



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, March 22, 2010
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane Continued Review of Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, T-Mobile (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

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 Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation
 - b. Request for Re-Issuance of Expired Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-152 (Nextel), Existing Wireless Antenna Facilities at the Woodside Priory, 302 Portola road, TowerCo
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review for House Additions and Remodeling and Replacement of existing Detached Garage with New Garage, 170 Ramoso Road, Wick
 - b. Architectural Review for Replacement of Detached Accessory Structure/Barn with New Guest Unit, 440 Cervantes Road, Denenberg
6. Review and Evaluation of Story Pole Policy Statement
7. Approval of Minutes: March 8, 2010 and March 12, 2010

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: March 19, 2010

Carol Borck
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: March 18, 2010
RE: Agenda for March 22, 2010 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: A special ASCC field meeting has been scheduled to start at 4:00 p.m. on the afternoon of Monday, March 22, 2010. The special meeting is for continued consideration of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) request X7D-170, T-Mobile Corporation. The site meeting has been noticed as a joint meeting with the planning commission as the commission is responsible for final action on the CUP. The specific purpose and focus of the meeting are discussed under agenda item 4a.

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

4a. CONTINUED REVIEW OF PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) X7D-170, WIRELESS COMMUNICATION ANTENNA FACILITY, INTERSECTION OF GOLDEN OAK DRIVE AND PEAK LANE, T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION

At an October 26, 2009 joint site meeting with the planning commission, the ASCC initiated review of this application for installation of a 50-foot tall wireless antenna facility on the Cal Water District property at the intersection of Peak Lane and Golden Oak Drive. The matter was further discussed at the November 9, 2009 ASCC meeting and then at the February 8, 2010 meeting.

The primary role of the ASCC is to provide input to the planning commission as to the aesthetics and aesthetic impacts of the proposal. The ASCC has been considering both monopole and "monopine" design options and has raised a number of aesthetic concerns, particularly with respect to the health of the existing site trees and the role the trees can play in screening views to the proposed facilities. Direction was provided for an arborist to review the conditions of the existing trees and provide a report as to tree condition and status. This report, dated February 22, 2010, has been prepared and is included with the enclosed March 16, 2010 submittal by Zon Architects provided on behalf of T-Mobile Corporation.

In order to fully appreciate the current design options, tree conditions and concerns that have been expressed by neighbors, we have, as noted at the head of this memorandum, scheduled a joint site meeting with the planning commission for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, March 22, 2010. Greg Guerrazzi, representing the applicant will be present at the meeting as will the project arborist. In light of concerns of staff and those expressed by neighbors, we have made contact with representatives of the property owner, California Water Service, and asked them to also be present at the site meeting. We are, however, at this time unsure of attendance by a representative of Cal Water.

To assist the ASCC prepare for the meeting, we asked that the applicant provide the enclosed March 16, 2010 submittal that now includes detailed plans for both monopine (Alternative 1) and monopole (Alternative 2) options. In addition, the submittal includes a March 16, 2010 statement with details on the project, the proposed alternatives, analysis of the alternatives, and also responses to neighbor concerns. Supporting data include the arborist report, visual simulations, photos of monopole and monopine installations, coverage maps, and data on an alternative micro cell facility that the applicant concludes would not provide the necessary service or coverage. The statement also includes data on noise and RF standards compliance.

The following comments are offered to facilitate the March 22nd ASCC review.

1. **Background and primary focus of March 22nd site meeting.** For background, the following are attached:

Vicinity maps

October 15, 2009 Preliminary Review report to the planning commission

Minutes from the October 26 and November 9 ASCC meetings

December 23, 2009 staff report on the status of wireless applications

Staff report and minutes associated with the February 8, 2010 ASCC meeting

February 4, 2010 letter and supplemental letter from John and Diane Vedder,
285 Golden Oak Drive

February 22, 2010 letter from Diane Shattuck, Fawn Lane

The materials from the various meetings set forth town and neighbor concerns. The December 23, 2009 status report includes input from the town attorney on the limits to town authority for review and action on such requests. In particular, the town cannot make a decision based on RF/health concerns, as this matter is under the responsibility and authority of the FCC. The town can, however, require frequent reporting to ensure the FCC standards continue to be met.

The primary focus of town and ASCC consideration is that the proposal is the least aesthetically intrusive of the alternatives to provide the proposed service. Thus, the site meeting will provide the ASCC with the opportunity to fully consider the tree and monopole options and site and area conditions. The arborist will be present to further discuss tree conditions and advise on not only the trees discussed in the report, but also the other trees at the site that the ASCC finds are significant to aesthetic considerations.

The ASCC should consider the enclosed materials and data gathered at the site meeting and then formulate specific comments and recommendations on the

proposal and the alternatives for consideration by the planning commission in acting on the use permit request. At this point, we have tentatively scheduled the planning commission CUP hearing for April 7, 2010.

In preparation for the site meeting, we've also asked that the applicant provide some site modeling of the width of the proposed monopole and pole height reference points relative to adjoining trees.

2. **Alternatives to monopine or monopole and options relative to the proposed "poles."** The applicant has advised that the only possible alternative to provide the proposed coverage would be with the micro cell system described in the March 16, 2010 statement. It is noted, however, that the coverage would be incomplete compared to the pole alternatives and that the micro cell system would provide little to no "in-building" coverage. The applicant concludes, therefore, that the micro cell alternative is not a "viable" one.

In follow-up to discussion at the February 8th meeting, we reviewed the scope of alternative analysis that the town could require of an applicant and the town attorney advised that the scope is limited. We did also review the suggestion made at the 2/8 meeting regarding evolving technologies for "non line of site" service. We have not identified any sources that would confirm such technology is available as an option to the current proposals.

It is also noted that while the plans show two options for the antenna pole, both are to be within the fenced equipment area. The March 16th statement from the applicant makes it clear the equipment enclosure can be up to 100 feet away from the pole. The option for separating the fenced enclosure from the "pole" should be considered during the site meeting. Further, if a pole option is preferred we understand it could be painted an alternative color to better blend with site conditions. Also, if the ASCC finds that the "tree" samples provided are not appropriate for the environment, the applicant should be questioned as to the ability to have a "custom" tree crafted that would satisfy aesthetics needed for a proper site installation. This might be a design that could stand on its own if one or more of the site's existing trees were lost. Lastly, the ASCC can and should at least consider and discuss other places on the subject property where a pole or tree might be placed with less potential for visual impacts.

3. **California Water Service responsibility under any CUP authorization.** The town attorney has advised that the town can require Cal Water to be a responsible party under the CUP, particularly relative to landscaping, maintenance of landscaping and also removal of the wireless facilities if they are no longer in use. For this reason and the concerns of neighbors, we have asked that Cal Water have a representative at the site meeting. It is also noted that T-Mobile has agreed to prepare and implement any landscape plan that the town determines is needed for appropriate screening. This should include provisions for planting of new trees now that would anticipate loss of the pines and/or other trees at the site over time, particularly the 10-year span that is the minimum limit that can be set for an any such permit.

The town has also been informed that Cal Water conducted a security survey of the water tank property. The results of the survey are provided in the attached March

17, 2010 email from Henry DeGroot. We have been advised that while Cal Water is considering security fencing, the scope would be less than suggested by the email. Again, we hope that a Cal Water representative would be present on Monday to further clarify the security and other matters of concern.

4. **Coverage area.** The coverage areas and populations served as described in the March 16th statement are existing and potential areas and do not reflect actual T-Mobile customers. In other words, the existing coverage **could** serve a population of 1,510 residents and with the new facility the possible service area would increase by 425 to 1,935, a 28% increase over the “existing” service area.

At this point, the primary role of the ASCC is to offer aesthetic comments and recommendations for planning commission consideration. No formal ASCC action is required. While the town appears to have limited authority for evaluation of such proposals, if the ASCC concludes that aesthetic impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated, then such a conclusion should be clarified with supporting statements and forwarded to the planning commission. However, if the ASCC finds that one of the alternatives appears reasonable, with whatever aesthetic limitations/conditions may be needed, then this position should be articulated and forwarded to the planning commission.

In addition to any ASCC findings and recommendations, we assume that planning commissioners may offer comments for staff and applicant consideration prior to the public hearing and that there will be additional neighbor input. In fact, the site meeting will provide the opportunity to again visit neighboring properties to consider visual issues.

4b. REQUEST FOR RE-ISSUANCE OF EXPIRED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT X7D-152 (NEXTEL), EXISTING WIRELESS ANTENNA FACILITIES AT THE WOODSIDE PRIORY, 302 PORTOLA ROAD, TOWERCO.

This request is described in the attached January 28, 2010 memorandum prepared for preliminary planning commission consideration of the CUP application. As that memo explains, the application is for re-issuance of a permit for the existing Nextel/TowerCo facilities at the Woodside Priory. The application proposes no changes to the facilities except for painting of the pole and equipment mounted to it. This painting is in response to ASCC findings at the November 9, 2010 site meeting relative to Sprint and Verizon applications as explained in the January 28th report and the materials attached to it.

Since the January 28, 2010 report was prepared, the applicant has provided the enclosed colored coverage maps (three sheets with a cover sheet titled CUP Renewal Plots) for sites in and around Portola Valley. Further, attached is the FCC compliance sheet for the facility dated 2/2/10. Color samples for painting of the pole will be presented at Monday's ASCC meeting.

Prior to completing action on this request and forwarding comments and recommendations to the planning commission, ASCC members should consider the

above comments and attached materials and, as necessary, again visit the antenna site.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND REMODELING AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE WITH NEW GARAGE, 170 RAMOSO ROAD, WICK

This proposal is for approval of plans for residential additions and remodeling, including new basement area, and replacement of an existing detached garage and trellis parking area with a new detached garage and driveway apron on the subject 3.1-acre Westridge Subdivision parcel (see attached vicinity map). The project includes demolition of a portion of the house to accommodate main level changes and new basement area. In addition, the new garage would have a basement space beneath it.

The total area in the added to house, excluding exempt basement, and with 400 sf in the new detached garage would be 5,806 sf. The total floor area on the site including the added to house, new garage and existing guest house would be 7,520 sf and just within the floor area limit of 7,521 sf. The exempt basement area totals 2,557 sf. Thus, the total living area with the project would be 10,077 sf.

The plans show that the basement excavation would be 1,350 cubic yards. Only a small amount of this material would be used on site, mainly for the fill at the new driveway apron. The majority would be off-hauled and not count against the earthwork calculation limits of the site development ordinance.

The proposed improvements are shown on the following enclosed plans prepared, unless otherwise noted, by Arnn Gordon Greineder, dated 2/16/10:

- Sheet A0-1, Cover Sheet (Index, Drawing Directory)
- Sheet A0.2, Project Data
- Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 10/20/09
- Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 2/11/10
- Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 2/11/10
- Sheet A1.1, Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Exterior Lighting Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Existing Floor and Demolition Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A2.3, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A3.1, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A3.2, Proposed Lower Level
- Sheet A5.1, Roof Level (Plan)
- Sheet A6.1, Elevations (materials)
- Sheet A6.1, Elevations (materials)
- Sheet A6.3, Elevation Showing Existing landscape Screen at Street

In addition to the enclosed plans, the applicant has provided the attached cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures received on February 17, 2010. The locations for the existing and new fixtures are shown on Plan Sheet A1.2. A colors and materials board has been provided and was received 2/23/10. It is discussed below and will be available for reference at Monday's ASCC meeting. Also provided is the attached completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist showing that 99 BIG points are targeted for the project.

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

1. **Background and project description.** In 1998 and 1999 the ASCC considered and approved plans submitted by Mr. Wick for significant residential additions and remodeling for this property. These have been completed according to the ASCC approvals and include significant front yard landscaping, the driveway alignment, driveway gate system and remodeling of the main house and pre-existing rear yard guest house and pool area. These proposals were complicated by an access easement that existed at the northwest corner of the subject property for the benefit of the parcel immediately to the northwest. Since that time, Mr. Wick purchased the adjoining parcel, eliminated the easement and demolished the neighboring residence. The adjacent parcel owned by Mr. Wick is now largely vacant.

The 1998 and 1999 approvals included requirements for significant front yard landscaping that extended into the right of way. This planting was to screen views from the street to the residence and also provide privacy associated with the trail that is within Westridge trail easement along the parcel's frontage. The landscaping has been in place and is well established and maintained. It is effective in screening of views and providing for privacy and is to be preserved with this project.

When plans were initially being developed for the current proposal, a major hurdle was the floor area limits. It was determined, however, that the site's geology was actually much more stable than indicated on the town's maps and eventually, the town geology and movement potential maps were modified, to the satisfaction of the town geologist, to be consistent with the findings of site specific investigations. These modifications permitted a recalculation of the allowed floor area and, therefore, pursuit of the current plans.

The main house and other improvements on the subject site are located on the southwestern, higher slopes and within relatively easy access to Ramoso Road. The northeastern two-thirds of the site are relatively steeply sloping with denser oak cover.

The site improvements include the main house and rear pool and pool/guest house. The guest house pre-existed the town's contemporary second unit provisions and is a legal, but non-conforming use. With the 1998-99 approvals, the ASCC allowed for the guest house and added to house, as well as the other site improvements to be remodeled into the current Mediterranean character. These approvals included the existing driveway alignment, driveway gate, front yard fencing and front yard wall and gate entry system. These improvements would be largely retained, slightly remodeled or replaced in kind, with the current plan. The driveway gate system would be slightly modified for a wider entry, but otherwise the gate would be much the same as current improvements (refer to note 1 on sheet A1.1). The key here is that the front yard is intended to, for the most part, be preserved or returned to a condition that is consistent with what currently exists and was approved by the ASCC in 1998-1999.

Except for replacing existing eastside elevation cast stone trellis columns with stone columns, the east side of the site would not be disturbed by the project. The focus

is in the area of the existing garage and parking trellis at the east end, adjacent to the driveway entry, and along the front elevation of the house. Specifically the garage with attached study and parking trellis would be demolished, as would the kitchen and breakfast area and the west side children's bedroom and playroom wing. A portion of the main entry access pathway system would also be disturbed to accommodate the project.

The new construction would include replacement of the kitchen, breakfast, and entry areas with remodeling and some added height and volume for the roof area and the entry roof forms and elements. Some of the roof heights would increase by 2-3 feet and somewhat more in the new tower areas. The maximum heights of the taller features would be 23 feet. The kitchen, breakfast and entry areas would be essentially the same location as the existing improvements. Moving the bedroom wing, however, allows for improvements to indoor and outdoor relationships for the kitchen and breakfast room areas.

The replacement bedroom wing would be moved roughly 12 feet to the northwest from the current location and would be roughly two feet higher than the current bedroom area. The new height would be between 16 and 17 feet. As noted above, with the replacement bedroom wing, a new basement would be constructed below it, with eastside light well. The basement would accommodate play, storage and laundry spaces.

The proposed replacement garage would also be located roughly 12 to 13 feet further to the northwest than the existing structure. It would be rotated so that the doors are not exposed to the street and moving the garage permits a more accommodating access apron. In addition, the garage change would somewhat open views from the driveway intersection with the street across the site and to the east. The garage plan makes use of the same setback averaging provisions that were applied to the original design.

The bulk of the grading is excavation for the basement areas under the replacement bedroom wing and under the proposed detached garage. The garage area basement would accommodate a gym. Only a small amount of excavated dirt would be used on site for development of the new parking apron. The fill would be a maximum of 4 to 5 feet deep and would be retained by a "landscape" wall as shown on the site and grading plan sheets. The wall would be over 30 feet from the side property line. The materials for the exposed face of the wall (roughly 4-5 feet maximum, but likely less with back fill) should be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. (Note: the grading plans suggest lower wall heights than the architectural plans, but we believe the range of 4 to 5 feet maximum is consistent with the plan data.)

The architectural character of the proposed improvements would match the Mediterranean style of the existing house and other site improvements. There would be somewhat of an elaboration of the architectural character with the proposed "tower" elements, entry columns, decorative ironwork and added use of stone veneer. Further, the current roof tiles would be replaced with antique terracotta tiles. The direction of these design changes and modifications is largely to further the historic quality of the architecture and add variety to the elevations.

There is some issue with the garage area basement spaces. Since the breezeway between the garage and house is not enclosed floor area, the "closet" and wine cellar below it would not count as exempt basement area. Thus, in order to avoid floor area conflicts, these small spaces would need to have heights of 7.5 feet or less to avoid being considered floor area. The issue has been shared with the project design team. Resolution of the matter should be verified to the satisfaction of planning staff during the course of building permit processing.

It is also noted that the proposed garage has somewhat more encroachment into the front yard area than the existing garage. The project architect has advised that some adjustments are now possible to reduce the added encroachment and these would include moving the garage somewhat closer to the house. It appears that with the adjustments the amount of encroachment would be the same or less than the existing garage encroachment. This should, however, be verified to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of the building permit.

In summary, while this is an ambitious project, at the conclusion of the effort, the scope of visible site changes would not be significant. There would be some added height and somewhat more formal architectural detailing, but the changes would not be dramatically different than the existing improvements. The most important considerations would be construction staging and protection of landscaping in the public right of way and within the front yard area of the parcel including the areas in the trail easement. Fortunately, given the site constraints, the applicant has the parcel to the northwest that can be used for construction staging and parking. In any case, a detailed construction-staging plan would need to be submitted with the building permit application.

2. **Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) review and approval.**
The WASC has informed town staff that in January it considered and approved the proposed plans.
3. **Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area (IS) and height limits.**
The total proposed floor area is 7,520 sf and just at the 7,521 sf limit. The proposed main house floor area is 5,086 sf and under the 85% limit of 6,355 sf. The main house includes the existing house, proposed additions and 400 sf of the 773 sf garage.

The plan elevation sheets demonstrate that most existing and proposed heights are 23 feet or less and that the maximum height is under 27 feet. Thus, the design conforms to the 28 and 34-foot maximum height limits.

Based on the new geologic data for the site, the impervious surface (IS) limit has increased to 13,209 sf. The current submittal does not include IS calculations. In 1998-99, the approved project had a total of 11,503 sf of IS area. Thus, it appears that there is ample available IS area to accommodate the proposed improvements. Nonetheless, final IS calculations should be provided with the building permit application to the satisfaction of planning staff.

With respect to yard setbacks, all additions and improvements would conform to required setbacks as noted on Sheet A1.1. The one minor issue regarding the

garage was discussed above and should be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

4. **Architecture, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed added to and remodeled house would preserve and elaborate on the existing Mediterranean style as explained above. The materials and colors board will be presented at the ASCC meeting and includes the following:

Roof:	Antique terracotta roof tiles to replace the existing terracotta tiles. The finish of the tiles varies, but has light reflectivity values (LRV) ranging from 30 to 40% and within the 40% policy limit.
Stucco siding:	The new stucco siding is to match the existing stucco finish, however, the sample on the materials board appears lighter than the current siding. If this is the case, than an alternative integral color needs to be selected that is no lighter than the current stucco siding.
Stone Veneer	The stone veneer is a mix of tan and brown “earthy” hues that should blend well with the existing stucco surfaces and other site conditions.
Windows Trim:	Wood with a medium green finish and within the 50% LRV policy limit for trim.
Windows/Door Casings:	Stone veneer.

The new garage doors are to be cedar with a darker, transparent stain finish. Photo images of the proposed materials and finishes are also shown on elevation Sheets A6.1 and A6.2.

In summary, the proposed design and materials and finishes are consistent with the existing site improvements.

5. **Fencing, entry gate and Landscaping.** No new fencing is proposed. The plans do propose to widen the previously approved entry gate by two feet. This is considered a minor change to the previously approved gate and we would recommend ASCC approval without the need for the design to conform to current setback limits, as this would not be practically possible given the driveway design and limitations.

The key landscape element is to ensure existing front yard landscaping is protected from the construction process. A carefully prepared and detailed vegetation protection and construction staging plan should be developed and implemented. In addition, a plan should be provided with the building permit to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member for landscaping around the retaining walls associated with the expanded parking area fill and along the northeast side of the garage. The plans include a note for drought resistant plantings, but a detailed plan should be provided and implemented.

6. **Exterior lighting.** Sheet A1.2 is the proposed exterior lighting plan. Very few new lights are proposed, mostly wall lights at the new parking apron. Otherwise most lighting changes are relocation of existing fixtures. Two new wall sconces are, however, proposed at the new breakfast room doors. All new wall mounted house fixtures are to match the existing lighting.

The scope of lighting along the front elevation of the house is likely somewhat more than would be encouraged by the ASCC today, but not necessarily excessive under current town policies. The proposed relocation of "spots," however, should be reconsidered and the all "spots" replaced with a fixture conforming to current town policies and standards. Further, given the exposure of the garage lights to the street, the ASCC might want to consider use of a shielded fixture and/or elimination of one of the wall mounted fixtures.

In any case, a reduction in overall site lighting is encouraged, but the ASCC will need to determine if any specific lighting reductions in addition to those suggested above should be considered and/or required.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-it-Green Checklist.** Pursuant to current town green building requirements, the applicant has submitted 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 99 points. The BIG minimum for a new whole house project is 50 points and less for minor addition. The attached March 2, 2010 report from planning technician Borck discusses the proposed sustainable elements of the project as well as existing energy efficient improvements, including operable clerestory window system and a photovoltaic system providing 95% of the electrical demands. The photovoltaic system will be "reconfigured" on the remodeled roof area.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the March 22, 2010 ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR REPLACEMENT OF DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE/BARN WITH NEW GUEST UNIT, 440 CERVANTES ROAD, DENENBERG

This proposal is for approval of plans for replacing a recently demolished rear yard, 454 sf barn with a new, 746 sf guest house and covered porch extension on the subject 1.0-acre Arrowhead Meadows parcel (see attached vicinity map). No vegetation removal is needed for the project and grading would only be as necessary for foundation work. Further, access to the construction area is achieved by a dirt path on the site and there is ample room on site for construction staging.

The proposal is described on the following enclosed plans prepared by Clay Baker Design, LLC and dated 2/26/10:

Sheet A-0, Project Data
Sheet A-1.0, Site Plan
Sheet A-2.0 1st & 2nd Floor Plans

Sheet A-3.0, Sections
Sheet A-4.0, Building Elevations

In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached cut sheet, received March 4, 2010, for the proposed exterior light fixture. The locations for the fixture are shown on the floor plan and elevation sheets. A colors and materials board has been submitted, and was received March 4, 2010. It is described below and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. Also provided is the attached completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist showing that 112 BIG points are targeted for the project.

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

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The parcel is located on the north side of Cervantes Road roughly 200 feet east of the Cervantes Road and Meadowood Drive intersection. The site has gentle to moderate slopes with elevation increasing by roughly 20 feet from the front to the northerly, rear side of the lot. The parcel is largely surrounded by pine and redwood trees and other trees and vegetation that screen views between parcels and provide for privacy in the area.

The main, partially two-story, house on the site is located on the south side at an elevation only somewhat higher than the street. It is set back over 50 feet from the front property line and existing tree cover buffers the house from street views and traffic.

To the rear of the house there is a swimming pool at an elevation similar to the house and north of the pool, there is a terrace approximately five to six feet higher in elevation than the house and pool pad. This terrace is 6 to 10 feet lower than elevations at the adjacent northerly parcel boundaries. Trees and other vegetation along the parcel boundaries for the most part help to screen views in the area.

The recently demolished barn was on this upper, rear yard terrace. The location of demolished barn is the site for the proposed guest house. The area is readily accessed by a fairly wide dirt pathway that extends along the east side of the property. This pathway has direct connection to the main house driveway and parking area and from there to Cervantes Road.

The terrace area is essentially level and the guest house can be constructed with minimum grading and without any impact on existing vegetation. The guest house would be sited at over 25 feet away from the rear property line and at least 50 feet from either side property line. In each of these cases, the required minimum setback is 20 feet.

The building site for the new cottage would be at least 10 feet lower in elevation than the building sites on the parcels to the north and east. The maximum, i.e., ridge height of the structure would be 20 feet.

The proposed guest cottage includes playroom, kitchen and bath spaces. Also included is a large, west side deck and utility and storage closets along the east

side. The applicant has advised that the design includes no window areas on either the north or east side to provide for privacy and protection from light spill for the uphill and east side neighbors.

The interior of the proposed building also includes a storage loft. According to the second unit provisions of the town, copy attached, the floor area is limited to 750 sf and height to 18 feet over grade unless additional height is approved by the ASCC. In order to conform to the second unit provisions and ensure that no portion of the loft is over 7.5 feet high, i.e., to avoid counting as floor area and therefore exceeding the 750 sf limit, we recommend that the ridge height be lowered by two feet.

The height reduction is also recommended in this case due to the length of the structure with covered porch, over 60 feet. Otherwise, the site and building design appear generally acceptable as proposed.

(Note: while we believe the covered porch extension is well designed and a positive way to control sun exposure and privacy for use of the area, both in terms of views to and from uphill properties, the larger roof form will make the structure appear larger than would otherwise be the case with a detached accessory unit. Site conditions and elevation differences help to mitigate concerns, but the ASCC should specifically consider potential impacts and visual relationships during any site visit. Also, all immediate neighbors have received notice of the project, but story poles were not placed to model the proposal.)

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

The total proposed floor area as stated on the plans is 3,368 sf. This number, however, does not include the partial second story floor area of the house or closet areas on the east side of the proposed guest unit. The total permitted floor area on the site is 5,067 sf and therefore there is 1,699 sf available to cover the partial second story and guest house closet areas. While we believe there is not a floor area issue, full floor area data should be provided with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of planning staff.

While the 20-foot maximum height for the guest house would be well within the normal 28 and 34 foot height limits, second units are limited to the 18 and 24 foot height limits unless the ASCC allows the design to exceed these limits. For the reasons stated above, in this case, we believe the ridge height should be limited to 18 feet.

The impervious surface (IS) limit for the parcel is 7,419 sf. The IS calculations on Sheet A-1.0 show the proposed IS to be 7,178 and within the limit.

3. Conformance with second unit zoning regulations and accessory structure policy requirements. Pursuant to the town's accessory unit policy statement, the proposed cottage design must be considered a second unit. In order to approve the guest unit the ASCC must, therefore, 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 cottage is designed for entertainment and second unit

uses. With the above recommended adjustments, it would conform to the 750 sf limit and otherwise meet the provisions of the policy statement.

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 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 generally match the house, has the same driveway access and is clearly secondary to the primary residential use. Further, necessary parking is provided for and with the recommended height adjustment, we conclude the key other second unit design elements would have been addressed.

As to lighting, second unit provisions limit lighting to one fixture at each access door and in this case two fixtures are planned at the south side entry doors. Further, exterior lights are planned at the east side closets. While we appreciate the need for lighting to get to the closets, we recommend that only one fixture be used on the east side and that it be manually switched. It is noted that lights are also proposed inside the closet areas.

Architecture, exterior materials and finishes. The proposed guest cottage would be of a very simple design that generally matches the more traditional Ranch style architecture of the main house. Materials and finishes include the following:

Roof:	Asphalt composition shingles, in a dark charcoal finish. The light reflectivity value (LRV) is under 10%, and well below the 40% policy maximum.
Siding:	Hardi-Board, medium dark olive color, with a LRV of less than 20% and well under the 40% policy limit.
Windows/Door Trim:	Stained wood in a natural finish.
Decks, sash, eaves and posts:	Wood in a dark brown solid stain, with a LRV of less than 10% and well below the 50% policy limit for trim areas.

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

- Fencing and Landscaping.** No new fencing is proposed. The only new landscaping specifically proposed is some extension of the lawn area. During any site inspection, ASCC members should consider the need for any additional screen landscaping. There is some opening of views to the northeast of the cottage site, but there do not appear to be significant views from above in this area.
- Exterior lighting.** Our primary lighting comments were offered above. The lighting proposed in the porch area was not discussed, but appears appropriate as planned.

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 112 points. The attached March 16, 2010 report from planning technician Borck discusses the proposed sustainable elements of the project. This is a significant effort in terms of sustainable building and the plans also include considerations for a future photovoltaic system.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the March 22, 2010 ASCC meeting.

6a. REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF STORY POLE POLICY STATEMENT

In 2003, upon recommendation of the ASCC, the town council amended the town's design guidelines to incorporate the attached "**Story Poles Requirements and Guidelines.**" These have been helpful in project evaluations and, for the most part, have worked well to support the ASCC project review process. Recently, however, in a few cases, after a project has been approved and is under construction, neighbors have wondered if it is consistent with the story pole modeling and have questioned the conformity of the construction to the plans approved by the ASCC.

While checking of the construction typically finds it is in conformity with the heights on the approved plans, there is often no photo record of the story pole placement, views to the poles from off site, etc., although we usually do have a plan showing the story pole layouts and heights. This data, however, does not specifically ensure that the story poles as modeled at the site are a precise reflection of the final construction heights or that every sensitive view line is recorded by a photo essay.

As a result of the foregoing, there has been question as to the need to have more involved story pole policies and/or requirements. For example, should the town require not only a story pole layout plan, but also surveyor verification of the heights of the poles and a photo analysis of views to the poles from sensitive off site locations? This would add to the costs of the review process and the town would need to determine how the photo records would be best kept. It would also require very careful documentation the photo locations and angles of view.

To date, the ASCC has relied on general verification of the accuracy of the story poles and, as noted above, for the most part this has served the process well. We are sensitive to the concerns that have been recently expressed, but are also sensitive to the added burdens that a more involved story pole policy could place on applicants and the town staff.

In any case, we ask that the ASCC discuss the matter and determine if any modifications to the story pole policy statement should be considered.

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor