



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, October 24, 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., 451 Portola Road Field session for preliminary consideration of plans for additions and other improvements to the historic “Lauriston-Willowbrook Farm,” Superintendent’s House and Office. (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. New Business:

a. Architectural Review for Residential Additions and New Attached Garage, 21 Santa Maria Avenue, Berka/Akers

b. Preliminary Architectural Review – Proposed Additions and Remodeling, Addition of Attached Garage and Other Site Improvements, “Lauriston-Willowbrook Farm,” Superintendent’s House and Office, 451 Portola Road, Naify

5. Staff Reports:

a. Process for Implementation of Stanford C-1 Trail Landscape Plans

6. Approval of Minutes: October 10, 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: October 21, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: October 20, 2011
RE: Agenda for October 24, 2011 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The October 24th meeting will begin with a 4:00 p.m. afternoon field session for preliminary consideration of plans for additions and other improvements to the historic "Lauriston"- "Willowbrook Farm," Superintendent's House and Office at 451 Portola Road. The proposals for the property are discussed below under agenda item **4b. Naify.**

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

4a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND NEW ATTACHED GARAGE, 21 SANTA MARIA AVENUE, BERKA/AKERS

This proposal is for approval of plans for the net addition of 579 sf to an existing 2,331 sf two-story residence, including detached carport, on the subject .51-acre Woodside Highlands property (see attached vicinity maps). The plans include replacing the existing carport with a 417 sf attached garage and adding 327 sf to the living area of the house. The house additions include main level kitchen expansions and upper level bath and laundry space. Also planned is a new deck off of the main level.

The plans can be completed with minimum grading and no significant vegetation removal, but would result in 94% of the allowed floor area being concentrated in the main house. This would be 285 sf over the 85% limit and the concentration of floor area is only possible subject to specific findings being made by the ASCC. These findings are evaluated later in this report. In this case, due to geologic and slope constraints, and pattern of existing development, we believe the required findings could be made.

In order for this project to proceed, a deviation from the provisions of town Resolution 2506-2010 must also be granted by the planning commission. The deviation issues and requirements are explained in the attached October 13, 2011 report to the planning commission. The report explains the geologic constraints impacting the property and includes excerpts from the geologic investigation prepared for the applicant in support of the deviation application as well as the town geologist September 29, 2011 review of

the project. The planning commission considered the report at its October 19, 2011 meeting and preliminarily supported the deviation, but did ask for a summary of all of the house and site improvements, including drainage, that would be accomplished to improve stability and safety. The commission is scheduled to complete review and action on the deviation at its November 2, 2011 meeting.

The proposed project is presented on the following enclosed plans dated September 8, 2011 and prepared by F. John Richards Architect:

Sheet A.1, Site Plan
Sheet A.2, Proposed Plans
Sheet A.3, Existing Plans

Submitted in support of the proposal are the following materials:

- Materials board. A black and white copy of the board received 9/9/11 is attached and includes two pages. The first page shows the roofing, light fixture and colors for the siding, trim and garage door surfaces. The second page includes the proposed "Trex" decking and deck railing material. The color version of the "board" will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting and is described further below.
- July 15, 2011 Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist (attached).
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist: Existing Home (attached). The checklist targets 49 BIG points, which is over the 25 points required for this "Elements" project under the town's mandatory green building program.

To facilitate ASCC review of this project, story poles have been placed at the site to model the proposed house additions and attached garage. The following comments are also offered to assist the ASCC consider and act on this proposal.

1. **Project description, site conditions, geologic constraints, grading and vegetation impacts.** The attached October 13, 2011 staff report to the planning commission on the deviation provides considerable description of site conditions and the proposed house and garage additions. As noted in the report, the new garage would replace an existing carport that does not meet current town requirements for covered parking. The carport also extends into the required northwest side, side yard setback area. The new garage would be attached to the front, i.e., southwest side, of the existing house and the majority of the proposed new kitchen and upper level bath and laundry additions would also be on the front side of the house and just to the southeast of the proposed garage.

The area where the additions are planned is, for the most part, level and easily accessed by the existing driveway connection to Wayside Road. The northerly side of the property is a relatively steep slope and accommodates the existing septic system. Thus, this side of the site is not easily developed. Further, due to the steeper slopes and Pd, potential deep landslide designation for the property, deviation requirements would not permit new floor area associated with the slope or the location of the septic system.

Thus, given site conditions and constraints, the only practical placement for the new garage would be on the southwest side of the existing house. The kitchen and bath

additions are relatively minor and are rational given the layout of the existing house. Also, as noted above, the existing carport extends into the required side yard setback area, and is within 6 feet of the northwesterly side property line. The new garage would be fully within the building envelope and at least 10 feet from the property line. Also, there is fill of questionable stability in the area of the new garage and this fill may also contain an old septic tank. This area needs to be excavated to ensure the fill is properly compacted and remove the old septic tank if it is still in the ground.

The project includes replacement of the existing retaining wall along the front elevation of the house and would also remove some of the existing driveway and parking surface as shown on the enclosed site plan. With the reduction of paved space and reconfiguration of driveway access to the new attached garage, opportunities are created for improvements to the pathway to the front door and also some new front yard landscaping. The scope of the changes is described on the site plan.

The proposed "Trex Deck" would extend to the north and east of the kitchen area. It would be over existing pathway improvements and the northerly side slope. Views to the lower deck supports would be from Santa Maria Avenue and there is significant existing vegetation to screen views. In addition, as noted in the report to the planning commission, there is more parcel area to the east of the deck than suggested by the site plan. In any case, there is significant east side vegetation to screen views to the deck and the proposed deck area.

Based on the foregoing analysis and the evaluations included with the report to the planning commission, there is very little option for significant living area additions and deviation provisions limit opportunities for additions or placement of site improvements. Given these factors, the plans appear appropriate and would result in enhancing structural stability and safety of existing improvements, with minimum grading or impact on other site conditions.

(Note: At the October 19, 2011 planning commission meeting, in response to a question from the town geologist, the applicant advised that the house has been bolted to the foundation, tie-down straps added, and sheer walls installed.)

2. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height limits and setback.** The total proposed site floor area is 2,910 sf and within the 3,088 sf limit. Further, it is just within the addition limit of 25% allowed for under the deviation provisions as evaluated in the attached October 13, 2011 report to the planning commission.

The total area proposed in the main house is the same 2,910 sf. This is 94% of the total permitted floor area and, as noted above, 285 sf over the 85% limit of 2,625 sf. The findings that need to be made to allow the added concentration of floor area are discussed below.

The total existing/proposed impervious surface (IS) area identified in the table on the site plans is 800 sf. This is well within the 2,240 sf IS limit for the property. The increase in building coverage, particularly with the garage addition, reduces the existing scope of IS, as does the scaling back of the amount of driveway surface,

part of which will be converted to landscaping. Thus, there may actually be some changes to the IS numbers. Final IS numbers should be provided to the satisfaction of staff, for the record, prior to issuance of a building permit.

The maximum height of the house will not change with the additions and is approximately 29 feet, i.e., within the 34-foot maximum height limit. The new garage would have a maximum ridge height of 13-14 feet and the proposed two-story house addition would have maximum height of 20 feet. Thus, the addition areas are well under the 28-foot height limit.

In this zoning district there is also a daylight plane height limit that establishes a 1.5:1 plane from the property boundary 24 feet into the site. Only the new garage would be in the area impacted by the daylight plane and its maximum height of 12-13 feet ensures that it does not conflict with the daylight plane limit.

Compliance with required setbacks is demonstrated on Sheet A.1. These include 20-foot front and rear yards and 10-foot side yards. As noted above, the proposed garage is located so as to fully conform to the 10-foot side yard setback and it would be at least 39 feet from the front property line. The other planned improvements including "Trex" deck, are well removed from any required setback area.

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 94% of the floor area in the single largest building and, in this case, the only site building, 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, the request is to address covered parking requirements and make minor additions to the existing house. The options for additions are significantly constrained by geology, which clearly limits options for placement of the additions. Placing the 285 sf over the 85% limit in a detached accessory structure would not solve the parking issue as a detached required garage space is still counted against the 85% limit. Further, a detached accessory structure would likely cause more site disturbance and not solve the needs for more kitchen and bath space.

Based on the foregoing comments and those in the staff report and materials associated with the deviation request, we believe that the ASCC should be able to make the necessary findings to permit the concentration of floor area.

4. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** The proposed additions would be completed so as to fully match the architectural style of the existing house. In fact, the additions, while adding some massing to the front elevation, would not change the basic architectural character of the elevation. The changes, however, would add more texture and break-up what is now more of a single plane, vertical form. The garage extension and hip roof proposed over the lower, kitchen addition help to minimize the apparent massing of the southerly side of the house.

The following materials and finishes are proposed for the added to and remodeled house:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Roofing: | Composition shingles, medium brown/tan tones, identified as GAF, "Barkwood." |
| Exterior walls: | Stucco in a medium moss green color identified as Kelly Moore, "Head for the Beach," with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of 40% and just at the 40% policy maximum. |
| Trim: | Painted wood in a tan color identified as Kelly Moore, "Spanish Sand," with an LRV of 47% and under the 50% policy limit. |

The garage door would be painted to match the proposed stucco siding color and the few new windows would match the existing windows. The "Trex" deck and railing would have dark redwood finished deck boards, rails, caps and posts identified as "Fire Pit." The balusters would be somewhat darker, with the finish identified as "Vintage Lantern."

5. **Landscaping.** A very small area of new landscaping is proposed to help focus the entry pathway to the house. This area between the pathway and garage would be planted with native shrubs and ground cover. Otherwise, all other site vegetation is to be protected. While there appears to be ample room on the property to accommodate the construction operation, a final vegetation protection and construction staging plan should be provided to the satisfaction of staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. **Exterior Lighting.** The cut sheet for the proposed light fixture is included on the attached copy of the materials board. It is a Craftsmen style fixture with metal and opalescent glass casing and the fixture directs light downward. The fixture design conforms to town lighting policies.

He proposed locations for the fixture are shown on plan Sheet A.1. Three are proposed, with two located at entry doors and one on the front elevation of the garage. We have no issue with the lighting plans as proposed, but did note that there are some spotlights with sensor switches. These conflict with current town lighting policies and standards and should be eliminated with this project.

7. **"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 received by the town 9/9/11. In this case, the checklist targets 49 points. The mandated minimum point total for this "Elements" project is 25 points and BIG greenpoint rating would be self-certified. The checklist is further evaluated in the attached September 12, 2011 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

Prior to any action on this application, the ASCC should consider the above comments, visit the project site and also consider any new data presented at the October 24, 2011 meeting.

4b. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, ADDITION OF ATTACHED GARAGE AND OTHER SITE IMPROVEMENTS, "LAURISTON-WILLOWBROOK FARM," SUPERINTENDENT'S HOUSE AND OFFICE, 451 PORTOLA ROAD, NAIFY

On October 24th the ASCC will conduct a preliminary review of this request for approval of plans for additions to and repair/remodeling of the existing historic Superintendent's House and Office on the subject 1.13-acre property located on Portola Road immediately east of the Portola Road intersection with Willowbrook Drive. The attached vicinity map shows the parcel and general conditions in the area. The house and office are structures recognized in the town general plan historic element for preservation and are landmarks within the Portola Road corridor.

The project includes repairs and additions to the House and repairs to the Office. The project also includes general clean up of the property, including demolition of the existing detached garage, which is structurally unsound and has suffered from general lack of maintenance. Also proposed is a new, main access driveway connection to Willowbrook Drive and deck and swimming pool additions.

Since the project involves recognized historic structures, the proposed changes, repairs and additions must be evaluated in terms of their potential for impacts on the historic resources. The plans that are proposed have been evaluated by a historic architect and plan adjustments have been made or are being made as recommended by the architect for conformity with requirements for preservation of historic resources. The analysis and design adjustments allow the project to be found in conformity with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEAQ). A section of this report addresses the historic analysis and the necessary project adjustments to permit conclusions relative to CEQA compliance.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Josh Warner Residential Design and dated 8/4/11:

- Sheet A1.0, Site Plan
- Sheet A2.0, 1st Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.1, 2nd Floor Plan
- Sheet A3.0, 1st Floor Plan (Dimensioned)
- Sheet A3.1, 2nd Floor Plan (Dimensioned)
- Sheet A4.0, Ext. Elevations
- Sheet A4.1, Ext. Elevations
- Sheet A4.2, Ext. Elevations
- Sheet A4.3, Ext. Elevations
- L1.1, Landscape Lighting Plan
- Sheet C.1, Topographic Map, Rick Skierka, Jan. 1999*

*The applicant has advised that this map was prepared for the previous owner and that the owner has made the map available to the new owner for their use.

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

- Photo “samples” of proposed slate roofing material and stone siding received 9/27/11. These will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. In addition, a complete colors and materials board will be presented at the meeting with roofing, stone and shingle samples, as well as proposed colors.
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received 9/27/11(attached). These include proposed path lights and two wall mounted fixture designs.
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist: Existing Home (attached). The checklist targets 113 BIG points, which is well over the 50 points required for this project under the town’s mandatory green building program.
- Historic Resource Evaluation, Siegel & Strain Architects, October 8, 2011 (attached). The report evaluates the proposed plans against the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and sets forth findings for plan adjustments to satisfy the standards. The applicant is revising the plans to meet the evaluation comments and the report will be updated to reflect the plan revisions. The report will also be updated to comment on the plans for the Office rehabilitation.

As noted at the head of this memorandum, this preliminary review will start with a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on Monday. Story poles have been installed to facilitate the site meeting and, as noted above, a complete exterior materials and finishes board will be available for reference.

(NOTE: The applicant was attempting to get the modified plans and updated historic analysis to the town in time for review with this report and to be inserted in the packets for the October 24th meeting. This did not occur and, therefore, it is likely that the revised plans and updated reports will be provided to ASCC members at the 10/24 site meeting.)

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

1. **Project description, site conditions, and grading and vegetation impacts.** The applicant recently purchased the subject property with the specific objectives of cleaning up the site, removing existing structures and other elements that are in poor condition and repairing and rehabilitating the existing historic structures. The plans also include some minor repair and painting of the existing workshop on the west side of the site that was rehabilitated subject to plans approved by the ASCC in 1999.

Much work has already been pursued to clean the site and start the rehabilitation process. This includes removal of the green house, tool shed, wood shed, and “cottage 2,” shown on the site plan. These structures were removed subject to a demolition permit issued by the town. The plans also proposed to remove the existing garage noted on the site plan, as it is in poor structural condition. Since, however, this existing garage provides the only covered parking on the site, it cannot be demolished until permits have been issued for a new garage.

The new garage would be placed in the lower level of the two-story addition that is planned to the south of the main House. This garage would be accessed by a new

driveway with entry gate that would be connected to Willowbrook Drive as shown on the site plan. The new driveway can be constructed with minimum grading and/or vegetation impacts, and would allow for reduction of the hardscape associated with the existing Portola Road access. The change would also reduce potential conflict with bikers and pathway users along Portola Road, but there are concerns over the traffic engineering conditions with the proposed driveway connection that need to be addressed as explained in a later section of this report.

Besides the driveway changes, the main change to site improvements that would result from the project is the two-story house addition to the rear of the main House. The project design team has had several conversations with staff and a site meeting with Nancy Lund, town historian, to view options for the additions that would be consistent with the historic preservation provisions of the town's general plan (copy of the provisions attached) for the House and Office. The main elements relative to the addition are that it would conform to the historic character of the resource and that the addition could be removed at a future time to reveal the historic resource as it appeared prior to the additions or rehabilitation.

Discussion of the architectural elements of the House additions and rehabilitations are contained in the attached historic resource report and in the next section of this report. The applicants have worked with staff and the historic resource architect to develop a plan consistent with town and other historic resource standards and to conform to the historic character of the House.

As can be seen from the plans, and better appreciated from the site session on Monday, the House additions can be accomplished with minimum grading. One tree, a sycamore, on the east side of the addition would be removed, but no other vegetation of any significance is in the area of the proposed addition or the areas of the proposed swimming pool, terrace, or kitchen deck extensions.

For the most part, the emphasis of the project has been to make the House more functional as a residence, repair and enhance the Office to function better as a second unit, and to remove structures and improvements that are in poor condition and conflict with the historic and residential character of the property. While the proposed house additions would result in some increase in massing on the south side of the House, distance from other nearby residences and vegetation surrounding the site help to mitigate potential impacts associated with the visual changes. Further, the main view to the additions would be from Willowbrook Drive and the parking lot of the Sequoias.

Overall, we conclude the proposed improvements have been well thought out in terms of the site and area, but a number of details need to be worked as project plans are finalized. Further, the proposed new driveway access faces some engineering issues that need to be resolved before the public works director is prepared to support the new access.

- 2. Historic Resource Evaluation and project architecture.** The attached report prepared by Burton Edwards of Siegel & Strain Architects (the firm that was significantly involved in the design and implementation of the town center project), provides the historic perspective for the project. It discusses the structures and offers design comments for the proposed House additions and rehabilitations. The project plans are being modified to be consistent with the comments, particularly,

use of roof slate for the House and Office, and use of the “historic” shingles for portions of the house addition and also on the Office repair. Basically, where stucco is shown on the existing walls to be repaired, the historic shingles would be used. Further, the shingles would be used on the upper level of the house addition, rather than continuing the use of the river rock veneer.

The historic elevation also includes comments relative to windows, doors, driveway gates, and color scheme. Details for these elements are being clarified and the intention is to fully conform to the recommendations in the historic analysis.

It is noted that the proposed addition will, in part, correct the upper level, south elevation modifications made at some point without sympathy to the historic character of the House. This correction, along with the manner in which the new addition would have minimum contact with the historic elements of the House, help conform to the requirement that the addition could be removed at some point, to permit the building to be returned to its original form. At the same time, as long as the addition conforms to the recommendations in the historic analysis, it will result in a house that is more functional for the applicant and allow the property to be usable in terms of contemporary residential needs for a family.

As noted above, the historic analysis is being updated to reflect the plan modifications being made for consistency with the initial historic evaluation comments. The updated analysis will also include evaluation of the Office proposals. The revised report will be shared with town historian Nancy Lund for final review and comment before the ASCC is asked to take final action on this project.

Again, we appreciate the efforts that the applicant and the project design team have made to date to clean up the property and to also develop plan concepts that are responsive to the historic resource provisions of the town.

3. **Engineering review of proposed driveway access changes.** The public works director has considered the proposed new driveway connection. Initially he was concerned that the plans were for three driveway access points, two on Willowbrook, and one on Portola Road. The Portola Road gated driveway must remain, as it is part of the site’s historic resources. It, however, is intended to be modified to eliminate some of the existing hardscape and it would not be used as the day-to-day driveway for the site. Full details for the modification to this area still need to be developed.

For some time there was a driveway connection from the south end of the property to Willowbrook Drive that served the former “cottage 2” that has been demolished. With removal of the cottage and sheds, this access point has also been eliminated.

The plan is to make a new main driveway connection with gates just to the north of the workshop. The key issue that needs to be analyzed by a traffic engineer is the safety of this location for a driveway entry point. The public works director is concerned that the distance from Portola Road to the driveway, particularly for cars heading south on Portola Road and turning west on to Willowbrook, is insufficient for safe warning and stopping. The problem condition would occur with a car waiting to turn into the new driveway. Thus, this issue needs to be evaluated to the satisfaction of the public works director. If a safe distance were not available the

access plans would have to be modified. The applicant has been made aware of the issue and is pursuing development of the analysis required by the public works director.

It is also noted that the plans do not include design details for the proposed wood and iron entry gate with columns. These need to be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC. We understand the intent is to be consistent with the site's historic resources but, again, detailed design plans should be prepared after the public works director's safety concerns have been resolved. It is noted that the proposed gate location does conform with the requirement for the gates to be set back at least 50% of the required yard area, in this case a minimum of 10 feet for the west side, 20-foot side yard.

4. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed site floor area is 5,160 sf and just under the 5,346 sf, floor area limit. This reflects removal of the structures noted on the site plan and the 1,040 sf, two-story addition to the rear of the main house. The Office "Casita" floor area would remain at 625 sf, well under the 750 sf for a guest house, and the 1999 approved workshop floor area would also remain at 1,029 sf. The total area in the added to house with attached garage would be 3,443 sf and well under the 4,555 sf, 85% limit for the single largest structure. In this case, the floor area in the main House would be 64% of the maximum allowed floor area.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 4,489 sf. This is well under the 7,983 sf IS limit for the property.

The historic House has a maximum height of over 40-feet to top of the turreted tower, and the maximum height would not be impacted by this project. While the maximum height exceeds the 34-foot limit, it is a pre-existing condition that could not be changed without adversely impacting the historic resource of the House.

The proposed addition area on the plans is to be adjusted to conform to the 28-foot limit for height relative to adjacent grade. The plans currently scale somewhat above 28 feet, and actually closer to 30 feet. In any case, the intent is to conform to the 28-foot limit. The Office "Casita" has a maximum height of just under 18 feet and fully conforms to the height limits.

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 for the addition, proposed pool and new deck elements. The existing House and Office both encroach into the front setback area along Portola Road. Again, these are legal, existing, non-conforming conditions and are also part of the site's historic resources.

5. **Landscaping, swimming pool, fencing.** No new fencing is proposed, but some temporary post and rail fencing was added for security to close off the old driveway connection to Willowbrook Drive at the south end of the site. Thus, if any new permanent fencing is planned in this area or any other site area, it should be identified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The only planting shown on the plans are "native hedges" on the property along Portola Road. The plant materials need to be specified to the satisfaction of both the ASCC and conservation committee and the ASCC may want to encourage a less linear approach, as the plantings are to essentially follow existing site rock walls.

6. **Exterior Lighting.** Existing and proposed light locations are identified on plan Sheet L1.1. Symbol 1 is for existing fixtures and 2, 3 and 4 are for proposed fixtures. Cut sheets for the proposed fixtures are attached. The number of fixtures proposed is not excessive and appears consistent with town polices and standards. Our main concern is with the use of the "circa coach" fixture due to the locations, particularly, on top of the new driveway entry gate columns and on the entry elevation to the garage. We recommend that there be no lights on top of the driveway gate columns and that if the more historic style fixture is to be used on the garage and house, a seeded glass be considered to limit the potential for glare and light spill.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the applicant has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated existing home checklist. In this case, the checklist targets 113 points. The mandated minimum point total for this project is 50 and BIG greenpoint rating certification is also required. The checklist is evaluated in the attached October 5, 2011 report from Carol Borck, planning technician.

Since this is a preliminary review of the project, the ASCC should conduct the special afternoon site meeting, consider the above comments and any new information developed at the site meeting or regular evening meeting and offer comments and reactions to the proposal. Project review should then be continued to the regular November 14, 2011 ASCC meeting to permit time for response to preliminary review comments and completion of the engineering analysis of the proposed driveway access changes. This will also provide time the plans and historic analysis to be brought into conformity with each other.

5a. STAFF REPORT – PROCESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF STANFORD C-1 TRAIL LANDSCAPE PLANS

During oral communications at the October 10th ASCC meeting Commissioner Breen expressed some concerns regarding the approved landscape plans for the Stanford/Alpine Road C-1 Trail project (see enclosed meeting minutes). She was concerned that the ASCC had not been asked to review the plans and was also concerned that without careful implementation, the planting could appear excessive and out of character with the native conditions along the Alpine Road corridor.

Based on these concerns, I discussed the status of the plans with Public Works Director Howard Young. Howard advised that he was going to involve the ASCC, trails and conservation committees in the process of placing the plantings to ensure all areas of concern are addressed to the extent possible. Howard will let the ASCC know when the planting placement, etc., is to proceed and then organize the planting schedule so that it would proceed under the guidance of the committee/commission input.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that the ASCC designate one or two members to participate in the planting process and then, when it is ready to proceed, staff will coordinate times with the various representatives.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor