



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)  
Monday, December 12, 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 Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, 205 Cervantes Road, Kodukula
5. New Business:
  - a. Architectural Review for House Additions, Remodeling and New Detached Garage with Guest Unit, 30 Antonio Court, Murray
6. Approval of Minutes: November 28, 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: December 9, 2011

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning Technician

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
**DATE:** December 8, 2011  
**RE:** Agenda for December 12, 2011 ASCC Meeting

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

**4a. CONTINUED REVIEW, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT,  
205 CERVANTES ROAD, KODUKULA**

---

On November 28, 2011 the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this request for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.4-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. The review included an afternoon site meeting that was also attended by neighbors of the property. The ASCC tentatively concluded that the plans and materials presented with the subject application were appropriate as presented and clarified at the November 28<sup>th</sup> site and evening sessions. The November 23, 2011 staff report prepared for the 11/28 meeting is attached and the draft meeting minutes are enclosed. The project plans and materials listed in the 11/23 staff report remain the project that is before the ASCC for action. The listed plans are enclosed.

Since the 11/28 meeting no new issues have been identified and no new correspondence has been received on the project. It is noted, however, that due to the applicants' desire to achieve a new house on the site as soon as possible, a demolition permit was requested and issued and, shortly after the 11/28 meeting, the "existing" house was removed. The applicants intend to proceed with processing of building permit plans as soon as ASCC action, which they hope will take place at the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, is effective. The effective date is 15 days after the action is taken.

Most of the story poles were removed with the demolition work. The project architect has advised that if necessary, and requested by the ASCC, they could be reinstalled prior to the effective date of any ASCC action. It is also noted that should final grading plans call for earthwork in excess of 100 cubic yards, additional ASCC review of the required site development permit would be necessary.

Prior to taking final action on this request, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the December 12<sup>th</sup> regular ASCC meeting.

**5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS, REMODELING AND NEW DETACHED GARAGE WITH GUEST UNIT, 30 ANTONIO COURT, MURRAY**

---

This proposal is for architectural review approval of plans for additions to and remodeling of the existing single story residence on the subject 1.1-acre, Antonio Court parcel. The project would convert the existing attached garage to living space and provide required parking in a new, detached garage. The proposed single story detached garage would include a 435 sf guest unit and the total area of the detached structure is proposed at 995 sf.

The parcel is located immediately northwest of the Antonio Court cul-de-sac bulb as shown on the attached vicinity map. The property is northwest of the Lacerte/Chung residential redevelopment project recently completed pursuant to plans approved by the ASCC. Between the subject site and the Lacerte/Chung parcel there is an access drive to Lot 1 of the Priory subdivision. The drive is within an easement that extends over portions of both the subject and neighboring property and the easement is for the benefit of Lot 1 now owned by Robert Larson. The ASCC also approved plans for development of the Larson parcel, but construction of the project has yet to proceed.

The project includes demolition of a portion of the existing house and interior and exterior remodeling of the residence. Also proposed are driveway improvements to serve the new garage location. The driveway changes not only accommodate the new garage, but also include a turning circle to facilitate ease of ingress and egress for the property.

The proposal would result in concentrating 87% of the permitted floor area in the added to residence, at total area of 4,550 sf. This, by zoning definition, includes 400 sf of the detached garage. Thus, the ASCC would need to make findings to support the proposal to exceed the 85% single structure floor area limit. In this case, the 4,442 sf limit would be exceeded by 108 sf. The necessary findings for floor area concentration are reviewed later in this report.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Mark Percy Architecture and dated 11/28/11:

Sheet A1, Site Plan (with planting notes)  
Sheet 1, Topographic Survey Plan, MacCleod and Associates, 10/28/11  
Sheet A2, Floor Plan (house and garage)  
Sheet A3, Existing Floor Plan (for reference) & Roof Plan  
Sheet A4, Exterior Elevations (house), 2/3/11  
Sheet A5, Exterior Elevations (garage), 2/3/11

The following materials have been submitted in support of the plans:

- Story Pole Layout Sheet. This attached sheet explains the locations and heights of the story poles placed at the site to model the proposed house additions and detached accessory structure.

- Light fixture cut sheets. Attached sheets A-F, received 11/28/11, provide the fixture details for the lights located on plan Sheet A2.
- Exterior colors and materials board, received 11/28/11. The board will be presented at the ASCC meeting and is discussed below.
- Build It Green project checklist, dated 11/28/11 (attached), targeting a total of 70 points for this proposal. This is 20 points over the minimum required by the town's BIG program for this project, which is considered under the "Whole house" category.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC review and act on this architectural review request:

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** As noted above, the subject 1.1-acre site is located at the northwesterly end of the Antonio Court cul-de-sac bulb. The existing residence is located on a relatively level pad in the center of the parcel. The existing driveway extends in roughly a straight alignment, through a front yard gate, from the cul-de-sac bulb to the house with a gradual ascent of 8-9 feet in elevation. The existing house is set back over 120 feet from the front, cul-de-sac property line. With the project, this setback would not be decreased and, with the proposed demolition, would likely increase somewhat.

The project would not change the driveway access or front yard gate and fence. The driveway would, however, be extended on the south side to provide access to the new garage and a turning circle around a large oak to enhance ingress and egress to the site. The driveway extension would accommodate added guest parking and all driveway improvements would be with asphalt surface to match the existing driveway.

Only minimum earthwork is needed to accommodate the proposed driveway improvements. Some trimming of the oak in the new driveway circle appears necessary and should be accomplished under the direction of a qualified arborist.

The proposed house additions and remodeling include removal of some floor area at the south side of the house, i.e., at the existing garage entry. Most of the house addition area is also at the south end, with a smaller master bedroom addition at the northwesterly house corner. These additions should not in any significant way change the scope or scale of the house as viewed from off site, as existing tree cover around the parcel provides screening and would not be impacted by the project. Further, minimum grading is needed for the additions due to the relatively level nature of the building site. Some ornamental plants would be removed, including one front elevation Japanese Maple.

The proposed detached garage with guest unit is located south of the main house and aligned parallel to the access easement discussed above. The siting of the proposed structure takes into account the required 20-foot setback from the access easement line and also preserves the screening trees along the southerly and westerly boundaries. An interior fence would be removed to accommodate the garage/guest unit and no new replacement or new fencing is proposed with the project.

The ground slope in the area of the garage/guest unit has some gentle slope to it. The plans propose to accommodate the slope with the design of the structure and foundation, rather than grading a pad for the foundation. Four existing fruit trees would be removed to accommodate the new building.

For the most part, existing site and perimeter landscaping would remain and is effective in providing screening in terms of views, both from and to the site. The rear parcel area has significant planting along the boundary that screens views to the building site on the parcel to the west, but has been controlled to preserve views to Windy Hill. A small vineyard is located on the westerly side of the house on a gentle, 12-13% slope that descends from the building site to the rear parcel boundary. The change in elevation is approximately 9 feet and the added to house would be no closer than 50 feet to the rear parcel line.

Overall, the project should have minimum potential for any significant impacts relative to on or off site views. Further, the proposal can be accomplished with minimum grading or impacts on significant trees.

2. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** The plans propose a total site floor area of 5,145 sf and this is just within the 5,226 sf, floor area limit that applies to this property. The total proposed floor area includes the added to house (4,150 sf) and detached garage/guest unit (995 sf). As noted above, the floor area in the single largest structure, by zoning definition, includes the added to house and 400 sf of the detached garage, for a total area of 4,442 sf and 108 sf over the 85% limit. The proposal is over 87% of the floor area to be concentrated in the largest structure. The findings to allow the 85% limit are discussed in the next section of this report.

The proposed guest/second unit that would be attached to the garage would have a total area of 435 sf and this is well under the 750 sf limit for second units. The design and relationships to the other spaces appear to be fully consistent with the town's second unit zoning provisions and accessory structure policy statement. Copies of these zoning provisions and policies are attached for reference. Further, with this design, and due to the garage space being needed to meet covered parking standards, we concluded that modification of the detached space to create a second unit larger than 750 sf is of minimum risk and do not see the need for a deed restriction in this case.

Most of the addition area would have heights of 21 feet or less and would be well under the 28-foot limit for heights above adjacent grade. Further, the maximum height of the house with the additions would be just over 22 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit. The maximum height of the garage/guest unit structure is just below 19 feet, and it complies with both the 18-foot and 24 foot height limits for guest units. In this case, since the guest unit is attached to the garage, the normal 28 and 34-foot height limits could also apply.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area totals 5,900 sf and this is well below the 7,740 sf limit.

Compliance with required minimum 50-foot front and 20-foot rear and side yard setbacks is demonstrated on the site plan sheet. The house additions would be no closer than 130 feet to the front property line, 50 feet to the rear property line and 40 feet to a side property line. The detached accessory structure would be no closer than 24 feet to the access easement line, 30 feet to the rear boundary and 114 feet to the front parcel line.

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 87% of the floor area in the single largest building, in this case the main house with 400 sf in the detached garage, 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. We believe that the plan as proposed is a superior design (finding A.1.), as it provides for the scale and mass of the main house to actually be less than if the garage were attached to it. Further, the design results in adding a second unit to the parcel, with minimum site disturbance, and this helps meet the objectives of the town's housing element.

As proposed, with the single story forms, the project would not impact significant views from neighboring parcels, and the improvements would be in keeping with the character and quality of the neighborhood. Thus, we do believe the necessary findings can be made for the small increase over the 85% limit.

4. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The house additions have been designed to fully match the contemporary Ranch style design of the existing single story house. And, as called for under second unit policies and standards, the detached accessory structure incorporates the same design character as the house.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include replacing the existing wood shingle siding with cement plaster and some new wood siding elements, and changing the white trim elements to finishes consistent with town policies relative to Light reflectivity values (LRV). The proposed finishes and materials are:

Cement plaster siding:	Medium dark sand color with a LRV of 31.5%
Stained wood siding, trellis elements and garage doors:	Medium dark tan, with a LRV of 26%
Composition shingle Roofing:	Dark rust tones with a LRV of 10-15%
Trim:	Dark brown with a LRV of 18-20%
Window cladding:	Very dark brown with a LRV of under 6%
Window flashing:	Same as cladding or, as an alternative, Copper
Chimney:	Plaster to match siding or stone cladding

Overall the design and color scheme appear consistent with other houses in the neighbor and with town design guidelines and policies.

5. **Landscaping, fencing.** The main aspect of the landscape plan is to preserve existing conditions. A detailed vegetation protection and construction staging plan should be provided with the building permit plans to the satisfaction of planning

staff. The only new plantings would be close to the house and the proposals shown on the site plan appear fully consistent with town guidelines and standards.

No new fencing is proposed. As noted above, however, an interior fence in the area of the proposed detached garage/guest unit would be removed and not replaced.

6. **Exterior lighting.** Plan Sheet A2 identifies proposed exterior lighting by fixture type and location. Cut sheets for the lights, i.e., A-F, are attached. While the general approach to lighting does not appear excessive, we offer the following comments for discussion with the applicant and design team at the ASCC meeting:
  - a. Given the notes on the cuts sheets, the applicant should verify that fixture D has a solid top and would direct light down only. Further, it should be clarified that fixture C will only be mounted to direct light down.
  - b. Typically the ASCC encourages the use of only one light on the entry elevation to a garage. In this case, two D fixtures are proposed. The ASCC should determine if any reduction in fixture number should be considered.
  - c. The F fixture is to be in the trellis elements on the rear elevation of the house. Mounting of the fixture should be within the trellis to ensure it can't be easily adjusted to direct light out from the house. Further, we wonder if both C and F fixtures (total of five fixtures) are needed for lighting of the terrace off of the family room.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green Checklist.** As noted above, the proposed BIG checklist targets 70 points. Given the scope of this project, it qualifies as a "whole house" design and therefore a 50-point threshold needs to be achieved. This also will need to be verified through the building permit and construction processes by a certified greenpoint rater. Further evaluation of the BIG checklist is provided in the attached November 30, 2011 memorandum 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 December 12, 2011 meeting.

TCV

encl.  
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison  
Planning Manager  
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison  
Applicants

Mayor