



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Tuesday, February 15, 2011
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Special ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., 9 Redberry Ridge (vacant Lot 10 of Blue Oaks subdivision) Preliminary consideration for Architectural Review and Site Development permit plans for new residential development. (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - SPECIAL AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:

2. Roll Call: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr

3. Oral Communications:

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

4. Old Business:

a. *Continued Review – Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Installation of a Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Golden Oak Drive at Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation *Continued to February 28, 2011 meeting**

b. *Continued Preliminary Discussion – Review for Conformity with Provisions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30 and Site Development Permit for Grading and Refurbishment of School Play Fields, Including Use of Artificial Turf, 302 Portola Road, The Priory School*

5. New Business:

a. *Preliminary Architectural Review for New Residence and Site Development Permit X9H-624, 9 Redberry Ridge (Lot 10 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Srinivasan*

b. *Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling Permit, 255 Golden Oak Drive, Geenen*

6. Other Business:

a. *Update, City of Palo Alto Referral, Temporary Use Permit (TUP) Request, "Portola Vineyards," Winery Concert Series, 850 Los Trancos Road, Leonard Lehmann*

7. Approval of Minutes: January 24, 2011 and February 1, 2011

8. Adjournment

Architectural & Site Control Commission
February 15, 2011 Agenda
Page Two

*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: February 11, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC

FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner

DATE: February 10, 2011

RE: Agenda for Special February 15, 2011 (Tuesday) ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The first February meeting will take place on February 15 (Tuesday) instead of the regular Monday, February 14th meeting date.

The Special February 15th meeting will begin with a joint ASCC and planning commission field meeting to preliminarily consider architectural review and site development permit plans for new residential development at 9 Redberry Ridge (vacant Lot 10 of the Blue Oaks subdivision). The site meeting will convene at this Blue Oaks property at 4:00 p.m. and the proposal is discussed below under agenda item **5a. Srinivasan**.

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

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

The ASCC last considered this matter at its November 22, 2010 meeting and since then review has been continued several times as the applicant develops plan revisions and details to address the issues discussed at the November 2010 meeting. On February 7th, a site meeting was held with the applicant's representatives and neighbors to review the most current landscape and faux tree plans and ASCC members Chair Aalfs and Breen participated in this meeting. Several clarifications were requested by staff in follow-up to the meeting, including input from representatives of California Water Service. The applicant is currently responding to these requests and also input received from Chair Aalfs and Breen.

The requested responses will not be available in time for consideration at the February 15th meeting and, for this reason, staff and the applicant concur project review should be continued to the February 28th regular ASCC meeting. We have informed the neighbors of the status of the 2/15 meeting and continuance. Nonetheless, any public input should be received prior to continuing review to the February 28th meeting.

4B. CONTINUED PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION -- REVIEW FOR CONFORMITY WITH PROVISIONS OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) X7D-30 AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR GRADING AND REFURBISHMENT OF SCHOOL PLAY FIELDS, INCLUDING USE OF ARTIFICIAL TURF, 302 PORTOLA ROAD, *THE PRIORY SCHOOL*

This request was considered at a site meeting on February 1, 2011. The matter is discussed in the attached January 27, 2011 staff report and general reactions provided at the site meeting are noted in the enclosed site meeting minutes. In follow-up to the site meeting, it was agreed that the matter would be placed on both the February 15th ASCC agenda and February 16th planning commission agenda for sharing of additional preliminary reactions as may be determined appropriate. Further, some additional data has been prepared specifically related to the environmental issues associated with artificial turf. This is presented in the attached memorandum from our office dated February 10, 2011. The ASCC should consider this data and offer further reactions on the proposal.

We will, as the project moves ahead, be doing additional evaluation of the impervious surface questions raised at the site meeting. At the same time, the environmental issues are likely more significant, and we are seeking additional reactions to help staff and the Priory know how best to proceed. Further, we wonder if both the ASCC and planning commission might want to consider a field trip to the Woodside School to view the two fields installed there (one natural and one artificial turf) and discuss with school district representatives their experiences with the surfaces and community reaction to them.

In any case, ASCC members should consider the attached materials, provide the opportunity for public input and offer additional reactions to the project as determined appropriate. With this input and that from the planning commission to be received on February 16th, the applicant will make decisions on how best to proceed in developing detailed plans for the field refurbishment project.

5a. Preliminary ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW RESIDENCE AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-624, 9 REDBERRY RIDGE (LOT 10 BLUE OAKS SUBDIVISION), *SRINIVASAN*

As noted at the head of this memorandum, the *preliminary* review of this proposal will start with a February 15th, 4:00 pm site meeting with the planning commission. Story poles and ridgeline taping has been set to facilitate the site meeting and the preliminary review process. While the Blue Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA) has been invited to participate in the preliminary review process, we understand that project approval has already been granted by the HOA. In any case, the comments that follow have been provided to facilitate planning commission and ASCC project consideration. ASCC discussion should be continued from the site meeting to the regular evening meeting and then from the evening meeting to the February 28, 2011 regular meeting.

Since the planning commission is the approving authority for the proposed site development permit, the commission will need to eventually hold a public hearing on the grading proposal. No date, however, has yet to be set for this hearing.

The subject proposal is for new residential development of this vacant, 2.52-acre Blue Oaks subdivision site. The attached vicinity map shows the property and conditions along Redberry Ridge. It should be noted, however, that the vicinity map, from the town's GIS base map, has not been fully updated to show improvements on all parcels and, in particular, shows a house footprint on the parcel to the north that does not exist. This is from an approved plan that was not implemented and the approval has now expired. At the same time, the three "vacant" parcels shown on the vicinity map to the north and west of the subject site are residentially developed.

The requested site development permit proposes 1,210 cubic yards of cut and fill counted pursuant to site development ordinance standards. The total volume of earthwork, including foundation excavation, is 1,850 cubic yards, and of this, 530 cubic yards would be off-hauled from the site. No basement is proposed, thus grading volume are less than with many Blue Oaks project that include basement cut and related off haul of materials.

Lot 10 is located on the east side of Redberry Ridge and is within the "Stonecrest Zone of Habitation" as defined in the Blue Oaks PUD Statement. The relevant PUD provisions for this Zone and the subject parcel are attached for reference. The 2.52-acre site descends in elevation from the road toward the east and the Los Trancos Road corridor. The building envelope is in close proximity to the road and is constrained by the east side slopes, drainage features and geologic limitations. While the parcel has a relatively large area, as the attached PUD provisions demonstrate, this is one of the smaller building envelopes in the subdivision.

The subject application proposes a mostly single level, contemporary Ranch style design house that maintains a low profile and follows the horizontal contours of the site. The form of the house footprint is a direct reflection of the building envelope. No basement is proposed and the grading is mainly to cut the house into the site, and ensure the low profile and strong horizontal forms called for in the PUD.

The proposed 6,144 sf residence and the site development proposal are shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 12/15/10 and prepared by William Maston Architect and Associates:

Sheet A0.01, Cover Sheet, Project Data, Vicinity Map

Sheet A0.02, Floor Area, Impervious Surf. Calculations, Sustainable Bld. List.

(Note: this list has been superseded by the attached BIG checklist dated February 8, 2011.)

Sheet C-1, (Title Sheet) Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet C-2, Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet C-3, Details (Grading & Drainage Plan), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/26/10

Sheet 1, Partial Topographic Survey Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/28/09

Sheet A1.01, Proposed Site with Neighbors
Sheet A1.02, Site Plan With Floor plan Options
Sheet A1.02.1, Site Plan – Floor Plan Comparison
Sheet A1.03, Proposed Landscaping Plan
Sheet A1.04, Staking Plan – Floor Plan Comparison

Sheet A2.01, First Floor Plan
Sheet A2.02, Roof Plan
Sheet A2.05, Proposed Roof Plan
Sheet A4.01, Site Sections
Sheet A4.02, Building Sections
Sheet A5.01, Elevations
Sheet A5.02, Elevations
Sheet A5.03, Front Elevation, Glazing Reduction Data
Sheet A6.01, Renderings
Sheet E1.01, Exterior Electrical Plan
Sheet 1.05, Construction Staging Plan and Tree Protection Plan, 2/8/11

In support of the plans, an exterior color board has been submitted by the project architect and was received 12/17/10. It is discussed below and will be available for reference at the site meeting. The cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures are contained on plan sheet E1.01.

Also provided in support of the proposal is the attached arborist report prepared by Ray Mornea, dated April 23, 2010. The report describes the site trees and their condition and sets forth tree preservation guidelines with site-specific tree protection measures.

In preparation for the preliminary review meeting, and as noted above, story poles, staking and taping of roof and ridgelines have been installed at the site. In addition, a project model has been prepared and will be available for reference during the project review meetings.

The following comments provide a preliminary review of the project:

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The PUD defined building envelope (BE) on the subject site has gentle to moderate slopes with steeper slopes on the east side. It is constrained as discussed above, and also by soils conditions that require the use of deep concrete piers for the foundation as described in the attached January 18, 2011 report from the town geologist. There are a number of smaller oaks on the site and a few of these are to be relocated to accommodate the proposed improvements. This is necessary due to their location in the constrained building envelope and the efforts needed to meet access and guest parking requirements of the PUD. A few trees are, however, important to the site design and relationship to neighboring views and these are proposed to be preserved and protected in place. The site meeting will offer the opportunity to fully appreciate the design efforts to save and/or relocate trees.

The majority of the grading is to cut the house into the building envelope so that it can maintain a low profile as called for in the PUD provisions. Further, the fill from the cut would be used with east side retaining walls to create level space for the driveway and guest parking areas and also the rear, east side patios. Due to site

limitations, retaining walls are needed to limit the extent of earthwork and to ensure that patios are placed in the building envelope. It is also noted that due to the limited building envelope area and guest parking and access requirements, the site does not have space to easily accommodate a swimming pool or other more significant accessory structures and none are proposed.

During the course of early planning work, the project architect discussed the plans with us on several occasions and made a number of adjustments in response to our comments and concerns. In addition, as the plan "option" and "comparison" sheets indicate, a number of adjustments were made to address HOA concerns including the scope of front elevation glazing. We understand that all of these efforts supported the final action by the HOA to approve the project and that a formal HOA approval letter should be available for reference at next week's meeting.

In addition to the above, the owner of Lot 12, Mr. James Gibbon, has contacted us and stated appreciation for the design efforts made by the applicant and Mr. Maston. He has only one matter he remains concerned over and that is to ensure tree #6 at the northerly corner of the bedroom wing, is properly protected as this tree helps screen views from his property to the north and easterly elevations of the proposed house and the rear terrace areas.

In light of Mr. Gibbons concerns, and pursuant to normal town practice, site construction should only take place under the careful oversight of the project arborist. This would ensure that if any roots were encountered for tree number 6 or the others to be preserved in place, the roots would not be adversely impacted. Further, all tree relocation should be under the guidance of the arborists and should be timed to avoid conflicts with the grading operations.

While we find the proposal is in general conformity with the Blue Oaks PUD provisions, we offer the following more specific comments relative to items needing attention as project planning continues:

- a. **Sewer service.** The sewer connection will require a grinder pump system and related panel and equipment. The panel location should be planned at this time and provisions made for sewer district access and necessary landscaping.
- b. **Tree removal/tree protection.** As noted, the plans propose relocation of several oaks. These are shown on Sheet A1.03. The conservation committee should review the proposed tree relocation and arborist report and offer comments. Also, the scope of "judicious" pruning proposed for tree #6, the tree of concern to Mr. Gibbons, should be more fully evaluated and explained.
- c. **Grading/ridge heights.** The result of the proposed grading will be to pull the proposed, stepped one story house into the site so that the highest ridge peaks are at elevation is 919.7 feet and so that the house will conform to the 18 and 24-foot single story limits that pertain to this Stonecrest, Blue Oaks PUD property. This cutting is necessary to comply with the single story height limits as demonstrated by the plan section and elevation sheets.
- d. **Driveway and all hardscape surfaces.** The driveway surface needs to be clarified and should be asphalt from the street to the property line. The surface

is not clear from the plans. Further, all hardscape surfaces should be clarified on the plans.

- e. **Retaining walls/main walkway entry columns.** Walls can be no higher than four feet in the front setback and 6 feet in the side setback areas. At one point the proposed front yard wall appears to have a height of at least 4.5 feet. This will need to be adjusted to conform to PUD provisions. Also, the plans need to be adjusted to eliminate the walkway entry columns proposed in the front setback area.
 - f. **Trails.** The public trail is on the other side of Redberry Ridge and there are no trails on this side of the street.
 - g. **Fireplaces.** These must conform to the Blue Oaks fireplace standards and such conformity would be verified at the building permit stage.
 - h. **Garage interior dimensions.** The proposed two-car garage parking space has a dimension of 21+ ft. by 18.5 feet. The interior must be at least 20 ft. x 20 ft. to conform to zoning ordinance for covered parking standards.
2. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, and Height Limit Compliance, and parking space issues.** The total proposed floor area is 6,144 sf and this is just below the 6,175 sf FA limit sf. The floor area includes the house (5,433 sf) and the attached garage (711 sf). No basement area is proposed or “excluded” from the FA numbers. Further, no swimming pool is planned that, with this PUD, would require additional adjustment to the maximum allowed floor area.

The Impervious Surface (IS) area calculations on Sheet A0.02 are somewhat confusing or potentially inaccurate. They attempt to account for allowed PUD exclusions for four parking spaces and driveway over 25 feet from the house. The parking spaces identified are, however, only 14-15 feet deep and don't meet ordinance standards. Further, only a driveway IS can be exempted, not all of the apron space and an additional parking space. In any case, the total IS shown on the plan sheet of 9,509.6 sf cannot be verified from the data provided. Our calculations show a total of actually 6,143 sf, which is well within the 10,000 sf limit. Thus, the plan calculations need to be clarified and the plans need to be modified to show the guest parking spaces as 9'x18' minimum and access to the “sixth” space, which extends to the southeast, needs to be clear of conflict with the 18 foot space to the northwest.

The PUD places a “one story” height limit on this site. Height limit compliance was discussed above under project description. Further, compliance with BE setback requirements was also reviewed above, with the only concern being some retaining wall areas.

3. **Site development committee project review.** To date, the site development permit committee comments received include the attached December 20, 2010 report from the public works director, attached January 18, 2011 report from the town geologist and attached December 27, 2010 report from the Fire Marshal. The reports recommend conditional approval of the project. Since the site is served by sanitary sewer, a report from the health department is not expected and there are

no trails issues with the project. A report is, however, still needed from the conservation committee and we've highlighted a few areas above for the committee's consideration.

4. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The site is within the "Stonecrest Zone of Habitation" and the PUD guidelines provide that homes in this zone will maintain a low profile, "hugging" the land, have horizontal forms with roofs that are flat or of a low pitch, and with preference for "hip" forms. Further materials are to be of stone, wood and others that help to pull the house into the site both in terms of form and finish.

The proposed stepped house plan does flow with the land, and has a long, horizontal form. Further, heights are low, particularly in relationship to street views and those form off site. The roof elements are all low pitch and of hip forms. The design has been approached to "hug" the site.

The proposed materials include ledger stone, with rust, tan and darker hues, stucco siding with darker, varied tan and brown tones and dark stained wood for the entry and garage doors. Wood windows are to also be in a darker brown/taupe finish. Railings are to be dark bronze and the patios dark colored concrete. The roofing is to be a very dark, rust/brown tone, composition shingles.

Overall, we conclude that the house has been designed in concert with the PUD design guidelines. The siting, and layout, as described above, flow with the contours of the site and stay within the required single story height limit. Further, the garage and guest parking are close to the street and minimize grading for driveway access.

5. **Landscaping and fencing.** Generally the proposed planting on Sheet A1.03 appears appropriate in concept. Issues include the need for a detailed plan and ability to relocate the oaks as proposed. Further, the PUD calls for significant screen planting, but this may not be fully consistent with current ASCC views on scope of landscaping. In any case, it may be appropriate to consider some additional oak planting along the northerly boundary to further enhance screening to and from the Gibbons house entry.
6. **Exterior lighting.** Sheet E1.01 shows the proposed exterior lighting. Based on our review of the plan against PUD provisions and town standards, we believe there is excess lighting proposed and at least one fixture that needs clarification. The following specific suggestions are offered:
 - Remove all lights within the street right of way.
 - Reduce the scope of lighting along the entry walk.
 - Reduce the scope of lighting along the guest parking spaces.
 - Reduce the scope of rear terrace lighting.
 - Clarify fixture 2 with respect to up-lighting characteristics.
 - Clarify the specifics for house wall and soffit lighting.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green (BIG) Checklist.** Attached is the mandatory BIG checklist submitted by the project architect. The checklist targets 178 BIG points, however, our calculations suggest that the mandatory target

should be slightly higher at 180 points, but this would be verified with detailed calculations provided with building permit plans. In any case, the final number would need to be confirmed on the building permit plans and achievement verified by formal GreenPoint rated certification.

The ASCC should consider the above comments, conduct the preliminary project review, including the afternoon site meeting, and offer comments to assist the applicant and staff in assembling the application in form for eventual ASCC action. Project review should then be continued to the February 28, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING PERMIT, 255 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, GEENEN

This proposal is for architectural review approval of plans for additions to and significant remodeling of the existing single-story residence and detached pool house on the subject 1.1-acre Alpine Hills property. The property and area are shown on the attached vicinity map. The project would concentrate all new work in the area of existing site improvements and can be accomplished with minimum grading, less than 15 cubic yards, and minimum impact on existing vegetation. Further, the general character of site development would not change in any significant manner and the way in which the improvements are expressed in the neighborhood, particularly scale and massing, would be much the same as current conditions.

The proposal is also well within height and floor area limits, including the 85% floor area limit for the single largest structure. Thus, no special floor area findings are required. The few issues with the project are related to the scope of floor area with the proposed pool house expansion and some concerns we have with the current nature of existing front yard landscaping and fencing, particularly since significant portions of these elements appear to be in the public right of way.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated January 31, 2011 and prepared by William Duff Architect:

- Cover Sheet (with color perspective photo simulation of the proposed front main house elevation)
- Sheet A0.1, Project Data
- Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, July 2010
- Sheet A1.1, (E) Site Plan
- Sheet A1.2, (Proposed) Site Plan (with landscape and lighting notes)
- Sheet A2.1, Demolition Floor Plan Main House, Garage & Pool House
- Sheet A2.2, Floor/Roof Plan Main House & Pool House
- Sheet A3.1, Existing Exterior Elevations - Main House & Garage (and pool house)
- Sheet A3.2, Proposed Exterior Elevations, - Main House & Pool House
- Sheet A3.3, Rendered Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A3.4, Rendered Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A3.5, Rendered Exterior Perspectives

In support of the plans, the project architect has submitted an exterior colors and materials board received, January 31, 2011, that will be presented at the ASCC

meeting. Also submitted are the attached cut sheets for the proposed house light fixtures. These cut sheets are also on plan Sheet A1.2.

The completed 1/31/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project is attached with a reduced site plan showing turf areas. Also attached is the 1/31/11 completed Build It Green project checklist targeting a total of 76 points for this "whole house" proposal.

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

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject 1.1-acre site is located on the west side of Golden Oak Drive, immediately north of the Golden Oak Drive intersection with Granada Court. It is one parcel south of the Peak Lane water tank property.

The existing residence is located at the northeastern corner of the parcel, where ground conditions are relatively level and driveway access is readily achievable from Golden Oak Drive. The majority of the southwest side of the parcel descends in steeper slopes to a drainage course along the Granada Court frontage. These steeper slopes and drainage conditions, along with dense vegetation, make the southwest side of the property more difficult for improvements. For this reason, the front parcel boundary has been established as the one along Granada Court and the existing house was developed with the Golden Oak Drive boundary considered a side property line.

The established building site contains the loop driveway connecting to Golden Oak Drive, the existing house, garage and pool house and existing swimming pool. The house will be added to, and the existing roofed carport between the garage and house converted to living area. The bulk of the new addition will take place on the north side of the existing house, between the house and existing pool house. Some demolition of existing house floor area is proposed to accommodate the expansion and remodeling.

The addition would have minimum impact on existing vegetation and significant older pines along the northerly boundary provide screening between the subject site and the house at 265 Golden Oak Drive. Further, an existing solid board fence along this boundary will be preserved and enhances privacy between properties.

The existing pool house currently contains 533 sf and is proposed to be enlarged to 833 sf. The expansion and floor area changes would result in a structure that would be considered a guest unit under town zoning provisions. The 833 sf would exceed the 750 sf limit and, therefore, the plans need to be adjusted to conform to the 750 sf maximum. Additional comments on the guest house are provided in a separate section below.

The site plan calls for minimum changes to site conditions beyond the areas where the additions are proposed. The loop driveway would be retained and some new pathway and stair improvements also proposed. Further, no changes to the existing fencing and driveway gates are proposed at this time, although the landscape notes on Sheet A1.2 state a landscape plan would be provided with the building permit

that would conform to town standards. Additional landscape comments are offered below.

The architecture of the existing house is of a dated contemporary character with a flat roof. The proposed improvements would continue use of contemporary architecture, but with significant updating. There would be flat and low pitch roof forms, and more variety in exterior materials and finishes. Overall, we believe the house plans are well developed, but we do have concerns relative to the loop driveway, landscaping along the street frontages, right of way fencing and the pool house floor area, as detailed in comments that follow.

2. **Pool house expansion, conformity to town guest unit zoning provisions and accessory structure policies.** Attached are the current town zoning regulations for guest houses and policies associated with accessory structures. The floor area limit for a guest house is 750 sf and the policy statement provides clarity as to what is considered a guest house. With this proposal the existing pool house would be enlarged in such a way that it must be considered a guest unit. Such units are permitted on this site, but cannot exceed 750 sf for the guest house space.

The proposed plan appears to combine pool/cabana and guest spaces and the total area that must be considered the guest unit is roughly 800 sf. This is the total area less the external equipment cabinet. The options would be to reduce the floor area by 50 sf or to design the building so that the pool bath and shower do not have an internal connection to the guest space. This option would likely also trigger the need for a deed restriction as the building would still exceed the 750 area and the ASCC must be assured it could not be easily converted to a guest unit in excess of 750 sf.

Except for the floor area issue, the guest house would appear to satisfy the other town second unit policies and regulations. This assumes that the final front yard site plan accommodates the three guest parking spaces that would be needed for the main house and guest house uses. Two uncovered guest spaces are needed for the main house in addition to the two covered garage spaces. One additional space would be needed for the guest unit. Currently there is sufficient asphalt driveway space to provide for the required parking, but under our landscape comments below we are suggesting consideration of some changes and possible elimination of one of the loop intersections with Golden Oak Drive.

3. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** The plans propose a total floor area of 4,849 sf and this is well within the 5,556 sf, single-story floor area limit that applies to this project. The floor area proposed in the single largest building, i.e., the main house with attached garage, is 4,016 sf. This is 73% of the floor area limit and well under the 85% standard of 4,722 sf. No basement area is planned.

Most of the proposed house heights are under 16 feet, and the maximum height is just over 16.5 feet. These are well within the single story limits of 18-feet and 24 feet. The garage portion of the house will have a height of roughly 12 feet and this is the same for the guest unit. The small height increases are noted in the table on Sheet A0.1 and modeled with story poles at the site.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area of 6,374 sf is detailed on Sheet A0.1 and is under the 7,871 sf limit for the property. We are, however, suggesting some driveway changes, discussed below, that could reduce the scope of impervious surface.

The compliance with required 50-foot front and 20-foot side and rear yard property line setbacks is described on Sheet A1.2. As noted above, due to slope and topographic considerations, the front setback has been established along the Granada Court parcel frontage.

4. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed house improvements would update and enhance the contemporary architecture used on the existing house, as detailed on the rendered plan elevation and perspective sheets. Proposed exterior materials and finishes include the following:

Stucco siding in a light taupe color, with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 70% and well above the 40% limit
 Dark brown-bronze clad aluminum windows or wood windows in a similar finish
 Dark stained wood panels and doors, including the garage doors, and fascia
 Roof material is to be "EPDM," an energy efficient finish, with an LRV of well above the 50% LRV limit.

The plans also propose the use of a rammed earth entry feature. The sample on the materials board for the rammed earth is considerably lighter than what is suggested by the color renderings. In fact, the color scheme on the renderings appears to meet town LRV standards, while the sample board finishes are lighter. We recommend that finishes be selected to reflect what the renderings suggest..

With appropriate color adjustments, we would find the proposed design and architecture appropriate for the site and consistent with town design objectives. Also, while the roof material is light, the house is relatively high on the site and should have minimum potential for visual impact. At the same time, there may be some potential for views to the roof from the upper level of the house at 265 Golden Oak, and this should be considered by the ASCC when visiting the site and acting on the final color scheme relative to conformity with town policies.

5. **Landscaping, fencing.** As noted above, the plans on sheet A1.2, state that a landscape plan conforming to town standards will be provided with the building permit plans. We recommend that the ASCC request that this plan eliminate of the loop driveway connections to the street, as only one driveway connection is typically allowed under current town policies unless there is a safety issue. In this case, we believe that sight distance is restricted by the dense ornamental planting in the town right of way and not by the manner in which the site fronts Golden Oak Drive. If this ornamental planting were removed and planting pulled to the property line, the sight distance would be significantly enhanced. In any case, we recommend that a landscape plan be required that would eliminate the exotic materials in the right of way along both Golden Oak Drive and Granada Court and also, if possible, replace east side yard turf area with drought tolerant materials. Any final east side, i.e., entry side, yard landscape plan would also need to accommodate the required three guest parking spaces as discussed above.

As to fencing, the current Golden Oak side fencing is an open iron design that has significant extension into the public right of way. Under the provisions of the fence ordinance, the ASCC has the authority to require, with a project of this scope, compliance with current ordinance standards. This would include that the fencing at least be moved to the property line and that the entry driveway gate be no closer than 10 feet to the Golden Oak property line.

6. **Exterior lighting.** The plans indicate that a lighting plan will be provided with the building permit plans. This should be to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member and should ensure that the proposed sconce fixture has a cap so that light is only directed downward.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green Checklist.** The initial checklist for this project assumed that it was an "element" level design, but staff concluded the checklist needed to be modified, as this is a "whole house" project, where a minimum of 50 BIG points is mandated. The revised checklist now targets 76 points.

Prior to any action on this request, the ASCC should consider the above comments, visit the project site and also consider any new data presented at the February 15 meeting.

6a. UPDATE, CITY OF PALO ALTO REFERRAL, TEMPORARY USE PERMIT (TUP) REQUEST, "PORTOLA VINEYARDS," WINERY CONCERT SERIES, 850 LOS TRANCOS ROAD, LEONARD LEHMANN

As we informed ASCC members at the last meeting, the town received the attached referral card for the subject proposed TUP on this Los Trancos Road property (see attached vicinity map), and we raised concerns with the proposal as set forth in our attached January 4, 2011 memo to Scott McKay, Senior Planner. After the last ASCC meeting we also shared the additional ASCC comments with Mr. McKay.

We just received the attached copy of the February 8, 2011 letter to the applicant granting the TUP with conditions. While the letter sets forth a number of important conditions and makes it clear that the TUP is for a very limited number of Sunday concerts, it also includes some interesting findings regarding compliance with the Palo Alto comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. We wanted to share the letter with ASCC members. Given the limited number of concerts and the provision that they can be essentially shut down if problems arise, we conclude that additional town staff and commission effort on this matter may not be productive at this time. We will, however, monitor the TUP and if problems do arise contact Palo Alto. Further, we intend to continue efforts with Palo Alto relative to how the City considers and administers its use provisions for hillside properties that are within close proximity to the town.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor