



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, January 9, 2012
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: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr
3. Oral Communications:

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

4. Old Business:
 - a. Follow-up Review – Architectural Review & Site Development Permit X9H-616, New Residential Development, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review – Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, and Related Yard Improvements, 15 Valencia Court, Kieturakis *Continued to January 23, 2012 Meeting*
6. Approval of Minutes: December 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: January 6, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: January 5, 2012
RE: Agenda for January 9, 2012 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW & SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-616, NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 300 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, *WHITNEY*

On July 12, 2010 the ASCC conditionally approved the subject architectural review application and recommended planning commission approval of the site development permit application. On July 14, 2010 the planning commission conditionally approved the site development permit request. One of the ASCC approval conditions requires full ASCC consideration and that is related to the proposed construction staging plan. Therefore, the following plans, prepared by Arcanum Architects, Inc., have been provided for ASCC consideration and action:

Sheet A1.1, Site/Roof Plan, F.A.R. Calcs., Const. Staging Plan, 12/01/11
Sheet TPR, Tree Protection and Relocation Plan, 11/29/10

For some background, the minutes from the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting are enclosed as is a copy of the report on the site development permit that was considered by the planning commission. The vicinity map for the project is also attached as is the staff report prepared for the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete review and action on the construction staging plans.

1. **Project status, completion of tree removal and relocation.** Building permit plans for the project are now being processed. The site has been generally maintained and trees cleaned of dead wood and debris and brush removed. Trees #11 and #19 as shown on Sheet TPR have been relocated as shown on the approved site plan. Existing tree #1, a 37-inch incense cedar located to the southeast of the building site, was originally planned to be removed and replaced with new screen trees. This tree provides significant screening relative to views to and from Westridge Drive and the plan has been modified to preserve the cedar. The modified plan was shared with staff and ASCC member Breen and found

acceptable. A second incense cedar, i.e., tree #2, has been removed as proposed on the approved site plan.

The access driveway route into the site has been bladed as shown on the construction staging plan. We assume this was done during the work on tree removal, management, and relocation. It is also noted that work on the new house approved for the parcel immediately to the east, i.e., 121 Ash Lane, is now underway.

2. **Construction staging plan review/approval by Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC).** The WASC reviewed an earlier version of the proposed construction staging plan and issued the attached October 26, 2011 approval e-mail from Committee Chair Rusty Day. The one condition relative to parking noted in the email has been addressed with the “clouded” revision to Construction Staging Plan note 6 on enclosed Sheet A1.1. One of the main reasons for having the construction staging plan come back to the full ASCC for review was to ensure that the WASC would have a formal chance to comment on it.
3. **Specific comments on proposed construction staging and tree protection plans.** While we find the proposed construction staging and tree protection plans generally acceptable, the following comments are offered for ASCC consideration in acting on the plans:
 - a. Early tree planting and additional tree protection fencing. The plans provide for early planting, i.e., after site grading, of three 48” box size oaks along the easterly property line for screening between the subject site and 121 Ash Lane. The specific timing of this planting will need to be set with the project contractor at the staff level preconstruction meeting and the installation completed under the direction of a designated ASCC member. Further, the plans should be modified to clearly provide that construction protection fencing will be placed around the newly planted trees as well as relocated trees 11 and 19. The current plans do not specifically provide for such tree protection fencing for the new and relocated trees.
 - b. On-site Construction parking. Even though the note on Sheet A1.1 was modified as requested by the WASC, there is still a note on sheet TPR that suggests construction parking can take place along one side of the street. This is under “Construction Operation Plan Notes.” The plans need to be modified to clearly identify the on-site locations where construction parking will be contained, and the plans should provide for temporary “no construction parking” signs along Westridge Drive. The plans, Sheet A1.1, do note that the proposed auto court area and temporary access driveway are to accommodate construction storage and parking, but the plans should be modified prior to the preconstruction meeting to specifically identify the areas to be designated for construction parking and the number of vehicles that can be accommodated on site. This will be important to ensure that no spill over parking occurs on Westridge Drive and to also determine if alternatively off site parking arrangements need to be considered.

Prior to any action on this follow-up submittal, the ASCC should consider the above comments and also consider any new data presented at the January 9, 2012 meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, AND RELATED YARD IMPROVEMENTS, 15 VALENCIA COURT, KIETURAKIS

This request is for approval of plans for additions to and remodeling of the existing single level, 3,372 sf residence, including attached garage, on the subject 1.05-acre, Alpine Hills area property. The attached vicinity map shows the project location and provides an overview of site and area conditions. The project includes 603 sf of new living area, yard and fencing improvements and likely substantial efforts to deal with what appears to be longer-term deferred maintenance of the property. In general, however, the proposed changes will not result in any significant increase in the scope of house massing on the property. Further, the project is well within floor area and height limits and no special findings are needed for the proposed floor area increases. A number of plan clarifications are needed, however, as explained below.

The proposal can be accomplished with minimum grading, and the improvements would be located within the area established for original site development. No tree removal is proposed, but it is likely that substantial thinning of overgrown vegetation will be needed to facilitate site access and accommodate appropriate fire/fuel management standards.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Waldemar Kaczmarek and dated 7/15/11:

- Sheet A0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Detailed Site Plan, 6/29/11
- Sheet A3, New Demolition Plan
- Sheet A4, Floor Plan
- Sheet A5, Reflected Ceiling Plan
- Sheet A6, Roof Plan
- Sheet A7, Building Sections, 7/16/11
- Sheet A8, Building Elevations
- Sheet A9, Building Elevations
- Sheet A10, Door & Window Schedule
- Sheet A11, Flooring Plan
- Sheet A12, Lighting Plan
- Sheet A13, Build-It Green, Green Building Checklist

In support of the plans the project architect has provided the attached cut sheet for the proposed Kichler Lighting "Architectural Bronze Scone" wall mounted light fixture. Proposed fixture locations are shown on Sheet A 12. A color sample has also been provided for the proposed exterior wall finish, but a complete colors board is still needed.

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

1. **Project description, site conditions, and grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject 1.05-acre site is located on the northerly side of Valencia Court and roughly 75 to 100 feet easterly of the Valencia Court and Bear Gulch Drive intersection. The established building site on the property is approximately 12-14 feet higher in

elevation than the section of Valencia Court immediately south of the parcel. The building site is also five to seven feet higher in elevation than the building site on the parcel immediately to the west and within the closest visual proximity to the proposed project.

The established building site is on the highest portion of the parcel and on the area that is most easily accessed from Valencia Court. It is relatively level and actually is part of a small local hilltop that also accommodates the building site on the parcel to the west. Both of these sites have been in residential use for some time.

The southerly half of the site accommodates the existing house, driveway and guest parking and related yard improvements and more ornamental landscaping. The northerly part of the parcel has significantly steeper slopes that descend into a local drainage course. The majority of this northerly area is in native oaks and grasses. The area below roughly contour line 530 (refer to attached vicinity map) is also designated Ps and Pd on the town's map of land movement potential. Both of these designations represent unstable slopes. Thus, due to steepness and stability constraints as well as access limitations, the northerly, lower portions of the site are not readily usable for residential improvements and have been left in a more native condition. It is also noted that the plans propose a new retaining wall to support the pool deck on the north side of the pool area. This wall will address some existing problems and help ensure against further distress to the pool patio area. A detail for the wall is presented on Sheet A2.

The subject building site accommodates the existing single story residence, a swimming pool, deck and patio areas and two small-detached side yard storage/accessory structures. The existing residence is of a dated, more modern design and both the house and yard improvements are currently in various stages of disrepair. Further, existing vegetation around the parcel frontage and house and yard improvements has not been regularly managed and is overgrown and appears to need control to be consistent with contemporary fuel management standards. We believe that such vegetation management is intended with this project, but the plans do not currently specify the scope of the work. A detailed vegetation removal and management plan should be provided with the building permit application to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. This plan will be important to fully appreciating the opening of views to and from the property that would result from plan implementation.

The existing driveway access to the property from Valencia Court is to be preserved, but plans indicate a new driveway entry gate and new pavers for the upper portion of the driveway that provides for guest parking and access to the existing garage. The driveway from the street to the existing turnaround "circle" on the site is relatively steep and the proposed gate would be at the top of the steep section of the driveway.

The plans indicate that the driveway width is 20 feet and this is considerably wider than the 12-foot maximum standard called for in town ordinances. A wider driveway is permitted if needed for fire access or safe access to and from the site. In this case the main constraints to site access are sight distance limitations created by existing, overgrown vegetation and the steepness of the lower driveway section. Given the apparent scope of the project, a detailed plan for vegetation clearing to

improve sight distance and for the final driveway improvements should be developed that is closer to the 12-foot width standard. Further, the plans do not detail the driveway entry gate proposal and, if such a gate is to be permitted, details need to be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC. In particular, the plans need to demonstrate that all gate elements are at least 25 feet back from the front parcel boundary and no higher than four feet. The gate design also needs to meet the 50% opacity standard required under the provisions of the town's fencing ordinance.

Much of the current project is to repair, replace or otherwise improve existing structures in their current location. Further, the most significant portion of the proposed 603 sf house addition would be in the existing front entry patio area that is bounded on three sides by the existing house. This area of additions should have minimum if any potential for off site visual impacts and can be accomplished with minimum grading and no impact on any significant vegetation. The entry area addition would include some added height with new parapet walls, but the total height above adjacent grade at these walls would not exceed 16 feet, and these walls would be the highest part of the added to house.

The result of the house additions and remodeling would be to update the existing house architecture into a more contemporary modern design, but not change in general, the character of site development. The main issues we have with the plans have to do with clarifications of details as discussed above and further elaborated upon in comments that follow. In particular, we wonder given the condition of the existing house, if the scope of the project as it proceeds will result in more replacement and rebuilding so that it would be viewed as a new project under both definitions of the town's fire management building code (i.e., Chapter 7a) and mandatory green building ordinance. This will need to be evaluated by the building official as project building permit plans are being considered.

- 2. Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** From the data on the plan sheets, the total proposed site floor area appears to be 3,975 sf and well under the 5,324 sf, floor area limit that would apply to this single story project. The total area includes the existing house (2,922 sf), the attached garage (450 sf) and the proposed house additions (603 sf). There is some inconsistency in the numbers on the plans, but even if we use the larger of the numbers, the project is still well under the floor area limits. Further, the 3,975 sf total does not exceed the 85% single structure floor area limit of 4,525 sf. Thus, the project conforms to town floor area standards and no special findings need to be made relative to floor area.

Not included in the above numbers is the area associated with the two existing detached accessory structures located within the east and west required side yard areas. On the west side of the house immediately west of bedroom 2 (Sheet A1) is a roofed structure with mostly open sides and on the east side is a small storage building immediately east of the east side bedroom 4 deck. Given the scope of the project, these structures should be removed or relocated to locations that do not conflict with setback requirements.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is calculated at 7,369 sf on Sheet A1.1 and stated as 7,070 sf on Sheet A0. In any case, the number includes 3,537 sf of the house floor area and, as this area is under the roof, it does not need to be

included in the IS calculations for the purposes of compliance with the zoning ordinance IS limits. Therefore, by adjusting the 7,389 sf number to deduct the 3,537 sf of house area, the total proposed IS would be 3,832 sf and well under the IS limit of 7,426 sf.

The above analysis notwithstanding, prior to release of building permits, detailed and accurate floor area and impervious surface area calculations should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff clarifying and correcting the inconsistencies in the numbers on the plan sheets.

Existing and proposed house heights do not exceed 16 feet above adjacent grade and are therefore well within the 28-foot height limit. The proposed maximum height from low point of contact with finished grade to the highest roof ridgeline (i.e., the top of the proposed entry parapet wall) is also under 16 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit. Thus, as noted above, the project can be evaluated taking into account the 5% floor area bonus for single story structures.

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 A0 demonstrates compliance with the yard setbacks for the added to house. The proposed existing house and new construction would be no closer than 95 feet to the front property line and over 25 feet from the nearest, west side property line. The distance to the rear boundary is over 160 feet.

Assuming the existing detached side yard structures are removed from non-conforming locations or relocated to conform to setbacks, there would still be a non-conforming condition associated with the existing swimming pool and related pool deck and fencing. The pool and deck partially extend into the west side required 20-foot yard setback area. This extension includes the existing 6-foot high privacy fence on the pool deck. While these are considered legal, non-conforming improvements, the ASCC will need to make a decision on the proposed replacement fencing. More is offered on this matter below under the fencing and landscape section of this report.

3. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** As discussed above the existing house has a modern/contemporary style of architecture that is somewhat dated and the house is suffering from deferred maintenance. The plans would address these problems and upgrade the basic contemporary architectural style. The proposal calls for the remodeled house to have stucco walls with a medium to dark tan color that has a light reflectivity value (LRV) of under 25% and well under the 40% maximum policy limit.

The plans indicate that the fascia is to be wood, but no trim color is identified. We understand that windows would have bronze frames, but door and other trim elements are to have finishes specified by the owner. Also, it is noted that the existing garage door is to be reused for the new project, but finish for the door is not specified and a number of fabric canopies are planned, but not detailed in terms color/finish. In any case, a complete colors and materials board, in conformity with town LVR policies, should be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of any building permits.

The plans also include a number of skylights as noted on plan Sheet A6. Due to the height of the building site relative to the immediate neighbors, the skylights should not be highly visible from off site. There will be some views to the roof from higher residential areas in Alpine Hills to the west, but distance and tree cover should mitigate for potential impacts of light spill. Roof color and materials should, however, be specified for the record to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

4. **Entry gate, fencing, deck guardrails, pool equipment location.** The proposed driveway entry gate was discussed above, and details are needed before any action could be completed for such a gate. It should be understood that any such gate feature is only possible pursuant to ASCC approval under the provisions of the town's zoning ordinance. It is noted that the plans state that the face of the gate would be 25 feet from the front property line, but all gate features including the support posts must also meet the 25-foot setback standard.

The plans largely call for repair or replacement of existing fencing and, except for the entry gate feature, do not propose fencing in new areas. Sheets A0, A1 and A2 describe the fencing plans and plans for some replacement of existing rear yard deck guardrails. Some existing wood fencing and guardrails would be replaced with more transparent features to open views as described on Sheet A1. In addition, a significant area of existing decking and railings is to be repaired and cleaned for continued use.

The plans for the existing six-foot high west side wood pool privacy fence are somewhat inconsistent and unclear due to what appear to be typographical errors in plan notes. We assume that the current six-foot fence that is overgrown with ivy is to be replaced, except for the northerly area that is to include a deck extension and more transparent guardrail, i.e., over the proposed retaining wall. Plan sheet A1 states that the "existing redwood face is to remain." We assume this refers to the fence. On Sheet A2 the note referring to the same location states, "replace existing 6' redwood face with new 6' redwood fence." We assume this means that the six-foot fence is to be replaced with a new fence.

In any case, if the privacy fence is to be replaced and the vegetation on it removed, there would likely be some potential for increased visual impact for the rear yard area on the parcel to the west. The ASCC may wish to require for some additional screen planting along the west side of the replacement fencing and this should be considered during any visit to the project site.

Currently, the pool equipment is below the northwest corner of the pool deck, i.e., immediately west of the proposed northerly deck extension shown on Sheet A2, and in the area of the proposed new retaining wall. A small shed contains the equipment. With the proposed wall work and other changes, the existing equipment area could be impacted. The plans for the pool equipment should be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

5. **Landscaping.** Sheet A0 includes a number of landscape protection notes including provisions for tree protection. A detailed tree protection plan should be provided with the building permit plans and this should include a clear description of the scope of vegetation clearing proposed with the project. Our main concern is that the scope of clearing and even house demolition might increase as detailed house

and site conditions are completely evaluated and building permit plans prepared. While this is not necessarily a problem overall, we just want to ensure that the plans are realistic and that the scope of the project does not significantly increase without full appreciation by all involved including town officials and neighbors. Further, if the scope of vegetation removal is greater than implied by the plans, the ASCC may conclude there is a need for some new screen landscaping.

In addition to the above, it is noted that plans appear to call for the protection of existing oleanders on the northeast side of the rear deck area. Oleanders are discouraged in town and the applicant is encouraged to remove these and other invasive and none native plants with this project.

6. **Exterior Lighting.** The locations for proposed exterior lights are shown on Sheet A12 and the cut sheet for the proposed wall sconce fixture is attached. The scope of lighting shown on the plan sheet is minimal, but does include front and rear entry pendant lights that have not been detailed with a fixture cut sheet. Further, the plans need to note that all existing wall mounted spotlights would be removed. Further, we assume that there will be some yard and pool lighting and such lighting needs to be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated new home checklist contained on Sheet A13. In this case, the checklist targets 36 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached December 5, 2011 report from planning technician Carol Borck. As presented, the proposal is considered an Elements project with a target BIG threshold of 25 points. We, however, have some concern as evaluated above, that the scope of the project would require work on most house walls. This could trigger a conclusion on the part of the building official that, by ordinance definition, the proposal is a "new" project. If such a conclusion were reached, a significantly higher BIG point total would be mandated. It is recommended that the applicant discuss this matter in detail with the building official as soon as possible.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments as well as any new information developed at the regular evening January 9, 2012 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor