



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, March 8, 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. Continued Review of Request for Modification of Building Envelope for Lot 28 Blue Oaks Subdivision, 9 Buck Meadow Drive, Stritter
 - b. Continued Review -- Architectural Review for New Blue Oaks Residence and Site Development Permit X9H-611, 2 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 36 Blue Oaks), Toor
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review of Proposed House Additions and Remodeling, 25 Saddleback, Stroh
 - b. Architectural Review of Proposed House Additions, Remodeling and Conversion of Carport to Garage, 3 Coalmine View, Grundfest
 - c. Request for Approval of Redwood Tree Removal, 330 & 340 Golden Hills Drive, Klope
6. Approval of Minutes: February 22, 2010
7. 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: March 5, 2010

Carol Borck
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: March 4, 2010
RE: Agenda for March 8, 2010 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. CONTINUED REVIEW -- REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF BUILDING ENVELOPE FOR LOT 28 BLUE OAKS SUBDIVISION, 9 BUCK MEADOW DRIVE, STRITTER

The ASCC initiated review of this request for building envelope (BE) modifications at the February 8, 2010 meeting and then, on February 22nd, conducted a site meeting on the proposal. The February 19, 2010 report prepared for the site meeting is attached, and the minutes of the meeting are enclosed.

At the conclusion of the February 22nd meeting, the ASCC provided directions for adjustments to the proposed BE as noted in the meeting minutes. The applicant agreed to make those changes and has submitted the attached March 1, 2010 letter outlining the specific modifications that have been made. Further, the new alignment for the BE addition area on the south side of the site has been staked at the site for ASCC inspection. The stakes for the adjusted BE alignment are identified with pink ribbons.

The applicant has also provided one annotated copy of the site plan showing the BE modifications. This will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. We have, however, also made a copy of the portion of the plan that shows the BE changes as well as the proposal for Private Open Space Easement (POSE) replacement, as agreed to at the site meeting. The 8.5" x 11" copy, with changes emphasized by enhanced lines, is attached for ASCC use in inspecting the site relative to the revised proposal. As noted on the copy, the BE would remain the same size with the reduced and added area both equal to approximately 5,700 sf. The proposed POSE area is roughly 6,600 sf and considerably larger than the 5,700 sf reduction in POSE that would occur with the BE changes.

The revised proposal appears to directly conform to the ASCC directions provided at the site meeting. In particular, the "corner" adjustments at the easternmost corner help

to preserve the Buck Meadow Preserve when viewed from the intersection of Redberry Ridge and Buck Meadow Drive. Further, the POSE area expands the controlled open space adjacent to the town owned "neighborhood preserve" just to the east of the subject property.

Prior to completing action on this request and forwarding any recommendation to the town council, ASCC members should consider the above comments and inspect the new stakes set at the site. As noted in the attached materials, the changes to the POSE area will need to be considered and acted on by the town council once the ASCC has concluded its position on the BE adjustments.

4b. CONTINUED REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW BLUE OAKS RESIDENCE AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-611, 2 BUCK MEADOW DRIVE (LOT 36 BLUE OAKS), TOOR

On February 22, 2010, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the subject applications submitted in support of plans for new residential development of this 3.08-acre vacant Blue Oaks subdivision/Planned Unit Development (PUD) parcel. The 2/22 review included a joint site meeting with the planning commission and follow-up ASCC discussion at its regular evening meeting. The attached February 19, 2010 staff report prepared for the February 22nd meeting and enclosed meeting minutes provide an evaluation of the project and highlight the comments that were offered by both planning commissioners and ASCC members. At the conclusion of the 2/22 review, project consideration was continued to the March 8, 2010 regular ASCC meeting.

In follow-up to the preliminary review, the project design team has been working on plan refinements to address the fill, landscaping and carport issues discussed at the site and evening meetings. Further, the plans are being modified to address the fencing, fire pit, and lighting matters discussed in the original staff report, as well as the lighting comments offered at the ASCC meeting.

According to Tom Carrubba, project architect, the efforts will continue through this week, particularly with respect to the landscaping and fill matters and structural evaluation of the carport design. As a result, the intent is to present the plan modifications and adjustments at Monday's meeting. Therefore, the ASCC will need to determine on Monday night the adequacy of the revised plans relative to the issues raised during the preliminary review. The matter of fill will need particular attention, as the ASCC should forward specific comments on this part of the grading plans to the planning commission for consideration in conducting its hearing on the site development permit.

Since the 2/22 meeting, only one new site development permit committee report has been received. The attached March 1, 2010 report from the Conservation Committee offers a question regarding the lighting plan and one recommendation relative to the landscape plan. The report has been forwarded to the project design team for consideration in preparing the materials to be presented at Monday's meeting.

If the ASCC finds the plan adjustments acceptable, it could act on the architectural review component portion of the project. Again, the ASCC should also forward specific comments on the final grading plans for consideration by the planning commission.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, 25 SADDLEBACK, PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH, STROH

This proposal is for the addition of 415 sf of floor area to the existing multi-level, flat roof, 3,600 sf residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel (see enclosed vicinity map). The addition is to be made to the lower, ground level and includes a new mudroom, exercise room and small expansion to the existing family room. Also proposed is a stair and trellis system to connect the back of the detached garage to the main house. The garage is at a significantly lower elevation to the house entry and access from the garage to the house is relatively long and open to the elements. The trellis system would solve this access issue. The proposal is shown on the following enclosed project plans unless otherwise noted revised through 1/20/10 and prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet: A-1, Site Plan

Sheet: A-2, Proposed Floor Plan

Sheet A-3.0, Section and Existing Exterior Elevations, 12/14/09

Sheet: A-3.1, Proposed Exterior Elevations

Sheet: A-4, Details, 12/14/09

Sheet: A-5, Trellis Details and Images

Provided with the plans are the attached cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures and photo images how the fixtures are currently used on the residence, including railing/stair lighting. Also attached are images of the existing wood railings and conditions associated with the relationship between the detached garage and the house. Color copies of the images will be available for ASCC review at the March 8th meeting.

It should be noted that the proposal states that all new improvements would match existing materials and finishes, including decks and railings. Further, the project was conditionally approved by the Ranch Design Committee as stated in the attached letter dated 2/5/10. The letter includes a note that the approval conditions were addressed with the revised plans as approved on February 9, 2010. "New" Sheet A-5 specifically responds to the Ranch conditions.

The following comments are offered on the request:

1. **Project description and evaluation: grading, vegetation impacts and architectural design.** The subject building site has varying slope conditions, but the most significant elevation difference is between the level of the detached garage on the north side of the site and the ground floor of the house. The garage is at elevation 632 and the house at elevation 656. As noted above, there is a relatively long pathway from the garage/driveway level to the house that extends up the main entry stairs on the west side of the garage. There is no weather protection for this

access and even adequate lighting for night access would be difficult as it would result in considerable off site spill.

The multi-level, mostly two-story house has flat roof forms, as does the detached garage. The siding is cedar shingles with a natural stain and the fascia boards have a dark, solid stain in a taupe color. The window frames are dark bronze. All new construction is to match existing improvements including, as noted above, the railings and deck areas.

The house additions would take place on the lower, ground level and include new mud and exercise rooms at the northeasterly corner of the house, between the garage and house, and the family room extension into the rear existing deck. The mud/exercise room would maintain the PUD required 4-foot separation from the garage and would include a new entry door and entry stairs, landing and north side shingled privacy wall. These improvements would essentially fill the area between the house and garage, and be adjusted to the existing grades. Only six cubic yards of grading is proposed and no trees or other significant vegetation is within the area of the proposed additions. The photo elevation "models" on sheet A-5 describe in detail how the proposed improvements would be fitted into the existing area between the house and garage.

The family room extension would take place in the existing lower, rear side deck. The plans include some new and expanded rear deck space to accommodate both the family room extension and access from the exercise room to the rear yard.

All house additions and deck extensions are within the established building envelope as shown on Sheet A-1. Further, the maximum house heights, with the additions are in the 28-30 foot range. The height limit for the Ranch is 36 feet measured from an average point of contact with grade, and, therefore, this proposal is well within the height limit.

The proposed stair and trellis connection from the garage to the mud/exercise room entry is located along the rear elevation of the garage. In order to provide protection from weather, the ten foot high trellis elements would overlap, while still meeting the Ranch design standard for an openness of 50%. To enhance privacy, the plans propose to extend a 9-10 ft. high wing wall from the northeasterly corner of the garage at the base of the stairs and the flat roof of the garage would also be extended with the wing wall. This wall would shield the downhill neighbor from views to the stairs and stair use as well as the new rear garage door and light at the door.

The detached garage was constructed in the side yard area with ASCC approval as allowed for in the PUD. Since it is in the side yard, it cannot be connected to the house with enclosed floor area. To provide the desired weather protected entry, therefore, the current trellis and open stair system was designed. While the PUD allows for the garage to be in the side yard, it does not specify the elements of the garage or limitations relative to access from the garage to the house. At the same time, with the original approvals for lot development by the developer Portola Valley Associates, the ASCC did allow for stairs and trellis features to be used to connect detached garages and carports to the main residence.

Given the foregoing, the ASCC will need to determine that the proposed stair and trellis system is a reasonable design that is appropriate relative to providing access from the garage to the house. In this case, particularly given the elevation differences, and efforts to screen views to the stairs from the downhill neighbor, we believe the design is appropriate. Our only concern is to ensure that the stair and trellis work does not impact the oak immediately east of the garage and just downhill of the proposed exercise room addition. The plans state that this, and the second oak to the east would be protected, but specific plans for this protection should be provided with the building permit plans.

The PUD allows for a maximum impervious (IS) surface on the property of 30%. This is based on the IS definition that existed when the PUD was approved, which included the house and other impervious surface areas. There is no specific floor area limit for houses at the Ranch. We have done a rough calculation and it appears that the plans comply with the 30% limit, but detailed IS calculations should be provided for the record with the building permit to the satisfaction of planning staff.

2. **Conformance with Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) Statement provisions.** Based on the proposed addition designs as evaluated above and continued use of existing materials and colors; we believe the proposal is consistent with the Ranch PUD provisions. Also, as noted above, the Ranch Design Committee, as required by the PUD statement, has approved the plans.
3. **Landscaping and exterior lighting.** Besides protection of existing oaks, the plans propose to install new manzanita shrubs along the northerly wall of the garage as shown on Sheet A-1. This would screen views from the residence on the property to the north.

The locations for the new exterior wall and railing mounted step lights are shown on Sheet A-2. The wall mounted, Ranch approved, fixtures would be located at the new rear garage entry door and at the door to the mudroom. The stair lights would be along the new stairs from the garage to the house and at the new rear deck off the exercise room. The scope of lighting does not appear excessive, and the with the wall extensions at the garage, the lights should be effectively screened from most off site view. The wall mounted fixtures direct light down and, again, are of a design approved for use at the Ranch.

4. **Sustainability aspects of the project.** The applicant has provided the attached Build It Green (BIG) checklist for the project, which targets 30 BIG points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached February 26, 2010 report from planning technician Carol Borck. Under the BIIG program, this would be considered an "Elements" project, with a minimum required threshold of 25 points. According to interaction with the project architect, as project details are finalized, it is likely that additional sustainable elements would be added to the plans.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site, and consider the above comments and any other information presented at the ASCC meeting. Given the above evaluation, however, project approval is recommended subject to provision of adequate construction staging and vegetation protection plans and addressing of the few other matters noted in the evaluation.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS, REMODELING, AND CONVERSION OF A CARPORT TO A GARAGE, 3 COALMINE VIEW, PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH, GRUNDFEST

This proposal is for the addition of 251 sf of floor area to upper level of the existing partial two-story, pitched and flat roof, 2,883 sf residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel (see enclosed vicinity map). The project includes minor additions to the main, upper level, but also 750 sf of new floor area in the lower level that would be constructed fully within the footprint of the existing house. The existing detached carport would be converted to a garage and storage space added to the east side of the garage and within a new attic area with interior stair access. Except for the side storage addition, the basic form of the detached garage with gable roof would not change.

The project includes improvements to the pathway entry to the house, i.e., converting the entry from a deck system to stone pavers, and a small deck extension on the downhill side of the upper level of the house. With all new floor area, the added and remodeled project would result in a total house floor area of 3,884 sf.

The proposal is shown on the following enclosed project plans unless otherwise noted dated 2/10/10, prepared by William Maston Architect & Associates:

- Sheet A0.01, Title Sheet
- Sheet A0.02, Floor Area Calculations
- Sheet A1.01, (E) Site and Landscape Plan
- Sheet A1.02, Proposed Entry Area Plan
- Sheet A1.03, Area – Site View - Plan
- Sheet A2.01, Existing Lower Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.02, Existing Main Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.03, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.04, Proposed Main Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.05, Roof Plan
- Sheet A5.01, Existing Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.02, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.03, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.4, Carport

Provided with the plans are several color photo images of the existing house and site conditions that will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. Black and white copies of these images are attached for reference. The plans note that unless otherwise specified all new materials and finishes would match existing conditions. The siding, trim and window and door frames would match existing conditions, but the deck railings would be changed from the existing metal pipe system to a cable railing system and the new entry would replace the existing decking with concrete paver on a raised platform.

The project has received conditional approval from the Ranch Design committee as stated in the attached February 5, 2010 letter from Deborah Soule of the Portola Valley Ranch Association. Story poles have been placed at the site to define the upper level additions and the storage addition to the east side of the garage.

The following comments are offered on the request:

1. **Project description and evaluation: grading, vegetation impacts, architectural design, landscaping.** For the most part the improvements to enlarge the carport/garage and house are minor with respect to the apparent change to site conditions. The existing carport separates the house from the street and the guest parking easement area adjacent to Coalmine View. Pathway access to the house is on the west side of the carport and extends under a trellis that is partially in the side yard area as shown on Sheet A1.02. The house is immediately south of the carport and from the entry level has a single story form. The lower level descends from the main, entry level, as is typical for houses along Coalmine View. On its downhill, south side the house has a full, two-story form as shown on the plan elevation sheets and the attached photo images.

The roof areas on the north side of the house are flat with build up roof materials. On the south side, the roof has a shed design. The carport roof has a modified gable form that is in harmony with the shed portion of the house roof. With the proposed garage conversion of the carport, the area enclosed by the gable form would be improved for storage with an interior stair as shown on sheet A5.4. In addition, a new exterior stair would be added at the south elevation of the garage to provide direct access from the garage to the main house entry. The proposed, roughly 40 sf, side carport/garage storage addition would replace the existing ground level storage lost to the stairs to the new upper level, interior storage loft/attic.

The upper level house additions include a small modification to the master bath at the northwest corner and a small bedroom addition at the northeast corner. Both of these additions and the east side garage storage addition, make use of the yard setback averaging provisions, as allowed for in the Ranch PUD, as they all have minor extensions into required yard areas. Further, it appears that the additions maintain the Ranch HOA requirement for a minimum of 32 feet between buildings on adjoining parcels, but this is somewhat difficult to confirm with the plan data, particularly the information shown on Sheet A1.03. This sheet does not scale at 1"=10 ft. noted on the sheet. Thus, accurate data should be provided to confirm the dimensions shown on this sheet and the 32-foot separation between buildings.

On the east side of the house, and fully within the building envelope, an existing main level balcony would be replaced with new floor area enlarging the kitchen and dining area. Existing windows and sliding glass doors would be replaced with a bank of new windows that would capture the more dramatic distant views to the southwestern hillsides of the town.

On the east side of the lower level, a new bathroom addition is proposed and new windows are also planned. Also on the lower level, unfinished crawl space north of the existing family room would be developed into new bedroom, bath, laundry and storage areas as shown on Sheet A2.03. This is the bulk of the new floor area, but would have little potential for visual change to the house as it is all within the footprint of the existing building.

The wood siding on the house and carport, and all wood trim, are finished in a dark taupe solid stain. As noted above, the plan for the additions and changes are to match the existing materials and finishes unless otherwise noted. The plans identify

that most windows and doors would be replaced. Existing doors and windows mostly have a bronze finish. If the new improvements are to change this, the changes should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The house addition areas would have flat roofs and the roof material would match that used on the existing flat roof areas. The gable roof areas have medium/dark rust colored composition shingles and would not change with the project. As noted above, the existing metal pipe deck railings would be replaced with a cable system. Further the existing south side wood decks would be replaced and extended using Epe wood. In the lower deck area, a new mechanical enclosure is also planned.

Overall, the changes to the house and deck areas are not dramatic in terms of views from off site. This is a significant remodeling project, but the apparent changes to the house and site conditions would be relatively minimal and consistent with the architecture of the Ranch. The most significant visual change would be the upper level bank of windows on the east side. This area however, is not open to significant views from neighbors and there are currently windows and sliding glass doors in the general area of the proposed new windows.

2. **Proposed carport conversion.** Over the years, the criteria for carport enclosure at the Ranch have been simplified, largely due to the desires of the Ranch residents and also the significant growth of vegetation around the carports. The key issue now is that the enclosure is done in a manner that is consistent with the architecture of the house and that it will not block significant distant views through the carport. In this case, the proposed enclosure would be accomplished to fully match the added to and remodeled house, although the finishes for the new garage doors needs to be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Due to the design of the carport and the siting relative to the house, there are no distant views through it. Specifically, the existing storage cabinets at the back of the carport, and the house location south of it, block any potential for views.

Our only concern is that the proposed interior configuration does not result in dimensions that ensure the requirements are met for two full covered parking spaces. The PUD approved designs for covered parking have a minimum depth of 18 feet and with this plan, the 18-foot depth would be reduced to roughly 17.5 feet in the area of the storage cabinet. This cabinet may, therefore, need to be adjusted to allow for the 18-foot depth. At the stairs it appears that the 18 foot depth is achieved, assuming that the stairs can be construed in such a manner leaving and 18 foot clearance, but interior elevations need to be provided so that can be verified.

3. **Conformance with Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) Statement provisions.** Based on the proposed design of the house additions and carport conversion, and related improvements, as evaluated above, we believe the proposal is consistent with the Ranch PUD provisions. A few matter, as noted, however, do need clarification. Also, as explained above, the Ranch Design Committee, as required by the PUD statement, has approved the plans.

It should also be noted that the PUD does not include a floor area limit for Ranch parcels, but does set architectural standards, and an impervious surface limit (IS) of 30%. Even with the proposed additions, the detached garage and other site

pathways, etc., the total coverage is approximately 5,000 to 5,500 sf. The parcel area is approximately 25,141 sf and 30% of that area is 7,542 sf. Thus, this project appear to be below the IS limit. Nonetheless, IS calculations should be provided for the record with the building permit submittal.

The maximum height of the existing/proposed house is just below 33 feet and this would not change with the project. This is within the PUD height limits, which are more generous than the town's current height limits.

4. **Landscaping and Exterior lighting.** The Ranch Design committee approval calls for the detail for the entry concert paver improvements with landscaping to be provided for committee approval. These should be also specified with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. The suggestions for the design and some exterior lighting are presented on plan Sheet A1.02. The lighting includes wall, ceiling, floor and post mounted fixtures and a ceiling fixture would be in the proposed roof extension over the main entry. Light fixture cut sheets have not yet been provided. The final details for all exterior lighting changes should be specified with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
5. **Sustainability aspects of the project.** The applicant has provided the attached completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist for the project currently targets 49 BIG points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached February 24, 2010 report from planning technician Carol Borck. As noted in the report, many design details will be worked out as building permit plans are developed. This will provide the opportunity for adding sustainable elements to the project. This would be considered an "Elements" project under the BIG system, with a required point threshold of 25. Thus, even with the current proposals, the plans would reach the targets set by BIG for this type of project.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site, and consider the above comments and any other information presented at the ASCC meeting.

5c. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF REDWOOD TREE REMOVAL, 330 AND 340 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, OAK HILLS SUBDIVISION, KLOPE

Landscape Architect Thomas Klope Associates has submitted the following enclosed plans dated 2/19/10 in support of this application for removal of 257 redwood trees from the subject two, commonly owned, residential parcels, totaling 7.4 acres, in the Oak Hills subdivision:

- Sheet L1, Tree Survey Plan
- Sheet L1.1, Tree Survey Index
- Sheet L2, Tree Status Plan
- Sheet L3, Proposed Planting plan

The attached vicinity map shows the site and conditions in the immediate area. Due to the scope of the proposed tree removal, planning staff has referred the application to the ASCC for consideration and action. The conservation committee and Oak Hills

Homeowners Association have also considered the matter. Due to the large size of the house on 330 Golden Hills, i.e., the larger of the two parcels at 4.7 acres, and distant views to the house from the Westridge area, we have also referred the request to the Westridge Homeowners Association (HOA) for information, even though the site is not in Westridge and the Association would not be in the normal notice area.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider this request.

1. **Project description and background.** The proposal is to remove all redwood trees from the site. The two parcels are under contract for sale, with a contingency relative to the tree removal, to a family that we understand has resided in town for 10 years, but at this point chooses not to be identified. Therefore, the landscape architect has been authorized to submit the subject request. The buyers desire to remove the redwood trees and return the site to more of an oak grassland condition that is consistent with the general character of the "Oak Hills" neighborhood. The tree removal would be the first phase of the process that is to also include restoration of extensive irrigated lawn areas to meadows and removal of other exotic plantings. Further, there would be some new landscaping with natives, but these and other site plans would be developed and implemented, with any necessary additional town permits, over time.

The site is one of the larger properties in the Oak Hills area and was developed incrementally during the early 1980's. The original project was processed and considered prior to contemporary ASCC review requirements and was the focus of neighborhood concern for a variety of reasons.

In 1985, the site improvements were evaluated as part of the town's *Phase I Design Standards Review Study*. The evaluation pages from this study are attached. While a number of ordinance changes were recommended and implemented based on the study findings, it is interesting to note that for this site one of the critical problems was the intensity of "perimeter planting which is inconsistent with native oak grassland." Based on this finding, the ASCC guidelines were developed that now require that intense perimeter, property line planting be avoided and that plant materials be appropriate for their setting.

The individuals now pursuing purchase of the property have provided the town and area with a unique opportunity to resolve what has been viewed as a long-standing inconsistency with town objectives. At the same time, the redwoods do provide screening to the large house, over 18,000 sf not counting the basement. Thus, it is understood that some neighbors would be sensitive to the view impacts of the tree removal. Such concerns were identified and considered during the conservation committee and Oak Hills HOA reviews of the proposal as discussed below.

2. **Conservation committee review and recommendation.** On February 24th, the conservation committee conducted a site meeting with Thomas Klope and members of the Oak Hills HOA. We also attended this meeting, as did ASCC member Breen. Mr. Klope noted that of the 257 trees proposed for removal, only 35 are of a size that would require a removal permit under the provisions of the town's site development ordinance. These are identified on the enclosed plans. The others could be removed without a permit. It was also noted that the plans do not propose to remove the redwoods in the Oak Hills Drive right of way, but that the applicant

would be willing to also remove these if granted an encroachment permit by the town for the work.

The conservation committee considered the request and members concurred that the trees should be removed including those in the public right of way. Members present concurred that with the removal of the trees the environment for the oaks would be greatly enhanced and that the site conditions could be returned to the more appropriate oak grassland.

Mr. Klope clarified that the removal process would include cutting of the tree trunks in ten to twelve foot segments for removal from the site and that the wood then would be recycled for various uses. It was further noted that limbs would be chipped with the mulch spread on site.

During the course of the site walk, it was noted that the scope of planting proposed on Sheet L3 may not be needed. It was generally agreed that a final planting plan should be developed and implemented after tree removal, with the primary focus on planting with native shrubs where needed to enhance screening of views. It was also concluded that such screen planting would be preferable, and likely more effective, closer to the house leaving the street corridor in a more open oak grassland condition.

3. **Oak Hills HOA review and other comments.** The Oak Hills HOA participated in the 2/24 site meeting and members present were generally supportive of the request, although some caution was expressed relative to opening of views from the neighboring residences immediately to the west and east. We understand that a second meeting between the HOA and Mr. Klope took place over the 2/27 weekend and that similar concerns were expressed and discussed.

We also understand that the owner of the parcel immediately to the northeast of the large house is on an extended trip, but has been contacted regarding this proposal. Final input from this neighbor has yet to be received.

In addition to specific view impact concerns, the HOA is concerned regarding the noise and traffic from the tree removal effort, the time frame for it, and general management of the work to minimize the impacts on the neighborhood. At the same time, the benefits to be gained from the removal of the redwoods were appreciated, with the cautions relative to the views of the immediate neighbors.

Mr. Klope has advised that, while the applicants fully appreciate the concerns over view changes, they want to remove all of the redwoods. They note that oaks have grown significantly since the project was completed in the early 1980s, that these trees afford extensive screening for both nearby and longer-distance views, and with removal of the redwoods the growing environment for the oaks would be greatly enhanced. Additionally, it is noted that redwoods and pines off the site also provide screening. Lastly, the applicants have committed to provide replacement planting with appropriate natives to screen any sensitive views that may be opened.

As noted above, the proposal has been referred to the Westridge HOA for information. No comments have yet to be received in response to this referral.

4. **Recommendations for action.** Given the above evaluation and, particularly, the history of how the redwood planting was accomplished and the comments from the conservation committee, removal of the redwood trees appears appropriate for the site and the oak hills environment. The work, however, needs to be done with care, particularly to protect the heritage oaks on the property, and any needed replacement screen planting should be identified and provided after the tree removal is accomplished.

In acting on this request, the ASCC should, therefore, require that a detailed tree removal plan be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff and a designated member of the ASCC. Prior to approval, this plan should be shared with the Oak Hills HOA for review and comment. The plan should include or address at least the following items:

- The dates for the tree removal work, and anticipated length of the project.
- The truck hauling routes, staging of the loading process for the cut tree trunks, patterns of on-site circulation, and provisions for traffic management.
- Provisions for no parking along Golden Hills Drive or staging of work along the street, except if needed for removal of the trees close to the street.
- Assurance that all work would be limited to the hours allowed for in the town's noise ordinance.
- Identification of an on-site project manager who would be available during all work times for contact by the town or HOA if any issues arise.
- Provisions for protecting the existing oaks from the tree removal process and measures to be employed to ensure the tree cutting equipment has been cleaned to ensure against any potential for SOD contamination.
- Appropriate erosion control measures as may be needed for areas disturbed by grinding and removal of stumps.

In addition, any approval action should include the requirement for a screen planting plan to be developed, as discussed above, and implemented to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member with input from the conservation committee and Oak Hills HOA. Further, just prior to the time the tree removal work is to take place, an inspection of the trees to be removed should be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that no significant raptor nests would be disturbed. If there is any potential for such disturbance the schedule for tree removal should be adjusted according to the recommendations of the biologist.

Prior to acting on this matter, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider any new information presented at the March 8, 2010 meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor