



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, November 14, 2011
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

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

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. Continued Architectural Review – Proposed Additions and Remodeling, Addition of Attached Garage and Other Site Improvements, “Lauriston”-“Willowbrook Farm,” Superintendent’s House and Office, 451 Portola Road, Naify *Continued to November 28, 2011 meeting*
 - b. Follow-up Review - Architectural Review, Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, 80 Golden Oak Drive, Liu/Chen
 - c. Follow-up Review - Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling and Site Development Permit X9H-627, 220 Golden Hills Drive, Pidwell
5. Approval of Minutes: October 24, 2011 and November 1, 2011
6. 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: November 11, 2011

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: November 10, 2011
RE: Agenda for November 14, 2011 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. CONTINUED 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 conducted 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. At the conclusion of the preliminary review, the ASCC indicated support for the project concepts, but with the understanding that a number of issues and details would be addressed before revised plans were returned to the ASCC for final consideration and action. Project review was continued from the 10/24 meeting to the 11/14 meeting. The ASCC comments and directions are set forth in the enclosed draft minutes of the 10/24 meeting.

The applicant and project team are still working to address the 10/24 review comments and have agreed that project consideration should be continued to the November 28, 2011 regular ASCC meeting. Staff concurs with this continuance. As a result, any public comments should be received at the 11/14 meeting, and project review then continued to the November 28, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

4b. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW, PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, 80 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, LIU/CHEN

On June 27, 2011 the ASCC considered and conditionally approved plans for this project for additions to and remodeling of the existing 3,251 sf contemporary Ranch style residence on the subject 1.5-acre Alpine Hills property. The June 23, 2011 staff

report on the proposal and minutes of the ASCC approval action are enclosed for background and reference.

The applicant has submitted the plans and materials listed below to satisfy the ASCC approval conditions. The plans are enclosed and, unless otherwise noted, have been prepared by Kohler Associates Architects and have a revised date of 10/12/11:

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 L1.1, Planting Plan, Linn Winterbotham, Landscape Architect, 10/11/11
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
Exterior (materials) Color Schedule, received October 19, 2011

The following comments discuss how the current submittal addresses the approval conditions. Condition language is presented in *italics*. Overall, however, it is noted that most all of the plan sheets, including floor plans, elevations, floor area calculations, impervious surface area calculations, etc., are the same as the plan sheets approved by the ASCC in June. The only sheets with changes are those that address the approval conditions.

1. *A detailed landscape plan shall be provided that includes provisions for removal of the redwood trees and other non-native and invasive plant materials along the Golden Oak Drive frontage. The plan shall also include provisions for removal of invasive materials on the entire property, including star thistle north of the building site. The landscape plan shall be directed at restoring the oak grassland conditions along the frontage below the building site and shall include two large size box oaks located just south of the replacement retaining wall below the access pathway.*

Sheet L-1.1 is a new landscape plan that, while consistent with the native plant palette used on the original plan, is more focused to areas needing supplemental planting, and less extensive in overall planting than the original plan. It includes provisions for removal of Golden Oak frontage redwoods and invasive materials and site restoration as called for in the condition. It also provides the two required larger size Valley Oaks (36-inch box) below the new retaining wall.

While the plan seems to fully address the ASCC condition, inspections at the end of the construction process will be important to ensure removal of invasive materials and site restoration as called for in the condition. This will be a normal part of the planning review prior to “finaling” of the project building permits.

2. *The replacement retaining wall with railing proposed below, i.e., south of the new entry to the house, shall be faced with a stone material consistent with the character of the stone used on the other site retaining walls to remain with this project. Further, the wall and railing design shall be revised to conform to town setback standards for such features in the required front yard setback area and details for the railing design shall be clarified.*

The wall now is to be faced with the required stone as noted on the site plan and shown on the elevation sheets. Further, the railing has been moved off of the top of the wall and the wall and railing heights now both are below the four-foot height limit in the small sections that extend into the front yard setback area.

The ASCC submittal package does not include a detail for the railing, but the construction plans apparently do have the detail and the project architect will have this available for ASCC consideration at Monday’s meeting.

3. *Final exterior materials and color samples shall be provided. In particular, the roof tile mix shall be darker than shown on the proposed color board received May 23, 2011. In addition, the lower portion of the south elevation, generally below the identified “datum board” line, shall be in a darker color as recommended in the June 23, 2011 staff report.*

The revised colors and materials board will be available for consideration at the ASCC meeting. It does include a darker roof tile mix and a darker color for the stucco area below the “datum board” line as required by the condition. The copy of the color sheet provided with the current submittal is not the original and the colors shown on the copy are difficult to fairly evaluate. Thus, the “original” revised board will be available for ASCC consideration on Monday night.

4. *The plans shall be clarified as to grading and vegetation removal that is proposed to improve sight distance at the driveway intersection with Golden Oak Drive.*

Sheet A1.1 includes new data relative to the planned improvements to enhance sight distance at Golden Oak Drive. Some cut is proposed with a new rock retaining wall. We’ve asked that the project team refine the detail to specify the maximum height of the new wall. From the contour data, however, it appears that the new rock wall would have heights ranging from roughly one to two feet.

5. *The lighting plans shall be modified to place south side terrace and deck area lights close to the surface of the deck rather than using higher wall mounted lights for required illumination in these areas. The intent is to specifically limit potential for light spill along the southern side of the property. Similarly, the lighting along the pathway below the south side replacement retaining wall shall be located in the wall and shall be with a low mounted step light fixture that directs light to the pathway*

surface and not out from the wall. The lighting plans shall include identification of switching patterns.

The proposed revised lighting plan is presented on plan Sheet LE1, with cut sheets on Sheet LE2. The lighting along the south side retaining wall has been modified as called for in the condition, but the cut sheet for the step light, i.e., "E" is not shown. It will be provided for ASCC consideration at the ASCC meeting.

The south side deck and terrace lights, for the most part, have been revised to a low mounted fixture, as called for in the condition. The cut sheet for the fixture also needs to be provided for approval and will be presented at Monday's ASCC meeting.

The lighting for the master bedroom balcony at the east end of the house is still shown to be with the originally proposed two wall mounted fixtures. This balcony is over 130 feet from the front property line and screened from lower views by extensive tree cover. The ASCC will need to determine if these lights also need to be changed to low mounted fixtures for conformity with the approval condition.

The switching pattern data is not shown on the revised lighting plan. It should be shown on the building permit plans to the satisfaction of planning staff. The architect has advised that he is aware of this requirement.

6. *The historic record of the house and its architecture shall be provided to the satisfaction of town planning staff.*

The applicant has provided the additional data called for and, based on this data and staff review of the records associated with the house, it has been concluded that it does not qualify for any further review as a historic resource. In particular, there is no formal data that would support the design as being a William Wurster House. Records listing Wurster houses have been considered and the subject house is not included in the lists.

Prior to acting on the follow-up submittal ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the November 14, 2011 ASCC meeting.

4c. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-627, 220 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, PIDWELL

On May 23, 2011, the ASCC initiated review of the subject applications submitted in support of plans for additions to and significant remodeling of the existing multi-level, traditional design residence on the subject 2.0-acre Oak Hills subdivision property. On June 13, 2011 the ASCC completed action to conditionally approve the project. For background and reference, the staff reports prepared for the May 23, 2011 and June 13, 2011 meetings are enclosed, as are the minutes of the two meetings. The June 13 meeting minutes include the approval conditions.

To satisfy the conditions of approval, the applicant has provided the plans and materials listed below. These enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, were prepared by designer William M. Justi Associates and have a revised date of October 24, 2011:

Sheet 1, Site Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc., 10/10/11
Sheet 2, Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan, Westfall Engineers, Inc., 10/10/11
Sheet FP-1, Proposed Main Floor Plan
Sheet FP-2, Proposed Lower (house) and (detached) Garage Floor Plans
Sheet ELEV-1, Exterior Elevations
Sheet ELEV-2, Exterior Elevations
Sheet BA-1, Building Study Area
Sheet IMP-1, Building and Impervious Surface Area Study
Sheet RP-1, Proposed Roof Plan
Sheet EL-1, Electrical Plan
Sheet EL-1, Electrical Plan (with Cut Sheets)
Sheet 1, Definitive Landscape Plan, Lisa Moulton, 10/11/11
Sheet 2, Landscape Lighting Plan (with cut sheets), Lisa Moulton, 10/19/11
Sheet 1, Planting Plan, Lisa Moulton, 9/11
Sheet TP S-1, Tree protection Plan, 10/18/11
Sheet TP S-2, Tree Protection Plan, 10/18/11

For the most part, the site, grading, and house floor plans are in substantial compliance with the plans approved by the ASCC in June. The house elevations, heights and overall massing also generally conform to the approved plans. The elevation details, however, have changed and these changes will need to be considered by the ASCC in completing action on the follow-up submittal. More comments are provided relative to the elevation changes under discussion of condition #5 below.

The following comments discuss how the current submittal addresses the approval conditions. Condition language is presented in *italics*.

1. *A final exterior lighting plan, with additional reduction in lighting, shall be prepared. The plan shall identify switching patterns for all exterior fixtures.*

Sheets EL-1 and EL-2 provide the plans for exterior house lighting with switching patterns and fixture cut sheets. The scope of lighting is a significant reduction from the original proposals and, for example, limits lighting to one fixture at entry doors and reduces the amount of lighting at the bridge and terrace areas. The original plans will be available for comparison at the ASCC meeting.

The yard lighting is shown on Sheet 2 of the landscape plans and this sheet also includes fixture cut sheets. This plan significantly reduces the scope of yard lighting originally proposed and the plans include the light switching patterns. We conclude that the scope of exterior yard lighting is now not excessive, however, we do have two concerns. First, the proposed "hanging Moonlighter" fixture appears to be tree mounted and town policies and regulations do not permit lighting in trees. These fixtures should be eliminated from the plans.

Our second concern is with the recessed louvered lights proposed for the driveway entry columns. The image on the plans and fixture name indicate a louvered cover with down directed light. The fixture dimension drawing does not show the louver cover and we simply want to make sure the cover is part of the fixture. Also, the lights on the columns should be mounted as low as possible to ensure minimum potential for views from the street to any light source.

The attached October 28, 2011 memo from the conservation committee comments on lighting as well as landscaping and raises concerns with proposed west side pathway lighting. Given ground elevation differences in the area, we don't have the same concerns and note that the majority of the pathway lights are at stairs, with only one light at each stair transition area.

2. *A final detailed landscape plan shall be provided consistent with the concepts shown on the proposed landscape plans. Oak(s) to replace removal of trees 88, 63 and 72 shall be with valley oaks or other deciduous native oaks. The final, detailed landscape plan shall be shared with the conservation committee for review and recommendations prior to being presented to the ASCC for approval.*

The proposed planting plan has been reviewed by the conservation committee, and the committee comments are provided in the attached October 28, 2011 memorandum. The plan should be modified to address the concerns in the memo to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The plans do include the addition of six deciduous, black oaks to replace removal of the referenced oaks. These plantings are largely on the east side of the house and not in the area of oaks 63 and 72. At the same time, a number of oaks exist in the area of trees 63 and 72 and other plantings are proposed for screening on the north side of the house.

Sheet 1 of the landscape plans includes some modifications to the boundaries of hardscape and some additional walls, including the 24" high stone walls with 48" high pillars to define the auto entry court area. The entry court walls and pillars do not conflict with any setback limits, but would add some formality to the project that was not on the plans approved by the ASCC. The other hardscape changes are minor and in substantial compliance with what was shown on the original site plan.

Sheet 1 also notes that the driveway and entry court would be surfaced with concrete pavers. Driveway surface in the street right of way is limited to asphalt or concrete to the satisfaction of the public works director. Further, in the past, the ASCC has preferred that the driveway in a situation like this be asphalt from the street to the entry court. Lastly, if any gate is anticipated between the pillars, this should be described to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Lastly, relative to the revised landscape plan, the neighbor to the southwest, i.e., Gary Hanning, has reviewed the plan and advised planning technician Carol Borck that the plan is acceptable to him (see attached email dated 10/26/11). He has, however, encouraged that the screen planting be installed as early for his and his neighbors benefit.

3. *A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.*

Sheets TP-1 and TP-2 provide tree protection and construction staging details. While the plans appear generally acceptable, we are concerned with the vehicle parking and trailer location plans for the area adjacent to Golden Hills Drive. Our primary concern is with any grading that would be necessary given the slopes in the area, particularly to accommodate the construction trailer. In any case, staff will review the plan details with the project contractor prior to issuance of any building permits.

4. *The requirements set forth in the following site development committee communications shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the reviewing committee member prior to issuance of a building permit:*

Public Works Director report of May 16, 2011

Town Geologist report of May 17, 2011

Fire Marshal report of May 10, 2011

Trails Committee report of May 3, 2011

Further, any requirements of the health department shall be adhered to.

These requirements will be addressed to the satisfaction of the various reviewers at the time of building permit processing.

5. *Any changes to the proposed exterior materials and finishes, including any proposed for "value engineering," shall be subject to prior review and approval by a designated ASCC member. If there are concerns that the project, with the changes, would not be in substantial compliance with the ASCC approval, the designated member may refer the changes to the full ASCC for review and action.*

The plans do include changes to the exterior elevations and the manner in which materials would be used. The changes include elimination of the wood timber elements within the areas proposed for stucco siding, and the manner in which windows and chimney elements are to be detailed. Also rafter extensions and eave details appear to be more simplified than what was shown on the approved plans.

In general, it appears that the overall texture and detailing is to be simplified and our primary concern is that the character of the design as appreciated by the ASCC with the project approval has been altered in conflict with the intent of this condition. It is, therefore, essential for the project applicant and design team to review the revised elevations with the ASCC and clarify the changes so that the ASCC is satisfied that the revised plans are, or if found necessary, can be modified to be in substantial compliance with the approved plans. The approved plans will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting as will the "box" of exterior materials approved with the June ASCC action.

Prior to acting on the follow-up submittal ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the November 14, 2011 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor