



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, June 13, 2011
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

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

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. Continued Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling and Site Development Permit X9H-627, 220 Golden Hills Drive, Pidwell
 - b. Continued Consideration of Subdivision X6D-210 and Planned Unit Development X7D-171, 1260 Westridge Drive, Shorenstein Realty
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling, 115 Shawnee Pass, Waschura
 - b. Architectural Review for Residential Additions, 30 Hayfields Road, Hayfields Planned Unit Development (PUD) X7D-71 – Lot 8, Oliver/Van Voorhis
6. Approval of Minutes: May 23, 2011
7. Adjournment

*For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE. The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

WRITTEN MATERIALS. Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: June 10, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: June 9, 2011
RE: Agenda for June 13, 2011 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. CONTINUED ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-627, 220 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, *PIDWELL*

On May 23, 2011, the ASCC initiated review of the subject applications submitted in support of plans for additions to and significant remodeling of the existing multi-level, traditional design residence on the subject 2.0-acre Oak Hills subdivision property. While the ASCC found the project generally acceptable, a number of comments were offered for further consideration by the applicant and project design team. These are set forth in the enclosed minutes from the May 23rd meeting. In addition, at that meeting design clarifications were provided by the project team, including the scope of the demolition project, and these too are listed in the enclosed meeting minutes. For additional background and reference, attached is the May 19, 2011 staff report on the project that was prepared for the May 23, 2011 meeting. Also attached is the May 23, 2011 communication from Ms. Julia Shepardson, presented at the last ASCC meeting, and a new communication relative to the proposed plans from neighbor Gary Hanning, 15 Deer Park Lane.

In response to the comments offered at the May 23rd meeting, the applicant has provided the two attached addendums to the original arborist report, both dated June 4, 2011. The first deals with trees 88, 63 and 72. These are the oaks that were of concern to the ASCC in the area of the planned new driveway extensions along the house entry and to the north. The addendum recommends removal of all three trees due to their poor condition and anticipated construction impacts. The second addendum addresses trees 13, 14 and 18 to the southeast of the proposed driveway extension that is to serve the lower level garage that is attached to the planned main house. The report recommends procedures, including installation of a driveway retaining wall, to ensure tree protection and preservation.

Based on the addendum arborist reports and other ASCC comments, the project plans have been revised. These plans, as listed below, are enclosed and, unless otherwise

noted, were prepared by designer William M. Justi Associates. The revised plan package was received June 6, 2011 and includes the following sheets:

Sheet 1, West and East (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011
Sheet 2, South (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011
Sheet 3, South and North (exterior) Elevations, Paul Fronck, May 9, 2011
Sheet , Elevation Auxiliary Structure (Details/Sections) Paul Fronck, June 6, 2011

Proposed Main Floor Plan, with Fire District Turnaround, 6/6/11
Proposed Lower (house) and (detached) Garage Floor Plans, 4/14/11
Exterior Lighting Plan (Main Floor Level), 4/5/11 (fixture cut sheet attached)
Exterior Lighting Plan (Lower Floor Level), 4/5/11
Preliminary Area Study
Preliminary Area Study, 6/6/11
Landscape Plan and Topographic Map, Westfall Engineers, Inc., 4/8/11 (revised)

Sheet 1, Site Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc., April 2011
Sheet 2, Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc., April 2011
Drainage Data Compliance Sheet, Westfall Engineers, Inc., April 14, 2011

Appendix D: Tree Inventory and Protection Map, Monarch Consulting Arborist, April 14, 2011

Story Pole Plan, 5/9/11

In addition to the addendum arborist report and revised plans, the applicant has provided a box of materials and color samples that are discussed below and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. Still part of the submittal is the completed 4/22/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project. Also the BIG checklist has been revised to reflect the "new house" condition of the proposal and the revised checklist is attached. It targets 181 BIG points and this is one point over the 180 required for this proposal.

The following comments are offered as to how the revised plans respond to the comments offered at the May 23rd ASCC meeting and also the status of site development permit committee review:

- 1. Overview of revisions and particularly oak tree impacts.** The site plan and house plans and elevations remain essentially as presented at the May 23rd meeting and evaluated in the May 19, 2011 staff report. One elevation sheet has been modified to clarify the north side stair to grade from the upper level guest unit. Further, the site, grading, area and landscape plans now consistently show the driveway access to the lower level garage that is attached to the proposed main house. Also, the proposed floor areas have not changed and remain as evaluated in the original staff report.

As noted above, the three trees of concern relative to the driveway extensions, i.e., 88, 63 and 72 are now proposed for removal due to their conditions and potential construction impacts. The revised conceptual landscape plan provides for some additional front yard oaks to accommodate for the loss of tree 88 and the plans also call for screen planting along the northerly property line that likely would be

sufficient to add screening. However, only the loss of tree 88 appears to have potential for screening impacts and mainly from Golden Hills Drive. The scope of canopy of trees 63 and 72 is not dramatic and there is considerable other tree and plant cover along the northerly property line. (It should be noted that the landscape plan incorrectly identifies tree 63, and the arrow from the note to the tree should be to the two-trunk, 12-inch oak shown in the open part of the parking extension "Y". The tree referenced on the plan is actually tree 62.)

There is also considerable existing oak cover along the north side of the driveway between Golden Hills Drive and the building pad. There is some tree cover on the south side and the landscape plan call for enhancing the tree cover with the addition of live oaks and "woodland" screening. Additional comments on the landscape plan are provided below.

2. **Site Development Committee Review.** As discussed in the May 19, 2011 staff report, site development committee review comments have been received as follows (reports are attached):

Public Works Director, May 16, 2011
Town Geologist, May 17, 2011
Fire Marshal, May 10, 2011
Trails Committee, May 3, 2011

The reports do not raise any significant issue, and most offer relatively standard approval conditions.

Also as noted in the May 19th report, the site is served by an existing septic system and there have been discussions between the applicant and health department. The health department has advised planning staff (personal communication from department representative to Carol Borck), that the existing septic system would be adequate for the proposed project.

The conservation committee considered the project and by email dated May 25, 2011 advised that the lighting plan was acceptable, but that a more detailed planting plan was needed. The revised landscape plan is being forwarded to the committee for review and comment.

Any action on the application should include a condition calling for conformity with the requirements of the various site development committee members and that the landscape plan should be modified as necessary to address any conservation committee concerns to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

3. **Driveway grading and landscaping in the driveway area.** The scope of driveway grading has been reduced as recommended by the ASCC. Some minor work is still planned at the top of the driveway to "ease" the transition to the building pad and this will likely require the removal of one small oak on the north side of the driveway. This tree has a very small canopy and vertical trunk and does not match the character of the other adjacent oaks. The plans call for replacing this tree with a new oak. At the same time, this tree has little impact on screening or the character of the oak woodland and, even without it, there is significant tree cover on the north side of the driveway. Thus, we wonder about the need for a replacement oak on

the north side and would suggest that the oak may fit better on the south side with the other planned oaks.

4. **Landscaping.** In general, it is still difficult to judge the impacts and appropriateness of the proposed landscaping until a more detailed plan is developed. While the concepts seem appropriate, a more detailed plan should be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC, with conservation committee input, prior to release of any building permits. This should be clear as to the materials to be placed for screening and to mitigate for the now planned oak tree removal.
5. **Exterior lighting.** The scope of lighting has been reduced, mostly as recommended in the staff report. It appears that there would still be reduction in lighting, particularly in the yard areas, for more consistency with town policies. We recommend that this be a condition of any action and that the final lighting plan be returned to the ASCC with the landscape for review and approval prior to issuance of the building permit. Staff can work with the applicant on this matter and also development of final switching plans.
6. **Exterior materials and finishes.** The box of materials provided by the applicant will be available for consideration at the ASCC meeting. It includes the proposed roof slate, rock siding, stucco color, window frames and window/door wood trim staining. The stucco siding is the same color considered at the 5/23 meeting and evaluated in the staff report, as is the bronze window frame material. The wood timbers are still to be in a natural finish, and a photo brochure has been provided to generally define the desired character with the proposed stone siding.

The only concern we have is with the stained wood trim elements that still have an off-white character and appear to still have potential for conflict with town policies. The main issue, however, is the potential contrast that could call more attention to the scale and mass, but this should be considered by the ASCC with the other materials at the 6/13 meeting.

Prior to any action on these requests, the ASCC should consider the above comments, visit the project site again as necessary and also consider any new data presented at the June 13, 2011 meeting.

4b. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF SUBDIVISION X6D-210 AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT X7D-171, 1260 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, SHORENSTEIN REALTY

On December 13, 2010, the ASCC and planning commission participated in a site meeting on this project that part of the preliminary review process for the proposed three lot subdivision. Since that time, processing of the requests has proceeded, including preparation of a detailed initial environmental study and proposed negative declaration. June 1, the planning commission opened the public hearing on the applications and after public comments continued the hearing to the July 20, 2011 commission meeting. *(Initially, the continuance was to be to the July 6th meeting, but that meeting was cancelled due to the lack of a quorum.)*

On June 13th the ASCC will meet to comment on the applications and the materials developed over the past several months in support of the proposals. Most of these materials are attached and briefly summarized below. The role of the ASCC at this time is to participate in the CEQA review process and offer any new comments for consideration by the planning commission in acting on the applications. Because there is considerable data being provided with this report, including the CEQA materials that are being provided online, the ASCC may find it needs to continue discussion from the June 13th meeting to the June 27th meeting.

For background and the current status of the application, the ASCC should review the attached May 25, 2011 report to the planning commission prepared for the June 1, 2011 start of the public hearing. The report includes relevant documents developed since December and also includes the preliminary review reports. Also provided with the May 25 report are the reports from the various subdivision committee members including the town geologist, public works director, fire marshal, health officer, trails committee and conservation committee.

On page one of the May 25, 2011 report is the web link to the detailed Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MNG). At this web site, the full CEQA document is available for review and the document includes the most recent versions of the proposed parcel map dated May 3, 2011. Should anyone want a hard copy of the map please let me know or contact Carol Borck at town hall.

On June 1, 2011 the planning commission considered the project and opened the public hearing. The unapproved minutes from the meeting are attached for reference. Based on the input from the meeting, including commission and public comments, additional project work is being pursued. The first task that was completed was a revision of the proposed PUD Statement and revised statement with a footer date of 6/8/11 is attached. It clarifies issues associated with remodeling of the existing house as well as the process for historic evaluations. Also, changes were made to address concerns over the scope of any new screen planting. Provided with the attached, review PUD Statement is an index to where the IS/MND mitigation measures are addressed in the PUD Statement.

Other matters that are under review based on 6/1 public hearing comments include clarification of the status and impacts associated with the existing well and mapping of the Madrone grove that is discussed in the 2/11/11 email from the conservation committee. It should also be noted that a response was received from FEMA seeking additional data on the request for flood plain change, and the project engineer is working to clarify the data needs and provide the information to permit FEMA to complete review of the request.

In any case, the ASCC should review the attached materials and the online IS/MND and, after taking public input, offer any additional comments on the proposal for planning commission consideration. Again, it is possible that ASCC members may want to continue the discussion to the June 27th meeting, particularly if members want to site review the Madrone Grove and offer any comments on that part of the conservation committee recommendations.

**5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW, PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING,
115 SHAWNEE PASS, WASCHURA**

This request is for approval of plans that would replace an existing, attached, fire damaged 3-car garage with a new attached 4-car garage and family room/study addition. The project is on the subject 1.0-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property and would result in a net increase in floor area of 581 sf, i.e., from 3,130 sf to 3,711 sf. The attached vicinity map shows the project site and conditions in the general area. All new construction would be single story and would match the architecture, including materials and finishes, of the existing single story, Ranch style residence and would be fully consistent with the design of the other Ranch style homes in this area of the Arrowhead Meadows subdivision.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by Clay Baker Design, LLC and dated 5/5/2011:

- Sheet A-0, Project Data
- Sheet A-1.0, Site Plan
- Sheet A-2.0, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.1, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.2, Roof Plan
- Sheet A-3.0, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A-3.1, Sections
- Sheet A-3.1, Build It Green Checklist

In support of the plans the project architect has provided the attached cut sheet for the proposed exterior light fixture received by the town on May 10, 2011. Also, a materials and colors board has been provided, also received May 10, 2011, that is discussed below and will be available for reference at the June 13, 2011 ASCC meeting. The applicant has placed story poles and taping at the site to model the proposed improvements.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in its review of this proposal.

1. **Project description, site conditions, and grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject site is essentially level and driveway access to the existing south side garage is along the south side of the parcel. The driveway extends to the rear of the house and the garage apron and doors are on the east, i.e., rear, side. The proposal would be to locate the new garage access doors along the south side of the addition facing the south side property line and reduce the impacts of parking and garage access on the rear yard area.

The proposed improvements can be constructed with no removal of vegetation and all work will either be within the footprint of the existing garage or the rear asphalt access apron. The proposed new four covered parking spaces satisfy parking requirements for the property. Further, the proposed family room and study additions do not trigger any new parking or septic system requirements.

The scope of site improvements and house massing and scale would not change in any significant way with the project and there is existing screen vegetation between parcels that would not be impacted by the proposal.

During our initial review of the plans, we were somewhat concerned that the space between the proposed addition and southern parcel line for backing out of the new garage may be somewhat constrained. After site inspections, however, and consideration of the footprint staking, there appears to be ample room for vehicle maneuvering.

It is also noted that there is adequate room on site for construction staging and vegetation protection should not be a significant issue. Nonetheless, a construction staging plan should be provided with the building permit application to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Overall, this a project that is straightforward and should encounter few issues in execution. Further, there appears to be minimum potential for the project to cause significant changes to visual conditions in the area or established patterns of use.

2. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed site floor area is 3,711 sf and well under the 5,481 sf, floor area limit that includes the 5% single-story bonus. The total area proposed is also the area proposed in the main house/single largest structure and this is only 64% of the maximum floor area limit for the parcel. Thus, the project is well under the 85% limit of 4,659 sf.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 3,704 sf. This is well under the 7,728 sf IS limit for the property.

The project has been designed to ensure that the house with the addition would have no heights that exceed 17.5 feet so as to capture the 5% single story bonus. Thus, the design is well within the 18 and 24-foot limits for the bonus, but in this case, the bonus is not needed.

Required building yard setback areas are 50 feet from the front parcel line and 20 feet from all other property boundaries. The site plan on Sheet A-1.0 demonstrates compliance with the yard setbacks. The proposed new construction would be no closer than 57 feet to the front property line and over 24 feet from the south side property line. The distance to the rear boundary is over 160 feet.

3. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** The existing house has a fairly typical Ranch style of architecture and the proposed additions and remodeling will conform to the basic Ranch style design. The color boards and submittal sheets indicate that all improvements would be finished to match existing conditions and include:

Hardi-Panel and Shingle siding painted in a dark taupe color with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of less than 20% and well under the 40% policy maximum,

Asphalt shingle roofing (CertainTeed, Shenandoah), with a dark charcoal color range and a LRV of under 10% and well below the 40% policy limit.

Windows, gutters and other trim elements are to be white to also match existing conditions, although a note suggests that copper might be used for the gutters. While this color is lighter than the current trim LRV limits, we support its continued use given the relatively limited scope of the project and the fact that the house is established in the area and, overall, will not be significantly changed.

There are two areas where materials and finishes need to be clarified. The existing garage doors are white and we are not certain that the new doors would also be white. Further, given that the doors would be more exposed to the public and south side neighbor, we suggest that they either be finished in a wood stain or painted to match the siding. We would, however, support continued use of the white trim around the doors.

The other issue has to do with roof material. The proposed addition is to have asphalt shingle roofing and the elevations suggest that the portions of the house to remain will have the "existing" roofing, which appears to be a simulated shake material. The mixing of roof materials could appear somewhat strange, and we wonder if the intent is to re-roof the entire house now or sometime in the near future. This should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

4. **Landscaping, fencing, construction staging.** The plans propose no new fencing except for the low cedar fencing around the planned rear elevation trash enclosure. Further, no new landscaping is proposed and the plans identify the areas of non-irrigated landscape surfaces with materials that are native or low water use (see attached Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist for the project dated 5/1/11).
5. **Exterior Lighting.** The locations for exterior lights are shown on the floor plan and elevation sheets and the cut sheet for the proposed Arroyo Craftsman fixture is attached. Only four fixtures are proposed, two at the garage entry and two on the rear elevation, i.e., at the family room door and over the trash enclosure. Switching patterns are shown on the floor plan sheet. The proposed lighting is not excessive and appears to conform to town policies and standards. Further, while there are two fixtures proposed on the garage entry elevation, they appear appropriate given the length of the elevation and the fixture design.
6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to current town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated "Existing Home" checklist that is on plan Sheet A-3.2. The checklist is evaluated in the attached May 18, 2010 report prepared by planning technician Carol Borck. In this case, the checklist targets 49 points. The BIG minimum for an "elements" project such as this is 25 points.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 13, 2011 ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW, PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS, 30 HAYFIELDS ROAD, HAYFIELDS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) X7D-71 - LOT 8, OLIVER/VAN VOORHIS

This request is for approval of plans to add 717 sf of floor area to the existing 5,070 sf residence, on the subject 2.6-acre Hayfields Subdivision/PUD property. The attached vicinity map shows the project location and conditions in the area of the property. The additions include expansion of the existing main level, attached two-car garage to add a third garage/workshop space and a 420 sf study over the existing garage area. Also planned is a west side deck extension off of the upper level study. The additions would match all existing improvements including the contemporary Ranch Style architecture of the existing two-story residence. No tree removal is needed and only minor grading is proposed to add guest parking to the north of the existing/proposed garage.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects Incorporated, dated 5/6/11:

Sheet A1, Title Sheet and Site Plan
Sheet A2, Existing & Proposed Floor Plans
Sheet A3, Existing and Proposed Ext. Elevations

The project proposes no new landscaping and there is no irrigated lawn on the parcel. Attached is the completed Build It Green (BIG) Checklist received May 11, 2011. The project targets 30 BIG points. Story poles and taping have been installed at the site to model the proposed additions.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in its review of this proposal.

- 1. Project description, Hayfields PUD requirements, Architecture.** The subject 2.6-acre parcel was created with the second phase of subdivision of the Hayfields PUD project. The PUD was approved by the town in 1977 and provided for five parcels higher on the hill and four in the lower area, second phase that includes the subject property. Overall, the PUD covers roughly 77 acres, with the majority of the land placed in a permanent open space easement.

The Hayfields development is accessed by Hayfields Road, which extends west from Portola Road, near the northern town limits. The northerly boundary of the project is part of the northern boundary of the town. An emergency connection extends from the upper portion of the Hayfield to Russell Avenue in Woodside Highlands.

The unusual shape of the Hayfield parcels are largely a result of identifying the most developable building sites based on slope, access, geology and tree cover and accommodating these conditions as well as septic system requirements. Further, septic system constraints and designs were somewhat unusual due to soils and geologic conditions. For the subject parcel, most of the lower area, i.e., north of Hayfields Road, is needed for the septic system. The part of the parcel south of Hayfields Road contains the developed building site and the subdivision road essentially cuts the parcel into two segments.

The developed portion of the site is defined not only by the road, but also slopes, geology and by the building setbacks established with the PUD. These setbacks are shown on the enclosed site plan. It is noted, however, that on the PUD plan the easterly setback line actually has a jog in it to accommodate the improvements that are shown on the site plan extending into the 20-foot side yard setback.

On the west side of the building area, just beyond the line of the existing house, there is a change in geology and the conditions are more constraining than in the area of the existing/proposed improvements. It appears that the supports for the proposed upper level deck may extend into this more constraining geology area and the final support system would need to be found acceptable by the town geologist. In any case, the final building permit plans will be subject to review and approval by the town geologist.

The existing two story house has been sited according to the PUD plans and the original house design was reviewed and approved by the ASCC. The house is served by a driveway connection to Hayfields Road that includes a turning circle that serves the existing garage access, guest parking north of the existing garage and access to the main entry of the house. This driveway and access system would be preserved with this project, but new asphalt surfacing is planned. The driveway design has been shared with the fire marshal and the fire marshal has advised that it is adequate to accommodate the planned improvements. *(Note: The drawing of the driveway circle on the plans seems incomplete. The project architect has advised that this may be a reflection of trying to accommodate surfaces and drainage improvements and that the drawing is not meant to suggest any change to the basic configuration of the existing driveway circle.)*

The proposal is to expand the north side, attached, two-car garage to add a third parking space and workshop adding 297 sf. This addition would take place in an existing asphalt parking area and minor grading and new asphalt surface is proposed north of the expanded garage to replace the guest parking lost to the expanded garage. No significant vegetation would be impacted by the parking area improvements.

Above the expanded garage, a new 420 sf study with bath is proposed. The study does not include any closet space and since it is not technically considered a bedroom would not trigger any new septic system requirements. The project architect has advised that this has been confirmed with the health officer.

The proposed additions should have minimal potential for impacting views from surrounding residences. The neighboring Hayfields houses have been located and designed so that views are not to or across the subject site and the site and area conditions, including topography and tree cover help to ensure minimum potential for privacy or view impacts. The proposed design further ensures that there would be minimum potential for any significant change in views or massing.

The existing architectural character of the house would be matched with the proposed improvements including colors and materials. These include dark asphalt shingle roofing, medium to dark taupe colored wood siding and dark brown wood trim elements. All existing/proposed finishes conform to current town policies relative to light reflectivity limits.

2. **Hayfields Homeowners Association (HOQ) Approval.** HOA review and approval is called for under provisions of the project CC&Rs. We understand that the plans have been shared with the HOA and that the applicant has been advised by an HOA representative the project appears acceptable. While the town does not enforce CC&Rs, it would be appropriate for the record to obtain final, written confirmation of HOA approval.
3. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** Compliance with yard setback limits was discussed above and is demonstrated on plan Sheet A1. The floor area, impervious surface and height limits were set with the PUD and are those in effect when the PUD was approved in 1977. These are listed in the Project Data column on Sheet A1.

The permitted floor area is actually governed by a coverage number and the limit is 10% of the parcel area. This is the footprint of the house and any deck area. The coverage limit is over 11,000 sf and the proposed coverage is only 4,202 sf. To be clear, there is no specific floor area limit under the provisions of the PUD.

The impervious surface (IS) limit is 25% of the lot area and, in this case, this is 28,260 sf. The proposed IS is 8,321 sf and well under the IS limit.

The height limit for the project is 36 feet and this is measured from the average point of contact with original grade. In this case, most house heights are 28 feet or less and the proposed improvements have heights of 22 feet or less. Thus, the plans conform to the PUD height limits.

4. **Landscaping, fencing, construction staging.** No new landscaping or fencing is proposed and none appears needed. Further, there is ample space on site for construction staging, but a staging and tree protection plan, particularly for the tree in the driveway circle, should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. **Exterior Lighting.** Only one new light is proposed with this project and that is on the north side of the garage. It would be a wall mounted fixture matching the existing fixtures and would serve to provide light to the guest parking area. While we appreciate that most of the existing lighting was provided with original plan approval by the town, the fixtures spill more light than would be encouraged by current town polices. We, therefore, suggest that as possible over time the wall mounted fixtures be changed to a shielded design that directs light downward
6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated "Existing Home" checklist for the project. The checklist is evaluated in the attached May 20, 2011 report prepared by planning technician Carol Borck. In this case, the checklist targets 30 points. The BIG minimum for an "elements" project such as this is 25 points.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 13, 2011 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor