



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, March 12, 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., 302 Portola Road (Woodside Priory School) Field session for follow-up review relative to a condition of CUP approval that pertains to both Verizon Wireless and AT&T Mobility. Meet at Administration front parking lot. (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. Consideration of Options for Compliance with Conditions of Approval, Conditional Use Permits (CUP) X7D-132 (Verizon Wireless) and X7D-138 (AT&T Mobility), Priory School, 302 Portola Road
 - b. Continued Consideration, Architectural Review – Proposed Residential Additions and Remodeling, New Guest House, Pool, And Related Yard Improvements, 250 Alamos Road, Sclavos
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review – Proposed Residential Additions, 30 Firethorn Way, Beriker
 - b. Architectural Review for House Additions and Remodeling, 5 Quail, Portola Valley Ranch, Feldman
6. Approval of Minutes: February 27, 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: March 9, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: March 8, 2012
RE: Agenda for March 12, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The March 12th agenda includes a special site meeting. The site meeting is for follow-up review relative to a condition of CUP approval that pertains to both **Verizon Wireless (CUP X7D-132) and AT&T Mobility (X7D-138)**. Both are for facilities in the wireless antenna area adjacent to the Monastery at the Woodside Priory, 302 Portola Road. The site meeting at the Priory antenna area will take place at 4:00 p.m. and this matter is discussed under **agenda item 4a**.

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

4a. CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION OF APPROVAL, CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS (CUP) X7D-132 (VERIZON WIRELESS) AND X7D-138 (AT&T MOBILITY), PRIORY SCHOOL, 302 PORTOLA ROAD

On September 15, 2010, the planning commission approved amendments to the subject conditional use permits to allow for improvements to the existing AT&T and Verizon wireless antenna facilities at the Priory. (Refer to the attached vicinity map for antenna and related equipment locations at the Priory.) The permit amendments were effective on October 16, 2011. Condition #2 of each amended permit provides for interim antenna improvements on existing poles for enhanced service while a plan is being developed for collocation of the AT&T and Verizon antennas on one “monopine” pole. The permits also include alternatives for landscape solutions if it is eventually concluded that a “monopine” is not the best aesthetic solution.

At this point, the permit holders and staff are seeking ASCC recommendations on possible options to the “monopine” collocation plan as noted in the enclosed March 2, 2012 letter from Jay Gruendle, Verizon representative. The 4:00 p.m. site meeting described at the head of this memorandum has been scheduled to facilitate ASCC consideration of the options and development of specific recommendations. These recommendations would be shared in a report to the planning commission and the

commission would then need to decide how the permit holders would proceed to satisfy the use permit condition(s) in question. To facilitate the site meeting and ASCC consideration of the options, the following comments are offered. It is emphasized that no formal ASCC action is required at this time and that the ASCC would only be offering input to the planning commission on the possible options.

1. **Condition wording and background.** The specific condition wording for each CUP follows:

Verizon CUP X7D-132:

2. Pursuant to the use permit application as revised with the September 1, 2010, submittal documents, for an interim period of one year, three new antennas may be installed on one of the two existing Verizon Wireless poles, i.e., as shown on Plan Sheet A-2, while a plan is developed with AT&T and other carriers at the Priory site for collocation of antenna on a monopine or similar faux tree. Any such tree design shall be subject to design review and approval by the ASCC and shall address the recommendations of the ASCC as stated in the record of the August 9, 2010 ASCC meeting when the Verizon Wireless monopine plans were before the ASCC for conceptual consideration. Within nine months of the effective date of this permit amendment, the applicant shall inform the planning commission of the progress being made for implementation of the collocation "tree" plan. The commission may allow for additional time for the plan to be developed and implemented if it is satisfied that acceptable progress is being made on the plan.

For the interim period, it is understood that installation of the three new antennas would include removal of one of the two existing poles and the existing white whip extensions and that the new antennas would be a dark brown color.

AT&T CUP X7D-138:

2. Pursuant to the use permit application as revised on August 19, 2010, for an interim period of one year, the new antennas may be installed on the existing AT&T poles while a plan is developed with Verizon Wireless and other carriers at the Priory site for collocation of antenna on a monopine or similar faux tree. Any such tree design shall be subject to design review and approval by the ASCC and shall address the recommendations of the ASCC as stated in the record of the August 9, 2010 ASCC meeting. Within nine months of the effective date of this permit amendment, the applicant shall inform the planning commission of the progress being made for implementation of the collocation "tree" plan. The commission may allow for additional time for the plan to be developed and implemented if it is satisfied that acceptable progress is being made on the plan.

For the interim period, it is understood that installation of the new antennas would include removal of the existing white whip extensions and that the antennas would be a dark brown color.

Within the nine month period from the effective date of the amendments, both Verizon and AT&T advised staff of the status of the collocation process and provided letters discussing the progress being made and requesting the allowed for time extension. As explained in letters, while progress was being made with the "monopine" collocation effort, both companies sought additional time to complete the design effort and work associated with the agreements that would be necessary for the plan, including changes in the lease arrangements with the Priory.

On September 7, 2011, the planning commission conditionally granted the requested time extension, but asked for an updated status report within three months, i.e., by the mid January 2012. Within that three month period, Jay Gruendle informed town staff that while efforts continued for collocation, it was hoped that the town might consider options short of a “monopine” as explained in his March 2, 2012 letter. It is also noted that both AT&T and Verizon have completed installation of their interim facilities. At this point, the permit holders have until April 16th of this year to complete the collocation planning effort called for in the permit conditions.

Again, at this point, staff is asking that the ASCC conduct the site meeting on Monday and provide its recommendation(s) for the most appropriate aesthetic solution.

2. **Review of options and some visual impact perspectives.** The possible options to a “monopine” collocation antenna “pole” are discussed in the March 2nd letter. Specifically, the “monopine,” as described in the letter and visual simulation attachments to it, would be a faux tree 70 feet high to accommodate Verizon, AT&T and a third carrier. Based on our field checks, an option that perhaps would call less visual attention to the site could be to paint the existing 30-35 foot tall antenna facilities a very dark green color, to blend with the background tree cover (at least in terms of views from the south and southwest along the Portola Road corridor), and add landscaping to enhance screening, particularly if/when some of the existing pines on the southwest side of the facility die over time. Planting of new trees closer to the northwestern end of the Monastery building, i.e., where the Verizon and AT&T “interim” facilities are located, would soften views and help to ensure that screening continues even if the pines do not survive. This is basically letter Option #2 and would, if pursued, require development and implementation of a screen planting plan to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

We have considered views from the intersection of Portola Road and Georgia Lane, along Georgia Lane and from higher elevations in Brookside Park, i.e., from the northern section of the Crescent Drive loop. We have also considered views from the north side, i.e., the nearby vacant parcels in the Priory subdivision at the end of Antonio Court. The most sensitive visual relationships appear relative to views from the south and southwest. The ASCC may want to consider these more distant views to the existing facilities as part of Monday’s field session.

Based on the field analysis on Monday and any input at the afternoon and evening meetings, the ASCC should offer reactions and any recommendations it may find appropriate on the options outlined in the letter from the Verizon permit holder. The planning commission would likely consider the options and ASCC input at its March 21, 2012 meeting. After that, Verizon and AT&T would need to proceed to develop final plans, to the satisfaction of the ASCC, for conformity with the “collocation” condition(s).

4b. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, NEW GUEST HOUSE, POOL, AND RELATED YARD IMPROVEMENTS, 250 ALAMOS ROAD, SCLAVOS

On February 27, 2012, the ASCC completed a preliminary review of this 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 preliminary review included an afternoon site meeting and continued discussion at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Attached is the February 22, 2012 staff report prepared for the February 27th meeting and the draft meeting minutes are enclosed.

The revised plans and materials listed below have been provided to address the preliminary review comments. The plans, unless otherwise noted, have been prepared by Kohlsaas & Associates and have a revision date of 3/5/12. The landscape plans do not include a revision date, but were received with the revised submittal on March 6, 2012:

- 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, (B.A. Zuhdi, Consulting Engineer)
- Sheet L2.1, Erosion Control Plan, (B.A. Zuhdi, Consulting Engineer)
- 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

Discussion of plan revisions and responses to other preliminary review comments are provided in the attached March 6, 2012 letter from the project architect and separate letter from David Fox, project landscape architect, both received March 7, 2012.

In support of the revised plan package the project design team has provided the attached light fixture data "cut" sheets (14 sheets total) for the exterior wall and yard/garden light fixtures. These sheets were received on March 6, 2012 and supersede the cut sheet package considered at the 2/27 meeting. The locations for the proposed fixtures are all identified on plan Sheets L3.0. The plan elevation sheets and architectural site plan also include data on locations, particularly for the height of the

proposed wall mounted fixtures. The lighting data on Sheet L3.0 specifies fixture by lamp type to be used, lamp wattage and “equivalent Lumens.” The cut sheets do, however, note that some of the fixtures can contain lamps with higher wattage than those proposed to be used.

Still part of the architectural review package are the following materials provided to ASCC members with the original staff report and discussed in that report:

- February 14, 2012 letter to Planning Department
- Color Samples Board, received February 15, 2012
- Perspective renderings of proposed house and guest house improvements received February 15, 2012
- Completed Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, 2/14/12
- Completed mandatory BIG, “Green Building” checklists for the house addition and guest house components of the project received February 15, 2012

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in its review of the revised plans completing action on the proposal. The comments focus on the specific items noted in the record of the preliminary review meeting and also the status of project review by the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee:

1. **Height of guest house.** As noted in the February 20th staff report, guest houses typically should conform to the single story height limit unless the ASCC approves a plan with heights above these 18 and 24-foot limits. The maximum height of the guest house is proposed at just under 21 feet, and therefore conforms to the 24-foot maximum height limit. The height above adjacent grade is, for the most part, 17.5 feet or less, and this is within the 18-foot limit. At the point of transition between the lower and upper terraces, the height may exceed the 18-foot limit and be as high as 18.5 to 19 feet. Given the design and location at the slope break, we see the minor added height to not be a design issue and the ASCC can approve it with the action on the plans under allowances in the zoning ordinance. This is not an exception or variance issue, but only a design review matter. The key issue, in this case, is to ensure that the construction as proposed would not adversely impact the adjacent 60-inch oak.
2. **Arborist’s review of potential impacts of project on 60-inch oak tree.** The design team has advised that an arborist has been engaged and that an evaluation of the tree was to be completed during the week of March 5, 2012. We understand a report on the arborist’s finding should be available for consideration at the 3/12 ASCC meeting. If a written report from the arborist is provided in time for distribution with the meeting packets, it will be included and reported on at Monday’s meeting. Also, the 3/6 letter from the project architect states that the arborist did determine that her recommendations for tree health would not impact the proposed design.
3. **Double access driveway.** Under current town regulations, double access “loop” driveways are not permitted unless needed for safety (Section 15.12.300.J. site development ordinance). The existing double access driveway has been in place since at least 1968 and is shown on the town’s 1968 air photo base map. Given the steepness of the slope below Alamos and, particularly, the history of this driveway access, it may remain without the need for removal. The ASCC could, however,

conclude that the scope of the project is significant enough to require reconsideration of the driveway design and, therefore, that the safety matter should be referred to the traffic committee and town engineer for consideration. Again, given the history of the driveway and site conditions, we are not recommending any driveway change.

4. **Landscape plan revisions, fencing plans.** The landscape plan, while still ambitious, contains significantly less planting and fewer plant materials than either the plan originally submitted or the revised plan provided at the February 27th meeting. There is less planting within the setback areas and the form of planting is more random and less linear. It is also noted that the plan includes removal of the 20" pine near the guest house site, as recommended by the ASCC, and removal of the northeast side planting beds/bio-swale, as discussed at the ASCC meeting. The site plans also incorporated the changes to the trellis feature to conform to setback requirements.

With elimination of the planting beds and bio swale, the terrace area has been extended and the form modified. This has allowed for a better siting of the trellis feature further from the property line and the terrace also now pulls away from the property in the area where the planting beds were originally proposed to follow the setback line.

The plans still do not provide details for the fencing and gates that are to extend from the house to the property lines. Also, at the 2/17 meeting, the record shows that the design team advised the ASCC that there would be a property line fence for pool security, but this is also not detailed on the plans. Any planned new fencing should be described to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

5. **Exterior lighting plan revisions.** Exterior lighting has all be placed on Sheet L3.0 and this sheet includes a list of the fixtures by type, lamping, LED wattage and equivalent lumens. For reference, 40 incandescent watts are equal to roughly 460 lumens. The only fixtures proposed with light sources in excess of 40 watts incandescent are the pool and spa lights. Most of the fixtures would have bulbs rated at 200 lumens or less (i.e., less than 15 watts incandescent).

Lighting reductions have been made to the plans as follows:

- One of the three garage fixtures has been removed.
- Side wall lights are now used for the stairs at the base of the new guest parking space above the guest house and the lights in the stairs eliminated.
- Lights at the trellis are shielded down fixtures with number of lights reduced from 8 to 4.
- The number of upper balcony A-3 lights has been reduced from 9 to 5.

It is also noted that the Kube fixture has been specified as a "down light" only. At the same time, a few A-2 fixtures have been added to the lower terrace walls adjacent to the house. The ASCC will need to determine if the scope of lighting change and reduction is sufficient to address the concerns noted at the 2/17 meeting. And, as noted above, some of the proposed fixtures can actually accommodate higher wattage fixtures than are proposed in the table on Sheet L3.0.

6. **Status of Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) review, improvements in the bridal path easement and public right of way.** Except for the brief comments in the 3/6 letter from the project architect, we have not received any updated report on the status of WASC review or the Westridge position relative to the bridal path improvements. Hopefully, however, the applicant will be able to provide the ASCC more data on the status of interactions with the WASC at the March 13th meeting.

Prior to completing action on this application, ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the March 12, 2012 ASCC meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW -- PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS, 30 FIRETHORN WAY, BERIKER

This request is for approval of plans for single story additions to the existing single level, 3,750 sf residence on the subject 1.0-acre, Firethorn Way property. The attached vicinity map shows the project location just to the southwest of intersection of Alpine and Los Trancos Roads. The project includes three small additions, i.e., a breakfast room on the south side of the house and new closet, bedroom and laundry areas in two extensions on the west side. The proposed new floor area is 600 sf and the total house floor area would be increased to 4,350 sf. This is only 82.5% of the permitted floor area so no special floor area findings need to be considered. Further, the site is relatively level and the only grading that would be necessary is for foundation work, and no significant vegetation exists in the area proposed for new construction.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, dated January 5, 2012, received by the town on February 17, 2012 and prepared by Architect Brian Webb:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan, Vicinity Plan and Sheet Index
- Sheet 2, "A" Floor Plan (breakfast room)
- Sheet 3, Plan "B" & "C" (bath, laundry, closet) and Roof Plan
- Sheet 4, Sections and Elevations
- Sheet 5, Section and Notes

In support of the plans the applicant has provided the attached cut sheet for the proposed wall mounted light fixture. The application sheet notes that the new stucco walls will be painted to match existing conditions, but that the breakfast room addition would have natural ledger stone walls. A photo image of the proposed ledger stone is attached.

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 1.0-acre site is, as noted above, located to the southwest of the intersection of Alpine and Los Trancos Roads. The property, however, does not have frontage on either of these roads and is not materially impacted by the 75-foot setback requirement from the Alpine Road right of way (see attached vicinity map).

The property gains access by a driveway that connects to Firethron Way and Firethorn then extends to Los Trancos Road. This driveway access and most existing site conditions would not be impacted by the project and a corridor for access to the construction areas is in place essentially along the alignment shown for construction access on Sheet 1 of the plans.

The site currently contains a residence, detached stable and corral fencing. Recent improvements, i.e., within the last 5-6 years, include the corral fencing and roughly 200-240 sf stable, a new driveway surface and some minor driveway realignment, horizontal solid board privacy fencing along portions of the east side property lines, interior fencing, a glass greenhouse structure and landscaping. The site plan from the corral fence permit issued by the town in 2008 is attached for reference. We have identified the stable structure location on this site plan for reference. There is no record of a building permit for the stable, but it appears to meet the required 50-foot front yard setback, and a horse keeping permit was issued for the property. The stable building permit issue will be reviewed by the planning and building departments.

In 2006, the previous owner applied for a driveway gate permit, but that gate was not pursued. The property was sold to the current owners, who have made the recent improvements noted above. While the current site plan does not reflect all of the more recent improvements, full data on, particularly, the stable and site impervious surface conditions will need to be provided to the satisfaction of planning and building staff prior to issuance of any permits for the proposed house additions.

The site, as commented above, is essentially level and the house additions can be made with little disturbance to existing conditions. Existing tree cover along parcel boundaries, the general relationship of residential uses in the area, and the relatively low profile and location of the additions should result in minimum if any potential for significant on or off site visual impacts. The key issues will need to be control of construction impacts to ensure that existing vegetation is protected and dealing with, for example, local drainage conditions.

2. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed site floor area including the stable appears to be 4,600 sf and well under the 5,269 sf, floor area limit that would apply to this single story project. The 4,350 sf in the added to house does not exceed the 85% single structure floor area limit of 4,478 sf. Thus, the project conforms to town floor area standards and no special findings need to be made relative to floor area. Nonetheless, as stated above, complete and accurate FA calculations should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any new building permits.

The project as proposed does not increase the impervious surface (IS) area, but we don't have current calculations for all existing IS. Such calculations should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff demonstrating compliance with the 7,321 sf IS limit for the property.

Existing and proposed house heights do not exceed 12 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 12 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, i.e., the line common with Firethorn Way and 20 feet from all other property boundaries. The site plan on Sheet 1 demonstrates compliance with the yard setbacks for the added to house. The west side additions would extend to the west side setback, but not cross it, and the breakfast room is well removed from all yard setback areas.

3. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** The west side house additions would fully match the contemporary ranch style of the existing house with very low pitch roof and stucco siding. The roof would be finished with the same medium brown/taupe colored asphalt shingles as the existing house and stable. The siding would be painted the same medium to lighter brown/tan color of the existing house. Trim is stucco molding painted the same color as the siding and the clad window frames are in an off white color.

The siding is at or slightly above the 40% light reflectivity value (LRV) town policy limit for such surfaces, and the white window frames are well above the 50% limit. In this case, given the relatively small scope of the project and the good condition of the existing improvements, we believe the ASCC could allow the continued use of the existing color scheme. This comment takes into account the very low profile of the house and additions and limited potential for any off site visual impacts including lack of any significant views to the property from Alpine Road.

The proposed breakfast room addition is to be more contemporary in character, with a more box-like than Ranch style form. With, however, the proposed stone siding, low height, 11 feet maximum, and the location on the south side of the house, the design should work well on the site and be consistent with the character associated with the other recent improvements, including the horizontal board fencing. In any case, all the additions appear to have little potential for significant change to site conditions or views to the property from off site.

4. **Landscaping/fencing.** No new landscaping or fencing are proposed. The only landscape issue is to ensure that all existing screen plantings are protected from construction impacts. All recent fencing, beyond the permitted corral fencing, will also need to be checked relative to conformity to town fencing standards. Most appears to be acceptable, but there may be a few areas where the six-foot height limit is exceeded.
5. **Exterior Lighting.** The plans are not fully clear as to the location of new exterior fixtures. It appears that a new ceiling mounted light is planned off of the west side door on the new breakfast room, but we don't have a cut sheet for such a fixture. We assume that a wall-mounted fixture would be located adjacent to the south side breakfast room doors, but this is not shown on the plans. Further, an exterior light will be needed at the new doors to the bedroom addition and one may also be planned at the doors to the new exterior utility closet. In any case, a complete, clear exterior lighting plan should be provided prior to issuance of any building permits.

6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, this proposal is considered an "elements" project. Under the mandatory Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint provisions, a total of 25 points would be required. A checklist was completed that targets 97 points and may not have been accurately developed. We are working with the applicant to ensure the checklist is realistic and that the required self-certifying point level would be achieved.

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 March 12th ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND REMODELING, 5 QUAIL, PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH, *FELDMAN*

This proposal is for the addition of 1,463 sf of floor area to the existing single-story, pitched roof, 2,241 sf residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel (see enclosed vicinity map). The project includes bedroom, common area and stair additions on the existing main level that total 661 sf. Remodeling of existing spaces on the main level is also planned. The new stairs in the main level addition would provide access to the proposed lower level recreation, workshop, bath and storage spaces containing 802 sf. The new lower level would be immediately below the upper level additions and extend under a portion of the existing upper level that is to be remodeled.

All proposed floor area additions would take place at the northwest end of the existing residence and within the established building envelope for the property. Attached for reference is a copy of the Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) building envelope plan for the subject property and neighboring parcels in the immediate area.

The project includes main level deck extensions around the northwest house additions and replacement of all existing wood siding with new stucco siding. The existing detached, wood sided garage at the Quail street frontage would not be changed except for painting to match the color of the new stucco house siding. The color scheme has not yet been settled, but color samples are to be provided at the March 12th ASCC meeting. The plans note that the color scheme would comply with the color palette approved for use at Portola Valley Ranch.

The proposal is shown on the following enclosed project plans dated February 27, 2012 and prepared by Greg Miller Designs:

- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Floor Plan - Main Level
- Sheet A3, Floor Plan - Basement
- Sheet A4, Elevations (North and South)
- Sheet A5, Elevations (East and West)
- Sheet A6, Roof Plan

Provided with the plans are the attached cut sheet for the proposed exterior light fixture received February 28, 2012. The location for the proposed five new exterior wall mounted fixtures, 4 on the main level and one on the lower level are shown on the floor

plan sheets. No new landscaping is proposed and no new yard lighting is planned. Footprint staking of the planned addition area has been installed at the site.

The application includes the attached completed BIG GreenPoint Rated checklist targeting 39 BIG points. Further, the project has received approval from the Ranch Design committee as stated in the attached December 2, 2011 letter from Dana Rhine of the Portola Valley Ranch Association.

The following comments are offered on the request. Many of these are a repeat of the evaluations for a very similar house addition project conditionally approved by the ASCC in 2009. That ASCC approval has expired and was for the previous owner of the property. Nonetheless, the current project is very similar to the plans approved in 2009 and the Ranch approval letter states the action of the Design Committee is an approval of "mid-construction change requests," although it appears that no construction has yet been initiated.

1. **Background, Project description and evaluation: grading, vegetation impacts, architectural design, landscaping.** At the time of the 2009 project approval, the ASCC was informed that the applicant was considering sale of the property but wanted to have the approval completed so that the action would be available for a new buyer, even though it was likely that a new buyer would want to make changes to the plans. In this case, while the new floor area is somewhat greater than what was approved in 2009, mainly at the lower level, the general scope of the project, particularly relative to the deck additions is less ambitious than the earlier proposal. Further, the 2009 project included added roof volume over the existing house not being pursued with the current request. The previously approved plans will be available for reference at the 3/12 ASCC meeting.

The existing 2,241 sf house is a single level design that occupies the majority of the PUD established building envelope on the approximately 20,000 sf parcel. The property is gently sloping from east to west with the west side roughly 20 feet lower in elevation than the elevation along Quail on the east side. As can be seen from the topographic data on the attached vicinity map and the plan elevations and sections, the existing main floor level is at approximately elevation 690 to 695, closer to the elevation of Quail, and at least 9 to 10 feet above grade along the western side of the house. Thus, there is a relatively high "crawl space" on the west side and there is considerable open height below the west side deck level to accommodate the proposed lower level addition without the need for significant excavation.

Beyond the house and the planters immediately adjacent to the house, the site contains a number of significant oaks and meadow/grassland. For the most part, the plans are to preserve these oak woodland "landscape conditions," but some additional native shrub plantings might be installed on the northwest side of the house. Given the site conditions and project proposal, our main concern is that the existing trees be protected during the construction process and that the necessary tree trimming for the 36-inch Blue Oak in the construction area be done under the direction of an arborist. It is also noted that the December design committee approval conditions call for a future landscape plan and any such plan should also be acceptable to at least a designated ASCC member. Given distances between structures, it appears that significant additional landscaping is not needed as long as

the oaks are protected from construction impacts and that exterior colors are similar to existing conditions, at least in terms of light reflectively value (LRV).

The proposed additions to the main level would be made at the northwest corner of the existing house. These, as well as the lower level addition, can be constructed with limited grading, except that needed for foundation work and some "basement" area excavation. Final foundation plans should, however, be subject to review and approval by a project arborist to, again, ensure the long-term health of the 36-inch Blue Oak.

The site topography and nature of existing and proposed main level improvements, allow for the proposed lower level addition to be "tucked" under the elevation of the existing west side deck. This permits for the lower level addition to be made with minimum change to the overall scale and massing of the existing structure. The proposed essentially flat roof on the new west side bedroom further controls potential for added massing. The northerly bedroom addition area roof would be an extension of the existing pitched forms. This design approach also helps to control potential for apparent increase in massing.

The plans propose to extend the existing west side deck around the new addition area. The deck extensions would, however, all be within the PUD established building envelope and substantially less in area and extension than approved with the 2009 project. Further, the house and deck additions would avoid the exiting north side sewer easement and appear be no closer than approximately 40 feet to the nearest adjacent residence.

Perhaps the most significant change to the existing house is the replacement of the wood siding with stucco. Stucco is permitted under PUD provisions and has been used on some but not many Ranch houses. While the general form of the additions are in harmony with the existing house architecture, i.e., the architecture approved for the Ranch, the stucco adds variety and should work well as long as the final color is somewhat similar to existing conditions, again at least in terms of LRV. *It is noted that the town is likely to see an increase in changes to Ranch house siding material for durability and to meet current Building Code, Chapter A, fire safety standards.*

2. **Conformance with Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) Statement provisions.** Based on the proposed design of the house additions and related improvements, as evaluated above, including locations conforming to the approved building envelope, we believe the proposal is consistent with the Ranch PUD provisions. Also, as noted above, the Ranch Design Committee, as required by the PUD statement, has approved the plans.

It should also be noted that the PUD does not include a floor area limit for Ranch parcels, but does set architectural standards, and an impervious surface limit (IS) of 30%. Even with the proposed additions, the detached garage and other site pathways, etc., the total coverage is approximately 3,200 to 3,400 sf. The parcel area is approximately 20,000 sf and 30% of that area is 6,000 sf. Thus, this project is well below the IS limit. The building coverage limit is 20% and in this case, the coverage is, at a maximum 17-18%.

The maximum height of the existing/proposed house is just above 26 feet. This is well under the PUD height limits, which are more generous than the town's current height limits. The existing and proposed heights would, however, also comply with the current town height standards.

3. **Exterior lighting.** The plans propose to use the shielded, down directed wall mounted light fixture in four locations at the main level and one at the new lower level. Three lights would be added around the upper level. One at the new door from the new addition to the deck, two to light the deck around the addition and one at the new south side stairs from the existing deck to grade. Our only question with these lights is the need for the light on the small north side deck extension. This light is only to light the wall and deck and the deck has limited space for evening use. Further, light spill from adjacent windows would also light the area. If there were stairs to grade, the light might offer a needed function. In any case, we wonder if this light could be eliminated. The lower level fixture is at an access door and appears appropriate as proposed.

The proposed wall mounted, shielded light fixture can accommodate a 150 watt or 250 watt incandescent lamp. Both appear excessive in terms of normal light fixture standards that are encouraged under town lighting policies and guidelines. Typically a 75-watt incandescent lamp is found to provide adequate lighting for such situations.

4. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the applicant has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated existing home checklist received on February 28, 2012. In this case, the checklist targets 39 points. The checklist is evaluated in the attached March 1, 2012 report from planning technician Carol Borck. The proposal is considered an Elements project with a target BIG threshold of 25 points. Thus, it would be consistent with town BIG standards that would be verified through the normal building permit review and "sign-off" processes.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site, and consider the above comments and any other information presented at the March 12th ASCC meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor