



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY**  
**REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**  
**Wednesday, April 20, 2011 – 7:30 p.m.**  
**Council Chambers (Historic Schoolhouse)**

---

**AGENDA**

**Call to Order, Roll Call**

Commissioners Gilbert, McIntosh, Von Feldt, Chairperson McKitterick, and Vice-Chairperson Zaffaroni

**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.

**Regular Agenda**

1. *Preliminary Review of Site Development Permit X9H-626, 15 Sausal Drive, Quezada*
2. *Proposed Planning Program for Fiscal Year 2011-2012*

**Commission, Staff, Committee Reports and Recommendations**

**Approval of Minutes:** April 6, 2011

**Adjournment**

**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 ext. 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

**AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION**

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.

Planning Commission Agenda  
April 20, 2011  
Page Two

Copies of all agenda reports and supporting data are available for viewing and inspection at Town Hall and at the Portola Valley branch of the San Mateo County Library located at Corte Madera School, Alpine Road and Indian Crossing.

**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: April 15, 2011

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning & Building Assistant

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** Planning Commission and ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
**DATE:** April 14, 2011  
**RE:** Preliminary Consideration of Architectural Review for residential redevelopment  
And Site Development Permit X9H-626, 15 Sausal Drive, Quezada

### **Applications and Preliminary Review Process**

This is a preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.1-acre Alpine Hills area property. The parcel currently contains a single level, dated contemporary style residence with attached garage. Two vicinity maps are attached identifying the property location and showing site and area conditions. (One is at a scale of 1" = 200 ft. and the other at a scale of 1" = 100 ft. The smaller scale map provides the same basic data but is somewhat easier to refer to for understanding of conditions on the site and how they relate to immediately adjacent parcels and improvements on them.)

The planning commission is involved with this proposal as the grading plans and proposed site development permit call for 2,560 cubic yards of earth movement and the commission is the approving authority for such permits where the grading exceeds 1,000 cubic yards. In this case, the plans propose 950 cubic yards of cut, and 1,610 cubic yards of fill counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance. This includes 420 cubic yards of imported materials for the fill operation.

ASCC involvement includes consideration of the site plans and forwarding recommendations on the grading proposals to the planning commission. Further, the ASCC is responsible for action on the architectural and other design aspects of the overall project.

Pursuant to town zoning and site development ordinance provisions, a preliminary project review is required where members of the planning commission, ASCC and public have the opportunity to offer comments on the proposal as it makes its way through the normal path of town project review. The preliminary review process will include a presentation to the planning commission at its April 20, 2011 meeting and then a joint site visit by the commission and ASCC, now scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, April 25, 2011. The ASCC review will continue at its regular April 25<sup>th</sup> evening meeting and then be continued to a future meeting for action on the architectural/design plans. After this action, the site development permit would be set for public hearing before the planning commission.

The proposed plans call for removal of the existing single story house and construction of a new single level, contemporary design residence containing 4,500 sf. The project includes a partial basement and extensive redevelopment of the rear, south side, outdoor areas, including the addition of a new infinity edge swimming pool and opening of an access from the lower basement level to the pool and adjacent new terrace areas. As explained later, this opening is a relatively logical way to gain access to the lower portion of the lot due to slope conditions and the manner in which the site was graded for original development.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated April 25, 2011 and prepared by Taylor Lombardo Architects, LLC:

- Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet
- Sheet C-1, Title Sheet (civil plans), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 12/21/10
- Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 12/21/10
- Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, 3/25/11
- Sheet L-2, Impervious Surface Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, 3/25/11
- Sheet L-3, Irrigated Landscape Coverage Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, 3/25/11
- Sheet L-4, Exterior Lighting Plan, Thomas Klope Associates, 3/25/11
- Sheet A0.2, Build It Green Checklist
- Sheet A1.1, Floor Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Roof Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Elevations

In addition to these plans, the project architect has submitted an exterior materials board also dated 4/25/11 that will be presented at the planning commission and ASCC meetings. A black and white copy of this sheet is attached for reference to the written descriptions of the proposed materials and finishes. These are discussed further below. Also submitted are the attached cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures. These are also identified on Sheet L-4. Lastly, the applicant has provided the attached outdoor water use efficiency checklist dated 3/25/11.

The April 25, 2011 site meeting will provide the planning commissioners, ASCC members and neighbors the opportunity for better appreciation of the project and the changes to site and area conditions. The comments that follow are offered to facilitate the site meeting and preliminary review process.

### **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts**

The existing/proposed house building site is a graded pad that was created to accommodate existing site improvements. The pad is 20 to 26 feet lower in elevation than the Sausal Drive street surface along the north side of the parcel. The slope between the street and pad is relatively steep, and accommodates driveway access. This driveway descends from the eastern end of the parcel frontage on Sausal Drive and encounters the pad at its western end. The driveway is to remain with the new project and, as is currently the case, driveway access to the garage will take place at the western end of the house. Overall, the general manner in which the site is currently used will continue with the proposed redevelopment.

The developed pad includes cut on the north side and fill on the south side. The fill is retained by an older retaining wall and creates an abrupt break between the house level and

the lower yard. Access to this lower yard is significantly constrained by manner in which the fill and retaining wall were installed and this has created potential for erosion and other issues in terms of overall site use and maintenance.

The lower level of the property is the actively used portion of the site and now includes a play lawn and play structure. The pathways to this relatively level area are poorly defined and difficult and, again, create maintenance and issues and limit usefulness of the site to the owners and their family.

The slope between Sausal Drive and the building site contain a mix of dense native and ornamental plant materials. The landscape plan provides for thinning of the materials to improve sight distance at the driveway intersection with Sausal Drive, to enhance clearance along the driveway and to reduce the extent of flammable scrub materials. One ornamental tree at the north end of the pad would be removed and, overall, the slope would be returned to a more native condition.

The east, south and west boundaries of the property are relatively densely planted with pines, redwoods and oaks and these materials would be preserved for screening. Some additional screen planting is proposed along the east side of the building pad where this is a closer proximity to development on the adjoining parcel.

In addition to the one ornamental tree to be removed on the north side of the pad, a small fruit tree to the south of the existing house would be removed as would a smaller oak cluster immediately to the south east of the existing house. Removal of this tree cluster is needed to accommodate the efforts to improve the slope transition from the pad to the lower yard area.

The majority of the grading is the cut and fill proposed to ease the transition between the established building pad and the lower level of property to the south and to create the opening from the basement to the planned lower terrace and swimming pool. The terrace and pool would be in areas currently occupied by the lower lawn and children's play structure. Some retaining walls are proposed to help create the level area for the swimming pool and a stair pathway to the pool. This will help resolve problems with the current access pathway system.

Some cut is also planned to accommodate better driveway access to the garage and for level area at the west end of the house pad to accommodate the new sanitary sewer pump system. The holding tank and pump would be part of the system that would eventually connect to the sanitary sewer and the project is proposed with the change from septic to sewer service.

Grading on the north side of the pad is largely for repair and replacement of the retaining wall that is at the base of the slope below Sausal Drive. The new wall generally follows the alignment of the existing wall, except for the area where the cut is proposed to accommodate the sanitary sewer pump system.

Overall, the approach to site development is not a significant departure from the way the property is currently used. At the same time the scope of work appears reasonable and appropriate to address problems created with the grading for original site development. The site meeting will help in appreciation of the design proposals and how they have been considered and developed.

### **Geology and Fault Setback provisions**

Murray Engineers Inc. conducted a comprehensive engineering and geotechnical investigation for the property (report dated August 2010). This report investigated the location of the "Roble Fault," shown on the town's geologic map along the northern side of the property. The fault is identified as an "other" fault feature on the town's map and policies call for an investigation to determine any specific constraints the fault may have on site development.

Figures A-2, A-3 and A-4 from the Murray report are attached for reference. The report concluded that the proposed house site and approach to improvements were appropriate and provided for necessary setback from the fault feature. The report was evaluated by the town geologist and found acceptable. His peer review report dated April 11, 2011 is attached.

The Murray report also sets for criteria for appropriate design of improvements, including foundations, walls, drainage control, etc. These would be incorporated into the final building plans submitted in support of building permit applications.

### **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance**

The plans note that the total proposed floor area is 4,500 sf and this is well within the 5,533 sf floor area limit for the site, taking into account the 5% bonus for a single story design. This total floor area is also the same area in the single largest building and, therefore, would be within the 85% limit of 4,703 sf. The lower level, basement space is approximately 1,230 sf. A small portion of this appears to be included in the total floor area numbers. While we have made a calculation of the floor area based on the floor plans, we will be seeking a more detailed breakdown of the floor area calculations for the record before the plans are presented to the ASCC for final action. This data will also need to be considered relative to final compliance with the town's mandatory green building requirements.

Most of the proposed exposed house heights are under 18 feet or less as shown on the elevation sheet. This design has been pursued to stay within the 18 and 24-foot height limits for use of the single story floor area bonus. Our only concern is with the view to the portion of the house that has the exposed basement access to the lower terraces. There may be the need to adjust grading so that views to this space are reduced on the lower level to maintain the single story height limit. This will be discussed further with the design team and adjustments made if necessary prior to the plans being presented to the ASCC for formal action.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) is detailed on Sheet L-2. The total permitted IS area is 7,827 sf and the project is 89 sf under this limit.

Compliance with the required 50-foot front setback line and 20-foot side and rear setback lines for all features are shown on the site plan sheets. All setbacks are satisfied and setback averaging is not necessary for compliance.

### **Site Development Permit Committee review**

To date, site development committee comments have been received from the town geologist as contained in his attached 4/11/11 report discuss above. The trails committee has advised it has “no comments” on this project. Input from the fire marshals has not yet been formally provided in a memo to the town. The design team, however, did meet with the fire marshal and received the direction noted in the attached March 10, 2010 email to the town from project landscape architect Tom Klope.

Comments from the public works director, particularly relative to the drainage proposals, and the conservation committee would be available prior to formal hearing on the site development permit. Further, since the project will be served by sanitary sewer a report form the health department is not anticipated.

### **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes**

As noted above, the proposed house would occupy roughly the same location as the existing house and would gain access in much the same way, with the garage and auto court/guest parking at the west end of the building pad. Like the existing house, the new house would be of a contemporary design; updated clearly, with more unique architectural elements and with a footprint that is roughly 1,600 sf larger.

The proposed design has a very low profile form with low pitch roofs and multiple breaks in the roof to ensure that height and scope of roof elevations are minimized. While the proposed house elevations have considerable articulation, overall the forms are relatively simple and “clean” with materials adding appropriate relief and detail.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include the following:

- Stucco siding in a medium sand tone that appears to have a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 40%, i.e., at the policy maximum. However, actual color is difficult to judge from the sample provided and a stucco sample will need to be considered at some point in the review process.

- Aluminum Windows with an “exposed steel” finish. The LRV of the color board sample is approximately 25% and well under the 50% maximum for trim features.

- Wood beams, rafters and doors with a natural finish

- Metal roof material and fascia in a “steel” finish similar to that proposed for the windows.

The plans also propose the use of stone veneer on portions of the elevations, the screen wall extension at the garage and facing on site walls. The design details include metal columns and beams and glass railings.

### **Landscaping and fencing**

No new fencing is proposed and we assume that pool security would be achieved with a cover. If there are any fencing plans they should be presented with the final architectural plans. Sheet L-1 shows the proposed plantings and these are relatively minimal, as discussed above, and appear consistent with town guidelines. Mostly, the effort is remove the overgrowth of more flammable and ornamental materials. The site meeting will allow an

opportunity for the scope of the clearing and landscaping to be explained by the project landscape architect. This will also provide the opportunity to consider views to and from the site and the need for any additional screen planting. During the course of the site meeting, the materials proposed for the terrace surfaces should also be described.

One of the important issues with this project will be the development and implementation of complete vegetation protection and construction staging plans. Construction staging will be a challenge, particularly given the constraints with driveway access, and limitations relative to on-site areas for parking and materials storage.

### **Exterior lighting**

Proposed exterior lighting is shown on Sheet L-4. Fixture descriptions are on this sheet and presented in more detail on the attached cut sheets. We have only conducted a preliminary review of the plan but do have some concerns with the overall scope of lighting. While fixture choices seem consistent with town policies and standards, the number and locations for the recessed down lights appear particularly significant and to have the potential to wash wall, window and terrace surfaces. The lighting plans should be explained in detail by the design team as part of the preliminary review process.

### **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green (BIG) Checklist**

Plan Sheet A0.2 contains the mandatory BIG checklist prepared by the project architect. The checklist targets 172 BIG points, consistent with the town's green building standards. The checklist and "green building" proposals are discussed in the attached April 4, 2011 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck.

### **Next Steps**

Again, since this is a preliminary review of the subject proposals, the planning commission and ASCC should conduct the scheduled April 20 and April 25 meetings, review the plans, consider the above comments, and any additional information presented at meetings. Preliminary review comments should be offered and thereafter project review continued to permit staff and the applicant time to address input gained through the preliminary review efforts.

TCV

encl.  
attach.

cc. Town Council Liaison to Planning Commission  
Town Council Liaison to ASCC  
Mayor  
Planning Technician Borck  
Applicants





# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

**TO** : Planning Commission

**FROM** : Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
Karen Kristiansson, Principal Planner  
George Mader, Town Planning Consultant

**DATE** : 4/7/11 (Updated April 12, 2011)

**RE** : Proposed Planning Program and Budget for FY 2011/12

### **INTRODUCTION, PLANNING BUDGET COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Each year a planning budget committee reviews the proposed work program and budget for the planning commission for the next fiscal year. The recommendations of the committee are forwarded to the planning commission, and the planning commission in turn makes its recommendation to Angela Howard, Town Manager, for consideration as a part of the town budget.

On April 12, 2011, the planning budget committee, consisting of the individuals listed below, met with us to consider the proposals in a draft of this memorandum and provided directions for changes to the program and budget:

Ann Wengert, town council liaison to the planning commission  
Angela Howard, town manager  
Jeff Aalfs, ASCC chair  
Nate McKitterick, planning commission chair (could not attend 4/12 meeting)

Planning Manager Leslie Lambert also normally attends these meetings, but since she is still recovering from her accident, Planning Technician Carol Borck was present in her stead.

The committee concurred with the program and budget as set forth for FY 2011-12 later in this memorandum. In particular, the committee supported work on the Major Items, including working on the issue of permitted floor area and impervious surface area on larger parcels. The committee also emphasized the need to pursue and, hopefully, resolve the Blue Oaks BMR issue as part of the work on housing element implementation.

Other program and budget adjustments were made to provide more time for special requests, as it is recognized that our involvement in day to day planning matters will be greater until it is possible for Leslie to return to her position.

#### **BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF MEMORANDUM**

In the discussion that follows, we first review expenditures and progress under the planning program and budget for FY 2010/11. Next, we present the planning program and budget for FY 2011/12, including revisions recommended by the budget committee. The budget includes work intended to support the planning commission and the ASCC.

The planning budget is carried as a single line item in the town's budget. Rough cost estimates are assigned to each work item within the planning budget. Once the budget is approved, the town planner proceeds with work on specific items in concert with the planning commission, ASCC, planning manager and town manager. The planner invoices the town on a monthly basis for work completed. Costs for individual work items often vary from the rough cost estimates. In these instances, the planner requests budget reallocations in which funds are transferred between work items within the budget.

Estimates for each work item in the budget are rough because it is not possible to develop exact estimates until the work has come into better focus and affected parties have had an opportunity to discuss the work item to make certain the scope is appropriate. Also, for projects that involve committees, public meetings and public hearings, it is difficult to estimate the amount of time that will be needed to accomplish a task. Not only does the process take time, but it can also lead to changes in direction.

If during the year entirely new planning matters arise that were not included in the original budget, then the town council can authorize budget augmentations that are implemented by purchase orders.

#### **STATUS REPORT: FY 10/11 PLANNING PROGRAM AND BUDGET**

The table "Status of Planning Program and Budget, FY 10/11" is provided separately and can be reviewed along with the following summary.

1. and 2. - Conservation Element and Open Space Elements. As work progressed during the year, it became necessary to also propose amendments to the Recreation Element. Work with the planning commission produced final elements and related CEQA documents dated March 2011. The planning commission completed its review of these elements and the CEQA documents on April 6<sup>th</sup> and recommended approval to the town council. The council is tentatively scheduled to consider the amendments to the elements at its May 25, 2011 meeting.
3. Implementation of Sustainability & Green Building Regs. & Guidelines. For this work item, we have been monitoring and evaluating application of the mandatory green building program adopted last year and tracking issues both with the program and other aspects of the zoning ordinance that reflect on the town's sustainability objectives. We have also been keeping track of changes to the BIG program as it adapts to the state "green" building code changes that took effect at the beginning of the year. Because of other pressures on the planning program, this work item has

not been viewed as a priority for completion this year and funds originally allocated for the work have been shifted to other items. We, however, want to continue the monitoring and evaluation through the end of this year and hope to complete the effort and appropriate ordinance modifications during the following year.

4. Implementation of Housing Element. Work to date has included preparing the first annual report to the planning commission on the status of several housing element programs, preparing an annual report to the state, and developing zoning ordinance amendments for changes called for in the housing element. These amendments were adopted by the town council on January 12, 2011. We also are providing assistance relative to the Blue Oaks BMR units as requested, are working on a second unit manual, and are participating in discussions about a potential county-wide nexus study that individual jurisdictions could use to establish housing impact fees.
5. Recordation of Historic Houses. A report with recommendations is being drafted and is scheduled to be before the planning commission on 5/18/11.
6. Implementation of Biological/Fire Study. An outline of the Biological/Fire Study recommendations was prepared, together with draft project review sheets. These were provided to Leslie Lambert and Carol Borck and discussed with them on December 2, 2010. We are obtaining additional information about the reports, and there will be further discussions with staff prior to the end of the fiscal year to assist in establishment of the program.
7. Coordination with ABAG re: Housing Numbers. This project has involved reviewing information on the Sustainable Communities Strategy effort required by SB 375, including the Initial Vision Scenario, which is the first draft of a plan for the entire Bay Area showing priorities for future development and transportation. This plan will be used as the basis for the next set of housing element numbers for the town. We will continue to monitor discussions about the Strategy and work to ensure that the projections for growth in Portola Valley are not unreasonable.
8. Referrals from other Jurisdictions. Items included were: Stanford Habitat Conservation Plan, Stanford University Medical Center plan, McNealy plan for covered sports facility in Palo Alto, Portola Winery in Palo Alto at 850 Los Trancos Rd.
9. Coordination with HOA's. Work consisted of largely addressing issues that come up over the year relative to interaction between the town and Westridge, Blue Oaks and Portola Valley Ranch HOAs. This year, we have also had to do some work relative to the provisions that relate to the PUD and HOA responsibilities for Portola Green Circle.
10. Expenses. This budget has not been used to date.
11. Special Requests. Items addressed include: Cargill Saltworks proposal, T-Mobile (possible moratorium and appeal), processing of safety element to adoption, adoption of geologic maps and regulations, Prado Court emergency access, OPR annual survey, Hibbard (Woodside Highlands) land issues, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, Ford Field plans, Sausal Creek daylighting.

12. Wireless Task Force. In response to issues that evolved with the T-Mobile Peak Lane application and appeal, the town authorized work to assist a special task force to develop revisions to town policies and regulations for wireless facilities. A draft ordinance (i.e., a new Chapter in the zoning ordinance) has been prepared and, with some refinements, found appropriate by the task force. We are making the changes requested by the task force and processing of the ordinance through planning commission and town council hearings over the next few months. The council is tentatively scheduled to consider the task force recommendations at its May 11, 2011 meeting.

## PLANNING PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR FY 11/12

Angie Howard has usually requested that two or three major projects be properly funded each year so they can be completed during the fiscal year. She has stressed that budgets should be realistic and high enough to cover the work. Major items that the planning budget committee recommended be pursued during fiscal year 2011/12 include starting the Portola Road Study/Plan, pursuing housing element implementation, including the focus on the BMR/Blue Oaks housing work, and addressing the issues associated with floor area and impervious surface area limitations for larger parcels, i.e., those larger than 10 acres.

Five projects under Other Items, while listed separately, collectively help make certain the zoning ordinance and general plan (including plan diagram) are up-to-date and user friendly and also provide for continuing monitoring and, as necessary, modifications to the town's sustainability and green building regulations and guidelines. The general plan and zoning ordinance are the primary planning tools of the town and should be in the best and most useable form possible. The work items are directed at ensuring their usefulness for current staff and officials, enhancing their use for citizens in general and for those who will serve the town in years to come. A goal is to complete these tasks by the end of the fiscal year.

In the following planning program, major items are listed first. It is anticipated that these can be completed in the fiscal year. As previously noted, the budget amounts are rough estimates. As work is undertaken, the scope of each item will be further defined. Also, experience has shown that what might appear to be a relatively minor item can become complex as it undergoes review by town officials and the public.

The proposed program also includes a larger "special requests" amount than in past years. This reflects the fact that with Leslie Lambert's rehabilitation somewhat uncertain, more day-to-day tasks will likely need to be handled with the background and history available in the town planner's office. This program and budget area is always somewhat uncertain, but more so this year, and the budget committee concurred more funds should be available for special requests. The program and budget items are grouped under three headings.

### Major Items

1. Portola Road Study/Plan (1 <sup>st</sup> Phase)	\$35,000
2. Housing Element Implementation	\$40,000
3. Floor Area and Impervious Surface Limitations on large parcels	\$25,000
Subtotal	\$100,000

### Other Items

4. Review and Update of Zoning Ordinance	\$15,000
5. Handbook for Administration of Zoning Ordinance	\$7,000
6. Revise General Plan for Internal Consistency and Format	\$5,000
7. Review and Reprint General Plan Diagram	\$5,000
8. Sustainability & Green Building Program	\$5,000
Subtotal	\$37,000

### Annual Tasks

9. Referrals from other jurisdictions	\$10,000
10. Coordination with Homeowners' Associations	\$3,000
11. Expenses	\$2,000
12. Special Requests	\$28,000
Subtotal	\$43,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$180,000</b>

## Descriptions of Work Items

1. **Portola Road Corridor Study/Plan – 1<sup>st</sup> Phase.** The preparation of this sub-area plan of the general plan was recommended by the planning commission after the most recent major revision of the general plan in 1998. Since then, this item has been carried each year as a project for a future year. Now, it appears appropriate to start this project. The plan will address the visual and functional aspects of this major corridor that links the Nathorst Triangle area and the Town Center area. It would include special attention to building design criteria, color controls, plantings, immediate and distant views, signage, any needed upgrades to the multi-use trail facility in the right-of-way and on easements, bike lanes and linkages to and from the town center. This work would also tie in with town plans for its land between Spring Down Farm and Portola Road as well as plans for the Neely and Al's Nursery properties.
2. **Housing Element Implementation.** The housing element calls for the town to take action related to several housing programs. Work on this item will include an emphasis on resolving the status of the Blue Oaks BMR units, which was a strong recommendation from the budget committee. Other tasks during 2011-12 will include finishing the second unit manual and starting work to revise the town's inclusionary housing program to make it more effective. Because the element also calls for the town to study a housing impact fee and implement one if appropriate, we will also continue to follow the discussion of a county-wide nexus study and will bring this item to the planning commission and town council as needed. Finally, we will also prepare annual reports to the planning commission and the state and monitor proposals for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and its related housing needs numbers.
3. **Floor area (FA) and impervious surface (IS) limitations for parcels larger than 10 acres.** There is an inherent question of fairness regarding the current limits on FA and on such parcels. The ordinance was crafted to allow for higher limits with a Conditional Use Permit. As actual applications have been considered, the question has come up as to the need and appropriateness of the town receiving some benefit when allowing such increases. The budget committee recognized that issues have come up with larger parcels on the western hillside and also with larger parcels within the more developed portion of the town. As the larger parcels change hands or transfer to an estate of a long-time owner, questions are raised regarding scope of use, subdivision, etc. In some cases, allowing consideration of more FA and IS without the burdens of CUP findings may be fully appropriate. The budget committee concluded that as a land use priority the town should focus on this matter and determine if changes to town policies and regulations are needed to better implement this provision and thereby help avoid unneeded future controversies.
4. **Update Zoning Ordinance.** There have been a number of amendments and additions over the past few years including those for signs and as related to the housing element implementation. The document is somewhat chaotic and needs to be looked at in a manner that makes sure it is most usable for those who need to use it. It is somewhat cumbersome and needs a real "spring cleaning." This will be of significant assistance to town staff and town officials as well as the public. (Also, coming soon is the wireless communication facilities Chapter.)
5. **Zoning Ordinance Handbook Update.** This will involve sitting down with staff to determine what is adequate in the handbook the town has and what needs to be

augmented. Interpretation of a number of items continues to be an issue and we have provided piecemeal information for Carol Borck and Cheyenne Brown's use. There are some issues that likely need more than interpretation. For example,

- a. Floor Area Determinations. Ordinance provisions with respect to overhangs, roofed cabanas without any walls, etc. are complicated when it comes to determining what should count as floor area. All of these ordinance provisions should be reviewed and guidelines established to ensure consistent administration. Some clarification in the ordinance may be needed. As a part of this, the intent of the ordinance needs to be discussed and clarified.
- b. Impervious surface exemptions. More and more, there are "hardscape" materials that are actually pervious such as pervious asphalt, pervious turf, etc. These need greater clarity as to the purpose of the regulations. For instance, are the IS limits clearly just for drainage and percolation, or are they also intended to be limitations on the scope of site improvement? This gray area needs attention.
- c. Lofts in guesthouses, attic spaces, storage, etc. We need to clarify how the ordinance is applied to determine when these features are counted or not counted as floor area.

While the town planner's office will take the primary role here, it is anticipated that both Carol and CheyAnne would provide significant assistance in the updating effort.

6. **Revise General Plan for Consistency and Format.** The general plan has had a number of revisions in recent years with the result that the text is not entirely consistent in format and organization. Also, the plan has not been published as a whole since 1998. This project would result in a new document so organized as to facilitate use by staff, town bodies and the public. As the key planning document for the town, the general plan should be user friendly. At the same time, we will work to create digital copies of all parts of the General Plan, including the appendices, so that they may be posted on the town's website. This work does not include changes to plan language other than with respect to organization.
7. **Review and Reprint General Plan Diagram.** The most recent version of the plan diagram still has some problems with respect to legibility. We would review the diagram and recommend ways to increase legibility, and then the town should print new copies.
8. **Sustainability and Green Building Program.** We want to complete at least an initial evaluation of the application of the program adopted in 2010 and evaluation of the "Green building" ordinance changes that may be necessary, as well as other zoning and building ordinance changes, including definition of "new building," that may be needed to enhance the program and implementation of the sustainability objectives of the town. However, due to the slower pace of construction and new projects, this is something that should continue to be reviewed during the next FY, but will likely be pursued in greater depth during FY 2012-13 when there has been more experience with the mandatory green building program.
9. **Referrals from Other Jurisdictions.** The town continues to receive referrals of planning projects to which it must respond. The amount shown is based on experience so far this fiscal year.

10. **Coordination with HOAs.** This continues to put a demand on the town and needs a small amount of funding. This covers costs that cannot be charged against an applicant.
11. **Expenses.** This covers minor costs of publication and materials not provided by the town.
12. **Special Requests.** There are always unanticipated items that come up for which responses are needed. As noted above, the committee, based on the experiences of the current FY and appreciation of staff demands under current conditions determined that some added funds in this item would be appropriate for FY 2011-12.

#### Defer to Future Years

1. **PUD and HOA Handbook.** Carol and Leslie both ask from time to time about the status of PUD provisions and how they are applied. We will study this and make recommendations so that staff is able to usually answer such questions.
2. **Scope of Grading and site development permits.** With green building and hauling issues, there has been an increased desire to keep cut materials on site. One view is that the town's policies and ordinances call for minimum grading and that even though a project may result in a good design solution, any extra fill is not consistent with town policies and standards. A discussion is needed to provide better direction.
3. **CUP Handbook.** This is needed for the same reason the town needs a PUD and HOA handbook. The town is again getting behind regarding annual reviews. There is a need to shepherd someone at town hall to go through the CUPs again and provide a schedule for doing the reviews. While the town is on top of the Priory and the Sequoias, there is a need to check other conditional use permits such as for the Alpine Inn, the horse stables, and others such as wireless facilities.

#### **Action, Next Steps**

On April 20, 2011, the planning commission should discuss the proposed planning program for FY 2011-2012 and forward a recommendation on it to Angie Howard as explained at the start of this memo.

TCV/GGM/KK

Attach.

cc. Angie Howard, Town Manager  
 Ted Driscoll, Mayor  
 Ann Wengert, Town Council Liaison to Planning Commission  
 Jeff Aalfs, ASCC Chair  
 Carol Borck, Planning Manager