



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, April 23, 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. New Business:
 - a. *Architectural Review For Garage/Accessory Structure Addition, 110 Willowbrook Drive, Morgan (Continued to May 14, 2012 meeting)*
 - b. *Architectural Review For House Additions, 134 Stonegate Road, Cashin*
5. Proposed Portola Road Corridor Plan – Planning Process, Background Report and Identification of ASCC Representative to Plan Taskforce
6. Approval of Minutes: March 26, 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: April 20, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

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

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

4a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR GARAGE/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ADDITION, 110 WILLOWBROOK DRIVE, *MORGAN*

In 2008, the ASCC considered and approved a number of proposals for the subject applicant and Willowbrook Drive site. These, for the most part, have been constructed and "finalized" by the town's building and planning departments. One part of the approvals, i.e., a detached two story accessory structure with lower level garage, storage and recreation room and upper level guest unit, was not pursued and the 2008 ASCC approval expired in June of 2010. The applicant has now submitted plans for new approval of the expired detached accessory structure project.

ASCC consideration of the new plans was noticed for the April 23rd meeting, but staff and the project design team are proceeding to address some floor area issues that could result in either modification to the project plans or changes to some of the existing site improvements, e.g., the gazebo structure. Further, the story poles for the accessory structure have only been up for a short period of time and have generated some neighbor reaction. We have recommended that the applicant and project design team interact with neighbors before the project is formally presented to the ASCC.

In light of the foregoing, we have determined that project review should be continued to the May 14, 2012 regular ASCC meeting. Thus, any public comments should be received relative to the meeting notice and, thereafter, project review continued to the next regular ASCC meeting. A complete report evaluating the current plans would be prepared for that meeting.

4b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS, 134 STONEGATE ROAD, CASHIN

This proposal is for approval of the addition of 800 sf of living area to an existing two-story, 3,805 sf residence, on the subject 1.4-acre Stonegate Road property (see attached vicinity map). The plans include expansion of an existing ground level bedroom into a master bedroom suite, a small exterior entry addition and a small addition to the existing garage. As explained below, this is a modification and somewhat of an enlargement of a project originally considered and approved by the ASCC in August of 2011.

As with the 2011 proposal, the plans can be completed with essentially no grading and most existing site improvements would not be impacted by the plan improvements. Further, the proposal is within the total and 85% floor area limits and there would be minimum overall changes to the scale and massing of the house in terms of views from both on and off site and, particularly, from within the Portola Road corridor.

The project is presented on the following enclosed plans dated 3/23/12 and prepared by Arnn Gordon Greineder:

- Sheet A0.1, Cover Sheet, Index and Project Directory
- Sheet A0.2, Data
- Sheet L1, Proposed Landscape Plan
- Sheet A1.0, Existing Site Plan
- Sheet A1.1, Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Main level Existing/Demolition Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Upper Level Existing/Demolition Plan
- Sheet A2.3, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A2.4, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A3.1, (Proposed) Main Level Plan
- Sheet A3.1a, (Proposed) Enlarged Entry & Sun Room Plans
- Sheet A3.1b, (Proposed) Enlarged Master Suite Plan
- Sheet A3.2, Proposed Upper Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A4.1, Main Level Reflected Ceiling Plan
- Sheet A4.2, Main Level Reflected Ceiling Plan
- Sheet A5.1, Proposed Roof Plan
- Sheet A6.1, Proposed Elevations/Sections
- Sheet A6.2, Proposed Elevations
- Sheet A6.3, Proposed Elevations

The applicant has advised that the exterior colors and materials board submitted with the 2011 project, i.e., received July 19, 2011, is the same materials board proposed to be used with the current proposal. The board is discussed below, will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting, and will also require some clarifications relative to the current plans. Also submitted in support of the request are the attached Build It Green Checklist received April 4, 2012, outdoor water use efficiency checklist dated 3/29/12 and cut sheets for the proposed step light (see plan Sheet A1.1).

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider and act on this proposal.

1. **Project description, site conditions, and grading and vegetation impacts.** The attached August 4, 2011 staff report prepared for the 2011 project describes site conditions and the descriptions are still relevant. Also attached are the minutes from the August 22, 2011 ASCC meeting where the 2011 proposal was formally considered and conditionally approved.

The proposed front elevation changes to the house entry, use of stone and replacement of windows and doors, are very similar to the plans approved by the ASCC in 2011. The current plans, however, call for use of stucco to replace wood siding in a number of locations and expanded use of stone. The 2011 approved plans will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. The garage changes shown on the subject plans are less involved than the 2011 project and, at the August 22nd review meeting, the applicant advised that the garage changes would likely be scaled back.

The new plans add over 600 sf more to the house than was proposed in 2011. Thus, ASCC review would be necessary even if the parcel did not have a Portola Road boundary. The main floor area additions are to be made at the northern end of the house. An existing bedroom and bath and a detached accessory shed are to be demolished to accommodate the development of a new, ground level master suite with expanded floor area. Roughly 800 sf of existing floor area, including the detached shed, would be removed to allow for the new, single story master bedroom suite. The proposed additional floor area, beyond the demolition replacement, would mostly be in the area of these existing north side improvements and over north side patio and walks. Some ornamental garden beds would also be impacted, but the overall site disturbance would be minimal as would be the grading, i.e., the proposed addition area is essentially level and at the floor elevation of the existing main level. Further, the existing shed has a significant encroachment into the northerly 20-foot side yard setback and this encroachment would be eliminated with the project.

The plans would preserve all existing screen vegetation around the property and, for the most part, existing site landscaping would be untouched. The side yard area where the shed is to be removed would be planted with "natural landscaping" as noted on plan Sheet L1. Further, there is substantial paved area on site for construction staging, but a specific vegetation protection plan with construction staging data should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff with the final building permit submittal.

The bulk of the proposed additions will be single story, matching the design character of the existing house with low pitch roof, and will be located at the northerly end of the house in the area that contains the existing bedroom and shed to be removed as discussed above. As a result the visual changes resulting from the additions in terms of off site impacts should be minimal. This is the case, not only due to the location and design, but also because of surrounding vegetation and topographic differences between the addition area and off site viewing areas, including residences on adjoining properties. While the project is somewhat larger than the proposal approved last year, we believe that the potential visual impacts would be no greater than was anticipated with the plans approved at the 8/22/11 meeting.

2. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), and height limits.** The total proposed site floor area is 4,606 sf and well within the 5,545 sf limit. The total area proposed in the main house is the same 4,606 sf. This is 83% of the total permitted floor area and is well under the 4,713 sf 85% limit. *(Note: the plans identify some "exempt" floor area. These include the new entry, which is not enclosed, uncovered decks and "sunroom" space with a low ceiling height.)*

The existing total impervious surface (IS) area is 9,899 sf and over the permitted IS limit of 8,385 sf. This is a pre-existing condition. With the current proposal, the IS area would decrease from 9,899 sf to 9,772 sf.

The maximum height of the house will not change with the additions, is at the two-story ridge over the bedroom above the garage and is less than 25 feet, i.e., well within the 34-foot maximum height limit. The roof changes over the new entry would have a maximum height of roughly 16 feet above adjacent grade and would be well under the 28-foot height limit. The master bedroom suite area additions would have a maximum ridge height of less than 15 feet and would also be well under the 28-foot height limit.

Compliance with required setbacks is demonstrated on Sheet A1.1. These include 50-foot front (from Stonegate Road) and 20 foot side and 50 foot rear yard (i.e., along Portola Road). As to the northerly master bedroom suite, the additions adhere to the 20-foot required side yard setback and are distant (i.e., over 100 feet) from all other property lines. The minor garage addition complies with the 50-foot required setback from the Stonegate Road front parcel line making use of the yard averaging provisions as calculated on Sheet A1.1.

3. **Proposed architecture, exterior materials and colors.** As with the 2011 proposal, the planned additions would be completed so as to match the contemporary Ranch style of the existing house. The basic building forms with low pitch roofs ensure that there would be minimum potential for visual change relative to building bulk or massing. While the plans do call for the continued use of the existing shake roofing, and some shingle siding, significant portions of the house would also have wood siding replaced with new stone and stucco sidings.

The scope of use of stone on the front elevation (i.e., facing Stonegate Road), is much the same as approved by the ASCC in 2011. Portions of the rear (i.e., south side) and north side elevations would also receive stone and there would be a number of surfaces around the front, north side and rear elevations, including on the upper bedroom level over the garage, that would be changed from wood siding to stucco siding. Also, there would be new doors and windows.

The color board approved with the 2011 project included the proposed stone material, cedar shingles with a medium dark stain, and off-white trim on some minor features to match existing conditions. Siding was to be maintained in the existing medium taupe finish. We are not clear about the finishes proposed with the new stucco surfaces and new windows and doors and, given the scope of the siding work, we believe the "white" trim elements should be changed to conform to the town policy limits on light reflectivity. We also have some concern with the more extensive use of stone. The sample on the 2011 materials board is somewhat light

and we wonder if a darker stone surface color should be considered. In any case, a new materials board should be provided that details all finishes to at least the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

4. **Landscaping.** The only new landscaping that is proposed is in the area of the shed to be removed within the northerly setback area. Sheet L1 identifies this to be “natural landscaping.” The details for this planting should be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member with the final building permit plans. The only other landscape matter will be protection of existing screen materials around the parcel and, therefore, a final, detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan should be provided, as noted above, to the satisfaction of staff with the building permit.
5. **Exterior Lighting.** Plan Sheet A4.1 shows the proposed lighting within the new entry porch and as associated with the master bedroom suite doors. At the new main entry there would be four recessed ceiling lights and two wall mounted sconce fixtures. The plans do not show all existing house exterior wall and soffit lighting and a comprehensive lighting plan for the house should be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. Given the scope of this project any exterior spot or floodlights should be removed and or replaced with fixtures that conform to current town lighting policies and standards.

Sheet A1.1, shows the location for new yard step lights southerly of the master bedroom suite. Other yard lighting is not identified. With the 2011 project the ASCC required that existing “up” lighting at the remodeled entry area be removed or replaced with fixtures that conform to current town policies and standards. We recommend that, again given the scope of the current project and exterior remodeling, a comprehensive yard lighting plan be prepared showing all existing yard lighting and that the plan be adjusted to provide for removal of other “up” lighting.

6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, the project architect has completed the attached Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint rated existing home checklist. In this case, the checklist targets 42 points. The mandated minimum point total for this “elements” project is 25 points and BIG greenpoint rating would be self-certified. The checklist is further evaluated in the attached April 5, 2012 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck.

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments as well as any new information presented at the April 23, 2012 ASCC meeting.

5. PROPOSED PORTOLA ROAD CORRIDOR PLAN – PLANNING PROCESS, BACKGROUND REPORT AND IDENTIFICATION OF ASCC REPRESENTATIVE TO PLAN TASKFORCE

One of the major planning projects for the current budget year is the initiation of work on the Portola Road Corridor plan. This work started with the development of the attached background report that discusses current conditions and identifies a preliminary list of issues. The report was shared with the town council at its April 11, 2012 meeting for

information and comment and also for council direction as to the planning process to be followed in corridor plan development. The attached April 18, 2012 memorandum to the town council outlines the process that the council directed be followed and this includes the use of a taskforce to review background data and help in identification of issues and possible programs to address the issues. The planning commission will have primary responsibility for development of the corridor plan taking into account the data and recommendations provided by the taskforce.

As noted in the April 18th memorandum to the town council the ASCC is to participate in the is process through review of the background report and assigning a member to represent the ASCC on the taskforce. As a result, on Monday night it is requested that the ASCC select a member to be on the taskforce. This member would then be identified for formal council appointment at the April 25th council meeting.

It is further requested that ASCC members provide any initial comments on the background report. We will want to seek additional ASCC input at future meetings, including after the first taskforce meeting in May. Later on, in the first quarter of the 2012-13 Fiscal Year, we intend to develop a draft of the proposed corridor plan and present the draft to the ASCC for review and recommendations to the planning commission and town council.

We look forward to working the ASCC and other town committees, commissions and interest groups as the corridor plan process proceeds.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager
Planning Technician

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor