



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, February 13, 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, 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 and Site Development Permit X9H-635 For New Residential Development – 3 Thistle (Lot 3004 Portola Valley Ranch), Portola Valley Associates
 - b. Request For Modifications to Previous Approval, Mailbox Addition and Color Change – Additions and Remodeling, Addition of Attached Garage and Other Site Improvements, “Lauriston” – “Willowbrook Farm,” Superintendent’s House and Office, 451 Portola Road, Naify
5. New Business:
 - a. Fence Permit and Request For Relief From Fence Ordinance Standards, 178 Corte Madera Road, Richards
 - b. Architectural Review for Residential Additions, 55 Golden Oak Drive, Rizvi
6. Other Business:
7. Approval of Minutes: January 23, 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: February 10, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: February 8, 2012
RE: Agenda for February 13, 2012 ASCC Meeting

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

4a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-635 FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – 3 THISTLE (LOT 3004 PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH), *PORTOLA VALLEY ASSOCIATES*

On January 23, 2012 the ASCC conducted 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 preliminary review included an afternoon site meeting and continued discussion of the project at the regular evening meeting. A number of letters from neighbors were considered at the January 23rd meeting and many of these neighbors were present at the site and evening sessions. For background, the January 20, 2012 staff report prepared for the 1/23 meeting is attached and the draft meeting minutes are enclosed. Also attached are the neighbor letters considered at the January 23rd meeting (listed in the meeting minutes), and one new letter dated January 24, 2012 from Mr. Christopher Berg, 4 Thistle.

In response to the comments from ASCC members, neighbors and in the January 20, 2012 staff report, the applicants have made some changes to the project that are reflected on the two enclosed revised plan sheets listed below. Other plans sheets and project materials not impacted by the revisions, i.e., as listed in the record of the 1/23 meeting, remain part of the application.

Architectural Plans, Knorr Architecture:
Sheet A0.1, Site Plan, rev. 2/6/12
Sheet A1.4, Building Elevations, rev. 2/6/12

Since ASCC members Clark and Koch were unable to attend the formal 1/23 ASCC site meeting, the applicants, project architect and town planner met with them at the site on the afternoon of February 7th to review the information provided to other ASCC members and to also advise them of the plan revisions.

The following comments discuss how the revised plans address the issues discussed during the January 23, 2012 preliminary review process.

1. **Plan revisions and response to input.** A number of comments raised by neighbors and in the staff report were responded to at the 1/23 site meeting and in the discussion at the evening 1/23 ASCC session. In particular, the applicant advised that the house color and finishes as presented on the materials board were still desired and ASCC members appeared to concur that the proposed colors and materials were acceptable. Also, the applicant advised that the rear deck extension would be corrected to address the setback issue noted in the staff report. The revised plans do resolve this matter as highlighted in yellow on plan Sheet A0.1.

While the applicants argued that the proposed "typical architectural plan" as presented was still desired, they agreed to consider changes to the height and also removal of all redwood trees to open views over the property to the western hillsides. As highlighted in yellow on the revised plan sheets, the height of the house has been lowered by one foot, and this includes the proposed gable ridgelines. Further, all of the redwood trees are now to be removed. In addition, as offered at the 1/23 meeting, the siting of the proposed flat roofed garage has been adjusted to be closer to the house, further from the street and further from the east side property line.

The height changes, removal of redwood trees and adjustment to garage siting open views over the site to the western hillside and also expand the view corridor along the east site of the site. These changes appear to address the most significant issues raised at the preliminary review meeting consistent with ASCC directions.

2. **Thirty two (32) foot PUD standard for "setback" between residences.** This was a matter of concern to Mr. Rex Brooks, owner of the parcel immediately to the east. He and the applicant were encouraged to check with the Ranch design committee relative to the Ranch design guidelines application of the 32-foot standard. As noted in the staff report and meeting minutes, the plans meet the town's PUD provisions, but there was concern that they might not meet the current Ranch guidelines.

After the meeting, we received a call from Mr. Brooks expressing further concerns on the matter and then we made contact with Bill Maston, architectural consultant to the Ranch design committee. Mr. Maston advised that the design committee guidelines call for a minimum of 32 feet between residences, and that this is not a separation that would impact the location of a garage or carport. Thus, the proposed plans with the 32-foot separation between building envelopes left free of any residence, would meet the test of the Ranch guidelines and Mr. Brooks would have his full building envelope to work with. We have informed both Mr. Brooks and the project architect of our discussion with Mr. Maston. We also understand that, at Mr. Brooks' request, Mr. Maston will be providing him a formal communication on the matter consistent with the understandings set forth above.

3. **Landscape plan.** In our original staff report, we advised that the proposed landscape plan should be modified to include some additional tree planting, particularly along the western boundary common with 5 Thistle. We believe this is

still needed. Also, the plans for the front yard area should be reconsidered with the removal of the redwood trees and garage relocation. A revised landscape plan should be prepared to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member as a condition of any action to approve the project. Further, as discussed at the 1/23 site meeting and again at the 2/7 session with ASCC members Clark and Koch, the revised landscape plan should include some additional front yard area mounding immediately south and southwest of the APE to enhance the feeling of separation and screening from the street for both the subject site and 5 Thistle.

4. **Site Development Committee review and input.** Site development permit committee comments have only been received as follows:

Trails Committee. By email dated 1/9/12 we have been informed that there are no trails issues with this project.

Fire Marshal. 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.

Public Works Director. By attached memorandum dated 1/24/12, the Public Works Director has provided conditional project approval.

Town Geologist. By attached memorandum dated 1/27/12, the Town Geologist has provided conditional project approval.

Conservation Committee. By email dated 1/27/12, Paul Heiple, on behalf of the conservation committee has offered that there are no objections to the proposed tree removal.

The site is served by sanitary sewer, thus no comments are anticipated from the health officer. In any case, an action to approve the project should include the requirement that the conditions set forth in the communications from the fire marshal, town engineer, and town geologist be addressed to the satisfaction of the specific site development permit committee member.

5. **Exterior lighting.** As a condition of any action on the project, the proposed exterior lighting plan should be revised to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member to address the comments in our attached January 20, 2012 staff report.

Prior to completing action on these applications ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information provided at the February 13th meeting.

4b. REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL, MAILBOX ADDITION AND COLOR CHANGE -- ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, ADDITION OF ATTACHED GARAGE AND OTHER SITE IMPROVEMENTS, "LAURISTON"- "WILLOWBROOK FARM," SUPERINTENDENT'S HOUSE AND OFFICE, 451 PORTOLA ROAD, NAIFY

On November 28, 2011, the ASCC completed conditional approval of this project for additions to and remodeling of the historic structures on the subject site. The staff report prepared for the November 28th meeting and meeting minutes relative to this project are attached. At this point the applicant is requesting approval of a color change for the exterior shingles and addition of a pillar mailbox on the Portola Road frontage of the property. Each of these matters is discussed below.

1. **Project status.** Building permit plans are now being processed for the improvements conditionally approved at the November 28, 2011 meeting. Some demolition work has started and the town's building official has been in contact with the applicant to ensure work does not proceed in any manner inconsistent with building permit processing standards and requirements. A plan for modification of the existing improvements on the Portola Road site of the property (i.e., pursuant to 11/28 approval condition 4) has yet to be developed. We are somewhat concerned that the "proposed" mailbox is not being considered in the context of a specific plan for the agreed to changes. In any case, for the reasons explained below, the ASCC should react to the mailbox proposal, as the reactions and any action would feed into the final plan for the Portola Road side of the property.
2. **Proposed change to shingle color.** The enclosed proposed shingle color sample, received January 30, 2012, is a medium gray blue color that would be consistent with the historic character of the existing shingles and also in harmony with the stone siding. A "true" color sample along with the approved colors board is to be available for ASCC consideration at the February 13th meeting.
3. **Proposed mailbox addition.** The "proposed" mailbox design and location are shown on the enclosed "Landscape Plan," received by the town on January 30, 2012. The proposed mailbox is a four feet high stone pillar feature with the stone matching that used on the site's historic structures. The "proposed" mailbox has already been installed at the site, generally but not exactly as shown on the plan.

Section 18.42.016.B. of the zoning ordinance provides that free standing mailboxes be on private property and specifies that they be of a "U.S. Government approved type." This section also states the specific standards for the support of the mailbox, but allows for alternative mailbox designs if approved by the ASCC.

Our first concern with this proposal is that the mailbox as constructed, does not match the location shown on the site plan and may actually extend, at least partially into the Portola Road right of way. We have asked the applicant to check the location and, if necessary, provide a survey that ensures it is on private property.

Alternatively, if the ASCC concludes that the mailbox pillar design is acceptable, we believe the location should be much closer to the main house entry path, i.e., more like is suggested by the proposed site plan. Portola Road is a scenic corridor as noted in the general plan and we would prefer that any such mailbox be further in on the property with more distance from the street and pathway. We could support the stone pillar design since the material is consistent with the historic structures, but it should be next to the entry pathway with some landscaping to integrate it with the historic house entry.

In any case, the ASCC should react to the design and offer any recommendations for adjustments or changes. These could be conditions of approval, but final mailbox location should be out of the right of way and also integrated with the final plan for Portola Road driveway changes as committed to in the 11/28/11 approval conditions.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments, visit the project site and also consider any new input provided at the February 13th meeting.

5a. FENCE PERMIT AND REQUEST FOR RELIEF FROM FENCE ORDINANCE STANDARDS, 178 CORTE MADERA ROAD, RICHARDS

This request is for ASCC approval of a fence permit that also seeks relief from the front yard fence standards due to the somewhat unusual conditions associated with the subject 1.0-acre property. The property, situated in a one-acre minimum parcel area zoning district, gains its street access to Corte Madera Road by way of a panhandle driveway easement that is on and also serves the neighboring property to the north. The easement extends east through the smaller parcel zoning district, i.e., 15,000 sf minimum parcel area, and the fence standards are different for each district based on parcel size. The site is shown on the attached vicinity map, assessors parcel map and zoning map excerpt. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC review this request.

1. **Proposed Fencing.** The proposed new fencing is shown on the enclosed “Deer Fence Plan” dated 1/12/12, prepared by J. John Richards, Architect, and Mr. Richards is also the applicant. The plan calls for installation of new six-foot high, mostly post and wire fence within the required 50-foot front yard setback area on the property. By zoning ordinance definition, this front yard setback area is located on the east side of the parcel along the boundary common with the rear parcel lines of the 15, 000 sf parcels (plus or minus) that actually front on Corte Madera Road and that are in the smaller zoning district. For the subject site, the “front” parcel line is the boundary most parallel with Corte Madera Road, i.e., the street from which the parcel gains vehicular access.

Along the rear boundary of the smaller, east side parcels, the fence ordinance permits property line fencing up to six feet in height. As shown on the enclosed plan, there is a six-foot high solid board and post and wire fencing along the rear parcel lines of these neighboring east side parcels.

The applicant seeks to enclose a small garden between his house and the east side parcel boundary by extending mostly six-foot high post and wire fencing from the existing house and other yard improvements to the existing east side property line fencing. A small solid board, six-foot high fence section is also planned immediately east of the applicant’s house across an existing pathway. This solid board fencing is also within the front setback area. With the project, other existing wire garden fencing would be removed, but this fencing is not within the setback area.

From a practical standpoint, the area where the fencing is proposed functions more as an interior side yard than a front yard. It has no street frontage and has been used for side yard type of activities including vegetable garden beds. Further, it is not highly visible from the neighboring parcels and is not visible from the Corte Madera Street corridor.

Under fence ordinance provisions, front yard fencing in the one acre zoning district must be setback at least 25 feet from the front parcel line, have a maximum height of four feet and also meet the 50% opacity standard. Most of the fencing proposed meets the opacity standard, but would extend to the front boundary line, i.e., the line common with the rear boundary of the parcels that front on Corte Madera Road and have a height of six feet.

2. **ASCC authority to grant relief from fence ordinance standards.** Pursuant to Section 18.43.080.C.3. of the zoning ordinance fence provisions, the ASCC is authorized to grant relief from the fence ordinance standards taking into account parcel conditions. The ASCC must, however, determine that “as reasonably possible,” the proposed fence achieves the purpose and principles of the fence ordinance (copy attached).
3. **Evaluation of request.** The front yard standards were, in part, established for the purpose of keeping road corridors as open as possible. In this case, the request is for fencing in a yard area that has no street frontage and will, therefore, have no impact on the openness of a street corridor.

The proposed deer fencing is to enclose a smaller garden area on the property and this area is already partially bounded by six-foot high fencing allowed along the property boundary on the east side of the site. The area is between the applicant's residence and the parcel line. No new parcel line fencing is proposed and the majority of the property will remain in an open condition.

The proposed fencing is mostly open, i.e., post and wire, and, due to topographic and tree conditions, would not impact any distant views from neighboring parcels. Further, the oak grassland condition of the majority of the parcel would not be visually impacted by the proposed fencing. The fencing should blend with the site and area conditions and should have minimum if any potential for impacting wildlife movement through the area. It would, however, likely have some impact on limiting wildlife access to the applicant's garden. In any case, we believe that given the conditions of the site, particularly no street frontage, and limited scope of the proposed fencing, the ASCC could find it consistent with the purposes and intent of the fence ordinance.

Prior to acting on this request ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information that is presented at the February 13th ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS, 55 GOLDEN OAK DRIVE, RIZVI

This proposal is for architectural review approval of plans for additions to the existing single story residence on the subject 1.1-acre, Alpine Hills subdivision parcel. The parcel is located immediately southwest of the intersection of Golden Oak and Bear Gulch Drives as shown on the attached vicinity map. The proposal is to add approximately 771 sf of living area to the ground level of the existing house. The new spaces would be largely additions to the master bedroom at the southwest corner of the

residence. Also planned is a basement under the proposed main level additions that would include a media room, bathroom and storage.

Only minimum grading is needed for the project, and the earth to be excavated for the basement will be off-hauled from the site. The proposed floor area in the house does not exceed the 85% limit for the single largest structure and, therefore, no special findings are needed relative to floor area.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by CJW Architecture and dated 11/1/11:

- Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet: T-0.3, Build It Green Checklist
- Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plans
- Sheet: A-2.2, Lower Level Plan and Roof Plan
- Sheet: A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

Submitted in support of the plans are the three attached cut sheets for the proposed wall mounted light (Sheet A), pathway light (Sheet B) and rear porch pendant light (Sheet C). Proposed light locations are shown on the enclosed site plan. Also provided is a colors and materials board prepared by the project architect dated 1/20/12. The proposed colors and materials and lighting are discussed further in later sections of this report.

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

1. **Background, Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** On February 28, 2011, the ASCC approved plans for this property and applicant for the addition of a guest house, swimming pool sports court and related rear yard accessory uses and improvements. In September, the planning commission found that the specific sports court surface was a pervious material and, thus the sports court does not count against the impervious surface limit for the property. The plans approved last February are now being implemented. The rear yard grading is complete, and work on the guest house, pool and other features is well underway. Also, approved perimeter fencing has been installed as allowed for on the approved plans.

The staff report prepared for the 2/28/11 ASCC meeting and meeting minutes are attached for reference. The staff report describes the site and scope of then existing and proposed improvements. As noted in the February 24, 2011 staff report, no changes to the main house were then proposed, but it was noted that the existing house was on a pad graded for original site development. The current proposed house additions would, as noted above, take place at the southwest corner of the existing single story house and would be within the pad area created for original house development.

The current plan calls for the additions to the master bedroom area of the house and would extend the house toward the guest house currently under construction. The intent is to maintain the single story profile, but also make use of more

contemporary building and roof forms similar to those approved by the ASCC for use on the guest house. The planned architecture is to link the main house with the guest house, transitioning from the original Ranch style to a more contemporary form, while preserving the overall single story character of structural massing on the property. Some more contemporary roof forms are also planned over the existing living room area to be remodeled as shown on the project floor plans and elevations.

Except for the basement excavation, the proposal requires minimal grading and, as a result, would have minimum potential for impacting site contours. Further, the only tree close to the proposed bedroom addition is a 12" Mulberry that would be preserved. It is also noted that construction staging has been established on the site with the 2011 project and would be maintained to complete the overall work with the current project. In any case, how the current proposal relates to the ongoing construction can be readily appreciated with a site visit and story poles are being installed to facilitate ASCC and neighbor consideration of this proposal.

When the 2011 project was being considered, we explained in the staff report that the site was potentially constrained by the existence of an earthquake fault shown on the town geologic and movement potential maps. A fault investigation was conducted and approved by the town geologist. This investigation identified the fault on the southerly side of the site and it was concluded that new living spaces should be setback at least 30 feet from the mapped fault trace. The guest house just meets this setback, and the proposed house additions would be at least 78 feet from the fault trace.

Also, when the 2011 plans were approved, we had raised a concern with the maximum height of the guest house exceeding the single story height limit. The plans were adjusted and clarified to ensure compliance with the limit to reserve the floor area needed for the currently proposed single story addition.

In any case, we conclude that the proposed house additions represent a minimal change to existing site conditions and appear well developed considering the site and neighborhood.

2. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** With the house addition, the total site floor area would be 5,541 sf and this is at the floor area limit for the property. The total, countable floor area in the added to house would be 4,684 sf and this is under the 85% limit of 4,709 sf. In this case, 84.5% of the permitted floor area would be in the main house, and single largest structure on the property.

The addition area would have maximum heights of 16 feet and, therefore, would be well under the 18-foot and 24-foot single story height limit, which allows for capturing 5% additional floor area. Further, the new roof form over the living room would have a maximum height of less than 15 feet and also conforms to the single story height limit.

The data on plan Sheet: T-0.1 calculates the proposed impervious surface (IS) area and the total is shown as 7, 810 sf and just within the 7,844 sf limit. As noted in the

IS table, the total IS excludes the sports court surface as permitted by the September 2011 planning commission findings.

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 only comes close to a building setback line on the west side and on that side is no closer than 23 feet to the side boundary. This, thus, conforms to the required minimum 20-foot setback.

- 3. Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The approach to house design was discussed above. Essentially, the architectural approach is to preserve the massing typical of a single story Ranch style house, but with some modified house and roof forms as a contemporary quality that transitions to the design approved for the detached guest house.

With this project, however, there is proposed a change in exterior finishes that would also impact the approvals for the guest house. The plan is now to use the following color scheme for both the guest house and the remodeled/added to main residence:

- Painted trim gutters and windows. Dark gray, with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of under 10% and well under the 50% policy limit for trim features.
- Painted wood siding. Warm gray with an LRV of under 20% and well under the 40% policy limit.
- Painted stucco siding. Medium tan color with an LRV that appears to just meet the 40% LRV policy limit.

The proposed color scheme is somewhat darker than the scheme used on the existing house that was also approved for use on the guest house. Both proposals, however, continue use of the existing dark brown/gray asphalt shingle material for the roofing. The 2011 project color board and the new board will be available for ASCC consideration at the February 13th meeting.

The revised color scheme is consistent with town policies relative to LRV maximums and also appears consistent with the proposed architecture.

- 4. Landscaping, fencing.** No new fencing is proposed and the fencing approved with the 2011 project has been installed. No new landscaping is planned beyond that required to be completed with the 2011 approved project. It is also noted that construction access and staging is in place and is consistent with the requirements for the project now under construction.

The front yard portion of the property is a steeper slope that descends from Golden Oak Drive to the building site. It is extensively covered with oaks, a pine, a pepper tree and yellow acacia. There is no plan for new landscaping in this area or changes to the front yard landscaping. During recent discussion over other projects in the area, the ASCC has encouraged removal of non-natives and exotics, particularly like the acacia, and may want to consider this during review of this proposal.

5. **Exterior lighting.** Sheet: A-1.1 identifies the locations for the proposed exterior lighting associated with the current project but is not a complete lighting plan, and the building fixtures proposed are different from those approved with the guest house project. We have discussed this with the project architect. We understand that the intent is to use the same fixtures for both the main and guest houses. The project architect will have a revised, complete and unified lighting plan for ASCC consideration at the February 13th meeting.
6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green Checklist.** The proposed BIG checklist targets 65 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 26, 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 February 13, 2012 meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor