



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, May 10, 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 ASCC FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., 385 Westridge Preliminary consideration of plans for the Addition of a Detached Accessory Structure, “Hobby Barn,” on this 3.3-acre Westridge Subdivision parcel, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

5:00 p.m., 35 Antonio Court Preliminary consideration of plans for Residential Redevelopment of this 1.1-acre property, 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte (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. [Architectural Review for New Freestanding Sign for Glenoaks Equestrian Center Conditional Use Permit \(CUP\) X7D-73, 3639 Alpine Road, Murdoch/Stanford University](#)
 - b. [Modifications to previous approval - Architectural Review for New Blue Oaks Residence and Site Development Permit X9H-611, 2 Buck Meadow Drive \(Lot 36 Blue Oaks\), Toor](#)
 - c. [Continued Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Garage/Guest Unit, Detached Cabana, Swimming Pool and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-614, 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbernd](#)
5. New Business:
 - a. [Preliminary Architectural Review for New Detached Accessory Structure “Hobby Barn,” and related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-587, 385 Westridge Drive, Cooper](#)

- b. Preliminary Architectural Review for New Residence with Detached Accessory Structure, Swimming Pool and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-613, 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte
 - c. Architectural Review for House Additions, Carport Enclosure and Modification of Accessory Parking Easement (APE), 1 Fremontia, Portola Valley Ranch, Bower/Shaw *Continued to next regular ASCC meeting*
 - d. Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-615 for Swimming Pool Grading and Related Site Improvements, 10 Peak Lane, Kelly
6. Approval of Minutes: April 26, 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: May 7, 2010

Carol Borck
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: May 7, 2010
RE: Agenda for May 10, 2010 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: A special ASCC field meeting has been scheduled to start at 4:00 p.m. on the afternoon of Monday, May 10, 2010. The special meeting is for preliminary consideration of two projects. At 4:00 p.m., the ASCC will convene at 385 Westridge Drive to consider plans for the addition of a detached accessory structure, "Hobby Barn," on this 3.3-acre Westridge Subdivision parcel. A preliminary evaluation of the request is presented below under **agenda item 5a., Cooper**. Since the project is within the Westridge Subdivision area, the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee has been given notice of the site meeting.

After the Cooper field review, i.e., at approximately 5:00 p.m., the special site meeting will continue at 35 Antonio Court for preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 1.1-acre property. A preliminary evaluation of the request is presented below under **agenda item 5b., Chung/Lacerte**.

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

4a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND FOR NEW FREESTANDING SIGN FOR GLENOAKS EQUESTRIAN CENTER CUP X7D-73, 3639 ALPINE ROAD, MURDOCH/STANFORD UNIVERSITY

This proposal is for installation of a permanent freestanding sign along the east side of Alpine Road at the entry to the existing Glenoaks Equestrian Center (see enclosed vicinity map). There is currently no "business" sign for this existing use that is located on lands of Stanford University. The equestrian use is regulated under the terms of town conditional use permit X7D-73, most recently amended in 2002. Any such sign request is subject to ASCC review and approval for conformity with the provisions of the zoning ordinance and the use permit.

The proposal is described in the attached letter from equestrian center owner David Murdoch, received by the town on April 20, 2010. Provided with the letter is a site plan and photo description of the proposed sign. In addition to the request for a permanent freestanding sign, the applicant has also requested permission to install a temporary banner to announce specific special events. The request notes that the banner would be in place for no more than two-weeks at a time. Such temporary banners are permitted subject to ASCC approval and to other limitations set forth in the zoning ordinance.

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

1. **Permanent Freestanding Sign.** The proposed sign would be double sided and each face would have an area of 11.9 feet. The dimensions of the sign copy area for each face would be 2 ft. 9 inches by 4 ft. 4 inches. The sign would be mounted on 4"x4" posts, that would have a maximum height of 7 feet. The background of the wood sign would be in a darker green color and logo, lettering and a line border would be routed into the wood and finished in a gold color. No lighting of the sign is proposed.

The proposed sign location is shown on the attached site plan. The sign is to be mounted perpendicular to the roadway, 12 feet east of the edge of the roadway and 8 ft. 8 inches west from the existing paved trail. Since the location is within the Alpine Road right of way, the public works director must approve an encroachment permit for sign placement.

The sign is desired for business identification and also to address access issues, as the entry driveway is not readily located by traffic traveling even at permitted speeds along Alpine Road. The location was selected because it could be viewed by traffic traveling in both directions.

Due to the right of way location and encroachment permit requirements, the public works director has reviewed the proposal and actually marked the proposed permanent sign location in the grass at the site. The public works director concerns with the proposal are set forth in his attached email to the deputy town planner dated May 5, 2010.

The following specific zoning ordinance provisions impact this request.

- Permitted sign area and height. Under provisions of the zoning ordinance, a total sign area of 24 sf is permitted for this use. The proposed sign would have two faces, each just below 12 sf in area. Thus, the size conforms to the zoning ordinance standard. The maximum height for a freestanding sign is 16 feet. Thus, the proposed seven feet is well below the limit.
- Sign design. The zoning ordinance provides that all signs must be appropriate for a rural environment, must harmonize with their surroundings in design and color, and be continually maintained to ensure an attractive appearance. While the basic design appears to conform to the design characteristics approved for the equestrian center, the majority of identification signs along Alpine Road have a dark wood "background" with either white or gold copy. We, therefore, would

recommend consideration be given to a similar design for the proposed permanent sign or use of a very dark green background.

- Right of way location. Signs are to be on the property they serve unless an encroachment permit is granted for a location in the right of way. The public works director has identified his concerns over the proposed location and the applicant has been made aware of the issues. We have visited the site and believe that in general the proposed location appears to provide for good identification, but also conclude that the sign could be moved somewhat further away from the road and might be somewhat smaller or lower to ensure that it does not block views at the driveway intersection with Alpine Road for either drivers or trail users. It is also noted that with planned improvements to Stanford's C-1 trail, the existing pathway will be moved somewhat east of its current alignment. This would allow for somewhat more space between the sign location and the trail even if the sign were moved somewhat to the east.

If the sign were moved back onto the equestrian center property, it is likely that considerable vegetation removal would be needed for visibility for travelers in both the north and south bound lanes. In addition, it is likely a second directional sign would be needed for the attention of north bound travelers.

Based on the concerns of the public works director and the practical conditions of the site and driveway intersection with Alpine Road, it is recommended that the ASCC consider the sign design issues discussed above, e.g., color, size and height and reach tentative conclusions on the sign design. It is further recommended that a designated member, or two, be appointed to work with the applicant, planning staff and, public works director to finalize the sign location so that it serves the applicants needs, but also avoids conflict with any safety concerns for drivers and trail users.

2. **Temporary banner request.** Section 18.40.050 of the zoning ordinance allows for temporary signs for such uses when the location and design are approved by the ASCC. The size of the temporary "banner" sign cannot exceed one-half the permitted sign area, i.e., in this case a maximum of 12 sf. A temporary sign cannot be in place for more than two months and it must be dated when installed to ensure compliance with the time limit.

In this case, a sign design has not been proposed, and the applicant is only seeking general permission for use of temporary event banners. It is recommended that approval of the temporary banner be delegated to a designated ASCC member and that all such banners be in place for a total of no more than two months over the year. If, for each planned special event, a banner were in place for two weeks, than a total of four such events would be possible. Any banner location should be on the property. A right of way location should only be considered if an encroachment permit were issued for the location by the public works director.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the May 10, 2010 ASCC meeting.

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

On March 8, 2010 the ASCC completed conditional approval of this project and also recommended planning commission approval of the subject site development permit. On April 7, 2010 the planning commission was scheduled to conduct the public hearing on the site development permit; but on the day of the hearing, received the attached April 6, 2010 letter from the owner of the adjacent parcel at 4 Buck Meadow Drive. This is the parcel that contains the driveway easement serving the subject property. The neighbor stated opposition to any work outside of the driveway easement and, as ASCC members likely recall, the approved project included considerable grading beyond the easement area largely to avoid the need for retaining walls.

As a result of the communication from the neighbor, the planning commission hearing was postponed and the applicant has now submitted the plans listed below that eliminate the need for any driveway work outside of the driveway easement area. The revised project is described in the attached April 22, 2010 communication from project architect Tom Carrubba and shown on the following plans:

- Sheet A1.01, Site Plan/Project Data/Tabulation, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
- Sheet A1.02, Partial Site Plan, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
- Sheet A1.03, Partial Site Plan Main Level & Basement Level, Partial Floor Plans, Square Three Design Studios, 4/22/10
- Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 4/21/10
- Sheet C-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 4/21/10
- Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan, Joni L. Janecki & Associates, 4/21/10

In addition to these plans, the project architect has provided the enclosed photo images for the "3-D" model prepared to clarify the revised driveway design with retaining walls, boulders and landscaping.

Attached is the April 1, 2010 staff report prepared for the canceled April 7th planning commission meeting. The report describes the previously approved project and includes the materials associated with the ASCC meetings and actions on the project proposals. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider the revised plans:

1. **Overview of changes.** The only changes to the approved project are those associated with the design of the driveway across 4 Buck Meadow Drive. The modified plan keeps the driveway and necessary construction work in the easement and makes use of low retaining walls, boulders and landscaping to minimize the impacts of construction. All other aspects of the project on the subject property remain as approved by the ASCC in March. This includes grading, landscaping, house design, materials, finishes and exterior lighting.

There is no practical way to stay within the driveway easement over the neighboring property without the use of retaining walls. The current design calls for walls on both the uphill and downhill sides of the driveway and makes use of boulders and landscaping to better integrate the walls into the landscape and minimize grading around the one significant oak on the downhill side of the driveway. The walls would have maximum heights of four feet and would be constructed of poured-in-place concrete. The wall finish is "Davis Color Sierra," which is a warm, "earthy" gray/concrete color that should blend well with the setting and adjacent conditions. A color sample will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting.

It is noted that with the plan revisions, the total scope of grading counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance **decreases** by 420 cubic yards from 1,720 cubic yards to 1,300 cubic yards. The revised civil grading plan also corrects the fence setback issue that was the subject of one of the original approval conditions included with the recommendations for planning commission action on the site development permit.

2. **Site development permit committee review of the revised plans.** The April 1, 2010 report to the planning commission includes the various review documents from site development permit committee members. The revised plans have been re-circulated to the fire marshal, public works director and town geologist for review and comment.

The fire marshal has stamped the plans as approved with no changes to the original conditions. It is noted that while the driveway maintains the 12-foot width standard, with the "shoulder" areas it has sufficient width to meet the 14-foot section required by the fire department when there are driveway retaining walls.

The public works director has advised that, relative to the revised plans, the standard conditions called for in his attached April 7, 2010 memorandum still pertain to the project.

The town geologist has provided the attached April 26, 2010 email stating no objections to the revised plans and, essentially, that the conditions included with his original 3/31/10 review memorandum still pertain to the project.

3. **Recommendations.** It is recommended that the ASCC approve the revised grading plan as a modification to the March 8, 2010 approval. The original approval conditions would remain as approved by the ASCC.

Prior to completing action on this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments and visit the project site. Further, any new information presented at the May 10, 2010 meeting would need to be appropriately considered prior to taking final action. With the ASCC action and recommendations, the site development permit would be placed on the planning commission agenda for public hearing. Tentatively, this is now scheduled for the May 19, 2010 planning commission meeting.

4c. CONTINUED ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED GARAGE/GUEST UNIT, DETACHED CABANA, SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-614, 121 ASH LANE, VIDALAKIS/ELSBERND

On April 26, 2010, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of the subject proposal and the review included a joint, special afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. The attached April 21, 2010 staff report and enclosed draft meeting minutes provide the background and overview of the preliminary review.

The project is on the May 10, 2010 ASCC agenda for action on the architectural review application and, after ASCC action, would be presented to the planning commission for formal consideration of the site development permit. In response the preliminary review process, the project design team has provided the attached May 5, 2010 letter to the town providing a detailed summary of plan changes that are shown on following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, with a revision date of 5/5/10, prepared by Swatt/Miers Architects:

- Sheet DR1, Title Sheet
- Sheet DR2, Reference Site Plan
- Sheet DR3, Site Plan A
- Sheet DR4, Site Plan B
- Sheet DR5, Ground Floor Plan
- Sheet DR6, Second Floor Plan
- Sheet DR7, Third Floor Plan
- Sheet DR8, Roof Plan
- Sheet DR9, Building Elevations
- Sheet DR10, Building Elevations
- Sheet DR12, Exterior & Landscape Lighting Plan
- Sheet DR13, Exterior & Lighting Plan
- Sheet DR14, Exterior Lighting Cut Sheets
- Sheet DR15, Build-It-Green Green-Building Checklist

- Sheet L-1, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 5/3/10
- Sheet L-2, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valerie Remitz, Landscape Architecture, 5/3/10

- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07
- Sheet SU2, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 11/1/07
- Sheet C-1, "Preliminary" Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
- Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Overall Site), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
- Sheet C-3, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Area of Detail), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10
- Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control & Construction Operations Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 5/4/10

Still part of the project application is the attached arborist's report prepared by Econo Tree Service, Inc., dated 3/11/10, and the exterior colors board prepared by the project architect, received on March 10, 2010. The colors board was found generally

acceptable at the April 26th meeting. In addition, the concepts for the driveway entry gate, to be outside of any required setback area, were found generally acceptable as described in the images contained in the project booklet, received 3/10/10.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete architectural review action on the project:

1. **Overview of responses to preliminary review comments.** The May 5th letter from the project design team offers relatively detailed comments on the plan changes that have been made to address the issues outlined in the draft minutes of the April 26th meeting. In particular, the scope and design of the courtyard has been substantially modified to reduce the size and adjust the form so that it better relates to site contours and conditions. Further, Sheet DR 11 explains the details for the courtyard retaining walls and the “guardrails” that would be a welded wire fabric fence within native shrub rows.

The plans include elimination of the previously proposed “swale” and, with this change, saving of the oaks that were of concern in the original staff evaluation. The landscape plans have been adjusted to eliminate some of the existing pines and reduce the scope of new planting, generally as requested by the ASCC and planning commission. New planting continues to be planned to screen the more sensitive views between properties.

With the site plan courtyard and “swale” changes, the scope of grading has been reduced from 4,000 cubic yards to 3,065 cubic yards, i.e., a 935 cubic yard reduction. The off-haul now includes 745 cubic yards of material that is excess from site work and 480 cubic yards that is excavation from work for cutting the house into the site to reduce the apparent height. This grading has not changed from the original submittal.

Other prominent changes include significant reduction in lawn area, particularly in the courtyard, and substantial reduction in exterior lighting. The landscape plans detail the lawn reductions and the 5/5 letter notes that work will continue to fully appreciate and implement the town’s new water conservation requirements. It is, however, noted that civil plans have not fully caught up with the landscape plans, as they still show “new lawn” in the courtyard area. This will need to be corrected prior to issuance of any building permit to avoid confusion.

Overall, the plan adjustments appear to be fully responsive to the preliminary review comments. The ASCC will need to determine if any further refinements are needed. Our only specific concern is the continued use of the string lights for the stairs, but ASCC members did not appear to find a problem with this part of the lighting proposal at the 4/26 meeting.

2. **Site Development Committee Review.** The attached April 21, 2010 staff report includes all of the comments received from site development permit committee members. Most comments are fairly standard or have raised issues that have been addressed by the applicant through the ASCC preliminary review process. The revised grading plans will, however, need to be circulated to site development permit committee members for review and any new comments that may be appropriate.

3. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** As noted in the May 5, 2010 letter from the project architect, the original BIG checklist for the project has been reconsidered and plan adjustments made to permit a higher target of 150 BIG GreenPoint rated points. Efforts will continue to strive for an even higher point total as work on the building permit plans proceeds.
4. **Construction staging.** The May 5, 2010 letter discusses refinements that would be pursued to ensure minimum potential for impacts on Ash Lane and neighbors from the construction process. Project contractor Rich Tincher is to be at Monday's meeting to further explain the construction staging effort. He should also respond to the comments in the attached May 2, 2010 letter from the neighbors at 137 Ash Lane as to this matter.
5. **Building height.** One building height issue was discussed in the 4/21 staff report and the applicant provided some clarifications on this matter at the 4/26 site meeting. We have looked at the contour data and conclude that it is possible, with somewhat more clarification of data, the height may conform to town standards. Nonetheless, we recommend that a condition of any architectural approval be that this matter be fully clarified to the satisfaction of staff during the building permit process.
6. **Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) comments on project.** We have yet to receive any formal input from the WASC other than the comments provided by Bev Lipman at the 4/26 site meeting. We hope to have more information on the status of Westridge review for presentation at the May 10th ASCC meeting.

Prior to acting on the architectural review portion of this project, ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the May 10th meeting. The planning commission is tentatively scheduled to consider the site development permit portion of the project at its May 19, 2010 meeting.

5a. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE "HOBBY BARN," AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-587, 385 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, COOPER

On June 23, 2008, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of a very different proposal by this applicant for the desired detached model railroad "hobby barn" on the subject 3.3-acre Westridge Subdivision property (see attached vicinity map). The 2008 proposal was far more ambitious than the current plan and raised a number of neighbor, ASCC and Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) concerns. The previous proposal and site and area conditions are described in the attached June 19, 2008 report prepared for the June 23, 2008 meeting. The scope of concerns and issues with the proposal are discussed in the attached June 23, 2008 meeting minutes.

In follow-up to the June 2008 review, attempts were made to address the identified concerns, but without major changes to the scope of the project. Eventually, the 2008

plans were placed on hold and then abandoned. Since that time, the applicant has decided to consider other options for the “hobby barn” program to serve his passion for model railroading. His design team has met with staff and considered a number of design variations, all requiring far less grading than the 2008 plan, and eliminating any basement space or need for a long access driveway. Finally, new project plans were developed and have now been presented to the town and WASC for consideration. These plans are enclosed and, unless otherwise noted, have a revised date of 3/26/10 and were prepared by CJW Architecture:

Sheet T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, June 2007
Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design, 3/24/10
Sheet: A-0, Site Facilities
Sheet: A-1, Site Plan
Sheet A-2.1, Floor and Roof Plans
Sheet A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A-3.2, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A-4.1, Building Sections

In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached arborist’s report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated January 8, 2008. Also provided are the attached cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures and a “Finish Board.” These materials were received March 26, 2010 and are discussed below.

As noted at the head of this memorandum, the May 5, 2010 meeting is for preliminary review of this new proposal. The review will begin with a site meeting that is scheduled to take place at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, May 5th. Story poles have been installed to facilitate the site meeting and the WASC has been invited to participate in the meeting. We understand, however, that WASC representatives met with the project design team recently at the site to review the proposal, but we have not received any formal communications from the Westridge committee in the aftermath of that meeting.

At the conclusion of the May 5th preliminary review, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting to permit time for the design team to respond to any preliminary review comments or concerns. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the preliminary review of the request.

1. **Project Description, Grading and Vegetation Impacts.** As noted above, site and area conditions are discussed in the attached staff report prepared for the June 2008 project review. The current proposal is significant in terms of the following changes from the 2008 project:
 - Location. The 2008 project placed the basement railroad facility with upper level entertainment space at the south side of the existing house. This added considerably to the scope of development on that side and required a number of support improvements that would have more dramatically changed the appearance of the south side of the property. The current plans eliminate all south site development and shift the proposed improvements immediately to the east side of the main house where they could be more easily and directly served by the existing driveway system. This shift in location and scaling back of the

scope of the project has permitted addressing a number of the issues identified with the 2008 project as further discussed below.

- Floor area. The current proposal eliminates any basement space, and associated grading, and has a total floor area for the model railroad and workshop uses of 3,514 sf, essentially making use of all remaining floor area. The 2008 proposal included 1,603 sf of “exempted” basement space. Overall, the current plan calls for 1,900 sf less than the previous plan. It is also noted that with the somewhat taller design, the project no longer qualifies for the single story bonus and the plans reflect the lower floor area limits. In any case, the proposal will make use of essentially all remaining permitted floor area and no proposed floor area is exempt from the floor area limits.
- Grading volume. The 2008 proposal called for just under 1,000 cubic yards of grading. The current plans propose a balance of 148 cubic yards of cut and 148 cubic yards of fill, largely to create the level space on the east side of the existing house to accommodate the shop, barn and covered access terrace. An additional 235 cubic yards of gravel and concrete would be brought to the site for the new concrete flatwork and gravel pads at the north and south sides of the railroad barn. Thus, the total volume of site grading is significantly less than proposed in 2008.
- Access driveway/Impervious surface. The 2008 plan proposed a long driveway along the east side of the site to accommodate access to the then proposed building site on the south side of the parcel. That driveway with associated parking area was of particular concern to the easterly neighbor. The current plans limit access to a driveway that would be located between the existing house and new shop and barn. Further, the parking associated with the access, i.e., to serve the barn and shop, would be largely screened from the neighbors view by the siting of the barn. The terrace area with provisions for the parking and vehicle access to the shop would also be covered with a roof that would support the proposed photovoltaic panels. The design approach significantly limits views to the terrace area and vehicle access that is needed to service the barn and workshop. This view control is not only relative to views from the property to the east, but also residences to the south that are at a significantly higher elevation, and the Westridge Drive view shed.

The total impervious surface area has been reduced by over 2,300 sf from 10,637 to 8,319 sf. This is well within the 13,770 sf impervious surface limit for the site.

As the project design team was developing the current design, they shared several options with town staff. We encouraged efforts to save as many oaks as possible between the new building area and view corridors from the parcel to the east and from Westridge Drive. One design option kept the two spaces more linear, running north to south, and provided more distance between the buildings and the easterly property line. This option preserved more trees along the east side, but required more grading and tree impacts for parking and driveway access on the north side. This would have resulted in more visual presence relative to views along the Westridge Drive Corridor. (It is noted that the new structures would be no closer to Westridge than approximately 85 feet. The minimum required setback is 50 feet.)

Eventually, the design team decided to maintain the required 20 foot setback along the east side and move several of the more healthy oaks from the building site to the east side to enhance screening. The proposed tree moving is shown on the landscape plan. The site meeting will be important in terms of appreciating the tree impacts, and how the oaks to be moved would add to east side screening. It is also noted that the plans call for removal of a number of large pines in the building area and these were to be removed as part of general site upgrading planned with the 2008 project.

Overall, the proposed improvements are relatively significant and unusual for a barn/workshop, but the current design effort is a marked improvement over the 2008 scope of work. We understand the needs of the applicant and appreciate the design efforts to create a barn-like character to accommodate the desired railroad hobby use. We do, however, encourage continuing efforts to enhance screening particularly along the east side and would even encourage consideration of some additional berming of earth to reduce the apparent height of the east side of the barn and increase the base elevation for the transplanted oaks. The barn has a maximum height of 28 feet when viewed from the east. While this is well below the 34-foot maximum height limit, it will be fairly visible from the east side. Added mounting for the trees and additional native shrubbery could help to reduce the apparent height and scale of the structure.

2. **Site Development Committee Review.** To date, the following attached comments have been received on the proposed site development permit:

- 4/22/10 memorandum from the public works director
- 4/22/10 memorandum from the town geologist
- 4/26/10 memorandum from the fire marshal
- 4/16/10 email relative to San Mateo County Health Department review

Comments have yet to be received from the conservation committee and there are no trails issues involved with the project other than possible conflicts during construction access.

Overall, the comments received to date raise no significant site development permit committee issues with the current project.

3. **Evaluation of request with respect to town policies for accessory structures.** As with the 2008 plans, the proposed detached structure is quite large for an accessory building and the ASCC must determine it cannot be easily converted to a second unit larger than 750 sf. In terms of the design, the attached “**Second Units and Accessory Structures**” policy statement is intended to guide the ASCC in terms of necessary findings. In this case, the proposed washroom space has a sink and toilet but no shower or tub facilities and no kitchen or bedroom facilities are proposed. This is in line with the policy statement.

The structure does include the model railroad facility and related workshop space and these more unusual spaces and uses were evaluated in the attached 2008 staff report. The ASCC should consider that evaluation in reviewing the current request and making the required accessory use findings. It is likely that, in any case, the

ASCC would want a deed restriction recorded against the property to ensure against future conversion of the structure to a second unit larger than 750 sf.

4. **Project Design and Exterior Materials.** The design of the proposed accessory structure is consistent with the Ranch style of the main house but it is higher and certainly has a barn character to it. As with the 2008, the structure would have relatively simple forms, and make use of materials and finishes that match the existing house. These include vertical wood siding, and wood trim. The roof would be standing seam metal with a dark bronze finish. The ASCC should consider the house finishes during the site meeting and determine if any darker finishes should be considered for the new structure, particularly in relationship to the darker "tree shadow" conditions of the building area. The main issue would be to minimize the visual presence of the building when viewed through the tree cover.

It is also noted that the east side elevation has limited windows and all of the windows are relatively high to minimize impacts on privacy relative to the property to the east. In general, the design and material and finishes appear consistent with town design guidelines. The primary issue is simply the apparent size of the building and measures that can be taken to soften and "break-up" views to it from more sensitive off-site locations. This should be fully considered during the site meeting.

5. **Landscaping and fencing.** The proposed landscaping is shown on Sheet: L-1, and we believe the landscape architect will be at the site meeting to discuss the plan. It is limited to transplanting five existing oaks to screen specific view corridors and the addition of native shrubs to enhance the screening. At the same time, it is directed at preserving the existing meadow areas. The plan should be reviewed at the site meeting and the suggestions offered above regarding mounding along the east side considered with the design team.
6. **Exterior Lighting.** Exterior lighting proposals are presented on Sheet: A-1.1. The few proposed path lights are to be along the new access driveway. The plans note that the lighting at the "porch" and barn doors would be with a surface mounted down light. The cut sheet for the fixture, however, is identified as a "barn light warehouse pendant." The shade for the barn door locations would be 12 inches wide and 18 inches wide in the porch area. We are unsure of the light spill from this fixture and also wonder about views to the light sources from lower elevations on the east side. We would prefer a more shielded fixture design unless it can be demonstrated that the fixture has minimum potential for light spill beyond task areas. Further, all lights should be manually switched.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** Attached is the completed BIG checklist for the project, which proposes a total of GreenPoint rated 49 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached April 20, 2010 report from planning technician Carol Borck. Given the scope of the project and over 3,000 sf of floor area, we would encourage a significantly higher point target. Under the program being considered by the town, a minimum 90 points would be targeted for such a project and we would encourage this to be pursued for this proposal as building permit plans are being developed.

The ASCC should conduct the preliminary review, including the site visit and offer comments, reactions and directions to assist the applicant and project design team to modify or clarify plans as may be necessary to allow for eventual final action by the ASCC. As noted above, project review should then be continued to the July 14, 2008 regular ASCC meeting.

5b. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-613, 35 ANTONIO COURT, *CHUNG/LACERTE*

This is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story, contemporary design residence with partial basement on the subject 1.1-acre Antonio Court property (see attached vicinity map for parcel location). The project includes a two-story detached accessory structure with upper level guest room and lower level recreation room. The accessory structure would be linked to the main house by an upper level bridge. The plans include a new swimming pool and landscape improvements and changes to site driveway access.

The new residence would have a total counted floor area of 4,275 sf, with an additional 789 sf of exempted basement space. The two-story detached accessory structure would contain the 323 sf upper level guest room and 436 sf lower level recreation room. The total site floor area, excluding the exempt basement space, would be 5,034 sf.

Demolition of existing residential improvements would precede development of the new project. These improvements include the existing two-story residence located near the center of the parcel, and the large asphalt driveway and parking area located over much of the front yard of the property.

The project proposes a total volume of grading of 885 cubic yards. This volume requires the subject site development permit and the ASCC is the approving authority for any such permit where the earthwork totals are between 100 and 1,000 cubic yards. The grading is largely to cut the new western end of the house into the site, repair the front yard area with fill and create space for the proposed rear yard swimming pool. A total of 645 cubic yards of excavated materials would be removed from the site and most of this earth is from excavation for basement areas and the pool cavity that don't count against the site development ordinance grading limits.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 3/3/10, prepared by David Solnick Architect:

- Sheet 0, Project Data, 3/4/10
- Sheet 1, Site Plan
- Sheet 2, Floor Plans
- Sheet 2.1, Area Calculations
- Sheet 3, Elevations
- Sheet L1.0L, Landscape Plan, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L1.1, (Landscape) Layout, Thuilot Associates
- Sheet L4.1, Planting Plan, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10
- Sheet L5.1, Lighting, Thuilot Associates

Sheet L7.0, Sections, Thuilot Associates
Sheet L7.1, Sections, Thuilot Associates
Sheet L8.0P, (Landscape) Materials Board, Thuilot Associates, 2/26/10
Sheet L8.0P, Perspectives, Thuilot Associates
Sheet C-1, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, MacCleod and Associates
Sheet C-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, MacCleod and Associates
Sheet GB-1, Green Point Rated Checklist

In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting LLC, dated December 9, 2009. Also provided is an exterior colors board prepared by the project architect that was received on March 5, 2010. The colors board is discussed below and will be available for reference at the May 10, 2010 ASCC meeting.

As noted at the head of this memorandum, this preliminary project review is to begin with a site meeting that is scheduled to take place at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, May 10th. Story poles have been installed to facilitate the field evaluation. A plan verifying the location of the story poles has been provided and is dated 4/14/10. This plan will be referred to at the site meeting.

At the conclusion of the May 10th review, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting to permit time for the project design team to address any issues that may result from the preliminary review process.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the May 5th review:

1. **Project Description, Grading and Vegetation Impacts.** The subject property is located at the southwestern end of the Antonio Court cul-de-sac. It is on the easterly side of the driveway easement that extends to Lot 1 of the Priory Subdivision. The ASCC recently approved plans for new residential development of this Priory property, i.e., for Mr. and Mrs. Robert Larson, 40 Antonio Court. This neighbor has expressed certain concerns with the subject proposal as set forth in the attached May 5, 2010 letter to the town. These concerns are discussed further later in this report.

The subject 1.1-acre parcel contains a relatively large two-story residence located near the center of the property that is viewed prominently from the Antonio Court cul-de-sac bulb. The building pad is roughly four feet higher in elevation than the street level, but the rear of the property, particularly at the more westerly corner reaches elevations that are over 20 feet higher than the street level.

The site contains more significant tree cover along the northeasterly boundary with mostly open, grassy slopes to the southwest and west where it bounds the three Priory subdivision parcels. The east side oak and maple trees are to be preserved and are specifically addressed in the arborist report. Along the driveway easement, however, there are some older pine trees and other more scrubby vegetation that are proposed to be replaced with new native trees, shrubs and ground cover as described on the proposed planting plan (Sheet L4.1). Also, on the northwest side of the driveway easement, on the neighboring property, there are significant trees that appear to fully screen views between parcels.

The easterly portion of the new, contemporary design residence and detached accessory structure are to be located in much the same place as the existing house and with similar ground floor elevation. The new residence would, however, also extend into the west side slopes and be cut into the slopes as shown on the elevation sheets. At the western end, the house would have a two-story form and the new garage would be on the lower level and accessed from the driveway that is in the access easement serving Lot 1 of the Priory subdivision. This would then be a driveway jointly used by the owners of Lot 1 and the subject property. While the driveway easement serves Lot 1, it is not an exclusive easement and the subject applicant continues to control the underlying property rights.

The front of the parcel is now dominated by asphalt and the driveway serving the existing house. The proposal would eliminate this asphalt and driveway and, as noted above, make joint use of the driveway easement along the northwest side of the site. The front of the parcel would be re-graded to more native contours, making use of fill generated from cutting the house into the site and creating rear yard level space for the new pool. The front yard would also be landscaped with mostly native materials. Retaining walls would be used to create pathways from the street to the house and from the west side garage to the front door. New planting would take place within and around the areas defined by the landscape retaining walls. The site meeting will provide the opportunity for the design team to fully describe both the grading and landscape concepts.

It is noted that with elimination of the existing front yard and guest parking pavement, the plans provide for two, gravel surfaced guest parking spaces along the cul-de-sac frontage. These are currently shown to extend partially into the street right of way. The public works director has stated, however, that the plans must be modified to move the parking spaces fully within the property and the applicant will be modifying the plans to conform to the requirements of the public works director. It is noted that currently cars park along the edge of the cul-de-sac and restrict turning in the street. The intent of the new parking is to at least partially relieve the pressure for parking along the street.

Grading in the rear yard area would accommodate the new swimming pool and other yard improvements including the planned circular lawn. The lawn area appears to be approximately 1,100 sf, and slightly over the 1,000 sf limit for lawn areas established by town's new water conservation ordinance. In any case, the final landscape plan will need to be consistent with the ordinance provisions and some minor adjustments appear needed for consistency.

In general, the site plan appears appropriate. We do, however, have some concerns over compliance with required setbacks along the west side driveway easement. Further, interaction continues with Mr. Larson to resolve his concerns as set forth in the attached May 5th letter and discussed in the next section.

- Neighbors Concerns.** On April 29, staff met with the applicant, project architect David Solnick and David Darling, architect for Mr. and Mrs. Larson, to discuss the concerns set forth in the letter from Mr. Darling to Mr. Solnick that is attached to the May 5th communication from Mr. Larson. A number of issues were clarified, but the two architects were to continue to interact to specifically address concerns over the proximity of the proposed two-story house to the driveway easement. It was staff's

understanding from the meeting that there was general support by the parties for the joint use of the driveway in the easement and for replacement of the pines along the driveway with landscape materials that would be more appropriate and better for long-term screening. We further understand that a meeting is scheduled for May 7th between the neighbors and their design teams to consider further adjustments or plan clarifications relative to the concerns of Mr. and Mrs. Larson.

In our plan evaluation and discussions with the project architect, we noted that the proposed house, and particularly the upper level that cantilevers over the lower garage, does not appear to fully comply with the 20-foot setback from the driveway easement line as required by the zoning ordinance. Further, the setback averaging shown on plan Sheet 1 measures from the garage level and does not account for the upper level cantilever. In addition to this technical issue, we've encouraged adjustment to the design to move the house further to the east to allow for a wider planting area between the proposed parking area and driveway easement.

In response to the setback issue and our planting concerns, the project architect advised at the April 29th meeting, that the house would be moved at least six feet to the east and that some additional movement would be considered as interactions with the neighbor proceed. We understand clarification of the planned and possible design adjustments are to be presented at Monday's site meeting. The ASCC will need to consider these and the story poles and provide reactions as appropriate.

The story pole plan appears to show that the pole closest to the driveway easement does represent the corner of the upper story. Scaled from the drawing, this corner is 14 to 15 feet from the easement line, but must be at least 16 feet to satisfy the setback averaging provisions of the zoning ordinance. Clearly the planned six-foot shift to the east will resolve this matter, but we do recommend consideration of additional shifting to the east so that the two-story portion of the house is less imposing on the driveway area. At the same time, we recognize the applicants desire to not encroach on the more significant east side trees. In any case, the issues associated with the relationship of the house to the easement need to be fully considered during the site meeting.

3. **Site Development Committee Review.** To date, the following attached site development permit committee comments have been received on the project:

Public Works Director. The March 29, 2010 memo identifies standard conditions with no unusual conditions or issues noted, except for those associated with the guest parking spaces along the Antonio Court cul-de-sac.

Town Geologist. The March 22, 2010 memo supports conditional approval of the grading plans.

Fire Marshal. The March 29, 2010 report sets forth fairly standard conditions of approval. It is also noted that use of exterior wood siding would need to be considered in light of the fire resistant requirements of Chapter 7a of the town's building code.

Conservation Committee. The March 24, 2010 memo from the conservation committee notes two planting concerns that will need to be considered in finalizing the landscape plan.

Trails Committee. The March 18, 2010 communication from the committee discusses mainly concerns over possible drainage impacts on the trail on the Priory subdivision lands. These concerns would normally be addressed by the public works director in his final review and approval of the grading and drainage plans.

The existing and proposed site improvements are served by the existing sewer and, therefore, no report from the health department is expected.

4. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 5,034 sf and under the 5,222 sf limit for the property. The floor area of the main house, including the attached garage, is 4,275 sf and 164 sf below the 85% limit. In this case, the design concentrates 82% of the floor area in the main house and, therefore, no special findings are needed relative to the proposed floor area.

The proposed detached accessory structure contains a total of 759 sf that includes the upper level, 323 sf guest space and 436 sf lower level recreation space. The floor area in the guest space is well under the 750 sf limit for such uses. Since, however, the total building area is just over 750 sf, the ASCC must determine that the space cannot be easily converted to a guest house larger than 750 sf (see attached accessory structure policy statement). In this case, given the design with internal stairs connecting the lower and upper spaces, we recommend that the detached structure be reduced by 9 sf so there is no issue in terms of conflict with the 750 sf limit. This recommendation is discussed further below relative to compliance with zoning standards.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 6,335 sf and under the 7,732 sf IS limit. There should, actually, be a decrease in IS area from existing conditions considering the scope of planned asphalt removal.

The plan elevation sheets and sections demonstrated that the house heights above adjacent grades would range from approximately 17 feet to a high of 23.5 feet. Thus, the plans conform to the 28-foot limit for height above adjacent grade. The maximum proposed height from low point of contact with finished grade to the highest roof elevation would be 28.5 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit. The detached accessory structure has a maximum height of just over 20 feet and is also well under the 28 and 34-foot height limits.

Compliance with required yard setbacks is demonstrated on plan Sheet 1. Except for the issue associated with the setback from the driveway easement, the proposed improvements are well beyond the required 50-foot front and 20-foot side and rear setback areas. The new house would be at least 80 feet from the front property line and no closer than 40 feet to the east side property line. Only a small portion of the house comes within 38 feet of the rear property line and most of the setbacks on the rear and east sides are 70 feet or more from the nearest parcel boundary.

5. **Project Design and Exterior Materials.** The proposed house architecture is Contemporary with stronger horizontal elements emphasized by the flat roof forms that vary in height in response to changes in site topography. Vertical elements are emphasized on the southern elevation with panel extensions for control of heat and light penetration. Trellis and roof extensions are also proposed on the south side for shading. Overall the architectural forms are relatively simple, with “clean” lines, and with sufficient variation to reduce the apparent mass of the building.

Exterior materials and finishes are detailed on plan Sheet 3. They include stucco and redwood siding, clear anodized window frames and TPO membrane “cool roof” surfaces. Two stucco finishes are proposed. One would be an olive green color with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of just under 40% and the other a medium brown/taupe color with a LRV of approximately 20%. Both finishes are under the 40% maximum LRV policy limit.

The membrane roofing is to be in two finishes. One would be a medium gray finish with a LRV of approximately 30% and under the LRV policy maximum of 40% for roof surfaces. The other is a cream color that appears to have an LRV of well over the 40% policy limit. The proposed use of the different roof finishes should be clarified at the May 10th ASCC meeting.

Sheet 3 states that trim would be painted wood, but we are not certain of the color proposed for the trim and this should also be clarified at Monday’s meeting. The proposed railings for the bridge to the second unit and the second unit south side balcony appear to be horizontal metal tubing and we assume the finish would be clear anodized aluminum, but this needs to be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The garage doors would match the redwood siding proposed for portions of the house.

Overall, the design and use of materials and finishes appear consistent with town design guidelines. In particular, the use of materials and colors should blend well with site and area conditions.

6. **Conformance with second unit and accessory structure zoning standards.** The second unit zoning standards are attached for reference. The proposed detached accessory structure contains a total of 759 sf, with 323 designated for guest use. The floor plan, however, includes the internal stairs connecting the upper and lower spaces and the upper level bath that can be accessed from both levels. To avoid conflicts with second unit provisions, we recommend that the total floor area in the detached structure not exceed 750 sf. This would permit the entire building to be available for second unit use without conflict with policy or zoning provisions.
7. **Landscaping, water conservation, fencing, entry gate.** The landscape plan appears to largely enhance and expand on the more native site conditions and conservation committee review raised only a few minor issues with the proposed plant materials. The proposed hardscape surface materials as described on Sheet L1.1 and shown on Sheet L8.08 appear consistent with the overall site architecture

and also with the effort to restore the front part of the property from the current asphalt dominance.

No new fencing is proposed nor is an entry gate planned. The site meeting will provide the opportunity for the landscape architect to fully describe the landscape proposals.

As noted above, town's recently adopted water conservation ordinance limits irrigated lawns to 1,000 sf and also places a limit of 1,000 sf for ornamental landscaping including vegetable gardens. These provisions are part of the ordinance that was needed to implement state water conservation mandates. The subject proposed landscape plan calls for approximately 1,100 sf of play lawn, but otherwise the landscape concepts appear to conform to the new water conservation standards. The final landscape plan will, however, need to clearly detail conformity with the standards.

The proposed swimming pool would include a pool cover and therefore no security fencing is proposed.

8. **Exterior Lighting.** The proposed exterior yard lighting is shown on Sheet L5.1. It includes pathway and step lights. In general the yard lighting appears to conform to town policies except for the number of lights along the pathway from the cul-de-sac to the front entry. We wonder if the lighting along the pathway could be reduced or an alternative approach could be used to the planned approximately two-foot high fixtures. We are concerned that the lights would appear more string-like when viewed from the lower street elevations.

The approach to lighting of the exterior of the house is not detailed on the plans. This needs to be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

9. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** Plan Sheet GB-1 contains the Build-It-Green checklist for the project. The checklist targets 136 points. The attached March 18, 2010 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck provides a more detailed evaluation of the sustainable aspects of the project as currently anticipated. The report notes that additional points are highly likely as building permit plans are developed. The proposed 136 BIG points is very close to the 143 points that would be required for this project with the green building program now being considered by the town council. Based on the comments in Ms. Bock's report, it appears highly likely that the final permit plans would exceed the 143 point target.

The ASCC should conduct the May 10th preliminary review, including the site visit, and offer comments, reactions and directions to assist the applicant and project architect modify plans as may be necessary to allow for eventual final action by the ASCC. Project review should then be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

5c. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS, CARPORT ENCLOSURE AND MODIFICATION OF ACCESSORY PARKING EASEMENT (APE), 1 FREMONTIA, PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH, BOWER/SHAW

This request is for the addition of 562 sf to the existing house on the subject Portola Valley Ranch property. The proposed project includes enclosure of an existing carport and modification of two accessory parking easements (APE) on the property. At the time the matter was set for consideration at the May 10th ASCC meeting, there was some question as to the accuracy of the plan data relative to the identified building envelope and APE boundaries on the property. As a result, a site survey is being prepared and the applicant and staff concur that project consideration should be continued until the survey data is available and can be evaluated in terms of any impacts on the details of the request.

As a result of the foregoing, it is recommended that at the May 10th meeting any public input be received and that, thereafter, project consideration be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

5d. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-615, FOR SWIMMING POOL GRADING AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, 10 PEAK LANE, KELLY

The request is for approval of plans for replacement of an existing swimming pool and the addition of a small, 130 sf spa and equipment pool house on the subject 1.3-acre parcel located at the intersection of Peak Lane and Cervantes Road. The attached vicinity map shows site and area conditions.

The pool, pool equipment structure and other proposed improvements would be located on the Cervantes side of the property and require a total of 270 cubic yards of earthwork for construction. This would include 36 cubic yards of cut and 234 cubic yards of fill. The work would be largely to extend level yard space to accommodate the new pool configuration and location of the pool equipment building and planned new spa. Since the total volume of earthwork exceeds 100 cubic yards, but is under 1,000 cubic yards, the ASCC is the approving authority for the site development permit.

In this case, the scope of work is essentially to redevelop an existing pool area and to extend level space. Given the nature of the project and existing site conditions, after the work is complete, the visual conditions in the area should not be significantly different than currently exist, and for practical purposes this is a fairly simple and straightforward project.

The proposal is discussed in the attached transmittal from the project architect dated April 15, 2010 and shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated April 6, 2010 and prepared by Thayer Hopkins Architects:

- Sheet A000, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A101, Site Plan
- Sheet A201, Pool House, Partial Site Plan
- Sheet A202, RCP & Elect. Plan
- Sheet A301, Pool House Elevations

Sheet A302, Pool House Sect./Elev.
Sheet A801, Pool House Details
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-2, (Overall) Site Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-3, (Area of Detail) Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-4, Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet C-5, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.

Attached to Sheet C-1 of the enclosed plans is a page of impervious surface calculations prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated 4/2/10. In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached Materials Samples sheet dated 4/6/10 describing the materials for the pool equipment house, which are largely to match those used on the existing house on the property. The color version of the sheet will be available for reference at the May 10th ASCC meeting.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete review and action on this proposal:

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject property is located immediately south of the intersection of Peak Lane and Cervantes Road. It has relatively gentle slopes over most of the building site and the building site ground elevations are roughly six to ten feet or more higher in elevation than elevations along the parcel's street frontages. These elevation differences and the surrounding tree cover and other landscaping result in the uses in the front yard area of the property being largely out of the view shed of most off site locations. The surrounding trees, other vegetation and wood walls would remain with this project.

The existing house is located toward the northerly center of the property and is over 80 feet from the front property line common with Cervantes Road. The two-story house is of a contemporary design and helps to frame the existing front yard area that contains the swimming pool, that is to be replaced, and other landscape improvements. The site's septic system, vineyards and other landscaping are located on the slopes to the southwest of the residence and pool yard area.

The proposal is to remove the existing kidney shaped pool and replace it with a new rectangular shaped pool in much the same location as the existing pool. The grading would extend level area to the southwest to accommodate mainly the added pool terrace, pool equipment building and spa area. The pool would maintain the required 50-foot setback from the Cervantes Road right of way, as would the pool equipment building. The maximum depths of fill to extend the level pool terrace would be three to four feet and no significant vegetation would be impacted by the fill.

The front yard landscaping includes oaks and other trees and shrubs along the street frontages that would not be impacted by the project. Only more ornamental materials, including two smaller trees, would be removed to accommodate the

grading and pool and terrace improvements. As stated above, after construction, there would be little apparent significant change in terms of site conditions or views from off site. The main factor is to ensure that existing screen vegetation to be preserved is properly protected from construction activities. It is noted that an existing Cervantes Road service drive to the south of the proposed work allows for direct construction access.

2. **Site Development Committee Review.** The following attached site development permit committee comments have been received on the project:

Public Works Director. The applicant has completed the attached public works standard guidelines and conditions checklist and the public works director has noted that the proposed improvements are acceptable subject to standard site development permit conditions. He is, however, pursuing some questions with the project design team relative to a few existing improvements that are in the public right of way.

Town Geologist. The May 6, 2010 memo supports conditional approval of the grading plans. The conditions identify no unusual conditions with the project.

Conservation Committee. Comments have not been received from the conservation committee. Any action should provide for the plans to be modified as determined necessary to address any concerns of the committee to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Trails Committee. No trails issues have been identified in association with this project.

Health Department. The health department has advised that the building permits could be issued, but a water test still needs to be completed to the satisfaction of the health officer.

3. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), and height limits.** The total proposed floor area is 4,555 sf and well under the 5,374 sf limit for the property. The floor area in the main house would not change and is only 69% of the total permitted floor area.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 7,736 sf and 967 sf of IS would be added with the project. The total is within the 8,040 sf IS limit for the property.

The proposed pool equipment structure with attached trellis would have a maximum height of just over 12 feet and is well under both the 28 and 34-foot height limits.

4. **Pool equipment building design, exterior materials.** The pool equipment building with trellis has been designed to match the simple, contemporary architecture of the existing house and other site structures. Exterior materials are to include stained wood siding and doors. The Materials Sheet notes that the siding would be either shingles or, if the existing house shingles are replaced with tongue and groove vertical cedar boards, the same board material would be used on pool equipment structure. Trim would also match that used on the main house.

5. **Landscaping.** The plans propose to protect most of the existing front yard landscaping with only removal of plantings in the areas where the new improvements are to be located. The key will be the development and implementation of an appropriate vegetation protection plan.
6. **Exterior lighting.** The only proposed new lighting are the “under cabinet” fluorescent fixtures at the outdoor kitchen area on the north side of the pool equipment building. These should have minimum impact and appear fully consistent with town lighting guidelines. Any lighting proposed in the new pool should, however, be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Overall, this is a straightforward project that has minimal potential for any significant site or area impacts. Prior to acting on the proposal, however, the ASCC should consider the above comments, visit the project site, and take into account any new information presented at the May 10th ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor