



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, September 26, 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., 50 Pine Ridge Way Field session for preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 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. Request for Re-Approval of Plans – Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-609, 40 Antonio Court, Larson
 - b. Follow-Up Review – Proposed Final Landscape Plan and New Proposal for Driveway Entry Gate, 5922 Alpine Road, Lefteroff *Continued to October 10th Meeting*
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-633, Residential Redevelopment, 50 Pine Ridge Way, Gilbert
6. Approval of Minutes: September 12, 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: September 23, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: September 22, 2011
RE: Agenda for September 26, 2011 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The September 26th meeting will begin with a 4:00 p.m. afternoon field session for preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of a property at 50 Pine Ridge Way. The proposed project is described in this report under **agenda item 5a. Gilbert.**

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the agenda for the September 26, 2011 ASCC meeting.

4a. REQUEST FOR RE-APPROVAL OF PLANS -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-609, 40 ANTONIO COURT, LARSON

This is a request for re-approval of plans for this project that expire at the end of December of this year. The request is to grant an additional two-year life to the plans. Typically, project timing and plan implementation, including the site development permit, is governed by the life span of an ASCC approval and this is two years from the effective date of the ASCC action. In this case the approval would expire on December 29, 2011 without ASCC action to grant a re-approval.

On December 14, 2009, the ASCC completed action on the subject architectural review proposal for new residential development of this 4.48-acre vacant Woodside Priory subdivision property. On January 11, 2010 the ASCC completed follow-up review and on February 3, 2010 the planning commission approved the site development permit. The staff reports for these meetings, and meeting minutes are attached and provide a comprehensive review of the project and project plans. The enclosed plans received September 12, 2011 are the same as the plans listed in the ASCC and planning commission approvals except for the 9/9/11 re-submittal date. To be clear, the applicant is seeking re-approval of the same plans and subject to the same conditions set with the original approval actions. No project changes are proposed.

In early August, the project architect informed the town that work on the building permit plans was 95% done, but due to the scope of the project, economy and other factors, it would take a bit more time for the plan package to be finalized and submitted to the town and for the applicant to be in a position to actually build the house. Typically, the town requires that the building permit plans be submitted within the two-year approval window, and be in process of review and permit approval and pick-up. Often, the building permit review and issuance process and start of construction takes longer than two years. In this case, the applicant has anticipated that the filing of a complete set of final building plans would take somewhat longer and is seeking additional time to ensure the plans are complete and meet all of his needs so that when issued, project construction can proceed in a timely manner.

As can be seen from the attached materials, this project was subjected to considerable reviews prior to approval, with considerable involvement of town staff, committees and neighbor input. It is a significant project for a large site and the plans are complicated. Thus, it is not surprising that some additional time would be needed to bring closure on the detailed building permit construction plans.

We have considered the plans and changes in conditions since the 2009 and 2010 approvals and find that there have been no significant changes to planning regulations in that time and, further, the parcel is governed by provisions in the Priory PUD for the property that also have not changed since original project approval.

Based on the forgoing, we do recommend re-approval of the same project plans previously approved and subject to the same conditions as were set with these approval actions.

4b. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW – PROPOSED FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN AND NEW PROPOSAL FOR DRIVEWAY ENTRY GATE, 5592 ALPINE ROAD, LEFTEROFF

The ASCC last considered this project in February of 2010. At that time a number of issues were outstanding, but the main issue was the development of a final landscape plan to the satisfaction of the ASCC. This plan was drafted and shared with Danna Breen on September 21st. It was determined that some plan refinements were needed and that some additional data should be developed in support of the revised plans. As a result, and to ensure adequate time for review of the revised plans and materials, it was agreed that consideration of this agenda item should be continued to the regular October 10, 2011 ASCC meeting.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that any public input be received and then project consideration be continued to the regular October 10th ASCC meeting. A complete report on the landscape plan and gate proposal will be prepared for the October 10th meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-633, RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, 50 PINE RIDGE WAY, GILBERT

This is a preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.4-acre Pine Ridge cul-de-sac property. The parcel currently contains a multi-level somewhat dated contemporary style residence with attached garage that extends south from the lower portion of the house toward the Pine Ridge cul-de-sac. A concrete patio extends over the roof of the existing garage. Two vicinity maps are attached identifying the property location and show 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 project calls for a new replacement house and attached garage that are very similar in siting, scale and configuration to the existing site improvements. The decision was made, as explained further in the attached submittal materials, to replace the existing improvements after careful consideration of the condition of the existing 46-year old house and other site improvements and in light of the efforts that would be needed to complete a remodel and addition project consistent with current building and fire codes and town green building standards. Further, the current approach allows the opportunity to remove a number of improvements, e.g., a front yard pond, and exotic plantings, e.g., palms, that have added overtime in a more random and piecemeal manner.

The existing house has a total floor area of 4,437 sf and the proposed house would have a countable floor area of 4,342 sf (a basement is also proposed). This is just at the total floor area limit for the property. This amount of floor area would, like the existing house, all be concentrated in the single largest structure and would exceed the 85% floor area limit for the largest structure. This will require special review and findings by the ASCC. The issue is discussed in the application materials and further evaluated below in this report. In this case, given site slope and geologic limitations, we believe the findings can readily be made to support the proposed concentration of floor area.

In order to slightly improve the existing driveway access and essentially "clean-up" and correct conditions with existing developed outside use areas, including steps and pathways, the project calls for 794 cubic yards of earthwork, with 328 cubic yards of cut to be removed from the site. The scope of grading requires the subject site development permit and the ASCC is the approving authority for such permits where the grading volumes are between 100 and 1,000 cubic yards.

The proposal is described in some detail in the two attached August 22, 2011 letters from project architect Marc Lindsell. The first discusses the design process leading to the decision to remove the existing house and also explains the reasoning for the request to concentrate the floor area as noted above. The second letter discusses the location of the story poles set to facilitate project review and includes a story pole site plan with ground and height elevations and architectural elevations that compare proposed heights and massing to existing conditions.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated August 22, 2011:

Architectural Plans, 2M Architecture:

Sheet A-0.0, Cover Sheet
Sheet A-1.1, Site Plan & External Building Lighting
Sheet A-1.2, Demo Upper Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.3, Demo Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.4, Proposed Upper Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.5, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-1.6, Proposed Basement Plan
Sheet A-1.7, Clerestory & Roof Plans
Sheet A-2.1, North Elevations
Sheet A-2.2, East Elevations
Sheet A-2.4, West Elevations
Sheet A-2.5, Perspective Views

Landscape Plans, Kimberly Moses Design:

Sheet L1.1, Landscape Plan
Sheet L1.2, Site Plan Stairs
Sheet L1.3, Site Lighting Plan
Sheet L3.1, Stair Section
Sheet L3.2, Stair Section
Sheet L3.3, Stair Section
Sheet L3.4, Stair Section
Sheet L3.5, West Stair Section
Sheet L5.1, Landscape Detail
Sheet L5.2, Landscape Details, Plant List
Sheet L5.3, Planting Details & Notes

Civil Plans, Vlad G. Iojica, P.E., August 24, 2011:

Sheet 1, Cover Sheet
Sheet 2, Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, 10/25/10
Sheet 3, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet 4, Driveway Plan and Profile
Sheet 5, Site Improvements
Sheet 6, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet 7, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

In addition to these plans and the letter materials from the project architect, the following materials have been provided in support of the application:

- Exterior "Color Palette," dated 8/22/11 that is discussed below and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting.
- Arborist report (attached), McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated January 19, 2011.
- Cut sheets (attached) for the proposed exterior light fixtures received August 24, 2011 (Fixtures F1, F2, F3, F4, F6, F7, and F8)
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist (attached), received 8/25/11
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist with 8/25 transmittal letter (attached) targeting 197 points for the project whereas the minimum required BIG points is 194.

As noted above, review of the project will begin with a 4:00 p.m. site meeting. The story poles are in place for this meeting and the site visit will provide the opportunity for ASCC members and others to fully appreciate site conditions and the proposed plans, as well as grading, tree removal and landscaping proposals.

The comments that follow are offered to facilitate the site meeting and preliminary review process.

- 1. Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The existing/proposed house building site is located on a relatively small area at the south, high end of the property. The house is cut into the top of building site at the north end of the more level area of the property. North from the base of the house, the site descends roughly 150+ feet in elevation to the drainage course along the northern property boundary. The northern boundary is over 280 feet from the house site and the ground in this area has a slope in excess of 50%. In addition, this entire, steeper slope is designated Ms, moving shallow landslide, on the town's map of land movement potential. This designation under town policy cannot be used for placement of buildings.

Based on slope and geology and the required 50-foot front setback and 20-foot side yard setbacks, the only location available for development on the subject site is the area that accommodates the existing site improvements. Even this area is not all level or easily improved for house, driveway, garage and minimal outdoor use elements. Further, access to the site was impacted by grading for the Pine Ridge cul-de-sac, which resulted in a steeper bank, noted as "cliff" on the landscape plan, which is along the parcel frontage that was further modified to accommodate the existing driveway and garage cut into the slopes on the south side of the existing house. From a practical standpoint, all of the areas currently proposed for changes and improvements have been already significantly modified by the original road and site development, and the planned changes are not a dramatic departure from existing conditions.

The plans propose to continue use of the existing driveway and the new garage would be in much the same location as the existing garage. This is cut into the front yard slopes. The garage roof with the new plan would, like existing conditions, be used as terrace space off of the main living level of the new house. The new garage, however, would be roughly 60 feet from the front property line whereas the existing garage with storage space extends to within 47 feet of the front property line.

Existing front and side yard improvements include features that extend into required yard areas. There are steps, wood walls, trellis elements, planters, etc. These elements would be removed, however, some improvements such as steps and pathways and some landscape walls would be placed in yard areas, as there are few options for side yard access or development of usable outdoor space on other portions of the property. For the most part, the plans have been adjusted, based on consultation with staff, to meet town standards for improvements in yard areas relative to, for example, wall height limits. The plan perspective view sheets and the site meeting will provide the best information on how the site details, including walls and other landscape elements, are to be improved. It is noted that the trellis type features along the side yard pathways are not modeled in the perspective views.

More on these elements is offered below under landscape and fencing plan comments.

The proposed replacement residence is of a more current contemporary design and is less “commanding” in roof forms and deck extensions than existing conditions. The changes in roof forms and decks can be appreciated in looking at the plan elevation sheets and these sheets also define heights, which have been controlled to meet both the 28-foot and 34-foot height limits.

The plan proposes removal of four trees. Three are “topped” Monterey pines located along the eastern edge of the driveway where grading is proposed to enhance driveway access. The fourth tree is a Coast redwood located on a slope at the northerly end of the existing driveway. The arborist report discusses the trees and finds all to have some compromised conditions. The town encourages removal of pines and, in this case, removal of the redwood that has been poorly managed prior to the current ownership appears appropriate.

Even though the proposal is largely to replace existing improvements in a very similar manner, it is clear that with the proposed basement work, essentially all of the existing building site will be impacted by the new construction. Further, given site slope limitations, it will be difficult to contain all construction activities on site. Thus, a detailed construction staging plan, with tree protection provisions relative to the key site oaks, as discussed in the arborist report, will be an essential part of the final plans for this project.

Much of the area around the building site is well screened with trees and shrubs both on the subject site and on neighboring parcels that is to be protected from construction impacts. This includes one oak at the top of the cul-de-sac cut that screens views from the street to the house. Thus, again, a detailed vegetation protection plan needs to be part of the building permit plans for the project.

Overall, it is clear that 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 original site development including features that extend into required yard areas like the existing “bunker” garage and more exotic planting include the pines, palms, etc. The site meeting will help in appreciation of the design proposals and how they have been considered and developed.

- 2. Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** The total proposed countable floor area is 4,342 sf and this is at the total floor area limit for the site. This total floor area is also the same area in the single largest building and, therefore, would be 100% of the allowed floor area. To exceed the 85% limit of 3,690 sf, the ASCC must evaluate and make special findings. These are discussed in the next section of this report.

The lower level, basement space is 2,401 sf. Of this, only 172 sf counts against the floor area limit. Total living space, including exempted basement, is 6,571 sf.

One of the first matters the applicants reviewed with staff was how to adjust the design to conform to town height limits. The plan elevation sheets include detailed

sections and dimensions that demonstrate conformity to the 28-foot and 34-foot height limits. It is noted that with the first design approach, i.e., remodeling and additions, developing plans that would conform to height limits was difficult due to the need to work around existing roof forms.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) is listed on plan sheet A-1-1 as 5,338 sf. The total permitted IS area is 5,960 sf. The majority of the proposed IS will be in the new driveway and pathway systems and patio areas. While the identified IS number appears consistent with plan information, a detailed breakdown of IS surfaces should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

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. At the same time, some of the landscape features proposed in the side yard areas, particularly the tall, trellis elements need to be further reviewed and considered as explained below.

3. **Findings to permit the proposed concentration of floor area.** In order to grant approval to concentrate 100% of the permitted floor area in the house with attached garage, the ASCC must consider and make the required findings set forth in attached section 18.48.020 of the zoning ordinance. Only one finding under A. of this section needs to be made. In this case, A.2 can be found as both steep slopes and geology significantly impact options for site use as well as the scope of possible floor area development. Further, the plans propose largely following the form of existing improvement so that after the considerable construction process, impacts on the site and neighborhood should not be significantly different than currently exist. Thus, it appears that in this case the required findings could be made. Nonetheless, the field meeting will be important to fully understanding the project and neighborhood conditions.
4. **Site Development Permit Committee review.** To date, the following attached site development committee comments have been received:
 - * Public Works Director, memo dated 9/16/11. The memo lists mainly standard conditions and does not find any unusual concerns with the project.
 - Town Geologist, memo dated 9/20/11. The memo recommends project approval subject to conditions to be addressed prior to building permit approval.
 - Fire Marshal, memo dated 9/15/11. The memo recommends conditional approval of the project. The conditions have become standard requirements of the fire marshal.
 - Trails committee, memo dated 8/30/11. The memo concludes that there are no trails issues associated with this project.
 - Conservation committee, memo dated 9/16/11. The memo finds the house to fit the site and surroundings, but notes concerns over exterior lighting and the proposed "lawn" area. The committee also advised staff that it might have more comments after reviewing the lower, northerly portion of the site, and representatives will likely attend the 9/26 preliminary review meeting.

Comments are still expected from the health officer, as the proposal is to continue use of the existing site septic system. The scope of the existing system is not fully shown on the plans, but is referred to as being on the on the northerly side of the site on the civil plans.

- 5. Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** As noted above, the proposed house would occupy the same location as the existing house, would gain access in much the same way, and garage, guest parking and outdoor use spaces would be similar to existing conditions. Like the existing house, the new house would be of a contemporary design; updated clearly, with simplified architectural elements and a less imposing roof form. The results of the design changes help to reduce massing and eliminate the more significant angular deck and roof extensions.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include the following:

Plaster siding in a medium sand tone that appears to have a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 40% to 50% and may be slightly over the 40% policy maximum. This will have to be reviewed in more detail and it is likely that a somewhat darker plaster color will need to be considered.

Aluminum Window and door “storefront” frames and cable railings, with what appears to be coated steel finish.

Wood panel siding in a stain that results in an LRV of under 20%

Dark bronze aluminum fascia and gutters.

Board form concrete siding with a sandstone finish

The plans also propose the use of a light cream color for the plaster soffit and the proposed color has an LRV of over 60%. This is over the 50% limit for trim elements and, therefore, a darker soffit color will need to be selected.

The plans do not specify roof color, but given the site’s elevation, it will be difficult for anyone to view the roof material. Nonetheless, for the record the roof material and colors should be specified. Finishes for the proposed garage doors also needs to be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

(Refer to the perspective sheets for a complete appreciation of how materials and colors are proposed to be used.)

- 6. Landscaping and fencing.** The proposed landscaping is limited to the areas that would be disturbed for site development and is largely to improve areas that were previously developed for outdoor use. The locations of focus are the downhill decks and the front yard terrace and “no-mow” fescue lawn. Also, the plans detail the side yard steps that are to be used to tie front and rear yard areas together in a unified manner that also provides privacy between parcels. The trellis screen panels proposed along the side stairs have been designed to provide privacy without developing a continuous fence or wall. These features, however, exceed the 6-foot height limit for yard areas and, unless the ASCC determined they were “ornamental garden features,” would be have to be eliminated or modified to conform to the 6-foot height limit for features in yard areas. It is possible that some of these

elements, in the most sensitive privacy locations, could be used and considered ornamental garden structures, which have a height limit of 12 feet and can be located in yard areas. This should be considered and discussed at the site meeting.

We understand that the landscape architect will be present at the site meeting to fully explain the planting and overall landscape plans. For the most part, the objective is to use native materials, particularly in the front yard area, but the planting details should be fully discussed at the site meeting.

Other than the railings and side yard trellis screens, no new fencing is proposed. It is noted that the landscape deck areas will have a somewhat different guardrail than the cable railings proposed for the decks off of the upper house levels. The detail for this railing is shown on plan sheet L5.1.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior building lighting is shown on Sheet A-1.1. Fixture descriptions for the F2, F4, F7 and F8 fixtures are attached. The F2 “step” fixture is to be used for lighting at the front entry stairway, and the F8 fixture used over entry and other locations shown on the plan is a recessed, downcast light. We are concerned with the used of the F4 and F7 fixtures and conformity to town lighting standards. The strip lights appear to, at least in part, be intended for use to highlight architectural elements, particularly the F4 strip. The F7 fixtures are to be mounted over the lower doors that open to the lower, east side deck. These appear to have potential to spread light over the deck area and appear somewhat excessive when considered with the other deck lighting proposed on Sheet L1.3 of the landscape plans.

Sheet L1.3 of the landscape plans propose extensive use of the step light fixture and considerable use of the F4, strip lights. Town policy opposes use of strip lights. Also, the F6 fixture appears mainly for accent lighting and we question the need for lighting of the “boulder and gravel path” in the front yard setback area. Overall, the extent of yard lighting appears to require extensive reconsideration for conformity to town policies and guidelines.

8. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green (BIG) Checklist.** As noted above, the attached completed BIG checklist targets 197 BIG points, consistent with the town's green building standards. The checklist and “green building” proposals are discussed in the attached August 30, 2011 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck.

Again, since this is a preliminary review of the subject proposals, the ASCC should conduct the September 26th site and evening 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 the October 10th regular ASCC meeting to permit staff and the applicant time to address input gained through the preliminary review process.

TCV

encl.

attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor