



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, January 11, 2010
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:
2. Roll Call: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr
3. Oral Communications:

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. Follow-up Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-609 for New Residential development of this 4.48-acre Priory subdivision property, 40 Antonio Court, Larson
 - b. Follow-up Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review for Site Improvements, Entry Gate and Fencing, Sports Court and Other Modifications, 4115 Alpine Road, Cianfichi
 - b. Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling, and Replacement of Detached Accessory Structure with New Guest Unit, 150 Shawnee Pass, Bellomo
6. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
7. Approval of Minutes: December 14, 2009
8. Adjournment

*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.

PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE. The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

WRITTEN MATERIALS. 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.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. 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 a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: January 8, 2010

Carol Borck
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: January 8, 2010
RE: Agenda for January 11, 2010 ASCC Meeting

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

**4a. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
X9H-609, 40 ANTONIO COURT, LARSON**

On December 14, 2009 the ASCC completed action on the subject architectural review proposal for new residential development of this 4.48-acre vacant Woodside Priory subdivision property. On November 18, 2009 the planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the site development permit application. The planning commission hearing on the site development permit is tentatively scheduled for January 20, 2010.

The staff report prepared for the December 14th ASCC meeting is attached and the meeting minutes are enclosed. As noted in the minutes and architectural review approval conditions, the landscape and grading plans were to be shared with the ASCC as a follow-up matter prior to the planning commission hearing on the site development permit. In response, the applicants have provided the following enclosed plans for ASCC consideration at the January 11, 2009 meeting:

- Sheet C-1, Preliminary Title Sheet, Lea & Braze, Engineering, Inc., revised 1/5/10
- Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze, Engineering, Inc., revised 1/5/10
- Sheet C-3, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze, Engineering, Inc., 1/5/10
- Sheet L1.0, Planting Plan, Bernard Trainor + Associates, 1/11/10

Specifically, the ASCC wanted to review these plans to ensure that the grading proposals on the landscape and engineering plans were consistently shown and also contained the refinements discussed by the landscape architect at the December 14th meeting. The following comments are offered with respect to the revised plans.

1. **Consistency of information.** The grading data is now consistent between the engineering and landscape sheets and, specifically the engineering plans have been modified to be consistent with the landscape plan refinements discussed at the December 14th meeting. While there has been some adjustment to the footprint of the proposed grading area, it is not significant, but the plans now show that all earthwork would be contained within the site. Further, the contours as now proposed ensure that the form of the grading would be as natural appearing as possible given the scope of the operation.

It is also noted that the bocce ball facility has been removed from the project, thus resolving the setback issue noted in the staff report and also a minor privacy concern of the neighbor. This modification also permitted some reduction in grading along the southwest side of the site.

2. **Plan refinements in response to ASCC comments and conditions.** In addition to the grading refinements and elimination of the bocce ball court, the revised landscape plan addresses the 12/14 landscape conditions as follows:
 - a. Eliminates the planting of new redwood trees in the northerly corner.
 - b. Reduces the number of new oaks along the driveway.
 - c. Clarifies that the "lawn" area is to be with drought tolerant, native species of grasses.
 - d. Identifies the early planting that will be accomplished after rough grading. This would need to be incorporated into the final construction schedule prior to release of any building permit.

In addition to the above, the schedule for the grading operations would be developed when detailed building permit and construction staging plans are presented with the building permit submittal and presented to the ASCC for acceptance. As a reminder, the final construction staging plans will be presented to the ASCC for consideration and approval at a public meeting and the neighbors will receive notice of this meeting.

Prior to taking action on this follow-up submittal, ASCC members should consider the above comments as well as any new information that may be presented at the January 11, 2010 meeting.

4b. FOLLOW-UP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-605, 210 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, YOUNG

On December 14, 2009 the ASCC conditionally approved the architectural review portion of this project. The staff report prepared for the December 14th meeting is attached and the meeting minutes are enclosed. Action on the site development permit portion of the request could not be completed as not all staff comments had been

received. Further, a number of specific landscape refinements were needed pursuant to ASCC conditions.

At this time the ASCC is being asked to approve the site development permit and confirm the landscape refinements that have been developed since the 12/14 meeting. Further, the revised plans also address a number of the other approval conditions. The following revised plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 12/18/09 and prepared by CJW Architecture, are now before the ASCC for consideration:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet (with project data)
- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 6/24/08
- Sheet: A-1.01, Near Neighbor Site Plans, 11/20/09
- Sheet: A-1.02, Impervious Surface and Setback Average Site Plans
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging, Tree Protection
- Sheet: L-1, Site Preparation Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
- Sheet: L-2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-2.2, Lower Level Plan and Roof Plan
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.2, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.3, Pool Pavilion Plan, Elevation & Section

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider this follow-up submittal and complete action on the subject site development permit.

1. **Follow-up review.** The revised submittal includes the plan adjustments to address approval conditions 1, 2, and 3 relative to the roofs and family room adjustments. In follow-up to the ASCC action, some refinements were made to the family room to address furniture requirements and these were discussed with ASCC Chair Clark. We understand that he concluded these were in substantial compliance with the intent of conditions 2 and 3. The family room changes result in a reduction of 66 sf of floor area (i.e., 33 sf on the main level and the same amount in the basement.)

The plans also address the changes to the pool pavilion roof and southeast “solid wall” to address condition 3 and the provisions of the landscaping conditions, as discussed below. Other conditions, particularly with respect to construction staging, would be addressed in detail at the building permit stage of the project. At that time, complete construction staging plans would be presented to the ASCC for approval as called for in the project conditions.

2. **Landscape plan revisions and phasing of planting.** The plans have been revised to address the landscape plan conditions, including phased planting of key screening materials. The process for revision included a meeting between the project landscape architect and ASCC members Breen and Clark. The framework for this meeting was set with the 12/14 approval and it was then understood that the meeting would take place prior to the time the plans were returned to the ASCC for consideration. We understand that Clark and Breen did find the revised plans acceptable, including the adjustments to the lower pool retaining wall and the slope between the wall and pool. The project landscape architect and ASCC members

Breen and Clark will review the revised landscape plans in detail at the January 11th meeting and discuss how they respond to the ASCC approval conditions.

3. **Site development permit review.** As noted at the 12/14 meeting, the total scope of proposed grading is 244 cubic yards as noted on Sheet: A-1.1. This scope of grading requires the subject site development permit and the plans have been considered and recommended for conditional approval by the following members of the site development committee

Public Works Director, attached memo report dated 12/3/09

Trails Committee, attached memo report dated 12/1/09

Town Geologist, attached memo report dated 12/14/09

Fire Marshal, attached memo report dated 1/4/10

In addition, the conservation committee has reviewed the project and offered comments relative to repair landscaping that have been addressed through the ASCC review process.

Lastly, since the project is to be connected to the sanitary sewer, no report is expected from the health officer. As is normal, sewer connection requirements are worked out with the West Bay Sanitary District during the course of building permit preparation and processing. Over the course of project review, some concern has been raised over the impact of sewer connection facilities on front yard landscaping. Thus, it is recommended that in taking any action on the site development permit, the ASCC include a condition that states when all of the requirements of the sanitary district are identified, they be presented to a designated member of the ASCC to determine if any landscape adjustments are needed to, as possible screen views to the required sewer connection facilities. *(Note: we understand that there has been communication between the project architect and sanitary district and more data on the district requirements will be provided at Monday's meeting.)*

In addition to the recommended condition relative to the sewer connection, any action on the site development permit should include the requirement that all of the conditions of the public works director, town geologist, and fire marshal be addressed to the satisfaction of the respective reviewer.

(Note: The town received the enclosed January 7, 2010 letter from Ms. Virginia Bacon on the revised plans late in the day on 1/7. We have not yet had time to fully review the comments, but will respond as appropriate and necessary at the January 11th ASCC meeting. The letter has also been made available to the project architect for consideration and response.)

Prior to acting on these requests, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the January 11, 2010 meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS, ENTRY GATE AND FENCING, SPORTS COURT AND OTHER MODIFICATIONS, 4115 ALPINE ROAD, CIANFICHI

This proposal calls for a number of site modifications, minor for the most part, that would continue the program for parcel improvement initiated with ASCC approvals in 2005 and 2006. The subject 1.0-acre site is located immediately to the southeast of the Alpine Hills Tennis & Swim Club (see attached vicinity map) and gains access by a series of easements that extend from the site along the north side of the Tennis & Swim Club to Alpine Road.

The scope of currently proposed improvements are shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by Cianfichi Architecture • Planning and received November 30, 2009:

- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Deck
- Sheet A3, Trellis
- Sheet A4, Guest House
- Sheet A5, Guest House Deck and Trellis

Also enclosed is a revised gate plan, identified as **Gate 1R** and dated 12/21/09, prepared by the project architect and transmitted with the attached letter also dated 12/21/09. In support of the plans the applicant has provided the following attached materials received 11/30/09:

- Light fixture cut sheet from the Lighthouse for the planned entry gate light
- Photo detail for the proposed entry gate (from Creative Gateworks)
- Photo example of proposed Good Neighbor Fence with Lattice Top
- Specifications sheets for proposed *StarPro Greens ProLawn Synthetic Fescue Grass Turf*

The primary focus of ASCC review is on the proposed entry gate and associated fencing and the sports court. The main house and guest house deck and trellis additions, for the most part, would not require ASCC review. Further, the decks, as designed, don't count as impervious surface area. Also, the guest house interior changes don't change the basic conditions associated with the structure and use and typically would not require ASCC consideration.

The comments that follow focus on the proposed entry gate and associated new fencing, creek setback requirements associated with the proposed southeast side deck, and the sports court.

1. **Background, project description.** The subject property is *Parcel 2* of the MacKay subdivision approved by the town and recorded in 1984. The subdivision process determined that the flood plain on the property is along the southeast side and an open space easement was established along the creek and creek bank over the area of the flood plan. Also, with this subdivision, the parcel access was established with the easements to Alpine Road, including the 20-foot wide easement over the northerly side of the property immediately to the northeast.

In 2005, the ASCC approved plans for general clean up and improvements to the existing house, guest house and garage. The approval included house additions and the low fence along the top of the bank of Los Trancos Creek. The improvements and the additions to the structures were completed according to the approved plans.

In 2005, the applicant advised the ASCC of the desire to fill the old drainage channel on the northeast side of the property, essentially within the front setback area that is adjacent to the boundary of the tennis & swim club. In 2006, a site development permit was processed and approved by the ASCC for this fill. The site development permit has been implemented and the drainage channel filled pursuant to the conditions of the site development permit.

The current proposal calls for the sports court to be installed in a portion of the area filled with the 2006 site development permit. The proposed entry gate and new fencing would be across the existing driveway where it enters the property at the northeastern corner. The proposed fence and gate would essentially complete the fencing of the property boundaries away from Los Trancos Creek. Such fencing appears generally appropriate given the site's relationship to the tennis & swim club and the front yard of the parcel immediately to the northeast.

Unfortunately, as explained below, the proposed new fencing and entry gate conflict with the provisions of the town's fence ordinance. There are some options for resolving the conflicts and these are also discussed below. Some will require the ASCC to grant exceptions to the provisions of the fence ordinance, and one other will likely require consideration of an exception by the planning commission. The options are set forth for ASCC reaction and discussion with the applicant. With ASCC direction, both the applicant and staff will be able to set a course for completing the design and permit review processes. Further, it may be possible for the ASCC to grant conditional approvals at this time with specific conditions articulated for how the identified conflicts are to be resolved.

2. **Deck compliance with required creek setbacks.** The south side deck proposed in the area between the existing residence and the top of the bank of Los Trancos creek is largely within the required 45-foot setback area if the setback is taken from the top of the creek bank. The proposed deck otherwise seems consistent with site conditions and could be constructed without any grading or impact on existing vegetation. Thus, the key issue is the setback conflict. In this case, the option is to provide data to the satisfaction of the public works director that identifies the ordinary high water mark and 50-foot setback from this mark, which is likely considerably south of the top of the bank. If this is the case, it is possible that the deck could be constructed much as desired. It is further noted, however, that the public works director needs to also confirm that the location and construction would be in conformity with the town's flood plain zoning provisions.

Thus, in this case the final deck location will be dependent on the findings of the public works director. In terms of aesthetic and impervious surface area impacts, the location and design seem acceptable and, as proposed, the deck would not be considered new impervious surface.

3. **Sports Court.** The proposed sports court would have an area of 1,800 sf. It can be installed with minimum grading and is an area that is presently used for play. The specifications for the surface have been provided, in part, to demonstrate that surface would be pervious and not counted against the town's impervious surface limits. Current town ordinances and polices would not recognize such surfaces as pervious and, therefore, at this time the court surface would need to be counted as impervious surface. (Note: for relief from this, the planning commission would need to consider the request and make a specific determination that the surface was pervious consistent with the intent of the impervious surface (IS) provisions of the zoning ordinance.)

The total existing site IS area is 3,835 sf and well under the 7,203 sf IS limit for the property. With the sports court, the IS would increase to 5,635 sf and still be within the IS limit. Further, there would over 1,800 sf of possible IS to accommodate, for example, a "future" swimming pool. Thus, at this point, the project as proposed does not face an IS conflict.

As to the sports court location, it appears well sited adjacent to the sports court activities at the tennis and swim club and away from the back yard area on the parcel immediately to the northeast. It is also noted that the court is over the filled drainage channel and likely does not conflict with any existing portions of the site's septic system, but this should be confirmed prior to court construction.

It is also noted that the court location adheres to the required 50-foot front yard and 20-foot side yard setback requirements.

4. **New fencing and driveway entry gate.** The proposed new gate and fencing extensions are to be located along the northeastern side property line as shown on Sheet A1. The fence would match the fencing in between the subject site and the parcel to the northeast and would be six feet high. The proposed black iron sliding gate would also have a maximum height of six feet and would be supported by columns as shown on the site plan and 12/21/09 gate elevation sheet. Lights would be placed on the east and west sides of each of the columns.

The proposed gate and fencing would be within the existing 50-foot front yard setback area as shown on the attached annotated sheet. Under provisions of the fence ordinance, any front yard fencing or gate is limited to a maximum height of four feet and must have an opacity of 50%. While the desired gate may meet the opacity standard, the proposed fencing does not. Further, neither the gate nor the new fencing conform to the four-foot height limit.

In addition to the above, a gate must be set back at least one half the required front yard area, or 25 feet with the 50-foot front yard setback. In this case, the proposed gate extends to within 16 feet of the front property line, even though this is the boundary common with the tennis & swim club.

Under the provisions of zoning ordinance Section 18.52.110, for a parcel like this with an individual access way, the planning commission can grant an exception that would reduce the front yard setback from 50 to 20 feet if specific findings can be made. In this case, it appears the required findings could be readily made and if the exception were granted, the gate could be located generally as proposed. This

exception would also open the front yard area for location of the future pool. Currently the "future" pool would not be possible as it is fully within the existing required front yard setback area.

Relative to the potential fence height and opacity conflicts, the ASCC has the authority in Section 18.43.080.C.3. of the fence ordinance to grant relief from the standards if it finds site conditions support the exception and would not otherwise conflict with the intent of the ordinance. Given the conditions that impact this property, particularly the access and relationships to the tennis & swim club, it appears that findings to support the exceptions may be possible. The ASCC should consider this and provide reactions and directions as appropriate.

During our site inspection and review of the plans, we identified some issues that appear to need further clarification and such clarification should be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC. The following are specifically noted:

- As shown on the site plan, it is not clear that the proposed fencing and gate, including support columns and lighting, would actually be located fully within the subject property. Some of the proposed improvements appear to extend onto the parcel to the northeast.
- The existing driveway and location of fencing do not appear to fully conform to the limits of the established access easement. It should be clear that the gate and driveway actually work with the location of the access easement and don't cause the access to cross the neighboring parcel outside of the easement area.
- There are currently a number of trash, compost and recycling bins on the subject property that we assume must be accessed by the trash company for pick-up. It appears that if they need to be placed outside of the new gate and fence, they would be on the neighboring property. How trash pick-up will be served with the proposed improvements needs to be clarified. It is possible that the gate and fencing should be adjusted to preserve some pavement outside of the gates for trash service and some space for vehicle turnaround. This should at least be discussed with the applicant.

The proposed plans include two lights on each of the gate columns; one each on the property side and one each facing the driveway easement. The proposed fixture appears to have a frosted lens, but is not otherwise shielded. We recommend that if column lighting is to be permitted, it be with a fully shielded, down directed light fixture and that consideration be given to only one such light on the easement side of the entry gate.

Prior to taking any action on this request or providing directions on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any other matters raised at the January 11, 2010 ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, AND REPLACEMENT OF DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE WITH NEW GUEST UNIT, 150 SHAWNEE PASS, BELLOMO

This proposal is for approval of plans for residential additions and significant house remodeling on the subject 1.1-acre Arrowhead Meadows parcel (see attached vicinity map). The project includes replacement of an existing detached accessory structure with a new second unit. The existing house and proposed improvements are all single story. While the project would expand site floor area by approximately 1,100 sf, the proposal conforms to both the total and 85% floor area limits and, therefore, no special ASCC floor area findings are required.

The proposed site improvements are shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by Chapman Design Associates and received December 16, 2009:

- Sheet A-1, Site Plan (and Project Data)
- Sheet A-2, Demolition Plan
- Sheet A-3, Basement Plan (Main House)
- Sheet A-4, Main Floor Plan
- Sheet A-7, Front and Rear Elevations
- Sheet A-8, Right and Left Elevations
- Sheet A-9, Guest House Main, and Basement Floor Plans and Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-10, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-11, Main House Cross Sections
- Sheet A-12, Main House Cross Sections

In addition to these plans, the applicant has provided the enclosed Site Grading, Drainage and Utility Plan, Berry and Associates, received 12/21/09. This plan will be reviewed by public works (drainage and grading) and the health department (septic system) as part of the normal building permit review process. Although the plan indicates 560 cubic yards of cut, this is for the proposed basement areas at the main house (897 sf of floor area) and guest house (564 sf floor area) and therefore, don't count against the grading volumes that trigger site development permit requirements. In this case, the volume of counted earthwork is less than 100 cubic yards and, therefore, any site development permit requirements would be under the review authority of the public works director. Nonetheless, the full volume of off-haul grading will be calculated in terms of required town hauling/street impact fees.

In addition to the enclosed plans, the applicant has provided the attached cut sheet for the proposed wall mounted light fixtures. The locations for the fixtures are shown on the floor plan sheets. Also provided is the attached completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist showing that 102 BIG points are targeted for the project.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC review and act on the architectural review proposal.

1. **Project description conformance with creek setbacks and flood plain zoning.**
The 1.1 acre site is, for the most part, relatively level with minimal ornamental landscaping, but significant oaks and other trees are located along the parcel

boundaries and in the western area of the site adjacent to Corte Madera Creek. Along the creek, site slopes are significantly steeper.

The trees around the site are effective in providing screening between residences and ensure that existing and proposed site improvements have minimum potential for impacting views in the neighborhood. All proposed improvements avoid areas with significant trees and measures are identified on the plans for protection of the one large oak located between the main house and guest house site. Further, there is ample room along the northern area of the site for construction staging and existing trees help screen this area from off site views.

The proposed house and guest house improvements are to take place in much the same location as existing structures. The existing single story house is just beyond the western boundary of the 50-foot front yard setback line. Approximately 1,000 sf of this house would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project. Most of this demolition would take place at the northern, i.e., garage end, of the main house. The additional 1,100 sf would also be added around the northern end of the house, but mostly in the area of existing porch and other hardscape. The additions can be accomplished with very minimal impact on existing vegetation. Further, the locations of the garage driveway and front entry walkway would not change with the project, although new surfaces would be used. The driveway would be resurfaced with asphalt and the walkway with flagstone.

The guest house would replace an existing detached accessory building of similar size in the northwest portion of the site. The new guest house would have a very similar location, footprint, size and massing to the existing accessory structure and would maintain the minimum 45-foot setback from the top of the bank of Corte Madera Creek. It is noted, however, that data will need to be provided to the satisfaction of the public works director verifying that the improvements conform to the flood plain zoning provisions of the town. We have reviewed the town's flood plain map and note that the Zone A boundary appears to be limited to the top of creek bank, but may extend to elevation 452. All proposed improvements are upslope of this elevation.

As noted above, the project can be completed with minimal grading, with the majority of the cut for basement excavation. This would include the 897 sf basement under the north end of the remodeled house and 564 sf basement under the guest house. The excavation for the basements includes access stairs and, for the main house, a small patio area on the west side of the basement. In all cases, the basement access stairs and lightwell/patio area are not visible from off site and do not add to the apparent height of the structures when viewed from off site.

While the improvements will be located in much the same place as the existing structures, they will, when finished, reflect significant changes in the quality and character of the structures. The existing single story improvements have a somewhat dated Ranch style with lighter finishes than would be encouraged by current town policies. The proposed improvements are also single story, adhering to the 18-foot height limit allowing for capturing for the 5% floor area bonus. The architectural style is of a more contemporary Ranch character with materials and finishes that conform to current town guidelines and policies. A more complete description of the materials and finishes is provided below.

It is clear that this proposal is for significant improvements to existing conditions and that the project is not small in terms of scope. Nonetheless, when the work is completed, the place of the improvements in the neighborhood will not be dramatically different from current conditions. Further, the updated Ranch style of the proposal would be fully consistent with the quality and character of other residential projects recently completed in the area.

2. **Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area (IS) and height limits.**

The total proposed floor area is 5,257 sf and just under the 5,374 sf limit, which includes the bonus for a single story house. The proposed main house floor area is 4,509 sf and just under the 85% limit of 4,565 sf. The main house includes the existing house, proposed additions and attached garage.

The proposed guest house has a total area of 748 sf and just under the 750 sf limit for such structures. As noted above, it is to also have a 564 sf basement, for storage, with separate access. The ASCC will need to make findings relative to conformity to town accessory structures policies relative to the basement area as explained below.

The plan elevation sheets demonstrate that the maximum heights of the proposed improvements are just under 18 feet and conform to the single story limits for capturing of the 5% floor area bonus. The sections and elevations show the basement and basement access areas, but these are all below finished grade.

The impervious surface (IS) limit for the parcel is 7,516 sf. The IS calculations on Sheet A-1 state the area to be 9,821 sf, but we believe this number includes the buildings, which do not need to be counted against the IS limit. In any case, while we do not see an IS conflict, correct IS figures should be provided to the satisfaction of staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

With respect to yard setbacks, all additions and the new second unit conform to the required 50-foot front and 20-foot rear and side yard zoning requirements as demonstrated on the site plan on Sheet A-1. Further, this site plan shows that the guest house as well as all other improvements maintain at least the required minimum 45-foot setback from the top of the creek bank.

3. **Architecture, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed added to and remodeled house and the proposed second would be finished in the materials and colors noted on the plan elevations and shown on the colors board received with the plan submittal in December. The materials and colors board will be presented at the ASCC meeting and includes the following:

Roof:	Asphalt composition shingles, in a dark brown/rust finish. The light reflectivity values (LRV) is under 20%, and well below the 40% policy maximum.
Stucco siding:	Smooth sand finished in a dark, muddy tan color, with a LRV of less than 30% and well under the 40% policy limit.
Windows/Door	

Trim:	Stained in a finish that has an LRV of under 20% and well under the 50% policy limit for trim.
Windows/Doors:	Metal frames, with a dark brown finish with an LRV of under 15% and well below the 50% policy limit for trim areas.

A portion of the front elevation of the house will be finished in stone veneer. The stone finish is a blend of darker brown tones, with a LRV of approximately 20% and well under the limit for siding of 40%.

The sheets and data do not state the materials and finishes for the house front door or garage doors. We assume these would match the proposed wood trim, but this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

In summary, the proposed architectural style and materials and finishes appear to be in harmony with the general character of development in the Arrowhead Meadows area and also in conformity with town design guidelines.

- 4. Conformance with second unit zoning regulations and accessory structure policy requirements.** As noted above, the project proposes a new second unit that would replace existing detached accessory structure that is not now considered a second unit. The ASCC must make findings pursuant to both a town policy statement and zoning regulations as evaluated below.

Second Unit and Accessory Structures Policy Statement, July 29, 1992 (copy attached). The proposed second unit is designed as such and intended for guesthouse use. It conforms to the 750 sf limit. It, however, includes a basement with separate access and no internal connection to the main level second unit area. Pursuant to the policy statement, the ASCC must determine that the main and basement levels cannot be easily connected to create a second unit larger than 750 sf. In the past, the ASCC has permitted such designs, with basements, but required a deed restriction be recorded against the parcel to ensure current and future owners are aware that the structure could not be converted to connect the upper and lower area or otherwise modified to a second unit larger than allowed by the zoning ordinance. In this case the deed restriction is recommended.

Zoning Regulations. Second units are permitted on parcels of one acre or larger pursuant to the limitations set forth in Section 18.12.040.B of the zoning ordinance (copy attached). Since the parcel has more than one acre a detached second unit is permitted, but must be in conformity with the provisions of the ordinance. In this case, the second unit has been designed to match the house, has the same driveway access and is clearly secondary to the primary residential use. Further, the necessary parking has been provided for and exterior lighting is limited to one fixture at each key access point, including the lights for access to the lower basement area. Thus, it appears that the proposed second unit conforms to the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

- 5. Fencing and Landscaping.** Existing property line fencing will be preserved. Further, existing fencing and gates between the house and side property lines are

to be preserved or replaced if they need to be removed to accommodate construction.

The plans propose no new extensive landscaping but note that existing landscaping is to be preserved to the extent possible. Currently there is a hedge along the front of the parcel that is largely within the town's right of way. It is recommended that a front yard landscape plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the ASCC that provides for eventual removal of this hedge and replacement with materials that are more in keeping with town landscaping policies and guidelines.

6. **Exterior lighting.** The floor plan and elevation sheets state that the new exterior lights will be fixtures with a "concealed source." The locations appear generally consistent with town guidelines, although the ASCC typically discourages two lights on the front elevation of a garage.

The proposed fixture has solid top and amber glass shade with a covering steel vine motif. The fixture can accommodate on, 100 watt maximum light.

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 and less for an addition project. The attached December 23, 2009 report from planning technician Borck discusses the proposed sustainable elements of the project.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the January 11, 2010 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor