



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, June 28, 2010
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:00 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., 300 Westridge Preliminary consideration for plans for new residential development of a 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property, Whitney (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:00 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. Other Business:

a. [Informational Meeting with Representatives of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee \(WASC\)](#)

5. Old Business:

a. [Follow-up Review – Request for Approval of Redwood Tree Removal, 330 and 340 Golden Hills Drive, Oak Hills Subdivision, Klope \(Tri State Capital\)](#)

6. New Business:

a. [Architectural Review for House Additions and Detached Garage/Accessory Structure with Studio, 150 Fawn Lane, Bach-Sausville](#)

b. [Preliminary Review of Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-616 for New Residence, Detached Accessory Structures & Related Site Improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney](#)

6. Approval of Minutes: June 14, 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: June 25, 2010

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: June 24, 2010
RE: Agenda for June 28, 2010 ASCC Meeting
(Note: Regular Evening Meeting to start at 7:00 p.m. for informational meeting with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee.)

NOTE: A special ASCC field meeting has been scheduled to start at 4:00 p.m. on the afternoon of Monday, June 28, 2010. The special meeting is for preliminary consideration for plans for new residential development of a 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property located at 300 Westridge Drive, i.e., on the north side of Westridge between Alamos Road and Bolivar Lane. This has been noticed as a joint meeting of the planning commission and ASCC, as the planning commission is the approving authority relative to the site development permit component of the proposal. In addition, since the project is within the Westridge Subdivision area, the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) has been given notice of the site meeting. (It is noted, however, that the WASC has already issued a conditional approval of the project.) A preliminary evaluation of the request is presented below under agenda item 6a., **Whitney.**

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

4a. INFORMATIONAL MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WESTRIDGE ARCHITECTURAL SUPERVISING COMMITTEE (WASC)

Periodically, the ASCC and WASC have met to discuss design review and other matters of mutual interest and concern. The focus of the discussion typically is about project review perspectives and, in some cases, differences between the objectives and responsibilities of the ASCC and the WASC. This is not meant to be a lengthy discussion, but more a refreshment for the members of each body as to how they view their roles and responsibilities. If any specific projects are discussed, they should only be those that have completed the review processes and not any that are currently under consideration as there has been no notice for such project specific discussion.

For reference, enclosed is a copy of the Westridge Homeowners Association Blue Book that discusses the Westridge association, the basic framework for the Westridge subdivision and the scope of project review responsibilities that have been assigned to and exercised by the WASC. ASCC members may want to review the Blue Book to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the WASC. This may result in some questions that might facilitate communication, particularly in any areas where there may be some apparent differences in perspective between the scope of ASCC project consideration and that of the WASC.

In the past, when such informational sessions have been held, there typically has been some clarification as to communication lines between the WASC, town staff and the ASCC. Specifically, several years ago, there was agreement that any significant project in Westridge would be subject to a preliminary review process that would include an ASCC site meeting and the WASC would be invited to the site meeting. The town has followed the agreed to procedures and this has facilitated the overall review process. Recently, however, there have been comments by some applicants that the WASC has not been as timely as hoped for in responding to requests for consideration of plans and that this has impacted the ability to address Westridge and town (i.e., ASCC concerns) in an organized and appropriate manner. The joint preliminary review process was instituted in part to help coordinate and, as possible, facilitate a more timely review and comment process. If there are any other actions that can be taken by the town to further facilitate project processing, perhaps this could be identified and discussed on Monday night.

Current members of the WASC are:

Rusty Day, Chair, Pinon Drive
Bev Lipman, Secretary, Favonio Road
Walli Finch, Westridge Drive
George Andreini, Mapache Drive
David Strohm, Mapache Drive

It is hoped that most would be in attendance at the ASCC meeting. Approximately one half hour has been allocated for the informational discussion on Monday night.

5a. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF REDWOOD TREE REMOVAL, 330 AND 340 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, OAK HILLS SUBDIVISION, KLOPE (TRI STATE CAPITAL)

At a special March 12, 2010 site meeting, the ASCC approved plans prepared by Landscape Architect Thomas Klope Associates for removal of 257 redwood trees from the subject two, commonly owned, residential parcels, totaling 7.4 acres, in the Oak Hills subdivision (see attached vicinity map). The approval included the understanding that additional redwoods could be removed off of, but along the property boundary, if a neighbor agreed to the removal or, where the trees are in the public right of way, an encroachment permit would be issued by the public works director to allow tree removal.

The project was first considered at the March 8th regular meeting and then consideration was continued to the special field meeting. The March 4, 2010 staff report on the proposal and minutes from both the March 8th and March 12th ASCC meetings are enclosed for reference.

In follow-up to the March 12th ASCC approval, and to satisfy the nine approval conditions, Mr. Klope has submitted the attached June 4, 2010 letter, with the May 19, 2010 *Raptor Nest Survey*, prepared by Bryan M. Mori, Biological Consulting Services, and the following revised and updated project plans, also prepared by Thomas Klope Associates, dated 6/2/10:

- Sheet LL-1, Tree Removal Plan
- Sheet LL-2, Landscape Screening Plan
- Sheet LL-3, Lawn Removal Plan
- Sheet LL-4, Revised Entry Gate Plan
- Sheet LL-5, Exterior Lighting Plan

The June 4, 2010 letter from Mr. Klope lists all nine approval conditions and notes how the current submittal satisfies each condition. For the most part, the revised plans and responses to the conditions appear to fully address the requirements. There will, however, be the need for additional staff oversight as the work proceeds, and we will need to finalize, at the staff level, an amount adequate to cover the required bond. Staff will continue to work with Mr. Klope, the contractor and other representatives of the applicant as work on the project proceeds over the next four to six weeks or so.

While we believe most of the approval conditions are adequately addressed by the plans and statements in the June 4th letter from Mr. Klope, we highlight the following for ASCC consideration and information:

1. **Adjustments to tree removal plan and conservation committee input.** Pursuant to ASCC comments and recommendations, the applicant has modified the plan to preserve some redwoods for privacy along the easterly boundary common with the Porter parcel (325 Golden Hills Drive) and to also reach agreement with these neighbors for removal of redwood trees in the panhandle of their parcel along the southeast boundary of the 330 Golden Hills Drive. Further, five of the redwood trees in the Golden Hills right of way are proposed for removal subject to obtaining an encroachment permit from the public works director. The removal of these right of way trees is not clear on the tree removal plan, but the trees planned for removal are # 582 through #586.

The net result of the plan adjustments is to increase the overall removal of trees from 257 to 281, or 24 more trees than originally planned. This is, however, consistent with encouragement of both the ASCC and conservation committee. The conservation committee has advised staff that it finds the revised submittal acceptable and continues to support the effort.

2. **Oak Hills HOA approval.** Berry Blocker, president of the HOA, has advised staff that the homeowners association has approved the subject submittal. Mr. Klope has also advised that in the process of plan revisions, all adjacent homeowners have been contacted and he has received no comments or concerns from this

outreach. The town has also received the attached June 22, 2010 email from Mr. and Mrs. Moseley, 280 Golden Hills Drive, supporting the project.

3. **Gate and fencing plan.** The existing gate will be removed and the new gate located at the 50-foot setback line. Thus, the location avoids any conflicts with the fence and gate ordinance provisions, which place design limits when placement is in a required yard setback area. The gate would have a maximum height of roughly 7 feet, and be attached to six-foot high stone columns. The gate would be constructed with a metal, cedar clad frame and metal pickets and would be relatively transparent. While we would prefer a lower height, not to exceed six feet, we recognize that the gate is outside of the setback area. The primary reason for our six-foot height comment is based on our view that it would be of a more appropriate scale and result in less potential for the gate to be viewed as an imposing feature. At the same time the 50-foot setback distance helps to mitigate our height concern.

The plans propose to connect the existing metal picket property line fence to the new gate with four-foot high horse type post and rail fencing. The alignment, as shown on the plans, is effectively a “placeholder” and a more irregular alignment is actually intended. Mr. Klope has advised that the existing property line fence is to be removed and a new fence plan developed after the tree removal. The intent is to pull the fencing into the site and a final fence will be provided to the ASCC for approval. Nonetheless, the desire is to receive approval for the gate plan at this time. (For clarification, no lighting is proposed with the gate plan.)

4. **Project timeline.** The submittal notes that the project would start after the ASCC appeal period of 15 days. Actually, the project was approved in March and the appeal period has passed. When the ASCC approves the follow-up submittal, the project can proceed and, based on input from Mr. Klope, it would proceed as soon as possible, i.e., with posting of the required bond/surety, after ASCC action on the subject plans. We understand that project staging is actually scheduled to start the day after ASCC action and that the neighbors have been informed of this. The hope is that much of the work can be completed during the neighbor vacation season.
5. **House painting.** Mr. Klope has advised that the applicants will be painting the main house and will select a color scheme consistent with town policies. When colors are finally selected they will be presented to the town for approval. This could be by a designated ASCC member.

Except for the few matters highlighted above, it appears that the current submittal appropriately responds to the ASCC conditions. Prior to acting on this follow-up submittal, however, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 28th ASCC meeting.

6a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND DETACHED GARAGE/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE WITH STUDIO, 150 FAWN LANE, BACH-SAUSVILLE

The proposal is for house additions and construction of a detached two-story, accessory structure, with lower level garage and upper level studio, on the subject 1.0-acre Fawn Lane parcel (see attached vicinity map). The proposed house additions total 744 sf and would increase the house area to 2,263 sf. The proposed 988 sf two-story structure contains a 494 sf garage and 494 sf upper level studio that would be connected to the expanded main house by a wood deck and bridge system.

Essentially no grading is needed for the project and the total floor area in the main house would only be 54% of the allowed site floor area. Thus, no special findings are needed relative to floor area.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by CJW Architecture and dated 5/19/10:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 12/15/09
- Sheet: A-0.1, Demolition Plan
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan (with site lighting)
- Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-2.4, Roof Plan
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet: A-3.2, Model Views

In addition to the plans, the applicant has provided a materials and colors board dated 5/21/10 that will be presented at the ASCC meeting. Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures shown on Sheet: A-1.1 will also be presented by the project architect at the ASCC meeting. Story poles have been installed at the site to model the proposed improvements and, according to the project architect, the plans have been shared with the immediately adjacent neighbors.

In addition to the plans and above referenced materials, an arborist report has been prepared for the project. A copy of this report is attached, as is a reduced version of the site plan showing the location of the five numbered trees discussed in the arborist report. It was prepared by McClanahan Consulting, LLC and is dated June 12, 2010.

The following comments are offered on the proposal.

1. **Project description, siting, grading and vegetation impacts.** The site is located on the south side of Fawn Lane and is accessed by a driveway that intersects Fawn at an acute angle. This is the case because of the topography between the street and established building site on the property. There is a swale that the driveway must cross and the bottom of this swale is as much as 20 to 30 feet below the level at the street/driveway intersection and also the existing building site to the south of the swale. The existing driveway access is to remain and essentially the pattern of site development is to remain much as currently exists.

Along the swale and over much of the property, there is considerable oak and pine tree cover. Most of this tree cover is to remain with the proposal and would continue to be effective in screening existing and planned site improvements relative to views to and from surrounding building sites.

The existing house is located on the established building site on the south side of the property. The building site has essentially two levels and is approximately 116 feet away from the front property line. The lower level, at roughly elevation 690, contains the existing driveway apron and parking area. It, however, does not have a garage or other covered parking space, even though two such spaces are required by the zoning ordinance. The plan proposes to construct the detached two-car garage with upper level studio, 988 sf total floor area, on the existing flat parking pad located at the west side of the established parking level. The lower level garage would include walkways on the north and west sides. The upper level studio would include a balcony on the west side and a deck/bridge connection to the main house over the slopes on the south side.

The existing, 1,519 sf, single level residence is located on the upper level of the building pad at roughly elevation 700 and this is similar to the elevation of Fawn Lane, across the front of the parcel. The existing house is over 180 from Fawn Lane, is screened from street and neighbor views by existing vegetation and has a very low profile further minimizing potential for visual impacts. The proposed 744 sf of additions would accommodate desired kitchen and master bedroom spaces, but the basic design, profile, and roof form of the existing house would be preserved with the project. Further, the proposed two-story accessory structure has been designed to conform to the simple, contemporary Ranch style architecture of the existing house.

Overall, the approach to design of the proposed site improvements is responsive to site conditions. It minimizes the need for grading and vegetation impacts, works with the topography and is carefully fitted into the tree environment. In fact, at this point only two trees are proposed for removal. One is a 22" pine located at the east end of the master bedroom addition. The other is a 13-inch oak (tree #2) located between 20 and 17-inch oaks (trees #1 and #3) at the southwest corner of the proposed garage/studio. Removal of this tree is desired to improve the growing conditions for the adjacent oaks.

Our primary concern is not with the site plan, or approach to design, but with the ability to preserve and protect the oaks that are in such close proximity to the planned garage/studio and adjacent to the master bedroom addition. Several oaks are very close to these improvements and, at a minimum, they will require removal of limbs and pruning to accommodate the additions. Also, foundation work will need to be pursued with care to protect the tree root zones and integrity of root support.

The arborist's report discusses the trees and potential impacts on root zones. The report sets forth provisions for tree protection and preservation. It is essential that the arborist's recommendations be carefully followed and installation of early tree protection fencing will also be important. All foundation work should be under the careful supervision of the arborist as called for in the arborist recommendations.

2. **Fire Marshal plan review.** According to project architect Mark Sutherland, the fire marshal inspected the site with the design team early in project planning. Due to topographic conditions, she was agreeable to the proposed design as long as the existing parking/apron area was not reduced and with the requirement that the project would have interior sprinklers. Further, the project will need to conform to the fire safety requirements of building code Chapter 7a, which include provisions for vegetation clearing. The result of these requirements, when evaluated by the fire marshal, may be that additional pine tree removal would need to be considered. In any case, Mr. Sutherland and the town have requested a formal comment letter from the fire marshal, and the project would need to conform to any requirements set forth in the letter prior to issuance of a building permit. *(See also attached June 24, 2010 email communication between Mr. Sutherland and the fire marshal as to project design understandings that have been confirmed.)*
3. **Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 3,251 sf and well within the 4,928 sf limit. The total floor area in the main house is 2,663 sf and includes the additions and 400 sf of the detached, 494 sf garage. This number is also well under the main building, 85% limit of 4,189 sf. In this case, the main house is only 54% of the total permitted floor area. Thus, the project complies with all basic floor area requirements.

The floor area permitted in the proposed upper level studio is 494 sf and, therefore, does not raise any issue of potential conflicts with the 750 sf limit for guest units. Further, the studio is designed for such use and does not include a bathroom or kitchen facilities and otherwise conforms to the town's attached policies for accessory structures. Also, pursuant to these policies, the ASCC must determine that the studio cannot be easily integrated with the garage to create a second unit larger than 750 sf. Given the required garage space and design of this project, we believe that the findings can be made in support of the proposed studio use.

The maximum height of the proposed two-story accessory garage/studio structure is just below 21 feet and, therefore, well under the required 28 foot and 34 foot height limits. The maximum height of the house with the proposed additions is just under 14 feet and also well within the height limits.

The total allowed impervious surface (IS) area is 7,140 sf. The proposed IS area is 4,384 sf and well within the IS limit.

The proposed garage/studio would be at least 130 feet from the front property line, whereas a minimum setback of 50 feet is required. It would be no closer than 50 feet to a side or the rear property line, whereas a minimum setback of 20 feet is required from these parcel boundaries.

The house and deck additions at the west end would be no closer than 160 feet to the front property line and at least 60 feet from the westerly side boundary and rear boundary. The master bedroom would be at least 24 feet from the side property line. These distances conform to the required setbacks. Further, as noted above, existing tree cover and topography enhance the feeling of separation between building sites in the area.

4. **Project design, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed house additions and detached garage/studio have, as discussed above, been designed to match the architectural style of the existing single level, Contemporary Ranch style residence with very low pitch roof. Both the main house and proposed structure are of a simple design that fits with the site's setting and general character of residential improvements in the area.

The new accessory structure and house additions would have vertical wood siding matching that used on the existing house. The siding would be painted a medium earthy bronze color. The light reflectivity value (LRV) of the color is 30% and well under the 40% policy maximum. The fascia, gutters and garage doors are to be painted the same color as the siding.

Window frames and door trim are to be painted wood in a medium, warm gray that has a LRV of 40%. This color also conforms to the maximum LRV of 50% for trim. Window sashes are to be wood painted and lighter, warm gray color and that has a LRV at the 50% policy limit.

The proposed low pitch roofing is to be composition shingles in a medium gray/green finish with a color that is at the 40% LRV policy limit. At the same time, the color should blend well with the tree cover conditions on the property.

6. **Landscaping.** The main landscaping issues are preservation of existing oak trees near the planned improvements and protection of all existing vegetation beyond the construction area from project work. Otherwise we see little need for additional screen planting.

The proposed construction staging plan appears to provide for needed protection from construction activities. We do, however, worry over how materials would be delivered to the site given the difficult driveway access. This should be clarified to the satisfaction of staff with the final staging plan prior to issuance of a building permit.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior lighting is shown on Sheet: A-1.1. The project architect has advised that the plan is being revised to reduce the scope of lighting and that a revised lighting plan along with light fixture cut sheets will be presented at the June 28th ASCC meeting.
8. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Attached is the Build It Green checklist submitted by the applicant for the project, received May 26, 2010. Until the end of June, use of the checklist remains voluntary. For projects submitted after that, use and certification of the BIG checklist will become mandatory. In this case, a total of 47 BIG points are proposed to be captured. With the mandatory program, for a project like this a minimum of 50 BIG points would be necessary and BIG certification will also be required. A review of the proposed checklist is presented in the attached June 22, 2010 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

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 June 28, 2010 ASCC meeting.

6b. PRELIMINARY REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-616, FOR NEW RESIDENCE, DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURES & RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, 300 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, *WHITNEY*

This is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, partial two-story, 5,860 sf residence on the subject vacant 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision parcel (see enclosed vicinity map for parcel location). In addition to the residence, the proposal includes a detached 685 sf guest cottage and detached 400 sf home office/study. Development would require a total volume of grading, counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance, of 2,190 cubic yards. The grading has been designed to roughly balance on site so there would be minimal "off-haul" of materials. The grading volume requires the subject site development permit and the planning commission is the approving authority for any such permit where the earthwork exceeds 1,000 cubic yards.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 5/14/10, prepared by Arcanum Architects:

- Sheet A0.0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Chappell Surveying Services, 10/3/07, rev. 5/5/10
- Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan and Utility Plan, LTI
- Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan
- Sheet A0.2, First Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)
- Sheet A0.3, Second Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)
- Sheet A0.4, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet A0.5, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet A0.6, Elevations/Building Sections
- Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Studio Green (with yard lighting), 5/14/10
- Sheet L2, Planting Plan, Studio Green, 5/14/10

In support of the plans the applicant has provided the attached arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated January 28, 2008, revised May 11, 2010. Also attached are the cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received by the town on May 18, 2010. The proposed materials and colors board, also received May 18th is discussed below and will be available for reference at the June 28, 2010 meeting.

This preliminary review will start with a site meeting scheduled to take place at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, June 28, 2010. Both the planning commission and Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) have been invited to participate in the site meeting and this meeting would serve as the planning commission's preliminary review of the site development permit application. To facilitate the site meeting, story poles and taping have been set to define the proposed house, accessory structures and auto court area.

Since this is a preliminary review, after the June 28th meeting, it is recommended that project consideration be continued to the July 12, 2010 regular ASCC meeting. This will allow time for the project design team to respond to any preliminary review comments. The following evaluations are offered to assist the ASCC and planning commission in Monday's preliminary review of the request:

1. **Background, WASC review.** In 2008, the ASCC and planning commission, as well as WASC, considered and approved a somewhat similar proposal for development of the subject property. That project, i.e., Bariteau architectural review and site development permit X9H-588, included a 4,400 sf partial two-story house, two auto court areas, and swimming pool with extensive north side terraces associated with planned pool and outdoor spaces. The 2008 site development permit called for 2,080 cubic yards of grading, which is very similar to the number proposed with the current project.

The 2008 plans placed the site improvements in a similar location to what is currently planned, but had the house and pool extended further to the northeast and closer to 121 Ash Lane, i.e., the Vidalakis/Elsbernd property, which was the subject of a recent ASCC review and approval for a new residence and accessory structures. The 2008 plans were developed by the same architect and civil engineer involved in the current project. A new landscape architect, however, has been retained for this proposal.

With the 2008 plans, two auto courts were proposed. The main auto court was in essentially the same location as shown on the current plans. A second auto court was proposed on the southeast side, i.e., where the current two-story kitchen and master bedroom wing is planned, to serve the garage access on that side. The garage doors would have been more exposed to views from Westridge Drive, and more grading was needed on this side for development of the second auto court.

Perhaps the most significant issue associated with the 2008 Bariteau project had to do with the driveway access connection to Westridge Drive where this site and 332 and 348 Westridge share a common access to the street. The access plan was complicated by the location of the Westridge Homeowners association trail. Fortunately, the matter was resolved and the joint access has been improved according to the plans approved in 2008. Further, the trail alignment was resolved as shown on the enclosed plans. The final trail improvements would be completed when the subject driveway work is pursued. According to the project architect, there is to be continued refinement of the driveway plan to ensure, if possible, that no additional tree removal takes place for the driveway work, although the enclosed plans do provide for one tree in the driveway area to be removed as noted on plan Sheet L1. Work will continue to adjust the plans to try and save this tree.

As noted above, the **WASC** has been invited to participate in Monday's meeting. It is noted, however, that the committee has already completed project review and issued its conditional approval as set forth in its attached June 9, 2010 letter. The conditions focus on landscape screening, exterior lighting and construction staging. Also, the letter indicates that the house would be shifted 5 feet "uphill" from what is modeled by the story poles. We've discussed this comment with the project architect. He advises that the adjustment is being made to ensure preservation of the live oak located immediately to the southeast of the inside of the building "L" formed by the garage and kitchen spaces. The exact amount of the house adjustment is still being reviewed, as it could also have impacts on the spaces between the house and detached structures. In any case, this is under further study and the status of the refinement will be explained at the site meeting.

2. **Parcel history, Project Description, Grading and Vegetation Impacts.** Some of the comments that follow include information from our 2008 project evaluation. They are included here for perspective on the site and area conditions as well as some additional history on the property.

The subject site is Parcel 1 of the three-lot Hurd subdivision approved by the town in 1989. In 2006, the ASCC considered and conditionally approved plans for the driveway access points for the three parcels. Also in 2006 the ASCC approved plans for development of then vacant Lot 1, Oakley (348 Westridge). The construction of this project is now complete. The center parcel of the subdivision, i.e., Lot 2, contains the original Hurd house, which is occupied by a new owner.

Shortly after the Oakley project was approved for Lot 1, the owners of three Hurd subdivision properties joined together to pursue extension of the sewer line to the properties. This extension, up Westridge Drive from Alpine Road, has now been completed. Thus, the new sanitary sewer line will serve this project.

The subject 2.5-acre parcel is the easternmost of the three subdivision parcels. It has a panhandle form, and the panhandle extends west from the main part of the site to accommodate the driveway access, which was set with approval of the Hurd subdivision and the more detailed driveway plan approved and implemented in 2008.

The majority of the property is oak grassland with gentle to moderate slopes. The proposed building site is located on the more level portions of the property, towards its southern half. To the north, the parcel descends to the northeast corner, which is roughly 60 feet lower in elevation than the building site. This lower, steeper portion of the parcel is also more heavily wooded and, with this project, as with the 2008 proposal, would be left in its native condition.

The planned building site is immediately northeast of the point where the proposed driveway leaves the panhandle of the property. It is a gently sloping, mostly grass covered hillside that can be relatively easily developed without impacting views from nearby residences and with minimum impact on site slopes or native trees. The building site and property are mostly surrounded by oaks and other native vegetation. These materials, the siting of houses on neighboring parcels, ground elevation of the building site, and the proposed house siting and design help minimize potential for impacts on either close-in or more distant views in the neighborhood.

It is noted that in the WASC review letter, there is concern over the impacts of the proposed southeast side two-story house form relative to views from Westridge Drive. The committee, while finding the two-story design acceptable, does seek additional landscaping to soften views from Westridge Drive. It is further noted that along this southeasterly side, are two large incense cedar trees (see plan Sheet L1) that are to be removed and replaced with three coast live oaks. This would be more consistent with the native site conditions, and the conservation committee (see attached May 28, 2010 letter) supports removal and replacement of these trees. Three new oaks, 24-inch box size, are proposed. (The plans have inconsistent data relative to new tree size, but the landscape architect has confirmed that the 24-inch note is the correct figure.) Initially, we suggested that the cedars be preserved

during construction to screen views of the work. However, we now understand that the desire is to plant the new trees early in the process so that they are in place and well established at the end of the project construction. Further, consideration is being given to transplanting the one existing coast live oak, located immediately southwest of the "bike" shop attached to the proposed garage, and perhaps another site oak, to the southeast corner. This would have to occur early in the project work. As a result, and based on conservation committee input, we support early removal and replacement of the cedars.

The plans call for placing the mostly single story house, guest unit, detached study and auto court in the open, grass covered building site. The auto court and guest parking area are located on the southwest side of the house and would be screened by the planned house and detached structures and the auto court wall. Further, the approach to grading is to lower the auto court area into the site to further reduce the visual presence of the parking and garage access apron.

As noted on Sheet C2.1, the majority of the grading would be for construction of the auto court and cutting the west end of the proposed house and detached accessory structure improvements, including the courtyard area between the structures, into the site. The materials from this cut would be used to develop level area for the north and east side terraces.

On the western side, the proposed structures and auto court and entry courtyard areas would be cut into the site up to roughly seven feet at their westernmost ends. The fill would be placed to the north and east, with maximum depths of between two and four feet to support the desired terrace areas.

The exposed landscape and retaining walls around the house and around the auto court area are to be constructed of stone that would match the stone to be used on the house walls. The finish is a medium to dark sand color and the color should blend well with site conditions including grasses, trees and native shrubs.

As with the 2008 plan, care has been taken to place the improvements so as to protect most of the oaks and *Dr. Hurd manzanita* that fringe the proposed building areas. In fact, the plans make use of the native trees and shrubs to frame and soften particularly the auto court and driveway improvements. It is noted that the plans include a very low drystack stone wall to ensure the preservation of the base of the three manzanita located just to the southwest of the driveway access to the auto court. While the plans only identify one of the manzanita, the project architect has confirmed that all of the plants will be preserved.

The asphalt driveway would extend through the panhandle and connect to the main auto court that is to have a brown cobble, sand-set surface. The auto court has been designed to provide the needed fire truck turnaround as shown on sheet A0.1. The previously approved driveway plans required the driveway surface to be asphalt and the plans conform to this requirement.

The approach to floor area development differs from the 2008 plan in that three separate buildings are proposed, rather than one house, and they would surround an entry court yard. This design approach helps to minimize the size and scale of

any single structure and also keeps much of the active space between the structures private and inwardly oriented on the site.

Overall, the proposed access, site plan, house siting and design appear appropriate for the site and the neighborhood. As was noted with the 2008 evaluation, care will need to be taken to protect the oaks and manzanita adjacent to the proposed construction areas, and Sheet C.O.P. has been developed to set the framework for the construction operation and tree/vegetation protection.

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

Public Works Director. The June 8, 2010 memo identifies standard conditions with no unusual conditions or issues noted.

Town Geologist. The June 1, 2010 memo supports conditional approval of the grading plans. It also discusses the grading and drainage conditions on the site.

Fire Marshal. The May 19, 2010 report sets forth fairly standard conditions of approval.

Conservation Committee. The May 28, 2010 memo from the conservation committee notes lighting and one planting concern. The lighting comments are considered later in this report. The landscape plan should be revised to eliminate the Rock cotoneaster of concern to the committee. Also, as noted above, the committee supports the proposed cedar tree removal.

Comments have not been received from the trails committee, but the only trail in the area is the one along Westridge that was addressed with approval of the 2008 driveway plan. The final construction staging plan should ensure that once the driveway and trail adjustment work is completed, the trail be protected from any construction activities.

As noted above, the project is to be connected to the new sewer line in Westridge Drive. The provisions for this connection should eventually be shown on the site grading and utility plans.

3. **Conformance with second unit zoning standards and accessory structure policy statement.** The second unit zoning standards and policy statement are attached for reference. The proposed second unit is 685 sf and designed to match the architecture used for the main house. Further, it is served by the same access and is clearly accessory to the primary residential use and integrated with it through the design of the courtyard entry. It is under the 750 sf limit for guest units and has been located to minimize potential for off site impacts. There is space for at least four uncovered guest parking spaces in the auto court that would be in addition to the two covered garage spaces, thus meeting main house and guest house parking requirements. Further, the low height, lighting and other design details appear to fully conform to the second unit zoning provisions. Some additional lighting comments are, however, presented later in this report.

In addition to the guest house, a 400 sf detached office/study is proposed and must be judged by the ASCC in accord with the attached policy statement. The ASCC must determine that this structure is not a second guest unit and that it could not be easily connected to the proposed second unit to exceed the 750 sf guest unit floor area limit. The office does not include a bath or any kitchen space and contains only one room. Further, it is located approximately 27 feet away from the second unit, so attachment would not be easily accomplished. Thus, it appears that all second unit and accessory structure findings can be made.

4. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 6,945 sf and under the 7,348 sf limit. The floor area of the main house, including the attached garage, is 5,860 sf and 80% of the permitted floor area. This is well under the 85% floor area limit for the single largest structure. No basement floor area is proposed.

The total proposed IS area is 10,620 sf and under the 12,573 sf IS limit. (The 2008 approved project with pool and pool terrace called for a total IS of 11,381 sf.) Proposed house heights are within the 28 and 34-foot limits as demonstrated by the height lines shown on Sheets A0.4 - A0.6. For the single story portions of the house and the single story detached structures, most heights are 19 feet or less. For the two-story portions of the house, the heights are mostly 25 feet or less, with the maximum height, as measured at the southeastern high point, being just at 28 feet over finished grade that includes some fill. The two story parts of the house, in any case, do conform to the 28-foot height limit and are well under the 34-foot maximum height limit.

The plans have been developed to conform to all yard setback requirements as demonstrated by the information shown on the site plan, Sheet A0.1. In particular, the house is over 60 feet back from the front, Westridge Drive parcel line and 240 feet away from the rear, northern parcel line. A minimum front setback of 50 feet is required and the required rear setback is 20 feet. Required side setbacks are also 20 feet. In this case the setback along the western property line is at least 53 feet and on the east side at least 73 feet.

5. **Project Design and Exterior Materials.** The house architecture is a contemporary Ranch style similar to houses typically found in the Westridge area. The design approach can give the impression that the site has been developed over time with spaces and detached structures added as needed, which has been the history of development on many parcels in the area. The variety in heights, building forms and massing and use of materials and other design details such as trellises, balconies with railings, and dormer and shed roof bay windows all help to ensure that the project's elements will not be overpowering on the site. Further, the elevations, for the most part, have considerable depth, detail and variation that will help to further reduce any apparent massing.

The proposed exterior material and finishes support the architectural style and should also result in a more rural, rustic character. The materials and finishes include:

Cement plaster walls and Trellis columns:	Integral color, smooth trowel, medium-dark tan/sand tone, LRV of approximately 40%, or just under 40% policy maximum.
Wood board siding:	Reclaimed redwood, with a dark brown transparent stain, LRV under 14% and well below the 40% limit.
Wood windows, doors, garage doors eaves, rafter tails:	Stained mahogany or cedar in a dark brown transparent finish, with an LRV of under 14% and well below the 50% policy maximum.
Metal roofing:	Select seam, with one-inch narrow batten in a dark brown/bronze, matte finish with an LRV of under 15% and well under the 40% policy maximum.

Steel trellis and balcony guard railing members would have a powder coat finish matching that proposed for the metal roofing. Downspouts and gutters would be copper and the chimney cap would be dark bronze metal, also matching the roof finish.

Our only concern with the proposed color board is the precast stone proposed for the window sills and balcony headers. The sample is a very light, almost white material and well above the town's 50% limit relative to the LRV for trim. We suggest consideration of a darker material, but this should be considered and discussed with the project design team at the ASCC meeting.

6. **Landscaping, water conservation, fencing, entry gate.** Conceptual plans for landscaping are shown on Sheet L1 and L2 and, except for one plant, the conservation committee has found the plan acceptable. It is noted that no lawn areas are proposed and the applicants have completed the attached water conservation form. The approach to planting is minimal and clearly is directed at preserving the oak grassland condition of the site. The concepts appear consistent with town design guidelines.

In reviewing the plan, we did note that two plants were not identified in the legend. These were clarified by the landscape architect and are NAS PUL, which is purple needle grass, and LON HIL, which is honeysuckle.

Relative to fencing, the plans propose no new fencing. However, the auto court entry will have a corten steel framed gate and a similar gate is to be used for control of access on the north side of the entry courtyard area. In both cases the designs appear to conform to the other project design elements and the gates are well removed from any setback area. In fact, the auto court gate would be no closer than 80 feet to the front property line.

7. **Exterior Lighting.** Cuts sheets for the proposed light fixtures are attached and the proposed yard light locations shown on Sheet L-2. Sheet A0.2 shows the locations for the fixtures to be mounted on the house walls.

The majority of the wall-mounted lights are proposed as fixture L-1, i.e., the Nite Star fixture. The wedge-shape L-2 CFL fixture is to be used in only one location over the door to the "bike shop." This is the only light proposed along the front elevation of the garage and no exterior lights are proposed at the second story balconies.

As we noted with similar lighting proposed with the 2008 plans, typically, the ASCC and town lighting guidelines would call for more use of the L-2 and less of the L-1 fixture. This is the case due to the illumination and the fact that the L-2 shape ensures that light will only be directed down and not out. Otherwise, the locations for the fixtures appear to be appropriate and consistent with town guidelines.

We also note that lights are proposed in the trellis features outside of the doors that would have the L-1 fixtures. The lighting in the trellises seems close to the location proposed for wall lights. As a result, we wonder if it would be possible to reduce some of the lighting, perhaps as mounted at the walls, and allow the trellis lighting to meet requirements for illumination at access doors. This should be considered and discussed with the project design team.

The locations for the proposed low, step and pathway lights appear appropriate to serve specific functions and are also oriented largely inward to the site and proposed improvements. The walls and buildings would screen views to the fixtures from off site locations.

8. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** The attached Build-It-Green checklist has been completed for the project and targets 101 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached June 8, 2010 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck. As noted in the evaluation, work will continue to enhance the sustainable aspects of the project as building details are pursued.

It is noted use of the BIG checklist becomes mandatory for projects submitted to the town after the end of June. In the case of this project, the mandatory requirements would call for approximately 200 BIG points to be captured and certified with project construction. The applicant is encouraged to try and achieve this level with final building permit plans.

The ASCC should conduct the preliminary review, including the site visit with the planning commission, and offer comments, reactions and directions to assist the applicant and project architect to consider plan refinements as may be necessary to allow for eventual final action by the ASCC on the architectural review request. As noted above, project review should then be continued to the July 12, 2010 regular ASCC meeting. After the ASCC completes action on the architectural review application, the project would be presented to the planning commission for public hearing on the site development permit. A specific time for this hearing has yet to be identified.

TCV

encl.

attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor