin "twig" design with louvers to control light direction. We have some concern with the proposed "in ground" well lights as they appear to direct light out along the north side of the house. The fixture appears to be designed and located so as to wash the terrace surface, but this should be clarified by the project design team.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-it-Green Checklist.** Pursuant to current town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated "Single Family Home" checklist for the project. The current "self-certification" checklist process, in this case, targets 102 points. The BIG minimum for a new single-family home project is 50 points.

The attached 11/11/09 report from Carol Borck reviews the checklist and offers an overview relative to the proposed "sustainable" design elements. As noted in our 11/11 report to the planning commission, we are encouraging the project design team to seek a higher BIG point rating in line with other similar projects recently reviewed and approved in the town.

Again, since this is a preliminary review of the subject applications, the ASCC should conduct the November 23rd site meeting with the planning commission, consider the above comments, and any additional information obtained at the 11/23 regular evening meeting. Thereafter the ASCC should continue project review to the December 14th regular meeting to allow time for processing of the site development permit and for responses to any comments from the 11/23 preliminary review.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor