



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, February 27, 2012
Field Meetings (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse (after conclusion of field meeting at 2
Buck Meadow)
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

FIELD MEETINGS*

4:00 p.m., 250 Alamos Road Field session for preliminary consideration of significant house remodel and addition project in Westridge (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 p.m., 2 Buck Meadow Drive, Blue Oaks Subdivision Site meeting to address a condition relative to exterior house lighting (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. Follow-up Review – Exterior Lighting, 2 Buck Meadow Drive, Blue Oaks Subdivision, Toor
5. New Business:
 - a. Preliminary Consideration, Architectural Review – Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, New Guest House, Pool, and Related Yard Improvements, 250 Alamos Road, Sclavos
6. Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2012
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: February 24, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: February 22, 2012
RE: Agenda for February 27, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The February 27th agenda includes two special site meetings. The first is for preliminary consideration of a significant house remodel and addition project in Westridge and the other is an evening lighting evaluation for compliance with a condition of project approval. The preliminary review meeting will take place at 4:00 p.m. at 250 Alamos Road and the project being evaluated is discussed under **agenda item 5a. Sclavos**.

The evening site meeting is scheduled for 7:30 p.m. and will take place at 2 Buck Meadow Drive, Blue Oaks subdivision. This site review is to address a condition relative to exterior house lighting as discussed in **agenda item 4a. Toor**.

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

4a. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW – EXTERIOR LIGHTING, 2 BUCK MEADOW DRIVE, BLUE OAKS SUBDIVISION, TOOR

As noted above, the ASCC will be conducting a 7:30 p.m. meeting at this Blue Oaks property, see attached vicinity map, to address the requirements of the following project approval condition:

- 4. The proposed soffit mounted exterior lights, i.e., Renaissance lighting 4DR5, white 4" LED down lights shown on plan sheet LE1.2, are recognized on the plan sheets but not formally approved. These lights, however, may be shown on the plans, but with the condition that a note is added that their use is subject to ASCC field checking of a demonstration installation prior to framing approval by the building official. Specifically, the soffit lights proposed along the northerly and easterly sides of the living room shall be temporarily installed at the site when the windows are in place. At that time a night review will be conducted by the ASCC to determine whether or not the proposed approach to use these lights to control glare to enhance views from the interior creates exterior glare impacts. The ASCC, based on this*

demonstration, will determine whether or not the lighting is consistent with town standards and to authorize use of the lights. The ASCC reserves the right to require that the lights be eliminated from the plans or to consider other proposals for lighting in the window areas where the soffit lights are proposed.

This project was conditionally approved by the ASCC on March 8, 2010 and the site development permit was approved by the planning commission on May 19, 2010. On September 27, 2010, the ASCC completed a "follow-up" review relative to conditions of project approval. Attached for background are some of the report and minutes materials associated with these meetings. The key matter that needs attention on Monday evening is the use of the soffit mounted fixture and the following enclosed plans show the location of the "temporary demonstration installation" that the ASCC will be viewing:

Sheet LE1.2, First Floor Lighting & Control Plan, Main Residence, Techlinea, rev. 11/22/11

Sheet LE3.1, (Lighting) Specification Sheet, Techlinea, rev. 11/22/11

Also enclosed is a cut sheet for the proposed Renaissance lighting 4DR5, white 4" LED down light fixture. "Load 709" as identified on Sheet LE1.2 will be temporarily installed for the evening inspection.

The approved house and other site improvements are now under construction consistent with the ASCC approved plans. Walls are framed and enclosed and windows in place to allow for the ASCC to consider the light reflection issues of concern as noted in the above condition and attached record of project review and approval. With walls enclosed (the roof is also enclosed) the ASCC will be able to not only consider the window reflection concerns but also potential for light spill off of adjacent wall areas.

Following the site inspection ASCC members should determine if the approach to lighting is acceptable or if changes need to be considered as provided for in the lighting condition stated above.

5a. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, NEW GUEST HOUSE, POOL, AND RELATED YARD IMPROVEMENTS, 250 ALAMOS ROAD, SCLAVOS

This is a preliminary review of a request for approval of plans for additions to and substantial remodeling of the existing mostly single level, 3,165 sf contemporary residence, with attached garage, on the subject 3.8-acre, Westridge Subdivision property. The attached vicinity map shows the project location and provides an overview of site and area conditions. Due to the scope of the project and the issues noted in the attached February 8, 2012 communication to the applicant from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC), staff determined that the preliminary review process, starting with an afternoon site meeting, was appropriate for the application. Thus, following discussion at the 2/27 site and regular evening meetings, project consideration should be continued to the regular March 12, 2012

ASCC meeting. This will permit time for issues discussed herein, and as may be identified at the 2/27 meetings, to be addressed and for the WASC to, hopefully, be in a position to complete its review of the proposal.

The project includes demolition of over 1,700 sf of the existing house and a small detached accessory structure. Much of the existing house would be impacted by the project and some added roof mass and forms are planned. In addition, existing lower house support elements and level terrace and swimming pool improvements are to be removed and replaced with a new living area and expanded terrace and new swimming pool. The remodeled and added to house would be within the 85% floor area limit and, therefore, no special findings are needed regarding floor area.

The proposal can be accomplished with minimum grading, and the improvements would be located largely within the area established for current site development. It is noted, however, that the existing lower level terrace and house structural elements will be expanded under portions of the main floor of the house and there will be new retaining wall work to accommodate the expanded lower level.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Kohlsaas & Associates and dated 2/14/12:

Sheet A-1, Cover Sheet
Sheet A-2, Plot Plan
Sheet A-3, Site Plan

Landscape Plans -- David R. Fox & Company, Landscape Architecture, 1/20/12:

Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan
Sheet L1.1, Trellis Views
Sheet L2.0, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet L2.1, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet L3.0, Lighting Plan, 2/8/12
Sheet L4.0, Concept Planting Plan

Sheet A-4, As-Built/Demo Floor Plans
Sheet A-5, As-Built Elevations
Sheet A-6, Proposed Main Floor Plan
Sheet A-7, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-8, Front & Left Elevations
Sheet A-9, Rear & Right Elevations
Sheet A-10, Roof Plan
Sheet A-11, Cross Sections
Sheet A-12, Guest House Plans
Sheet A-13, Guest House Elevations & Sections

In support of the plans the project architect has provided the following enclosed or attached materials:

- February 14, 2012 letter to Planning Department (attached). The letter transmits project exhibits (listed below) and also describes existing conditions and proposed site improvements.
- Light fixture data "cut" sheets (12 sheets total) for the exterior light fixtures (attached). These sheets were received on February 15, 2012 and the locations for

the proposed fixtures are identified on plan Sheets A-6, A-7, L3.0 (yard), and A-13 (guest house).

- Color Samples Board, received February 15, 2012. The color version of this “board” will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. A black and white copy is attached as it provides useful descriptions of the planned materials.
- Perspective renderings of proposed house and guest house improvements received February 15, 2012. The color versions will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. Black and white copies are attached.
- Completed Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, 2/14/12 (attached). The completed checklist notes that no irrigated turf area is proposed.
- Completed mandatory BIG, “Green Building” checklists for the house addition and guest house components of the project received February 15, 2012 (attached). The house checklist targets a total of 193 BIG points. The guest house checklist targets 124 BIG points.

In addition to the above listed plans and materials, story poles are being set at the site to facilitate the February 27th site meeting and the preliminary review process.

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 attached February 15, 2012 letter from the project architect provides a description of existing and proposed site conditions. The comments that follow expand on the description as part of our planning evaluation of the project.

The developed portion of the property would, for the most part, accommodate the proposed additions and remodeling. The developed area is a relatively small portion of the entire 3.8-acre site, i.e., approximately .3 acres of the 3.8 acre property. The scope of existing and proposed site improvements in relationship to the entire property can be appreciated on Sheet A-2, with a more detailed comparison of the site changes in the developed area on Sheet A-3. Sheets A-5, A-7 and A-8 compare existing and proposed house architectural elevations and, as described in the letter from the architect, the existing contemporary architecture will be continued with the remodeling and additions, and will also extend to the proposed guest house.

The primary house demolition will take place at the northerly side of the main level of the house, including the existing garage, a guest bedroom and kitchen. The proposed grading for the lower level expansion would be below this area and a portion of the grading will accommodate the “basement” portion of the new game room. This 665 square foot area is, by definition, a basement and, therefore, exempt from the town’s floor area limit. The remainder of the lower level expansion, i.e., 2,358 sf, would be mostly easterly from the existing lower level terrace, and the roof of this expansion would serve as the terrace off of the main level. This non-basement area of the new lower level does, therefore, count as floor area and this is reflected in the floor area calculations in the table on plan Sheet A-1.

The property is served by a loop driveway connection to Alamos Road that would be preserved with the project. Further, the existing auto court and guest parking area would be much the same as existing conditions as would access to the attached garage, although the garage would be expanded to provide space for

three cars. The sections of the driveway that extend to the street from the auto court area are relatively steep, and the loop system appears appropriate given the steepness and need for safe access to and from the site.

The ground elevation of the guest parking area and auto court and at the main entry to the house is 454 to 456 feet. The street elevation along the parcel frontage is 470 to 476, and therefore roughly 14 to 16 feet higher than the level at the entry to the house. The proposed additions with the new entry roof forms would result in the maximum height at the entry area being 15 feet above grade, and as will be appreciated during the site meeting and viewing of the story poles, primary distant views from the street will be well over the house and, on site, mainly to the proposed metal roofing. This roofing is much the same as the existing metal roof, and, therefore, views from above and across the property would not change significantly with the project.

The views to the guest house and its roof would be similar from above and would be screened in part by the large 60" oak that is between the main house and guest house. The house would also screen views from the street to the planned rear yard, i.e., east side improvements.

A number of the front yard elements shown on the plan are actually in place. As noted above, the loop driveway exists, as do the stairs from the driveway parking area to Alamos Road. The "new" parking space above the guest house is also in place as are the retaining walls associated with this space and the access to the guest house area. The lower driveway surface will be modified with a new paver surface, but the steeper asphalt extensions to Alamos will remain and conform to the 12-foot width standard of the ordinance. Other improvements in the front yard area are largely architectural elements at the main front entry including the proposed ponds.

The stairway path on the slope from the parking area to Alamos Road appears to have been installed during the recent house remodel project. The plans appear to call for some modification to the existing design, but in discussions with the project architect, we understand that the scope of any new work may be reconsidered, particularly as related to lower retaining wall changes. It is also noted that the upper portion of the stairway, adjacent to Alamos, includes a rock wall and concrete steps within the 10-foot wide Westridge bridal path easement. The WASC will need to comment on this situation. It is also noted that some pathway elements in the 50-foot setback area may exceed the four foot height limit. In any case, the existing and proposed conditions should be considered during the site meeting so that directions can be provided, as may be needed, for plan changes or clarifications prior to final ASCC action on the project.

The expansion on the rear, east side of the house, includes the new lower level living spaces that would be partially cut into the slope under the existing residence. There is already a partial two story expression on the east side as can be viewed in the "as built rear elevation" on Sheet A-5. This area is mainly across the south half of the house and includes the lower support columns, space behind these columns and access to the existing lower level wine cellar and partial bath. With the proposed extended lower level living area, the two-story form would continue to the

north side and be fully developed as can be seen in the rear elevation on plan Sheet A-9.

The rear and “left,” north side elevations are where the most visual changes would occur, at least in terms of heights and massing. Much of the current rear elevation with apparent two-story form has a height of roughly 20 feet. The proposal would extend this maximum height to 27.5 feet. This is a maximum height and well under the maximum height limit of 34 feet. It is also noted that the lower level expansion extends the main level terrace and includes new stairs to the pool terrace. The general approach to site use and development, however, is not dissimilar to existing conditions, but obviously larger.

The existing pool and pool terrace would be changed with the new pool and associated retaining walls, pool trellis and planter beds. The added terrace area and new pool would extend the developed yard roughly 25 feet to the northeast as demonstrated by the site plan data on Sheet A-3. The pool would maintain a 40-foot setback from the north side property line, whereas a minimum 20-foot setback is required. Two stepped retaining walls are proposed to support the infinity pool’s northeast extension and these walls accommodate a grade change of 6-7 feet. Thus, each wall would be roughly three feet in height, but sections should be provided to facilitate understanding of the wall heights, although the wall extensions and overall heights would not be significant and would daylight relatively quickly. *(Also, the perspective drawing attachments help with understanding of the proposed house elevations and rear yard wall improvements.)*

The proposed pool BBQ trellis extends into the required 20-foot side yard and parallels the north side property line. The structure comes within 12-15 feet of the property line and was placed here assuming it could be viewed as an ornamental garden structure, which is permitted to be in a yard area with a height of up to 12 feet. In this case, the proposed trellis would have a maximum height of 12 feet and also have a length of over 30 feet and a width of nearly 15 feet. The size and nature of the use are not consistent with the town’s application of the ornamental garden structure provision and we have informed the project architect that the structure needs to adhere to the 20-foot yard standard. (Note: The zoning ordinance is not fully clear as to what may constitute an “ornamental garden structure,” but application of the provision has not included allowance for a structure of the size of the proposed trellis and, particularly, with the types of active uses proposed for the trellis area.)

While we feel it is important for the trellis to maintain the 20-foot setback, it is also noted that there is some sensitivity relative to the proximity of the pool and terrace improvements to the residential uses on the parcel to the north. While there is not a major view issue, the ASCC may want to consider the conditions and adequacy of the proposed screen planting shown on Sheet L4.0. While a number of plants are proposed, we are not certain either the material selection or scope of planting is fully consistent with town landscape guidelines for area along property lines. We offer some additional preliminary comments on the landscape plan later in this report.

It is also noted that on plan Sheet L-2.0, the project is to be connected to the sanitary sewer system. The plans do not show the proposals for sewer connection

and this should be provided for on the final grading and utility plan. Also, it is noted that the intention is to use the existing septic tank and leach field system for storm water collections and distribution over the site. This would need to be to the satisfaction of the town geologist and health officer, particularly given the Ps Movement Potential Slope designation for the property on the town's map of land movement potential.

Overall, while the scope of work is substantial, the general approach to site use and development is, in character, similar to existing conditions and the existing contemporary architecture would be continued with the project. A number of details need to be understood and appreciated and the site meeting will provide the opportunity for the project applicant and design team to explain the project to the ASCC, WASC and site neighbors.

2. **Guest house proposal, design and compliance with zoning requirements.**

The two level guest house is to be located in the area of an existing detached accessory structure immediately to the southeast of the existing residence. It has been placed so that the footprint is near the edge of the dripline of the existing 60-inch oak, but it does partially extend into the dripline. An arborist report has yet to be prepared, but any grading or foundation work for the guest house should be done according to the recommendations and oversight of a professional arborist.

The guest house architecture is to match that of the existing residence as called for in the attached second unit zoning provisions. Further, the guest house is to be served by the same access as the main house, and the new parking space has been developed to satisfy guest house parking standards. Minimum lighting is proposed for the structure and the total floor area is 737 sf, and these elements also conform to the guest house zoning standards.

The siting and design of the guest house reflect the grade changes in this area of the property. Specifically, the upper bedroom portion extends westerly over a grade break and onto a bench above the lower main level of the proposed guest house. A two-story high window form has been used to add open volume in the guest house and extend light and air to the upper loft bedroom. One small oak would be removed for the construction, and this is in part to allow the guest house to be sited away from the 60-inch oak. It is also noted that other trees and the form of development on the parcel to the south, including a driveway retaining wall, effectively screen the guest house site from neighboring views. At the same time, the landscape plan proposes several new oaks along this southerly property boundary.

As noted above, the guest house with an area of 737 sf is under the 750 sf maximum limit for such accessory uses. Further, the structure, as presented in the elevations, has been designed to conform to the 18 and 24 foot single story height limits for guest houses and actually has a maximum height of just under 21 feet. While a guest house can be higher than these limits with ASCC approval, no special consideration for added height is needed with the proposed design.

3. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** In addition to the data provided above, the following comments are offered relative to FA, IS, height and setback compliance.

The total proposed site floor area appears to be 6,615 sf and well under the 7,716 sf, floor area limit. This does not include the 665 sf basement area exempt from floor area limits. The floor area in the single largest structure is 5,878 sf and this is the main house with attached garage. This represents 76% of the total permitted floor area and, therefore, is well within the 85% limit for the single largest structure.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is calculated at 14,045 sf on Sheet A-2 and includes the roof area of the buildings. These roof areas are calculated under the floor area standards and, therefore, do not count against the IS limit of 14,051 sf. Thus, with the roof area adjustment, the total proposed IS would be 9,943 sf and well below the IS limit for the property.

Guest house heights were discussed above. The heights of the added to and remodeled house above adjacent grade would range from 14 feet or less to a maximum of 23-24 feet and would, therefore, be well within the 28-foot height limit for the main house. The maximum height of the proposed house, from low point of contact with finished grade to the highest roof elevation would be 27.5 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit.

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 A-3 demonstrates compliance with the yard setbacks for the added to house and the guest house. The only setback issues identified are with the pool trellis and some of the front yard step/pathway elements as discussed above.

4. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** The proposed contemporary architectural style has been discussed above and in the February 14, 2012 letter from the project architect. Further, the attached "Color Sample Board," received February 15, 2012, lists the proposed exterior materials and finishes including gray painted stucco siding to "match existing," natural stained cedar board siding to "match existing," and natural stone veneer. The board also calls for steel paneling for doors, window frames and sashes to match existing and slate gray standing seam metal roof with fascia and gutters matching the roofing. The roof and other metal elements are also very similar to existing conditions.
5. **Landscaping, fencing, swimming pool security.** No fencing is shown around the pool and plans for satisfying required swimming pool security need to be clarified. Further, Sheet L1.0 has notes showing fencing with gates extending from the house to the side property lines, but no details for these features are provided. Any plans for new fencing should be detailed to the satisfaction of the ASCC so they can also be evaluated against fence ordinance provisions.

We understand that some changes to the landscape plan are currently in process, including those associated with the front yard stair pathway to Alamos Road. In addition, we share the concerns expressed by the WASC with the nature of the planting and, at least preliminarily, conclude that it is far more extensive and linear in character than would be consistent with current town landscape guidelines. The ASCC has attempted, within the spirit and intent of the guidelines, to minimize over planting and add materials only where needed to enhance privacy, control erosion, etc. The basic approach is to design a project in harmony with existing conditions

and avoid the need for significant use of landscaping to screen views, as this approach impacts the basic oak woodland conditions of the properties in town.

In any case, the site meeting will provide the opportunity for the project team to describe and clarify the intent of the landscaping. Prior to final ASCC action, we will also want to refer the plan to the conservation committee for review and comment.

6. **Exterior Lighting.** Locations for the proposed house fixtures are shown on the floor plan sheets and on the proposed house architectural elevation sheets. The yard lighting fixture locations are shown on landscape plan Sheet L-3. Light fixture data is attached. The following comments are offered on the plans and preliminary concerns with the proposals in terms of town exterior lighting standards:

- In general the proposed wall mounted and main level rear trellis fixtures appear to spill light both up and down and the wall sconces appear to have potential for washing of walls. The ASCC typically discourages any up directed lighting and prefers use of fixtures to address specific tasks, e.g., building code required lighting at doors and lighting of pathways for safe use.
- The number of main level rear terrace trellis fixtures appears excessive and creates potential for views to the light source from below. These could be viewed from the lower areas on the parcel to the north.
- Three fixtures are proposed on the garage entry elevation and the ASCC typically allows for only one or two fixtures in such areas. In this case, given the width of the garage and design, two fixtures may be appropriate.
- The number of driveway lights, especially for the steeper sections that connect to the street, appear to be more than typically supported by the ASCC.
- The number of step lights also appears to be higher than provided for in town guidelines.
- The number and height of the lights in the BBG trellis could have potential for spilling light to the property to the north. This, however, should be considered in view of changes that will be needed to conform to the 20-foot setback as discussed above.

In any case, the proposed lighting plans should be discussed with the design team during the preliminary review process.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated new checklists for the house and guest house projects. In this case, the checklist targets 193 points for the house whereas a minimum of 181 points is mandated. The checklist is evaluated in the attached February 22, 2012 report from planning technician Carol Borck. The guest house targets 124 and this is well above the minimum that would be required for this portion of the project.

Following the February 27th review of this proposal, ASCC members should offer preliminary reactions and then continue project review to the regular March 12, 2012 ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor