



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, September 27, 2010
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

3:45 p.m. 5010 Alpine Road “Patricia Law Homestead” (convene at Town Center parking lot in front of the Historic Schoolhouse) Preliminary consideration of the demolition permit request and associated Site Development Permit Application X9H-618 for removal of the “Homestead” ruins of the Lauriston Estate, (McKinney) (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

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

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. Continued Consideration - Request for Modifications to Previous Approval, Garage Addition, 10 Grove Drive, Dhillon *Continued to October 11th Meeting*
 - b. Follow-up Review – Architectural Review for New Blue Oaks Residence and Site Development Permit X9H-611, 2 Buck Meadow Drive (Lot 36 Blue Oaks), Toor
 5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review for Proposed Second Story Addition, 190 Cherokee Way, Morrell/Tenedorio
 - b. Preliminary Consideration of Demolition Permit Requests for Structures at 4394 and 5010 Alpine Road, and Site Development Permit X9H-618, For 5010 Alpine Road, McKinney
 6. Approval of Minutes: September 13, 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: September 24, 2010

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: September 23, 2010
RE: Agenda for September 27, 2010 ASCC Meeting

Note: A special ASCC field meeting has been noticed for 3:45 p.m. on Monday, September 27, 2010 and will convene at the Town Center parking lot in front of the Historic School House. From there, meeting participants will carpool to the "Patricia Law Homestead," 5010 Alpine Road. The purpose of the meeting is for *preliminary* consideration of the demolition permit request, and associated site development permit application X9H-618, for removal of the "Homestead" ruins of the Lauriston Estate. This request is discussed under agenda item **5b. McKinney**.

The special site meeting has been noticed as a joint session with the planning commission as the commission will be the approving authority for site development permit. No formal actions on the application are scheduled at this time. Based on preliminary input, the request and necessary CEQA documents will be prepared, particularly for the requested demolition permit, and the matters placed on ASCC and planning commission agendas for action.

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

4a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION -- REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL, GARAGE ADDITION, 10 GROVE DRIVE, DHILLON

The ASCC considered this request at the September 13th regular meeting as discussed in the enclosed meeting minutes. The matter was continued to the September 27th meeting to allow time for the applicant to consider ASCC comments and recommendations. At the 9/13 meeting, the applicant's attorney, Greg Klingsporn, advised that they might not be ready for further discussion on 9/27. This is the case and he has requested that review of the proposals be continued to the October 11, 2010 regular ASCC meeting. The neighbors have been sent notice of this request and staff concurs with it.

Thus, on Monday, the ASCC should receive any public input and then continue project discussion to the regular October 11, 2010 ASCC meeting. (It is also noted that the town has decided to pursue code enforcement proceedings relative to the garage and this process could further impact timing as to when any modified plans are actually ready for ASCC consideration.)

4b. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- 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 conditionally approved the subject proposal for new residential development of this 3.08-acre vacant Blue Oaks subdivision/Planned Unit Development (PUD) parcel. On May 10, 2010 the ASCC reconsidered the plans, as a driveway modification was needed to address the input of one neighbor. At the May 10th meeting, the ASCC found the modified plans acceptable subject to the same conditions set with the March 8, 2010 action. On May 19, 2010 the planning commission approved the subject site development permit. The attached May 14, 2010 report to the planning commission includes the materials associated with the ASCC reviews and provides complete background on the project review to date.

The applicant has now applied for building permit processing. To specifically address the ASCC approval conditions, the applicant has provided the enclosed plan package, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Square Three Design Studios and dated August 12, 2010. The package plans with the most relevance to the ASCC conditions are:

- Cover Sheet with Renderings
- Conditions of Approval Sheet
- Sheet A1.01, Project Directory, Project Data/Tabulation, Sheet Index
- Sheet A1.02, Construction Staging & Tree/Vegetation Protection Plan & Notes, Arborists Report
- Sheet C-1, Grading/Drainage and Utility Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 8/10/10
- Sheet C-2, Grading/Drainage and Utility Plan and Cross Section, MacLeod and Associates, 8/10/10
- Sheet C-3, Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 8/10/10
- Sheet A1.01, Site Plan

Detailed Landscape Plan Sheets, Joni L. Janecki Associates

- Sheet L1.00, Planting Salvage Plan & Notes
- Sheet L2.00, Finish Grading and Drainage Plan
- Sheet L3.00, Site Lighting Plan
- Sheet L4.00, Hardscape and Materials, Overall Site Plan
- Sheet L4.01, Hardscape and Materials, Site Plan (Driveway)
- Sheet L4.02, Hardscape and Materials, Site Plan (House and Cottage)
- Sheet L4.04, Site Plan (Driveway and Wall Sections)
- Sheet L4.05, Stair Elevations
- Sheet L4.06, Barbeque Elevation
- Sheet L4.07, Hardscape Details
- Sheet L4.08, Hardscape Details
- Sheet L4.09, Wall & Boulder Details

Sheet L4.10, Landscape Materials Details
Sheet L5.00, Irrigation Zone Plan
L6.00, Overall Planting Plan
L6.01, Planting Plan (Driveway)
L6.02, Planting Plan (House & Cottage)
L6.04, Planting Details
L6.05, Planting Notes

In addition to these plans, the applicant has provided enclosed five sheet plan set dated 8/6/10, prepared by Techlinea, that show the plans for house and cottage lighting. Attached to the plans are the cut sheets for proposed wall fixture, i.e., Cooper Lighting M660-WP and recessed carport light, Edge Lighting "4x4."

The following comments discuss how the follow-up submittal addresses the four conditions of ASCC approval. Condition language is presented in *italics*. In addition to these comments, it is noted that the plan package is fully consistent with the architectural and site plans approved by the ASCC and planning commission earlier this year.

1. *A final landscaping plan shall be provided that specifies the steps to be taken for use of native materials for restoration of fill areas and other areas disturbed by construction. Further, the plan shall remove Prunus Illicifolia from the plant list.*

The landscape plans are detailed and, again, fully consistent with the plans conditionally approved by the ASCC. Sheet L1.00 sets forth the steps to be taken to salvage the native materials for use in restoration of fill and other areas. The plan does not specifically note where the salvaged materials would be used, but according to the landscape architect, a note will be added to the sheet to clarify this. She has advised that the materials would likely be mainly used around the house and cottage areas. Also, the plans have been modified to remove use of Prunus Illicifolia.

Overall, this is one of the most detailed and comprehensive sets of landscape plan sheets we have seen and the plans appear fully directed at accomplishing the objectives set with the original ASCC approvals. Obviously, care will need to be exercised throughout the construction process to ensure the provisions of the plans are indeed achieved.

2. *A detailed tree protection and construction staging plan shall be provided that incorporates the restoration efforts provided for on the final landscape plan and the requirements of the project arborist.*

Sheet A0.02 provides details for tree protection and construction staging. It includes the arborist report and incorporates the recommendations for the arborist. Notes for tree protection are also provided on the landscape plans. Further, notes on Sheet L1.00 of the landscape plan set forth the process for native material salvaging that direct how work will proceed with the project contractor prior to any site grading. Sheet A0.02 needs to be modified prior to release of building permits to specifically incorporate the process for salvaging of native materials and this should also be included in the timeline for the project. This should be accomplished to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to release of any building permits. Also,

staff will work with the project contractor to finalize all construction staging details prior to release of any building permits.

3. *A final grading plan and drainage plan shall be provided that is consistent with the final landscape plan.*

Architectural, grading and landscape site plans are now consistent and are also consistent with the final plans previously approved by the ASCC.

4. *A final lighting plan shall be provided and shall include all exterior house and yard lighting. Further, data shall be provided to clarify that the proposed wall mounted sconce fixture has a cap that only allows for downward light spill. If the sconce fixture does not have a cap, an alternative fixture shall be specified or the pathway light used for access lighting.*

Sheet L3.00 provides the plans for site lighting. The number, location and fixture selection are in substantial compliance with the plans considered and found acceptable by the ASCC in March.

The proposed house lighting sheets are new. They include the sconce, wall-mounted fixture discussed at the time of previous ASCC consideration. The cut sheet states that the fixture will have a top so that there is no “uplight,” and this has again been confirmed by the project architect.

The house plans also include the “edge” light that is a small LED fixture to be mounted in the deck covering the carport area. In general, the scope of lighting in this area does not appear excessive, but we wonder if six lights are needed to provide lighting for the carport use.

We are also concerned with the window and wall wash lighting that is shown on Sheet LE1.2. We have discussed our concerns with the project architect and he anticipated that we might have some questions on these proposals. As a result, the project lighting consultant will attend Monday’s meeting to discuss and explain the proposals. We understand that the lights proposed outside of the large window areas are intended to control glass glare to facilitate night views out from within the house. We have also been informed that the lighting has limited potential for reflection off of the glass surfaces. If the plan is to be approved, control of outside reflection should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

In general it appears that the follow-up submittal adequately addresses the ASCC conditions and unless data presented at the September 27th meeting lead to other determinations, approval of the submittal is recommended subject to clarification of the few items noted above.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR PROPOSED SECOND STORY ADDITION, 190 CHEROKEE WAY, MORRELL/TENDEDORIO

This request is for approval of plans for a 367 sf second story addition to the existing 4,696 sf house on the subject 1.0-acre Cherokee Way parcel. The attached vicinity

map shows general site and area conditions. From a design standpoint and in terms of the manner in which site improvements are experienced in the area, the project as proposed would have minimum potential for any on site impacts or affecting views from surrounding properties. The request, however, is somewhat complicated only because it seeks ASCC approval to allow essentially all permitted floor area to be concentrated in the single largest building on the site. Such concentration is only possible subject to ASCC making specific findings. These are evaluated below and, in this case, we believe the findings can be made.

The proposal is shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by Staprans Design, unless otherwise noted, dated August 3, 2010:

- Sheet D1.01.0, Proposed Site Plan, June 18, 2010
- Sheet D2.01.0, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet D2.01.1, Proposed First Floor Plan
- Sheet D2.02.0, Existing Second Floor Plan
- Sheet D2.02.1, Proposed Second Floor Plan
- Sheet D4.01.0, Existing North & East Exterior Elevations
- Sheet D4.01.1, North & East Ext. Elevations with Proposed Addition
- Sheet D4.02.0, Existing South & West Exterior Elevations
- Sheet D4.02.1, South & West Ext. Elevations with Proposed Addition

In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached August 6, 2010 letter relative to the proposed concentration of floor area and to request the new entry canopy be allowed to extend into the side yard setback area, specifically as permitted under section 18.52.070 of the zoning ordinance. The ASCC does not need to specifically act on the "exception" as it is available to the applicant as long as the ASCC finds no design issues with it. In this case, we see no issues with the proposal as explained below.

Along with the letter the applicant has provided the attached photo images of the area between the existing house and Cherokee Way to demonstrate the scope of existing landscaping present to screen views to and from the proposed second story addition. The addition is to take place over the existing northwest side of the house. The letter also notes that no lighting additions are planned and that all addition areas would be finished to match those used on the existing house.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete action on this request. Further, the proposed addition area has been story poled at the site and ribbon extended to outline the roof forms.

1. **Background, overview of proposal, landscape and grading impacts, proposed design and exterior materials and finishes.** The subject site is located on the south side of Cherokee Way. The existing house is placed in roughly the center of the property and site topography is relatively gently sloping. The house and other site improvements are surrounded by significant screen vegetation that would not be impacted by this project. Further, the existing driveway and asphalt parking area appear more than adequate to accommodate the proposed construction operation.

The site is one of the lots in the Cherokee Way subdivision and a requirement for this subdivision was that an emergency access connection be installed between

Sausal Drive and Cherokee Way. This connection runs along the westerly boundary of this parcel, on the parcel to the southwest, but then crosses on to this property along the south side. This connection and easement limit the area on site to accommodate development.

The proposal would place the new 367 sf guest room and bath at the northerly end of the existing second story. It would be over an existing, main level recreation room, and set back from the north end of the house the width of the existing attached garage. The architectural form and roof extension would be fully integrated with the existing second story forms and massing. Further, as noted above, existing materials and colors would be used for all additions.

Existing materials include shingle siding in a medium to dark taupe finish and off-white trim, with bronze aluminum frame windows. The roofing is dark charcoal asphalt shingles. The siding and roofing are well within current town light reflectivity limits, but the trim is somewhat light. Given site conditions and the minimum use of the trim color, we support the proposed continued use of the existing materials and color scheme. If, however, the windows are to be changed and more extensive use of the off-white trim is planned, this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC and any adjustments made as may be found appropriate by the ASCC.

The proposed improvements can be made with no grading or impact on site topography or vegetative cover. This includes the proposed extension of the entry canopy. Further, the existing vegetation is effective in screening views from off site to the proposed addition areas. In particular, the entry canopy area is, practically, not visible from off site.

Overall, we view this project as a minor change to existing site conditions.

- 2. Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 5,063 sf and at the 5,064 sf limit for the property. All the floor area is to be in the main house and this would exceed the 85% floor area limit by 759 sf. The existing house, at 4,696 sf, is already over this limit. The findings to grant the requested additional concentration of floor area are discussed below. (Note: the applicant has provided detailed floor area calculation sheets that verify the above floor area figures.)

The house addition would be no higher than 26 feet over adjacent grade and the maximum proposed height is just under 28 feet. Thus, the project is within the 28-foot and 34-foot height limits. It is further noted that the heights of the addition would not extend above the levels of the existing second story roof peaks.

The total allowed impervious surface (IS) area is 7,414 sf. The project proposes no new IS area. In any case, for the record existing floor area calculations should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff with the building permit submittal.

The proposed house addition would be no closer than 112 feet to the front property line and well beyond the 50-foot minimum setback. It would be no closer than 48 feet to a side property line and over 160 feet from the rear property line. In both cases only a minimum setback of 20-feet is required. As a result, the plans fully conform to yard setback standards.

3. **Evaluation of request for approval of main building floor area in excess of the 85% limit.** In order to grant the proposal to place essentially 100% of the total floor area in the main building, the ASCC must make the four findings required under zoning ordinance section 18.48.020. A through D (copy attached). Only one of the sub-findings under A, however, needs to be made. In this case, finding A.1 appears supportable, as placing the addition in a detached structure would clearly have greater potential for grading and vegetation impacts. Further, the site is somewhat constrained by the existing emergency access easement. Also, based on the discussion above, we believe findings B., C., and D. can be made.
4. **Landscaping and Fencing.** No new fencing or landscaping are planned, and we see no need for additional landscaping. The only landscape issue would be to ensure construction operations do not impact existing trees and other screen vegetation. Thus, a construction staging plan should be provided with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of planning staff.
5. **Exterior lighting.** As noted above, no new exterior lights are proposed. Currently, there are a few exterior spotlights that are not consistent with current town lighting standards. These should be removed or replaced with lights that conform to town standards. This also could be accomplished with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** The attached Build It Green (BIG) checklist has been provided demonstrating that this "elements" project would achieve 29 points and this would be over the minimum required 25 points. The applicant has indicated that some of the existing house features qualify for BIG recognition and this will be reviewed by staff prior to release of the building permits.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments as well as any new information presented at the September 27, 2010 meeting.

5b. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF DEMOLITION PERMIT REQUESTS FOR STRUCTURES AT 4394 AND 5010 ALPINE ROAD, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-618, FOR 5010 ALPINE ROAD, MCKINNEY

This is a preliminary review of proposals for demolition of structures on two parcels owned by Don McKinney, both located on Alpine Road. Vicinity maps for both properties are attached. The first parcel is a 1.2-acre property located in the Nathorst Triangle area immediately north of Robert's Market. The second is a 23-acre property on the western hillside that was created as part of the process of transfer of a larger portion of holdings to the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) and eventually to the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD). The structures on these parcels that are proposed for demolition are over 50 years of age and, therefore, before any permit for demolition is issued, they must be evaluated, under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for any historic significance.

In order to satisfy CEQA requirements staff requested that the structures be evaluated for the historic significance by a qualified professional architectural team and this work

has been completed. The following enclosed reports have been submitted for staff, ASCC and planning commission consideration and both were prepared by Urban Programmers and MBA Architects:

Historical and Architectural Evaluation of Patricia Law's Homestead at Lauriston, 5010 Alpine Road, July 29, 2010

Historical and Architectural Evaluation of House and Barn, 4394 Alpine Road, August 5, 2010

Addendum #1 to the Historical and Architectural Evaluation of House and Barn, 4394 Alpine Road, September 10, 2010

Marvin Bamburg of MBA Architects has also assisted the town with work on the renovation of the historic schoolhouse at the town center and the Freeman House in the Blue Oaks subdivision. The addendum report was prepared after review of the full reports by staff and Town Historian Nancy Lund. These reviews are set forth in my attached August 11, 2010 email and the August 23, 2010 memo from Nancy Lund.

As noted at the head of this memorandum a special site meeting has been scheduled for 3:45 p.m. on Monday September 27, 2010 to consider the demolition and site development permit proposals for 5010 Alpine Road. The planning commission has been invited to participate in this site meeting as the commission will be the approving authority for the site development permit.

The conditions associated with the demolition permit for 4394 Alpine Road are less involved and the site can easily be inspected independently. Further, the planning commission does not need to be involved in this permit process. Thus, a field meeting relative to this property has not been scheduled. It is noted, however, that we understand that Mr. Bamburg will be at the site and evening meetings and will be prepared to answer any questions regarding conditions of the structures at 4394 Alpine Road.

The following comments are offered on the project review processes and requests associated with each of the properties.

1. **Process for review of applications.** Normally a demolition permit would be handled at the staff level and would not be referred to the ASCC or planning commission for consideration. In this case, however, due to CEQA requirements and the potential historic conditions, staff has decided that referral of the permits to the ASCC would facilitate the CEQA review and offer the opportunity for public comment on the requests. Further, because of the necessary site development permit for 5010 Alpine Road, it is appropriate for the planning commission to be involved in the CEQA review of the demolition permit associated with the site development permit request.

Based on Monday's site meeting and ASCC consideration of the demolition permit for 4394 Alpine Road, staff will complete necessary CEQA documents and bring the applications back to the ASCC for action on October 11th. The specific ASCC actions being then requested would be to approve the demolition permit for 4394 Alpine Road and forward recommendations to the planning commission on the demolition permit for 5010 Alpine Road. After staff processing of the site

development permit, the permit along with the demolition permit would be noticed for formal planning commission hearing.

2. **5010 Alpine Road, Patricia Law's Homestead.** This property contains the "ruins" described and evaluated in the enclosed report. In addition, it includes improvements that were made based on architectural review, use permit and site development permit approvals granted to Mr. McKinney by the town in 2000. The use permit (X7D-149) was for development of 22,370 sf of floor area, including restoration and "adaptive reuse" of the Homestead Ruins. The use permit was amended in 2003 and included the provision that if the permits for ruin restoration and construction of the new house were not issued by May of 2006, the permit would terminate. While significant utility and site maintenance work was completed, the ruin and house permits were not issued.

The enclosed report fully describes the current condition of the ruins and presents both the general plan and CEQA contexts for consideration of ruin demolition. Staff and the town historian have reviewed the reports and appreciate the conditions of the ruins and need for demolition. Further, the historic element of the general plan only call for a record of the ruins to be provided and they are not identified for preservation.

The proposed site development permit plans are not included, but will be presented at the site meeting. The scope of proposed grading, 1,271 cubic yards, is for restoration of the slope that now contains the ruins. The site development permit plans include five sheets prepared by BKF engineers, dated July 12, 2010. The purpose and scope of grading is further explained in the attached July 9, 2010 report prepared by Murray Engineers, Inc. The plans are currently under review by site development committee members.

3. **4394 Alpine Road, House and Barn.** These structures and their historic and CEQA contexts are also fully reviewed in the attached report. As noted in the report, the buildings are not listed in the general plan historic element and appear to meet no tests for historic significance. The buildings would be removed for the reasons cited in the report and the site reseeded with native grasses for erosion control. Minimum grading is needed and only for blending of the contour modified for original site development.

The ASCC and planning commission should conduct the preliminary reviews on Monday and then the ASCC should continue consideration of the requests to the October 11 regular meeting. The planning commission hearing on the site develop permit will be scheduled when staff processing of the permit is complete.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor