



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, June 27, 2011
Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., 80 Golden Oak Drive Field session to consider architectural plans for substantial residential additions to and remodeling of an Alpine Hills area property. (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:

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

3. Oral Communications:

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

4. Old Business:

a. Follow-up Review – Architectural Review for Residential Additions and New Detached Garage, 121 Santa Maria Avenue, Orchard

5. New Business:

a. Architectural Review for New Driveway Entry Gate and Fencing, 4 Grove Court, Howe

b. Architectural Review for Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, 80 Golden Oak Drive, Liu/Chen

c. Architectural Review for Guest House/Accessory Structure, Swimming Pool, Dining Pavilion, and related Yard Improvements and Site Development Permit X9H-627, 8 Applewood Lane, King

6. Approval of Minutes: June 13, 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.



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: June 23, 2011
RE: Agenda for June 27, 2011 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The June 27th meeting will begin with an afternoon field session to consider architectural plans for substantial residential additions to and remodeling of an Alpine Hills area property. The site meeting will be at 80 Golden Oak Drive, starting at 4:00 p.m., and the proposal is discussed below under agenda item **5b. Liu/Chen**.

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the ASCC agenda. Please note, that the applicant for the 4 Grove Court gate application, Howe, has a personal conflict and has requested that this “new business” matter be considered ahead of the one “old business” item. Staff supports the request and has informed the applicant for item 4a., Mr. Orchard, of the possible agenda order change.

4a. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND NEW DETACHED GARAGE, 121 SANTA MARIA AVENUE, ORCHARD

On May 23, 2011 the ASCC conditionally approved the subject application as set forth in the attached 5/23 meeting minutes. To satisfy approval conditions, the applicant has provided the following enclosed plans and materials prepared by Jeff Rigler and revised through June 10, 2011:

- Sheet A-2, (N) Site Plan (AMIS) and Landscape Lighting
- Sheet A-4, (N) First Floor Plan and (N) Second Floor Plan and Electrical Plan
- Sheet A-5, (E) Foundation and (N) Foundation Plan
- Sheet A-11, (N) Elevations
- Sheet A-17, (N) New Garage Plan and Views

Also provided is a colors and materials board, with light fixture cut sheet that is discussed below and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. The attached memo from Mr. Rigler received June 13, 2011 discusses the follow-up submittal and, particularly, discusses the matter of new garage roof form. In terms of the proposed

light fixtures, the original application submittal included the full set of fixture cut sheets and these are also attached to this report.

The comments presented below are offered as to how these plans and materials respond to the May 23rd ASCC approval conditions. Condition language is presented in *italics*. For background, attached are the 5/23 meeting minutes and the 5/19/11 staff report prepared for the May 23rd ASCC meeting. A full set of the plans considered at the May 23rd meeting will be available for reference at the June 27th ASCC meeting.

1. *A complete materials and colors board shall be provided.* (Consideration of change in garage gable orientation.)

A complete materials board has been presented and, as noted above, will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. The board specifically proposes that the planned stucco surfaces would be finished in a beige color, identified as "Huntington Beige," by Benjamin Moore with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of 38% and under the policy limit of 40%. The trim color to be used around windows and doors is a medium dark, powder gray/blue color, identified as "Blue Heron," again by Benjamin Moore with an LRV of 13%. The roofing is to be dark gray/charcoal colored "Timberline" asphalt shingles, identified as "Weathered Wood." The plan is to also reuse the existing vinyl dual pane windows that are in a white finish with white grids. While the window color is lighter than the 50% LRV policy limit, we support recycled use of the windows, particularly with the other changes to the materials and finishes that are now proposed.

Also to be used is a faux cobblestone siding for some of the house elevations, as shown on the enclosed elevation sheet. This material would be mainly on the lower portion of the front house wall that faces Santa Maria Avenue.

The proposed three-car garage is to be finished to match the house materials and finishes. The colors board shows that the front elevation would be surfaced in the faux cobblestone. The plans, however, do not specify the finish for the new garage doors and this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. The doors should either be stained wood or painted to match the beige color proposed for the stucco siding.

At the May 23rd meeting, it was suggested by the ASCC that the applicant consider reorienting the garage roof form so that the gable end did not face the street. This was considered and rejected for the reasons stated in the attached statement from the project designer received June 13, 2011. If the building is finished as now proposed with the cobblestone material on the front elevation, and assuming the garage doors are finished as recommended above, we see no need for further consideration of any change in roof form or gable orientation.

2. *A plan for landscaping along the west side of the proposed garage shall be developed and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.*

Attached is a June 22, 2011 email from the applicant with a plan that identifies planting areas and trees now proposed to be removed. The comments in the email advise that the 36-inch oak is now proposed for removal and that the new planting will not extend along the west side of the garage, but mostly be in the area between the new garage and house and at the westernmost corner between the garage and

street. In order to satisfy the condition, especially since the oak of concern to the ASCC (see condition #4 below) is now to be removed, we recommend that the any action on the follow-up plans include the requirement that a detailed landscape plan be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit. This plan should include some replacement tree planting between the proposed garage and adjacent property line.

3. *The plans shall be modified as necessary to conform to the floor area limits for the site to the satisfaction of planning staff. The revised plans shall be presented to the ASCC.*

The plans have been modified as explained in the attached statement from Mr. Rigler and shown in the floor area table on Sheet A-4. Specifically, the workshop below the garage has been eliminated and the space will only defined to the extent needed to support the upper level. The space will likely be used for some storage, but will be left open except for supports for the garage. Final design details will be subject to staff review prior to issuance of a building permit.

In addition to elimination of the garage workshop space, the lower level "basement" area will not be finished. Further, some of the originally proposed house addition area has been removed to ensure compliance with the floor area limits. Again, the plans, particularly the lower level space, will need to be reviewed by staff at the building permit stage to ensure conformity with the enclosed design plans.

4. *The plans shall be modified as necessary to provide for preservation of the 36-inch oak at the proposed garage site. The modifications shall be to the satisfaction of an arborist and the arborist shall provide written confirmation that the modifications are adequate to ensure tree protection.*

The plans have been modified to eliminate the lower level concrete walkway that was associated with the original plan for the workshop below the garage and the workshop space has been eliminated. As stated in the applicant's attached 6/22 email, however, the plan now is to remove the 36-inch oak. The ASCC needs to react to this change and determine if it has sufficient data to support tree removal. If so, the detailed landscape plan recommended above should be required with replacement trees to enhance screening between the garage and property line.

We have also asked that a representative of the conservation committee review the tree removal request and comment on it. Hopefully, this can take place prior to Monday's meeting. If not, then such review, along with the recommended landscape plan should be required.

5. *A vegetation and construction staging plan shall be provided and implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.*

This condition will need to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

6. *The exterior lighting plan shall be revised to eliminate any lighting associated with the retaining walls in the area of future improvements and to address the lighting comments in the staff report, including elimination of the lights on the driveway pillars.*

Plan Sheet A-2, has been annotated to state that the “future” pool area lights are not part of the current project or anything that the applicant is now seeking approval for. Further, the materials board includes a photo of the desired wall mounted light fixture that is a craftsman style with a solid top. This is the same as was proposed with the original submittal and the full set of cut sheets is attached, including wall, pendant, ceiling and yard fixtures. While we believe the plans offer improved clarity as to the planned lighting, the actual floor plan data suggests use of fluorescent fixtures in porch areas that don’t seem fully consistent with the fixture sheets. Further, there appears to still be the need for an additional wall fixture at the west side kitchen area doors to the deck between the house and new garage. We recommended that the final lighting plan details be clarified to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any building permit. In any case, we believe that the needed clarifications should easily be accomplished within town lighting standards and guidelines.

7. *The Build It Green checklist and calculations shall be revised for consistency with the final plans that are determined by staff to be consistent with the floor area limits for the property. Conformance with the final checklist shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff.*

This will be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

Prior to any action on this follow-up submittal, the ASCC should consider the above comments and also consider any new data presented at the June 27, 2011 meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR NEW DRIVEWAY ENTRY GATE AND FENCING, 4 GROVE COURT, *HOWE*

This proposal is for installation of a new metal, four-foot high driveway entry gate and associated fencing and fieldstone covered gate support columns on the subject 1.2-acre Grove Court parcel. The attached vicinity map shows the parcel location and site and area conditions. The subject property is immediately north of the Grove Court cul-de-sac bulb and several driveways extend from the bulb to serve residences in the area.

The gate proposal is shown on the enclosed “Howe Residence,” Entry Gate Plan, Sheet A-01, dated 6/8/11, prepared by F. John Richards, Architect. To be clear, the proposed 16-foot wide metal gate and associated fencing would extend across the width of the parcel frontage at the required 25-foot setback line and **would not** extend along the side property lines. Existing and to be completed grapestake fencing along the side property lines is being completed pursuant to a fence permit previously issued for the property. The gate system is the last element of the fencing project, and when the original fence permit was issued, the applicant was informed that ASCC review and approval, with notice to neighbors, would be required prior any gate installation.

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

1. Background and project description, 20-foot easement to 3 Grove Court.

There is considerable and complicated background related to the original fencing permit for this property that is presented in the following attached documents:

February 5, 2010 letter from Leslie Lambert to Mr. and Mrs. Howe

February 18, 2010 Memo from Leslie Lambert to the town council

March 10, 2010 memorandum from special town counsel Larry Anderson to Leslie Lambert

These documents review various concerns that led to a stop-work notice with the original fence permit, removal of the stop-work notice, and evaluation of the process by the special counsel. In any case, the stop work notice was lifted and the fencing work approved with the original 2006 permit is not largely completed, with apparently all fence posts in place and a small section of grapestake fencing along the easterly property line yet to be installed.

The proposed four-foot high metal gate with fieldstone covered support columns and metal fence extensions to the side property lines would be set back 25 feet from the Grove Court. The area for the proposed gate improvements is largely level and is now being graded to accommodate the driveway improvements shown on the enclosed plans. The circular driveway serves the subject site and also provides access to the garage and pathways on the parcel to the east, i.e., 3 Grove Court, the Simpson property, by way of the 20 foot access easement shown on the site plan.

As is explained in the attached documents, some of the stone wall elements on the property are recognized in the historic element of the general plan. The property and some features still on it are remnants of the Fitzhugh "Catocin" estate (items 42 and 42 A & B) of the historic element. The current work on the driveway includes use of the stone from the area for portions of the low walls that edge the reconstructed driveway loop. Further, the proposed gate columns are to be faced in fieldstone to match the appearance of the "Catocin Gates."

The proposed black iron gates and fence sections are to be of a somewhat ornate character, but also more in keeping with the period of the original estate. The fence sections match the gate design and would extend from the fieldstone columns to the four-foot high redwood posts at the side property lines.

Relative to the gate location and proposed landscaping, it is noted that the design appears to present some limitations on full use of the Simpson access easement. The design would almost require the neighbor to either stray out of the 20-foot easement or cross over the area intended for landscaping, at least in terms of gaining vehicle access to the garage on 3 Grove Court. Mr. Jim Simpson has raised concern over this matter with staff and has also advised that there have not been discussions between the neighbors over use of the gate or specifics of the currently proposed design. These issues need to be clarified and resolved prior to actual issuance of any permits for gate installation. Mr. Simpson has advised that he will be at the 6/27 meeting to further discuss his concerns. We have also informed the project architect of this matter and hope that there can be communication between neighbors prior to the ASCC meeting.

2. **Compliance with gate and fencing standards of the zoning ordinance.** All aspects of the gate, columns and fencing would conform to the four-foot height limit that applies to the 50-foot front yard setback from the Grove Court cul-de-sac bulb. Further, the gate opening takes into account the 16-foot width driveway standard required for fire apparatus access through the gates. And, as noted above, the proposal conforms to the 25-foot setback requirement for entry gates and features.

The gate and fencing are on essentially level ground and don't face any conflicts with fence ordinance slope standards. Further, the design of the gate and fence sections is relatively transparent and has an opacity level that is greater than the required 50% minimum. This takes into account the column width.

3. **Call box location, landscaping and lighting.** We understand that no new lighting is proposed with the gate. If, however, there is any lighting planned in the front yard area associated with the gate or other planned yard improvements, this should be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Further, if the gate is to be of an automatic design this should be clarified and the location and design of any call/intercom box identified on the plans.

The proposal calls for new landscaping between the gate and front property line and also behind the gate between it and the driveway paving. The specifics for the planting are not stated and details for landscaping should be identified to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. The planting should take into consideration planting on adjoining parcels so that the final installation has a relatively uniform condition that is consistent with the general character of the oak environment and that does not result in a more patchwork condition with ornamentals extending into the street right of way.

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 27, 2011 ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW, PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, 80 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, *LIU/CHEN*

This request is for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing mostly single level, 3,251 sf residence on the subject 1.5-acre, Alpine Hills area property. The project includes demolition of over 2,100 sf of existing floor area and the total floor area with the proposed additions would be 5,013 sf, i.e, a net increase of 1,762 sf. The total floor area with the proposed additions would be 90% of the allowed floor area for the parcel and this concentration of floor area is only possible subject to special findings being made by the ASCC. These findings are evaluated later in this report and in this case it appears the findings could be made.

The proposal can be accomplished with minimum grading, 45 cubic yards, and most improvement would be located within the area graded for original site development. Some tree removal is needed for the desired additions, but significant native tree cover

would be preserved and existing exotic materials, including vinca, would be removed and replaced with native materials.

Because of the proposed additions and extensive remodeling of the architectural style of the house, staff determined that project review should start with an afternoon site meeting. As noted at the head of this memorandum, the site meeting has been scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, June 27, 2011. Story poles and staking have been set to facilitate the site session.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Kohler Associates Architects and dated 5/20/11:

Sheet TP, General Information
Sheet A1, Existing Site Plan
Sheet A1.1, Site Plan
Sheet A1.2, Impervious Area Calculations
Sheet A2, Existing Lower Level
Sheet A3, Existing Upper Level
Sheet A4, Existing Roof Plan
Sheet A5, Existing Elevations
Sheet A6, Existing Sections
Sheet A7, New Floor Plan
Sheet A8, New Roof Plan
Sheet A9, Exterior Elevations
Sheet A10, Building Sections
Sheet LE1, Exterior Lighting Plan
Sheet LE2, Lighting Cut Sheet
Sheet L1, Landscape Plan
Sheet FA1, Existing Floor Area Work Sheet
Sheet FA2, Floor Area Work Sheet
Survey Sheet, L. Wade Hammond, Licensed Land Surveyor, 3/24/11
Sheet C.1, Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, WEC Associates, 5/11/11

In support of the plans the project architect has provided the following additional materials and data:

- Exterior (materials) Color Schedule, received May 23, 2011. A copy of this schedule is attached and the color version will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting.
- Corrected Sheet TP. This 8.5"x11" sheet is attached. The correction is to the floor area figure for the new garage. The original plan sheet had a number that was three sf larger than the corrected sheet.
- Arborist Report, S.P. McClenahan Consulting, April 19, 2011 (attached). The trees discussed by number in the report are shown on the attached 8.5"x11" copy of plan sheet A1.1.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, dated 5/19/11 (attached).
- Cut Sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received May 23, 2011 (attached).
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist: Single Family (attached). The checklist recognizes that the scope of improvements renders this a "new" project under the town's green building program and targets 133 BIG points, just over the 132 points required under the town's mandatory green building program.

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 an oak woodland property on the north, uphill side of Golden Oak Drive. The parcel is just to the west of the “fork” in Golden Oak Drive that splits with Sausal Drive. The property has relatively uniform, southeasterly facing slopes over most of the southern half. These slopes continue to the high point of the parcel and then descend to the north over a local ridge. Overall, the topography is not excessively steep and slopes are not dramatic.

The existing/proposed building site is located on the southeast facing slopes and is just below the highest points of the parcel. The building pad was graded for original house construction and accommodates the north side of the house, the current entry area, also on the north side, the garage/carport and the parking area at the west end of the house. The developed house site is roughly 25 feet higher in elevation than the average level of Golden Oak Drive along the parcel’s frontage.

The driveway from the house to Golden Oak Drive is located at the western corner of the property and this driveway and the parking area will be preserved with this project. There will, however, be some grading and vegetation removal work at the intersection with the street to improve sight distance and enhance safety, particularly for vehicles leaving the property. The existing driveway is surfaced with AC paving and this surface will continue to be used with this project. It is also noted that the existing rock retaining wall on the north side of the driveway will be preserved and this will be important to protect tree #1, the 36-inch oak, from construction impacts. The arborist has, however, also recommended some trimming to reduce pressure on the parts of the tree that have “structural” issues.

The existing house “spills” over the southern edge of the south side of the building pad and the “crawl” space extension to grade results in a two-story expression over the east side of the house. The lower area currently includes a guest room and bath that will be eliminated with the project. The remodeled house, however, will continue to use the current foundation design approach, with the taller, enclosed “crawl space” expressed on the southern elevation.

The proposed additions will replace the existing attached “carport” at the west end of the house with a new three-car garage. The current north side entry will be removed and a new entry created with the addition planned at the southwest end of the existing house. This addition is at the same level of the main floor of the existing house and is in an area supported by an existing stone retaining wall that is in poor condition and likely not structurally adequate. This wall will be replaced with a new wall that will reach heights of at least three feet in the 50-foot front yard setback area and maximum heights of over six feet. There is a potential issue, as the wall is noted to have a 42” railing on it. It appears that with this railing, the combination of wall and railing would exceed the four-foot limit for such features in the front yard area. Thus, a design modification may be needed in this area. Also, the retaining wall is to be painted to match the proposed house siding color and we suggest consideration of a different finish later in this report.

The proposed east side master bedroom addition is to be made in an area where there is a cluster of five smaller oaks (trees #11-15), ranking in size from roughly 12

to 17 inches. All are coast live oaks and considered to be in generally fair condition. The area for the addition is a logical and reasonable place for the improvements and the addition can be completed with minimal grading. Further, as will be viewed at the site meeting, the loss of canopy in this area will have minimum potential for impacting views to and from the site.

Overall, the proposed improvements will follow the lines and forms of the existing residence. The scale and massing will not be dramatically different, but there will be more house visible from Golden Oak Drive, particularly with the proposed west side entry area addition. Existing house heights when viewed from the south range from 14 feet to 24 feet, and the roof ridge is a fairly continuous element. When viewed from the same south side, proposed house heights range from roughly 17 feet to just below 27 feet at the new master bedroom addition. The roofline, however, would be more articulated and there would be more offsets and shadow patterns, but also more window area.

The approach to landscaping would be to protect the oaks outside of the construction area and also remove the more exotic materials, particularly the vinca and dwarf periwinkle that has become established on the downhill side of the existing residence. The new landscaping that is planned is not extensive and is mostly new shrubs and round cover close to the house. Otherwise the oak woodland condition is to be preserved. It is also noted that there are a few redwoods along the parcel's Golden Oak Drive frontage that we suggested be considered for removal as they appear out of character with the oak environment and have potential for impacting distant views and sun access. The applicant prefers to keep these trees at least or the time being.

It is noted that the project architect has advised that the site is served by sanitary sewer. Further, there is ample room on site for construction staging and parking. Nonetheless, a construction staging and vegetation protection plan should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

- 2. Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed site floor area is 5,013 sf and well under the 5,563 sf, floor area limit. The total area proposed is also the area proposed in the main house/single largest structure and this is 90% of the maximum floor area limit for the parcel. Thus, the proposed project is over the 85% limit of 4,729 sf by 284 sf. The findings the ASCC must make to allow this floor area concentration are discussed in the next section of this report.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 4,423 sf. This is well under the 8,423 sf IS limit for the property.

The proposed heights range from roughly 16 feet to 24 feet above adjacent grade and are therefore well within the 28-foot height limit. The proposed maximum height from low point of contact with finished grade to the highest roof ridgeline is just under 29 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit.

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-1.1 demonstrates compliance with the yard setbacks. The proposed new construction would be no

closer than 66 feet to the front property line and over 34 feet from the nearest, west side property line. The distance to the rear boundary is over 80 feet.

- 3. Findings needed to support request to concentrate more than 85% of the permitted floor area in the single largest structure.** To permit the concentration of 90% of the floor area in the single largest building and, in this case, the only site building (the existing small shed above the house is being removed with the project), the ASCC must make the findings set forth in attached zoning ordinance Section 18.48.020. Only one of the findings needs to be made under subsection A. In this case, it appears that finding A.1. can be made as the concentration would result in less grading and help ensure that most of the existing tree cover is preserved over the parcel. It is further noted that the front portion of the parcel has some geologic constraints and that, overall, the scope of site massing would change less with the current design than with a proposal that included a detached accessory building.

As proposed, the project will not impact significant views from neighboring parcels and, in general, the improvements would be in keeping with the character and quality of the neighborhood. Thus, we do believe the necessary findings can be made, but the site meeting will also facilitate ASCC consideration and conclusions relative to the required findings.

- 4. Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** The existing house has a contemporary Ranch style of architecture with board and batten wood siding and a wood shake roof. This style will be substantially changed with the proposed additions and remodeling. The proposed architecture is of a Mediterranean character with stucco siding, wood trim elements and clay tile roofing. The stucco would be finished in a medium sand/tan color with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 30-35% and below the 40% policy maximum. The clad windows and sills and eaves are to be painted a dark brown color with a LRV of under 20% and well under the 50% maximum for trim features. We assume that the doors, including the painted garage doors, would be in the same trim color, but this should be clarified by the applicant.

While the materials and colors palette and approach to use of colors appears consistent with town policies, we wonder if consideration might be given to a somewhat darker sand color for the lower portion of the south facing walls, i.e., below the "datum board." This would help ground the building into the site and further reduce the scale and massing of the house. For similar reasons, we also recommend that the replacement retaining wall below the house entry addition be either rock faced or painted a darker color than what is proposed for the house stucco siding.

- 5. Landscaping, fencing.** The only "new" fencing is wall and gate that would replace the existing wood fence and gate that extend into the hillside just to the east of the 36-inch oak north of the driveway parking area. The proposed landscaping was generally discussed above and is shown on Sheet L1.
- 6. Exterior Lighting.** The locations for exterior lights are shown on Sheet LE1 and the proposed fixtures are on Sheet LE2. The plans appear to be generally consistent with town lighting guidelines and standards and the scope of the

proposed lighting is not excessive. It might be argued that the garage door elevation and master bedroom terrace need only one fixture, but this is a minor issue and the lighting proposed at these locations has minimum potential for off site impacts. The plans, however, do need to be clarified relative to the pathway lights that appear to be located in the driveway asphalt. We assume this is not the case, but the installation needs to be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated new home checklist. In this case, the checklist targets 133 points. The mandated minimum point total for this project is 132 and BIG greenpoint rating certification is also required.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should conduct the special afternoon site meeting, consider the above comments and any new information developed at the site meeting or regular evening June 27, 2011 ASCC meeting.

5c. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR GUEST HOUSE/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, SWIMMING POOL, AND DINING PAVILLION, AND RELATED YARD IMPROVEMENTS AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-627, 8 APPLEWOOD LANE, KING

This proposal is for architectural review and site development permit approval of plans for significant accessory use improvements in the rear yard area of the subject 1.3-acre, residentially developed Applewood Lane subdivision property. The parcel is located near the end of the Applewood Lane cul-de-sac and its northerly border is common with the lands of the Woodside Priory subdivision. Site and area conditions are generally shown on the attached vicinity map.

The project calls for 150 cubic yards of grading to accommodate development of a new swimming pool with spa, 613 sf pool house, 420 sf guest room with exercise space and 192 sf dining pavilion. The pool house and guest room would be in a single structure, totaling 1,033 sf, but the building has been designed to conform to the town's second unit and accessory structures policy statement. The ASCC is the approving authority for both the site development permit for the proposed grading and the architectural review application for the proposed site improvements and building designs.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated May 27, 2011 and prepared by Samuel Sinnott & Company, Inc., Architecture & Construction:

Sheet A0.1, Site/Roof Plan, Project Data

Sheet A1.0, Site/Floor Plan

Sheet A2.0, Elevations

Sheet A3.0, 3D Views

Sheet E1.0, Lighting Plan

Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, William Johnson, A.P.L.D., 5/26/11

Sheet C-1, Topographic Survey Plan, MacLeod and Associates, 1/17/11

Sheet C-2, Preliminary Grading & Drainage plan, MacLeod and Associates,
5/24/11

Sheet C-3, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, MacLeod and Associates,
5/19/11

In support of the plans, the project architect has submitted an exterior colors and materials board, received June 20, 2011. The board will be presented at the June 27, 2011 ASCC meeting and is discussed below. A black and white copy of the board is attached for reference and it includes written descriptions of the proposed building and surface materials. Also submitted are the attached cut sheets for the proposed accessory building and yard light fixtures. Proposed fixture locations are shown on plan Sheet E1.0.

The completed 5/27/11 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency checklist for the project is attached as is the completed Build It Green project checklist (received 5/27/11) targeting a minimum of 49 points for this proposal.

Story poles have been installed at the site to model the proposed detached accessory structures and the enclosed plan Sheet (A1.1—Site Stakes) dated 6/17/11 has been provided to clarify pole locations and heights. As can be viewed at the site, the grading proposed will cut the proposed pool house, guest room and other yard improvements into the site and help to maintain a low profile for the new structures.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC review and act on the architectural review and site development permit applications:

1. **Project description, Applewood Subdivision provisions and grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject 1.3-acre site is located on the north side of Applewood Lane and is Lot 8 of the Applewood Lane subdivision, recorded as Portola Valley Place. This 12-lot subdivision was developed in the 1980's and is on land that was formerly owned by the Portola Valley School District and contained school district administrative offices.

The town approved subdivision was developed by the Chamberlain Group and the houses were all originally designed by Hoover Associates. The ASCC was involved in review and approval of all house and site designs. The subdivision provisions call for all new site improvements to be subject to review and approval by a committee of subdivisions residents. We understand that the homeowners association is inactive, and the town does not enforce CC&Rs. Nonetheless, the applicant should advise the ASCC as to any plan review by the subdivision neighbors.

The subdivision approval and recording also included a conservation easement over the rear portion of the subject site. The conservation easement boundary is shown on the site plan sheets on the northern portion of the parcel and impacts more than one-half of the area of the property. The conservation easement land must be left in an open space condition and, as can be seen on plan sheet A1.0, the proposed improvements extend to near the easement line, but do not cross it.

The site was developed with the existing 4,171 sf house, that includes the lower level three car garage, and provisions for off street parking to accommodate at least five cars. Thus, existing parking improvements satisfy not only zoning requirements for the main house but also those that would have to be met for a guest house.

The existing residence and other site improvements are between the conservation easement and the front property line. The house just meets the 50-foot front setback from Applewood Lane and, accounting for the house and site slope conditions and conservation easement limits, a very limited area is available for any developed yard space. The upslope conditions of the parcel also restrict ease of access to the rear yard and have forced development of storage area and some complicated access into the northeasterly side yard of the property.

Given slope conditions, existing improvements and the conservation easement, any more involved yard improvements can only be located in the relatively level 40-50 foot wide strip of land immediately uphill of the house. Most of this area is currently in irrigated lawn and a low retaining wall has been used to help create usable level space and accommodate a play structure and other more passive yard improvements.

The subject proposal would make use of the area immediately off of the northernmost house corner for the desired pool, pool house with guest room, dining pavilion and related wall and terrace improvements. The grading would be used to create terrace levels to fit the improvements into an area that was largely disturbed by work associated with original site development. The "3D" perspectives on plan Sheet A3.0, and the grading plans describe the walls and terrace levels that are proposed to accommodate the desired improvements.

While the area to be graded and developed has been disturbed previously, it does contain one large walnut tree that must be removed to, in particular, accommodate the dining pavilion. Given the scope of grading, however, it would have to be removed for the terrace work whether or not the pavilion were part of the plans.

The approach to development is clearly a reflection of the all the site constraints, including the large area impacted by the conservation easement. It is a fairly complicated project considering the relatively small footprint that would accommodate the range of desired improvements and access to them. Typically, we would be concerned with the scope of work proposed, but there is very little option to accommodate the range of uses desired and still have some open, landscape backyard space for active use that is not encumbered by the conservation easement. Further, the approach to development is not out of character with what is found on the other subdivision lots and the basic approach to development in this subdivision has been to use heavy landscaping to screen views and gain privacy.

In this case, the main sensitive view relationship is with the house on the parcel to the northeast. The existing and proposed boundary line planting is intended to achieve comprehensive screening over time. Further, cutting the improvements into the site will help minimize apparent height and also enhance opportunities for creating intimate spaces and privacy. The most significant initial change, however, will be the loss of the screen canopy provided by the large walnut tree.

Overall, this is a complicated and fairly aggressive project, but one that has been well considered given the applicant's desires and significant site constraints. There are some issues of concern discussed later in this report, but with care, we believe

the project can be completed in a manner that is consistent with the general scope of development in the subdivision.

2. **Site development committee project review.** The following site development permit committee comments been received and are attached:

June 3, 2011 report from the public works director
June 13, 2011 report from the town geologist
June 7, 2011 report from the Fire Marshal

The reports recommend conditional approval of the project. Since the site is served by a 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. Any action on the site development permit should include conformity with the requirements of the site development committee members.

3. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) area, height and setback limit compliance.** The plans propose a total site floor area of 5,421 sf and this is essentially at the 5,423 sf floor area limit. The floor area in the single largest building, i.e., the existing main house with attached garage, is 4,171 sf and would not change with the project. This is 77% of the floor area limit and well under the 85% standard of 4,709 sf.

The proposed detached accessory pool house/guest room structure would be one level and have an area of 1,033 sf. The 613 sf pool house has been designed as a cabana/entertainment room type structure and does not have internal connection to the pool bath. The guest room with full bath and exercise room has a total floor area of 420 sf and two separate rooms. Thus, it must be considered a guest house, and the ASCC must make policy findings associated with this space and the pool house. These findings are discussed in the next section of this report.

The 192 sf dining pavilion has open sides, but because of the proposed full roof, must be considered a building for purposes of floor area compliance. As noted above, this space has been accounted for in the floor area figures, specifically in the table on sheet A1.0.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 4,998 sf and includes 2,184 sf of new area that would be added with this project. This total is well under the limit of 8,1387 sf.

The proposed pool house/guest room structure would have a maximum height of 13.5 feet over finished grade and the dining pavilion would have a maximum height of 12 feet. Thus, the plans conform to the 28 and 34-foot height limits.

Compliance with required 20-foot side yard property line setback is described on Sheet A0.1. Most improvements fully conform to the side yard setback, but the proposed "storage area," with concrete block retaining walls, wood fencing above the walls and a roof, appears to conflict with setback standards. Maximum height for walls and fences in setback areas is six feet and a roofed structure is not permitted in the setback. Wall/fence height is difficult to judge from the plans and

the roof will need to be removed or the storage area relocated out of the setback if a roof is desired.

4. **Guest house/accessory structure 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 420 sf guest room/exercise space would be considered a guest unit and appears to conform to all of the policy provisions and, as commented on above, the existing parking on site includes all required parking that would be needed with a guest unit. The 613 sf pool house has been designed to meet the policy statement requirements for cabana and entertainment space. The key issue is that combined the spaces exceed the 750 sf limit for a guest house and the ASCC must determine that the spaces cannot be easily combined to create a guest house larger than 750 sf.

We believe that in this case, the proposed spaces are clearly designed for the intended cabana, guest room and exercise uses. Further, the building design and the proposed site design and nature of the uses make conversion difficult and impractical. Nonetheless, consistent with previous ASCC actions on such projects, we recommend that a deed restriction be required to ensure current and future property owners are made aware that the use of the structure must conform to town second unit and accessory structure zoning regulations.

5. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** Guest units are to be designed to generally match the design of the main residence on the property. In this case the pool house/guest unit structure and the dining pavilion have been designed to match the architectural character of the main house. The board siding is to be painted a medium taupe finish with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 30% and well under the 40% limit. Wood trim is to be finished in a dark brown color with a LRV of under 15%, and well below the 50% limit.

The proposed asphalt shingle roof will match the house roof and has a LRV of approximately 30-35% and within the 40% limit. Window and door trim are to be "African Mahogany," with a relatively dark Cherry stain. The terrace railings are also to be African Mahogany, but in a somewhat lighter stain. Stained African Mahogany will be used for the wood columns and decking.

Natural stone materials are to be used for site terraces and walls. Overall, all materials and finishes will be in harmony with existing site conditions.

6. **Landscaping, fencing.** The site currently has property line fencing and the only new fencing is that proposed with the new side yard entry gate and storage area as shown on Sheet A1.0. We have already noted our concerns with the storage area and clarifications needed with the improvements proposed in the side yard.

The landscape plan includes five significant screen trees along the eastern boundary line. Two would be oaks, i.e., a 48" box Valley Oak and a 36" box Coast Live Oak. Three would be 36" box size Arbutus "Marina." In addition, a number of

native shrubs are proposed for screening within the setback area. No significant planting is proposed adjacent to the conservation easement or on the west side of the proposed improvements.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Our most significant concerns are with the scope of proposed lighting and also with some of the fixtures that are planned. The identified wall sconce is an “up/down” fixture that has potential for significant washing of walls “up” and “down” and such light spill is contrary to town policies. A number of site wall mounted fixtures appear for accent or general area lighting and also would appear to have significant potential for light spill. This, again, is not consistent with town policies limiting light to areas for safety and specific tasks. Also, there are more fixtures proposed around the side yard gate entry and storage area than is common on plans considered and approved by the ASCC for such areas.

Most significantly, we are concerned with the scope of the lighting associated with the exterior, tile infinity pool walls. These water spill areas are to be illuminated with “color changing” underwater LED lights. This is purely for accent purposes and in direct conflict with town policies calling for minimal lighting to serve task and to not be for ornamental purposes. Overall, a significant reconsideration of the lighting plans appears needed to achieve consistency with town regulations and policies.

8. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green Checklist.** As noted above, the proposed BIG checklist targets 49 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached June 3, 2011 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

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 June 27th meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor

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 24, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant
