



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, July 12, 2010
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

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

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. [Request for Modifications to Previous Approval - New Residence with Detached Accessory Structure, Swimming Pool and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-613, 35 Antonio Court, Chung/Lacerte](#)
 - b. [Continued Review – Architectural Review and site Development Permit X9H-616, For New Residence, Detached Accessory Structures & Related Site Improvements, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney](#)
5. New Business:
 - a. [Architectural Review for House Additions and Site Improvements, 219 Wyndham Drive, Blair](#)
6. Approval of Minutes: June 28, 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: July 9, 2010

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner
DATE: July 8, 2010
RE: Agenda for July 12, 2010 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL -- NEW RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-613, 35 ANTONIO COURT, *CHUNG/LACERTE*

On June 14, 2010 the ASCC conditionally approved the subject project as explained in the attached meeting minutes and June 10, 2010 staff report prepared for the 6/14 meeting. At the meeting the ASCC received and considered the attached June 7, 2010 letter from Mark and Mary Ryan setting forth concerns over the proposed front yard parking spaces. The ASCC discussed options, but eventually approved the plans with the front yard parking as explained in the approved meeting minutes.

Following the meeting, on June 29th, the Ryan's filed the attached appeal of the ASCC approval specifically relative to the front yard parking plan. The applicants, in an effort to address neighbor concerns and avoid the various potential impacts associated with an appeal process, considered and identified options for parking alternatives. The enclosed revised site plan by David Solnick, dated 7/7/10, was developed and shared with neighbors. The applicant is now seeking ASCC approval of the modified plan, which would allow him to pursue final grading and landscape plans in concert with Mr. Larson as provided for in condition 1 of the 6/14 approval. The hope is that, with ASCC approval of the parking modifications, a final landscape and grading plan could be developed for ASCC consideration at the July 26, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Larson and Mr. and Mrs. Ryan have considered the revised plan and provided the attached emails in support of it. The 7/7/10 email from Mr. Larson states that he supports the parking scheme and that he will be working out the driveway details with the applicants. The July 8, 2010 email from Mr. and Mrs. Ryan also state support for

the parking plan. Further, they have advised by separate 7/7/10 email, also attached, that if the ASCC approves the plan, they would withdraw the appeal.

We have reviewed the revised plan and find that it does provide sufficient room to provide for the total required five parking spaces. All spaces have access and dimensions in accord with zoning standards. As a result, unless information at the July 12th meeting leads to other determinations, we do recommend approval of the revised parking scheme. This will permit the applicant to pursue satisfying the 6/14 ASCC approval conditions.

4b. CONTINUED REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-616, FOR NEW RESIDENCE, DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURES & RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, 300 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, *WHITNEY*

On June 28, 2010, the ASCC completed 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). The proposal is described in the attached June 24, 2010 staff report prepared for the June 28th meeting; and, the enclosed 6/28 meeting minutes set forth the preliminary review comments, findings and ASCC suggestions. Included with the record of the 6/28 meeting are the June 9, 2010 project approval letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) and the June 28, 2010 letter from George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road.

In response to the June 28th preliminary review, the project design team has provided the following enclosed materials:

Four sheet set (11" x 17") of "WASC/ASCC/PC" Responses, Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10, including:

Site Plan with View Corridors

View from Westridge Drive

View from 177 Alamos Road

July 7, 2010 Revisions for ASCC Response

Sheet C2.1, Grading Plan and Utility Plan, LTI, 7/7/10

Sheet A0.1, Site Plan/Roof Plan, Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10

Sheet A0.2, First Floor Plan (with exterior lighting), Arcanum Architects, 7/7/10

Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Studio Green (with yard lighting), 7/7/10

Sheet L2, Planting Plan, Studio Green, 7/7/10

The attached July 7, 2010 letter from project architect Tim Chappelle explains how the changes shown on these plans address preliminary review comments. Also attached is an email from project architect Austin Riley advising of the adjustments that have been made to the story poles at the site to model the design changes.

Still part of the project application are the following plans considered at the 6/28 meeting and, 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 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

These plans will be available for reference at Monday's meeting. The building elevations would eventually need some adjustments for conformity with the revised site plan and house shifts that have been made to the other design plans.

Also still part of the plan submittal are the attached arborist's report prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC dated January 28, 2008, revised May 11, 2010, cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures, received by the town on May 18, 2010 and the proposed materials and colors board, also received May 18th.

The applicant is now seeking ASCC architectural approval. With this approval, the project could proceed to the planning commission for public hearing on the site development permit. This hearing has tentatively been set for July 21, 2010. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider the project as modified since the 6/28 meeting:

1. **Overview of plan modifications.** The July 7th letter from Mr. Chapelle and the enclosed July 7, 2010 plan showing "revisions for ASCC response" provide a fairly detailed and complete review of the plan adjustments that have been made to address comments from the WASC, ASCC and Mr. Comstock. The thrusts of the efforts have been to shift the house to the northwest and northeast and to also make use of two oak relocations to enhance screening. This screening would be supported by planting of five new, 48-box size, coast live oaks. The screening is directed at the views to and from Westridge Drive and 177 Alamos Road. In addition, by not shifting the living room element to the northeast, the roof of this area can be used to further screen views from 177 Alamos Road to the window areas on the two-story portion of the proposed house that has been moved four feet to the northwest. The view analyses with the 7/7 response sheets demonstrate the visual impacts of the changes.

Other key changes include grading and landscape plan adjustments to ensure the manzanita along the driveway are identified and protected and to also save tree #14, a blue oak located to the south of the driveway.

The design team chose not to pursue the "right/left" swap of the building elements or the flat roof forms suggested by Mr. Comstock for the reasons explained during the 6/28 preliminary review. Further, there has been no provision made for addressing Mr. Comstock's request that there be a permanent restriction that would ensure "forever" maintenance of screen trees. This is not a provision that the ASCC has every mandated, partially do the difficulty of enforcement. It is noted, however, that the town attorney has advised that an ASCC approval runs with the property until it is modified by a future approval. Thus the town would expect that the screen planting would be preserved, but it would likely not be party to a deed restriction calling for the continued maintenance of landscaping. ASCC members may, however, want to further react to this matter.

2. **Exterior materials and finishes.** While there were suggestions for changes to the materials and finishes for the upper level, the project architect concluded that the actions summarized above would address the visual impact concerns and prefers to keep the materials proposal as presented at the 6/28 meeting. We still have

concerns with the very light window sill material as discussed in our June 24th staff report and the ASCC should consider this in taking any action on the project.

3. **Exterior Lighting.** The lighting adjustments appear to fully respond to ASCC comments and recommendations. Further, the remaining path, auto court and east side seat wall lights are all low and directed to internal yard spaces
4. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** The design team was encouraged to consider targeting a higher BIG, green building effort. We understand that such an effort will be made with development of the building permit plans.
5. **Construction staging and tree/vegetation protection.** It was understood during the preliminary project discussion that detailed construction staging and tree/vegetation protection plans would be provided for ASCC, WASC and neighbor consideration prior to issuance of a building permit. Thus it is recommended that the final, detailed construction staging and tree/vegetation protection plans be presented to the ASCC for approval and that this be a condition to any action on this project.

Prior to acting on this proposal, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the July 12th meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS 219 WYNDHAM DRIVE, BLAIR

The proposal is for house additions and construction of a detached carport to provide required covered parking on the subject .58-acre Wyndham Drive parcel (see attached vicinity map). The proposed house additions have a total net area of 800 sf and would increase the house size to 2,251 sf. The proposed carport is shown as an 18 ft. by 18 ft. structure for a total area of 324 sf. The design, as explained below, needs to be adjusted to meet the minimum zoning ordinance requirements for two covered spaces, which is 20 ft. by 20 ft. In addition to the house additions, the plans provide for driveway area improvements to accommodate the carport and required guest parking spaces.

Minimum grading is needed for the project and the total floor area in the main house, with the required covered parking space of 400 sf, would only be 65% 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 Florin Architects and dated 6/16/10:

- Proposed Site Plan
- Existing 1st Floor Plan
- Existing 2nd Floor Plan
- Existing Elevations (West & North)
- Existing Elevations (East & South)
- 1st Floor Plan
- 2nd Floor Plan

West (front) Elevation
East (rear) Elevation
North (left side) Elevation
South (right side) Elevation

In addition to the plans, the applicant has provided a materials and colors board also dated 6/16/10 that will be presented at the ASCC meeting. The color board proposes to largely make use of the existing materials and colors palettes as explained further below. Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures are attached and fixture locations are shown on the site plan. Plans for the detached carport will be presented at the ASCC meeting and will address some design issues discussed herein.

In addition to the plans and above referenced materials, the applicant has submitted the attached water conservation and Build It Green (BIG) Greenpoint Rated checklists. The BIG checklist proposes to capture a total of 49 points.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider the proposal. In addition, story poles have been placed at the site to model the proposed house additions.

1. **Project description and vegetation impacts.** The subject .58-acre site is an essentially level property located on the east side of Wyndham Drive. It is situated between the street and Sausal Creek. Sausal Creek is not recognized for flood plain purposes on the Federal Flood Insurance Maps, but it is one of the creeks with a town setback requirement for structures.

The assessor's map shows the property in two parcels. In 1984, however, pursuant to special provisions in the State government code, the town took action to merge the two parcels into one property, whose use and 25,319 sf area would be in line with the standards for the R-1/20M, 20,000 sf minimum area, zoning district. *(At that time, the parcel was owned by long-time town resident, naturalist and artist Herb Dengler, now deceased. Some of Mr. Dengler's prints are prominently displayed in the lobby of Town Hall.)*

The site contains the existing two-story residence, which is located near the center of the parcel and within roughly 23 to 25 feet of the Wyndham Drive right of way. The property also contains a driveway and parking area to the north of the residence and a swimming pool, shed and small studio on the south side. Yard and pathway improvements connect the various site features.

The proposal is to preserve the driveway access and most of the site features. An upper level, north side extension of the existing house is proposed to be removed and the planned additions would be made mainly to the south side of the residence, i.e., between the existing house and pool patio area. The south side addition would be two stories and include lower level kitchen and upper level master bedroom areas. Other portions of the house would be substantially remodeled to accommodate the planned changes and this would include a new main entry area with upper level bath extension. The scope of improvements would trigger requirements for compliance with Chapter 7a, fire safety, of the town's building code, and this may result in some need to modify the planned exterior materials or how they are assembled.

The majority of the site would not be disturbed with the project and most site improvements and vegetation would remain in their existing condition. The property is endowed with significant redwood and other tree cover that helps to establish its unique character and, for the most part, the vegetation and site character would be preserved. A few small plantings would be lost and a larger crape myrtle would be relocated to accommodate the south side addition.

While the existing driveway access is to be preserved, the access and related driveway area would be expanded to accommodate the required two covered parking spaces and two guests parking spaces. The driveway and guest parking spaces would be surfaced in gravel similar to the existing driveway improvements.

Overall, the site plan and plan for house additions appear well developed for both the property and area. The house additions will make it more usable and contemporary, but have been designed to be in harmony with the general character of the property and neighborhood. The main thrust of the site plan is to preserve the landscaping and established features that are beyond the limits of the proposed improvements.

2. **Geology and creek bank setback matters.** The site is located within the 50-foot to 125-foot setback area of the San Andreas Fault. Within this building setback area, structures for human habitation are permitted subject to the design being found acceptable by the town geologist. The town geologist has completed a preliminary review of the proposal and this included discussion with the project geotechnical consultant. Based on this review, the town geologist has advised that he finds the proposal generally acceptable, but will complete a final review when the building permit plans are provided with structural details.

As noted above, the site is not within the Federal Flood Plain area, but it is subject to setbacks from Sausal Creek. The required setback from the top of the creek bank for new construction is 30 feet. In this case, the proposed addition is no closer than 35 feet to the top of the creek bank.

3. **Carport Design and location.** The proposed carport is to be an 18-foot by 18-foot structure that would address zoning ordinance requirements for two covered parking spaces. As noted above, in order to satisfy zoning standards, the structure must have internal dimensions of 20 feet by 20 feet. The architect is aware of this and is modifying the site plan to show the 400 sf minimum covered parking area.

We have also advised the architect that the carport, now planned to be within 5 to 6 feet of the front property line, must maintain a minimum 20-foot setback from that parcel line, however, it could average the 20 feet and come as close as 16 feet to the front parcel line. He will be adjusting the site plan to meet this standard and likely the two most easterly parking spaces would be those in the relocated carport. It is noted, however, that making the adjustment will be partially constrained by the 30-foot creek setback boundary. If this does become a problem, then consideration may need to be given to taking the creek setback from the ordinary high water mark line. A setback of 35 feet is required from the ordinary high water mark. The modified site plan may be available for ASCC consideration at the July 12th meeting.

If, not, the ASCC may need to condition any approval on obtaining final, acceptable plans for the carport siting.

As ASCC members will notice, there are no plan elevations for the carport. These have yet to be developed, as the intent is to use old timbers that are available to the applicant. The timbers have yet to be evaluated as to how they might be configured to create the desired carport space. Thus, the applicant is seeking ASCC conditional approval with the hope that when the carport plans are finalized they could be presented to a designated ASCC member for acceptance prior to issuance of a building permit.

4. **Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 3,043 sf and well within the 4,048 sf limit. The total includes the added to house, 400 sf carport and existing detached studio and shed. The total floor area in the main house would be 2,651 sf and includes the additions and the 400 sf detached carport. This number is also well under the main building, 85% limit of 3,441 sf. In this case, the main house is only 65% of the total permitted floor area. Thus, the project complies with all basic floor area requirements.

The maximum height of the proposed two-story, added to house is just below 23 feet and, therefore, well under the required 28-foot and 34-foot height limits. The Height compliance for the carport would be determined when elevation plans are provided to the town. (*Note: the enclosed existing elevation sheets show a scale of 1/8 inch = 1 foot. The actual scale is 3/16 inch = 1 foot.*)

The total allowed impervious surface (IS) area is 5,369 sf. The proposed IS area is shown as 1,840 sf, but this does not appear to include all brick and cobblestone areas that are considered IS under town ordinances. If we assume all cobblestone, brick and other pathway areas were IS, then the total IS area would be 4,108 sf. This is still well within the 5,369 sf limit.

The proposed house would be no closer to a side or rear property line than 56 feet and for these boundaries the minimum required setback is 10 feet and 20 feet respectively. The house does come to within 17 feet of the front property line, but averages a front setback of 22 feet and also meets the minimum 16-foot setback standard. Thus, the house conforms to all required setbacks. As noted above, the current carport location does not conform to setbacks and a revised plan will be prepared.

5. **House/Addition design, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed house additions, and overall improvements follow and enhance upon the cottage style architecture of the existing residence. The new siding would match the dark stained wood, board and batten siding used on the existing house and the roofing would be cedar shingles to match the existing roof. The light reflectivity value (LRV) of the siding stain is under 20% and well under the 40% policy maximum. We assume that new windows would match the existing dark metal frame windows, but this should be clarified by the project design team.

The finishes for the fascia, gutters, doors, and any other trim details have yet to be specified. The finishes should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Subject to clarification of the details for some of the finishes, the architecture and materials seem well suited to the site and neighborhood. Also, as noted above, the final materials scheme may be impacted by the fire safety provisions of building code Chapter 7a. Any such changes, for example roofing materials, should be subject to review and approval by at least a designated ASCC member.

6. **Landscaping and fencing.** The main landscaping issues are preservation and protection of existing trees and vegetation. While it appears there is ample space on site for construction staging, a construction staging and tree protection plan should be provided with the building permit submittal. This plan should ensure that materials are kept away from the significant site trees and the creek bank area.

No new fencing is proposed. The existing site fencing is unique and consistent with the cottage style of the project and more rural setting. We find no issue with the preservation of the fencing and the apparent minor rebuilding of it to accommodate the house addition and front yard pathway changes.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior lighting is shown on the site plan and the proposed light fixture cut sheets are attached. While a minimum amount of lighting is proposed, it appears that more fixtures would be needed to accommodate building code requirements for exterior doors. The project architect has advised that only the minimum lighting required by code is desired.

It is also noted that the plans show a light post at the driveway entry. Town guidelines and the ASCC typically discourage such features, although the feature is not necessarily unusual for this neighborhood.

8. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Attached is the Build It Green checklist submitted by the applicant for the project, received June 29, 2010. The submittal was filed just prior to mandatory use of the checklist. For this project 49 BIG points are targeted. It is considered a "whole house" project and under the new, mandatory system a minimum of 50 points would be required. The applicant is encouraged to reach this minimum target with the building permit submittal.

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 July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor