



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, January 23, 2012
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., 3 Thistle Field session for preliminary consideration of architectural review and site development permit plans for new residential development of a vacant Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development property (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:

2. Roll Call: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch, 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 Consideration, Architectural Review – Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, and Related Yard Improvements, 15 Valencia Court, Kieturakis

5. New Business:

a. Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-635 For New Residential Development – 3 Thistle (Lot 3004 Portola Valley Ranch), Portola Valley Associates

b. Architectural Review for Residential Additions, 60 Golden Oak Drive, Rutherford

6. Annual Election of ASCC Chair and Vice Chair

7. Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2012

8. 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 20, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: January 20, 2012
RE: Agenda for January 23, 2012 ASCC Meeting

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

NOTE: The January 23rd meeting will begin with a special field meeting for preliminary consideration of architectural review and site development permit plans for new residential development of a vacant Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development property. The site meeting will convene at 3 Thistle at 4:00 p.m. and the proposal is discussed below under agenda item **5a. Portola Valley Associates**. The Portola Valley Ranch homeowners association and the site neighbors have been invited to participate in the preliminary review meeting.

4a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, AND RELATED YARD IMPROVEMENTS, 15 VALENCIA COURT, KIETURAKIS

The following report was prepared for the January 9, 2012 ASCC meeting. Unfortunately, due to the lack of a quorum for this application, project consideration had to be continued to the January 23, 2012 meeting. We are anticipating that some plan revisions will be provided that address some of the review comments provided in the following report.

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 non-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 23, 2012 ASCC meeting.

5a. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-635 FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – 3 THISTLE (LOT 3004 PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH), PORTOLA VALLEY ASSOCIATES

This is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for new residential development of a vacant lot in the Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD). The subject parcel is in Ranch subdivision Unit No. 3 and is shown on the attached vicinity map. Thistle is the cul-de-sac immediately south of the Frog Pond open space area and Corte Madera School. The proposed development is by Ranch developer Portola Valley Associates (PVA) and the vacant parcel is still owned by PVA. There is one additional vacant site adjacent to 3 Thistle and this is the parcel immediately to the southeast. This parcel was sold by the developer and is no longer owned by PVA. It has been vacant from some time and the town has received no proposals for development by the new owner.

The project also proposes 115 cubic yards of grading. This volume of earth movement requires the subject site development permit. The ASCC is the approving authority for grading applications that exceed 100 cubic yards but are less than 1,000 cubic yards. The plans have been circulated for site development committee review, but full review comments are not anticipated to be received for ASCC consideration until the February 13, 2012 regular meeting. In any case, since this is a preliminary review of the proposal, ASCC project consideration would normally be continued from the preliminary review meeting to the next regular ASCC meeting.

The following enclosed plans have been submitted in support of the application:

Architectural Plans, Knorr Architecture, 12/21/11:

Sheet A0.1, Site Plan
Sheet A1.1, Floor Plan
Sheet A1.2, Lower Floor
Sheet A1.4, Building Elevations
Sheet A1.5, Building Elevations
Sheet A1.6, Building Sections
Sheet A1.7, Exterior Lighting
Sheet A1.8, Garage, Proposed

Landscape Plans, Galli and Associates, 11/1/11:

Sheet L-1, Approved Mandatory Landscape Plan
Sheet L-2, Approved Optional Landscape Plan
Sheet L-3, Approved Conceptual Landscape Plan (ASCC 6/27/95)

Site Development Permit Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc.,

Sheet C-1, Cover Sheet, 1/10/12
Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, 11/22/11
Sheet C-3, Erosion Control Plan, 11/22/11

Record of Previous ASCC Plan Approvals, Knorr Architecture, 1/2/12:

Sheet A0.2, ASCC Approved Site Plan
Sheet A1.9, ASCC Approved Elevations

In addition to the plans, the applicant has provided the following:

- Colors and materials board received December 22, 2011. This board is discussed below and will be available for consideration at the 1/23 ASCC meeting.
- Completed Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 12/19/11
- Completed Build It Green (BIG), GreenPointRated checklist targeting 173 BIG points for the project.

As noted at the head of this report, the January 23rd preliminary project review will start with a 4:00 p.m. site meeting. Story poles and markings to identify proposed site improvements and tree removal have been installed to facilitate the site meeting. Further, the following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the preliminary project review.

1. **Background and Portola Valley Ranch PUD Framework for project consideration and ASCC action.** Development of parcels in PVR subdivision unit No. 3 are governed by the provisions in Ranch PUD statement approved by the town council through July 11, 1979. The provisions of this statement have been applied to previous plans considered for the parcel as discussed in the attached December 6, 1995 letter from the town to Joseph Whelan, president of PVA and the current application applicant.

Pursuant to the PUD, and as recorded in the 12/6/95 letter to Mr. Whelan, the ASCC in 1991 did approve plans for the subject property making use of the approved building envelope for the parcel and "typical architectural" plans. The approval allowed for two optional house designs, but both were "double flat roof" plans and with a detached flat roof carport. The actions did not include specific

proposals for colors and it was understood that the PUD required mandatory and optional landscape plans would be developed based on the approved conceptual landscape plan.

As explained in the attached 12/6/95 letter, the developer could proceed with construction plans for one of the 1991 approved house options without having to return to the ASCC for design approval. If, however, he elected to pursue a plan different than the previous approval, ASCC review and action would be necessary. In this case, the applicant/developer is seeking a different house plan and also a change in siting for the proposed detached garage. Thus, ASCC architectural review and approval is required.

Also as explained in the 12/6/95 letter, the developer need not take a revised house plan through Ranch Design Committee review and approval as long as PVA remains as the owner of the parcel, and that is the case with this application. Nonetheless, as noted above, not only the site neighbors, but also the Ranch HOA have been sent notices of the project and informed of the scheduled 4:00 p.m., 1/23 site meeting.

The preliminary review process and a site meeting are now normal elements of the ASCC review process for new homes. Further, as required by ASCC policy, story poles and other site identification, e.g., taping, ground markings, etc., are now normal elements associated with site reviews and meetings. Thus, the preliminary review will permit the ASCC neighbors and any other Ranch representatives to become informed on the plans and offer input, as found appropriate, for ASCC consideration in completing architectural review and site development permit actions.

2. **Proposed site plan and conformity to PUD standards, including location of proposed garage in side yard area.** The subject site is located on the south side of the Thistle cul-de-sac and is the second parcel west of the Thistle intersection with Indian Crossing. The attached vicinity map shows the site location and the attached excerpt from the approved PUD building envelope exhibit shows the building envelope and the non-living line. The house must be within the building envelope and not extend across the non-living line. Features such as decks can be located in required yards pursuant to the allowances in the PUD as discussed below. In addition, carports and garages may be located in required yards pursuant to ASCC approval and such approval was granted with the original plans proposed for improvement by the developer.

The site for a long period of time accommodated the developers project sales office and this was a "sales tent." The tent was removed a number of years ago, but a variety of oaks, redwood trees and native shrub were planted during the course of the time of sales tent occupancy. Some of these plantings have matured and provide some new opportunities and constraints that did not exist when the parcel was improved and recorded with subdivision unit No. 3.

Much of the more recently established planting is in the area where the original carport was planned to be located, i.e., north of the house building envelope and just south of Thistle. This includes small oaks, a number of smaller redwood trees and native shrubs. There is also some mounding in the original carport area that

was installed during the sales use of the site and some trees within the building envelope are now present that didn't exist when the subdivision was improved or were only very small at the time.

The approved building envelope is relatively level and can be developed with minimum grading. Further, given the site and cul-de-sac layout, the approved building envelope is where the house must be sited. There will be the need for some removal of trees in the building envelope that have grown over the years, but along the west side of the property, where current views are most sensitive due to proximity to the neighboring residence, there are some larger oaks and shrubs that, with proper protection, should not be impacted by the project. The landscape plans also provide for enhancing the buffer screening along the western property boundary and such enhanced screening is needed to "buffer" views to and from the neighboring west side improvements.

The site plan proposes to remove three of the smaller six redwood trees that were planted with the sales tent use and are located at the proposed house entry. Some smaller oaks and shrubs in this entry area, i.e., along the path proposed from the driveway to the house, will also need to be removed and/or trimmed to accommodate the project. We understand that an arborist report has been prepared and is in the process of being put into form for submittal to the town. This report should be available for consideration at the 1/23 ASCC site and evening meetings.

If the carport were located as originally approved, much of the newer front yard plantings would have to be removed and particularly the redwood trees and likely all of the shrubs and smaller oaks. The current plan for a flat roof, detached garage locates the garage and associated driveway further to the east and at least provides the opportunity for preserving some of the plantings. The site meeting will provide the chance for the design team to fully explain the plans and their intentions as to grading at the entry, plant protection and new screen plantings.

As to the proposed garage location, Section Q.1a)6) of the PUD states that garages or carports and driveways may be located in a side yard if detached from the main building and the ASCC determines such design is not injurious to adjoining properties. The ASCC did make this finding for the original plan and the current siting for the proposed garage is farther to the east, mainly to accommodate for plant growth that has occurred since the original designs were considered and approved.

We believe that with adequate screening, the proposed garage location can also be found acceptable and consistent with PUD provisions as long as the flat roof design is employed. We would also recommend that the service yard area, shown on the optional landscape plan sheet be considered for a different location so that there would be greater opportunity for screening along the side elevation of the garage.

The front of the parcel is also impacted by the existing, paved accessory parking easement (APE). The plans proposed some mounding and additional buffer planting to screen views between the house and APE.

The building site, as noted above, is relatively level. Further, there is considerable private open space easement area south of the site that along with the elevations changes helps to ensure separation from the parcels to the south and considerably lower in elevation to the building site. It should also be noted that the clustering concepts for Portola Valley Ranch allows for close side proximity for the houses along the cul-de-sacs, i.e., lots clustered along the streets, but also provides that houses should have one side open to more distant views and open spaces. Privacy screens and other elements are to be used to achieve buffering and directing of views out instead of to neighbors.

It should also be noted that the building envelopes were established based on a standard of 32 feet of separation between such envelopes on adjoining parcels. The allowances for carports and garages to be located in the setbacks were based on the clustering concepts discussed above. Thus, when found appropriate, distances between buildings on adjoining parcels did not have to meet the 32-foot separation standard and the developer was involved in working out this standard and the setback relief as permitted in the PUD. It is noted, however, that the Ranch design committee has applied it somewhat differently requiring a minimum 32-foot separation irrespective of the PUD wording or approved building envelopes. Since there is no development on the parcel to the east, there is no current issue in terms of Ranch application of the standard. When the parcel is developed, however, the Ranch might limit use of the adjoining building envelope based on its 32-foot separation rule. This rule, however, is not in the PUD and has not been employed in consideration of the original lot developments by the developer.

3. **Conformity with PUD Architectural standards.** The original plans for the site made use of typical house and architectural designs approved for the PUD. These included a flat roof carport and "double flat roof" house.

The proposed architectural style is fully consistent with the typical designs approved for use at the Ranch. Further, the proposed exterior materials and finishes also meet the basic PUD standards and also conform to current town policies relative to light reflectivity value limits. Specifically, the vertical wood siding is to be finished in a dark taupe color with a LRV of under 15%, whereas the town policy limit is 40%. The windows and patio/deck doors are to have bronze metal frames, and are consistent with the design standards for the Ranch. The pitch roof portions of the house would have asphalt shingles, defined as "Weathered Wood." The finish has a LRV of under 20% and well below the policy limit of 40%.

The PUD height limits are significantly higher than current town 28-foot and 34-foot height standards. The PUD includes the limits that existed in 1979 and these essentially permitted a house to have a height of 36 feet above the average point between the highest and lowest points of contact with finished grade. Relative to this standard, the proposed house has a height of 29.5 feet and well below the 36-foot limit. It is also noted that relative to current standards, the proposed house has a maximum height above adjacent grade just at the current 28-foot limit, but most heights are under 21 feet. The maximum height compared to the current 34-foot limit is 31-32 feet.

The above notwithstanding, the original approval for a double flat roof house had heights lower than the current plans. The story poles suggest that the current

proposal, without somewhat higher heights does not create any new visual impact issues, but the ASCC will need to consider this matter and input from the site and evening 1/23 meeting to determine if the roof forms and heights are appropriate as proposed.

Subject to ASCC approval, decks can extend into side and rear setback areas up to 10 feet, but no more than one-third of the required yard. The proposed east side deck adheres to these standards, as does the larger rear elevation deck. The smaller, master bedroom deck, however, extends more than one-third into the setback and will need to be adjusted to meet the one-third maximum limit.

The proposed deck railings and trellis elements are not detailed on the plans. These should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Also, the materials for the flat roof portions of the project should be detailed. Further, while skylights are a typical element of the houses in the Ranch, skylight material should be defined to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

4. **Grading and Landscape plans.** As noted above, the proposed grading is not significant. The majority of the cut and fill will be to level the pad for the footprint of the house, accommodate drainage and provide for north and east side mounds to enhance screen planting opportunities. The changes are in areas that were disturbed for subdivision improvement and initial sales tent installation.

The proposed mandatory landscape plan appears consistent with the concepts approved for the Ranch and would be implemented with project construction. The optional sheets, while required by the Ranch PUD Land Management Plan, would only be implemented if desired by the resident of the property. We have two concerns that should be considered by the ASCC as project review proceeds.

Our first concern is that no new trees are to be planted with the mandatory plan. We suggest that consideration be given to moving the trees shown on the optional plan to the mandatory plan to, in particular, enhance buffer screening between the subject improvements and the residential development on the parcel to the west.

Our second concern has to do with the proposed service yard location shown on the optional plan. We would prefer to see this on the rear side of the garage, within a screen enclosure and on the west side of the existing oak. A path could be extended to the front of the garage to accommodate access to and from the service yard. We believe this would be preferable to encroaching further into the side yard to accommodate the service yard.

5. **Site Development Committee review and input.** To date comments have only been received from the trails committee and fire marshal. By email dated 1/9/12 we have been informed that there are no trails issues with this project. By attached memorandum dated 1/17/12, the fire marshal has provided conditional project approval. Comments have yet to be received from the town geologist, public works director or conservation committee. The site is served by sanitary sewer, thus no comments are anticipated from the health officer.
6. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed locations for exterior lighting are shown on plan Sheet A1.7. The number and location of fixtures appears generally consistent with lighting

standards for houses at the Ranch. We do, however, suggest elimination of either path light at the northwesterly corner of the garage, as the wall-mounted fixture should serve to light the path at this location. We also assume that a fixture would be needed at the rear person door to the garage and this should be shown on the plans.

As to fixture design, the entry wall mounted fixtures apparently direct light both up and down. Town standards discourage up lighting of walls and a fixture with a cap should be considered. Also, the applicant should clarify that the other proposed wall mounted fixture will only direct light downward.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPointRated new home checklist contained on Sheet A13. In this case, the checklist targets the mandatory 173 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached January 5, 2012 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

Following discussion at the January 23rd afternoon and evening ASCC meetings, project consideration should be continued to the regular February 13th ASCC meeting. This will permit time for full processing of the site development permit and also for staff and the applicant to consider and, as necessary, address any issues identified through the preliminary review process.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS, 60 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, RUTHERFORD

This proposal is for architectural review approval of plans for additions to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.2-acre, Alpine Hills subdivision parcel. The parcel is located immediately northwest of the intersection of Golden Oak and Bear Gulch Drives as shown on the attached vicinity map. The proposal is to add approximately 1,721 sf of new, countable living area to be connected to the main house by an upper level bridge. The addition is a two-story design, with an upper level master bedroom and lower level entertainment and guest bedroom spaces. A small two-story addition would be made at the entry to the existing residence for the staircase to the upper level bridge to the main area of the proposed addition.

The project is unusual in that most of the new area is detached from the existing main house, but technically connected to it by the upper level bridge. The resulting total floor area would, therefore, be in one building and this building would exceed the 85% floor area limit for the single largest structure by 651 sf, for a proposed floor area concentration of 97.2%. The applicant is requesting that the ASCC make the necessary findings to permit this concentration of floor area and this request is evaluated latter in this report.

The project can be completed with minimum grading, i.e., less than 50 cubic yards and therefore a site development permit is not needed. In this case, the total estimated earthwork has been calculated at 16 cubic yards and this is all cut that would be removed from the site. In addition, there are no septic system issues as the site is

currently connected to the sanitary sewer and the additions would also be connect to the sewer system.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by CJW Architecture and dated 11/23/11:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet: T-0.2, BIG Checklist
- Sheet 1, Boundary and Topographic Survey, BGT Land Surveying, November 2011
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet: A-1.2, Site Plan – Construction Staging
- Sheet: A-2.1, Proposed Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

In support of the plans, the project architect has installed story poles at the site and provided the attached Story Pole plan dated 1/18/12. Also provided are color photo exhibits showing existing site conditions and a computer generated model of the proposed addition area. Black and white copies of these exhibits are attached and color versions will be available for ASCC consideration at the January 23, 2012 meeting. The exhibits show that the proposed new materials and finishes will match existing conditions and that new light fixtures would also match existing fixtures. These proposals are discussed further below.

Also provided in support of the application is the attached January 11, 2012 email statement from the project architect explaining the project objectives. The statement notes that the added to house will accommodate the multigenerational needs for the family and also has been designed to respect site and area conditions.

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

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The 1.2-acre site is a corner parcel with frontage on both Golden Oak and Bear Gulch Drives. It has gentle to moderate slopes, and extensive oak and grassland cover. Most of the existing site conditions would not change with the project including the driveway access from Golden Oak Drive, which is located at the southwest corner of the parcel.

Original site development created the existing building pad located roughly in the eastern center of the property. The pad runs from southwest to northeast and parallels the original site contours. The building pad accommodates the existing single-story Ranch style residence, a detached garage, the driveway connection to Golden Oak Drive and limited outdoor use areas, including a small lawn. The building pad is at elevation 531-532 and is over 30 feet higher than the elevation at the intersection of Golden Oak and Bear Gulch Drives. There are similar elevation differences along the full Bear Gulch Drive frontage, but the differences decreases as one travels west along Golden Oak Drive from Bear Gulch Drive.

The house pad is over 40 feet lower in elevation than the building site on the parcel to the west and at least 15 feet higher than the building site on the parcel to the

north. These are the two immediately adjacent parcels and the elevation differences along with extensive tree cover help screen views between building sites.

The approach to the design of the additions has been to preserve the existing building site and minimize any additional "pad" grading or impact any significant trees. Further, one of the objectives is to maintain the basic layout of and conditions of the existing residence and only impact the residence with the stair connection to the bridge that would link it to the bulk of the addition.

The proposed addition extends from the existing house entry to the west side hillside. It would be cut into the hillside to accommodate the proposed lower level guest bedroom and media room and the upper level master bedroom. A portion of the lower level, i.e., 502 sf, would be located in the hillside so that it meets the zoning ordinance basement definition, thus allowing the area to be exempted from floor area limits.

The west side addition has been located so as to fit within the existing hillside oaks so that the trees can be preserved. They provide screening and privacy in terms of views to and from the site and are also important relative to the quality and experience of the new spaces, particularly for the upper level master bedroom and the deck features associated with this part of the addition. The project also hopes to preserve some of smaller fruit trees along the west side of the entry walkway as noted on Sheet: A-1.1. These trees along with the entry trellis feature are important to the design and character of the pathway to the front door from the driveway and guest parking areas.

In general, the approach to the design has been to minimize the impacts of the addition on the site and all existing improvements. Further, the addition is relatively close to the center of the parcel, which provides for maximizing distance from adjacent property lines and residences. While the two story elements will result in some potential for visual presence due to added height and apparent massing, this should be mitigated by distance, topographic differences and existing tree cover. At the same time, visual relationships need to be considered by the ASCC in making findings relative to the proposed concentration of floor area and, thus, should be evaluated during the course of site inspections by individual ASCC members.

- 2. Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** The plans propose a total site floor area of 5,325 sf and this is essentially at the 5,327 sf, floor area limit for the property. The total proposed floor area includes the existing house to remain (3,058 sf) the proposed addition area (1,721 sf) and the detached garage (546 sf). It does not include the 547 sf of the lower level addition that qualifies as basement space and is, therefore, exempt from the floor area limit.

The total area in the main, added to house, would be 5,179 SF. This includes the existing residence (3,058 sf) the addition area (1,721 sf) and the required parking area in the detached garage (400 sf). As noted above, this is 97.2% of the total floor area limit and 651 sf over the 85% limit for the single largest structure. The

findings the ASCC needs to consider to permit the floor area concentration are evaluated in the next section of this report.

The addition area would have heights of 24 feet or less relative to adjacent grade and, therefore, would be well under the 28-foot height limit. Further, the maximum height of the house with the additions would be 25 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area is calculated on plan Sheet: T-01 at 5,083 sf. This is well under the 7,945 sf IS limit.

Compliance with required minimum 50-foot front, and 20-foot side and rear yard property line setbacks is described on the site plan sheet. The addition would be no closer than 89 feet to the rear, westerly boundary, and 89 feet to the north side boundary line. It would be over 126 feet from the south side boundary and over 98 feet from the front boundary line common with the Bear Gulch Drive right of way.

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 97.2% of the floor area in the single largest 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.

The is a very unusual project in terms of layout of spaces and how these spaces might be defined under town standards. With the plans as shown for the two-story addition area, there is no internal connection between the upper level master bedroom and the lower level guest bedroom and play area. During our initial plan review, we were concerned that with no internal connection, the lower level might have to be considered a detached guest unit. While this would resolve most of the floor area concentration matter, it would raise issues relative to conformity with town second unit and accessory structure polices. We contacted the project architect and were informed that the intent was to have an elevator located in the closet/storage area that is identified on both the upper and lower floor plans adjacent to the entry halls. The elevator would provide for the needed internal connection and eliminate concerns over a possible "detached" accessory structure.

While the plans do, with the clarifications provided relative to the elevator, result in one building with full internal connections, the design appears to be generally consistent with the basic intent of the 85% limit, which is to not have one building appear out of scale with the site or neighborhood conditions. With this plan, the low profile of the existing single level residence is largely retained and the addition is mostly detached and placed on the upper slope into the site trees. There will be some added height and massing over the existing house entry, but otherwise the addition is cut into the hill and separated from the bulk of the main house. It is also noted that part of the 85% overage is in the detached garage.

While it is possible that the addition could be placed on the level pad area east of the house, if the same spaces were desired it would likely not meet the 85% limit without more basement space and site excavation. Further, such an approach would remove most of the site's existing level, outdoor use space.

It is also possible that the addition could be made as a fully detached structure, i.e., eliminate the bridge connection, but this would not necessarily change the general location and basic design of the addition. The spaces in the detached structure would, however, have to be modified to satisfy the town's accessory structures and second unit polices and these modifications would not serve the actual needs of the family.

Our only concern with the current proposal, relative to the findings, is the potential for some added visual impact associated with the upper area over the planned main house entry staircase. In the elevations and model image, this area seems more visually dramatic than is actually indicated by consideration of the story poles. Further, with color control, as discussed below, we believe our concerns can be fully mitigated. In any case, as mentioned above, the ASCC should carefully consider visual relationships during any site inspection prior to the 1/23 meeting as it considers the request for concentration of floor area.

Based on our review to date, we believe that the project as designed represents a better solution than would be the case for a plan with more basement grading or placing the desired spaces in a fully detached accessory structure. Further, we believe that it is possible to make required finding A.1; and, in light of the proposed design, siting and buffer tree cover, as evaluated above, also the other required findings. This assumes the color adjustments suggested below.

4. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The house additions have been designed to fully match the Ranch style design of the existing low profile house with low roof pitch. The wood siding finish is to be the same dark taupe/green color used on the existing house and the roofing would match the existing medium gray metal shingles. Both the siding and roof colors conform to the 40% light reflectively value (LRV) limits.

The proposal also calls for new windows to match the existing white clad windows and the existing house windows are to be retained with this project. While we don't take issue with the continued use of the white clad windows, even though they don't meet the 50% LRV policy limit, we recommend that the trim boards around the windows and doors and fascia not be painted in the proposed white color matching the window frames. We believe the house would be more in keeping with town design standards if these trim elements were in a color conforming to the 50% LRV limit. This would also help support the proposed findings to concentrate floor area. This matter has specifically discussed with the project architect.

In addition to the above, the materials and finishes for the proposed deck railings should be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

5. **Landscaping, fencing.** No new landscaping or fencing are proposed and our only landscaping concern is to ensure that the trees beyond the addition area are protected from construction impacts. The construction staging plan provides for protection of the oaks and fruit trees immediately adjacent to the addition area, but should be expanded to include protection of the trees in the area of the materials storage shown on the north side of the building pad. We also note that there are some oleanders bordering the driveway and given the scope of the project and findings needed for concentration of floor area, the ASCC may wish to consider

calling for a plan for replacement of these plants as they are specifically discouraged in town under the town's landscape design guidelines.

6. **Exterior lighting.** Sheet: A-1.1 identifies the locations for the proposed exterior lighting associated with this project and the attached photo shows the existing wall mounted fixtures that also represent the design for the proposed new wall mounted fixtures. The scope of proposed lighting does not seem excessive, but the plan is also not complete. It does not include a cut sheet for the proposed pathway fixture and does not show the full scope of existing exterior lighting. Further, the plan legend suggests that some existing spots would be removed, but we are not certain where these are located. Also, there will be the need for some lighting at the upper level exit doors to the deck and deck stairs, but this lighting is not shown on the plans. Thus, a complete exterior lighting plan should be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to release of any building permits for the project.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green Checklist.** The proposed BIG checklist targets 30 points. Given the scope of the application, it qualifies as an elements project and therefore a 25-point threshold needs to be achieved. The proposed checklist is further discussed in the attached January 5, 2012 report 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 January 23, 2012 meeting.

6. Annual Election of ASCC Chair and Vice Chair

Each January the ASCC elects its chair and vice chair for the year and this should be done at the January 23, 2012 meeting. Also, for information, ASCC member Clark was reappointed to the ASCC at the January 11th town council meeting and town resident Megan Koch, 150 Alamos Road, was appointed to fill the ASCC position that became vacant when Jeff Aalfs was elected to the town council. We understand that due to previous scheduling commitments, Ms. Koch will take her ASCC position at the first ASCC meeting in February.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor