



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, June 25, 2012
Special Field Meeting (to take place AFTER regular meeting)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL FIELD MEETING*

8:30 p.m (approximate time), 120 Golden Hills Drive Site meeting for the purpose of considering proposals for exterior lighting changes. Site meeting will also include visits to at least two other parcels, i.e., 938 Westridge Drive and 125 La Sandra Way to consider nighttime views of 120 Golden Hills Drive.

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:
2. Roll Call: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch, Warr
3. Oral Communications:

Persons wishing to address the Commission on any subject, not on the agenda, may do so now. Please note, however, the Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion or action tonight on items not on the agenda.

4. Old Business:
 - a. Continued Consideration - Architectural Review For Residential Redevelopment, 274 Corte Madera Road, Byrne/Dickerson
 - b. Continuing Architectural Review For Changes To Original Exterior Lighting Plan, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Rubin
5. New Business:
 - a. Architectural Review For Garage Addition, 245 Cervantes Road, Choi
6. Approval of Minutes: June 11, 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: June 22, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: June 21, 2012
RE: Agenda for June 25, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The June 25th meeting will include a special field session that has been scheduled to take place **AFTER** the regular 7:30 p.m. meeting at the town center. The site meeting will start at 120 Golden Hills Drive at approximately 8:30 p.m. and is for the purpose of considering proposals for exterior lighting changes as explained in the comments under agenda item **4b. Rubin**. The site meeting will include visits to at least two other parcels, i.e., 938 Westridge Drive and 125 La Sandra Way, to consider nighttime views of 120 Golden Hills Drive. The notice for the site meeting also provides for possible visits to other sites as may be determined appropriate by the ASCC and that action on the proposals may be concluded during the course of the site meeting.

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

4a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, 274 CORTE MADERA ROAD, BYRNE/DICKERSON

On June 11, 2012, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject .48-acre Brookside Park area property. The preliminary review included an afternoon site meeting as well as continued discussion at the evening session. The June 7, 2012 staff report prepared for the June 11th meeting is attached and the minutes from the afternoon and evening reviews are enclosed.

As noted in the draft minutes from the last meeting, the ASCC concluded general support for the proposal, but identified some concerns for consideration by the applicant and project design team prior to final ASCC action, now scheduled for Monday's meeting. The ASCC review also included a tentative conclusion that the requested concentration of floor area was appropriate based on the staff report analysis and the finding from the site meeting. Key issues that were noted for follow-up included

reductions in the scope of landscaping, acceptability of siting of the cabana relative to the adjacent 36" blue oak, and need for a comprehensive exterior lighting plan.

In response to the preliminary review comments, the project plans have been modified. The modified plan package project is enclosed and, unless otherwise noted, the plans have a release date of June 20, 2012 and have been prepared by Feldman Architecture. The enclosed revised plans are listed below and the sheets with actual changes to address ASCC comments are so noted:

Sheet G.00, Project Info
Sheet G.01, Build it Green Checklist
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, 3/13/12
Sheet L1.00, Landscape Site Plan, Peter Rosekrans (**Modified -- landscape changes**)
Sheet A1.00, Site Plan (**Modified -- exterior house lighting additions**)
Sheet A2.00, First Floor Plan
Sheet A2.01, Second Floor Plan
Sheet A2.02, Roof Plan
Sheet A2.03, Cabana Plans
Sheet A3.00, East and West Elevations (front and rear) (**Modified – corrected note 3 re: garage door materials to be wood to match house and added note 14 re: exterior house lights**)
Sheet A3.01, South and North Elevations (left and right sides) (**Modified – added note 8 re: exterior house lights**)
Sheet A3.02, Patio Elevations
Sheet A3.03, Cabana Elevations

The cut sheet for the proposed house lights, i.e., FX Luminaire TC 20, is attached. Also provided to address preliminary review issues is the attached June 15, 2012 email from the project arborist John Henry McClenahan advising that the location of the proposed cabana near the 36" blue oak should result in minimum potential for root pruning and that tree prognosis is "considered favorable" with implementation of measures outlined in the email and original arborist report (copy attached). The project landscape architect has provided the attached June 21, 2012 letter explaining the changes made to the landscape plan to address the preliminary review comments.

Still part of formal application are the following materials considered by the ASCC at the June 11th meeting.

- Exterior materials board dated 5/1/12 that will be available for reference again at Monday's ASCC meeting.
- Outdoor water use efficiency checklist, 4/30/12 (attached)
- Arborist Report, McClenahan Consulting, April 4, 2012 (attached)

As noted above, the plans have been corrected to be consistent with the garage door plans as presented at the June 11th meeting. The door will not be metal and glass, but wood to match that proposed for the house siding as found acceptable by the ASCC at the last meeting. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete action on the proposal and address the specific issues identified in the record of the 6/11 review:

1. **Landscape plan revisions, planting reductions and “gas” fire pit.** The fire pit has been clarified to be a gas unit as suggested would be the case at the 6/11 meeting. The scope of front yard planting has been reduced with the elimination of most of the previously proposed Myrica Californica and one of the two White oaks as suggested by Marianne Plunder. One Toyon has been added and transitional grasses are now planned where the Myrica was previously located. It is also noted that some of the Myrica planned under the south side 16” oak has been removed from the plan.

Overall, while the scope of planting in the front yard area is less, the revised plan still calls for only a total net reduction of six plants. The bulk of the reduction is, however, the Myrica as encouraged by the ASCC. We have yet to receive a final report from the conservation committee on the planting plan. Marianne Plunder, on behalf of the committee, indicated that comments would be forthcoming.

In any case, we understand that the project landscape architect believes that the current plan addresses the key ASCC concerns and the applicants desires for screening between parcels. It, however, is likely still somewhat more “aggressive,” particularly for the area along the northern side property line, than the ASCC had hoped would be the case with its 6/11 comments. Thus, we recommend that any action on the plans should include a condition calling for consideration of further planting reductions taking into account any recommendations from the conservation committee, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

2. **Exterior lighting plans.** The yard lighting plan is shown on sheet L1.00 and is the same as considered during the 6/11 preliminary review. One comment at that time suggested that perhaps the number of step lights along the 80-foot long path between the house and cabana could be reduced. These are spaced roughly 16 to 18 feet apart and help light the few steps that descend to the cabana level. The path fixture is 12.5 inches high with a hood that directs light down from the 18-watt bulb. At one-foot high it would not wash a large area and, with the 16 plus foot separation, the fixtures would appear to create “target” lights for the pathway rather than a continuous wash of light.

The cut sheet for the proposed house light fixture is attached. It is a small copper box housing, 3.5” tall by 2.75” square, and is designed for down lighting only. It can accommodate one 20-watt halogen bulb. Proposed fixture locations are shown on plan Sheet A1.00. The locations do not appear to overlap with the yard lighting in any significant way. Our only suggestion would be that one rather than two fixtures be placed on the front elevation of the garage and this should likely be the one on the south side. It is also noted that no lighting is planned for the upper, master bedroom deck. Light switching patterns and controls should be specified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

3. **Cabana siting and protection of 36” blue oak.** The arborist’s 6/15 email suggests that the design siting would not adversely impact the adjacent blue oak. It is essential, however, that the construction work proceed in line with the recommendations in his report and under his oversight. This should be provided for in the building permit documents with periodic reports to the town from the arborist during construction confirming compliance with his requirements and recommendations.

In addition, a complete and detailed construction staging and tree protection plan should be provided with the building permit application, with approval by the arborist, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

Prior to completing action on this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 25th meeting.

4b. CONTINUING ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR CHANGES TO ORIGINAL EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN, 120 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, RUBIN

On June 11, 2012, the ASCC considered this request, input from applicant representative Bob Stoecker and comments from concerned neighbors. At the conclusion of the discussion, it was agreed that a night site session was needed to fairly evaluate the proposal and consider possible actions on it. As noted at the head of this memorandum, the special site meeting has been set for the evening of June 25th to start at approximately 8:30 p.m. Hopefully, agenda items 4a. (discussed above), and 5a. (discussed below) can be completed in a timely manner so that this site meeting can start as close to 8:30 p.m. as possible.

For reference in preparing for the site meeting, the June 7, 2012 staff report prepared for the June 11th meeting is attached, and the meeting minutes are enclosed. The June 11th statement received from Robert and Mary Jack, 938 Westridge Drive, is also attached, as is the June 6, 2012 letter from Ulrich Aldag, 909 Westridge Drive. The notice for the June 25th site meeting stated that the ASCC would start the session at the subject property and then consider views to it from at least the Jack property at 138 Westridge Drive and 125 La Sandra Way, i.e., the property of Mr. and Mrs. Lipa, who offered comments at the June 11th meeting.

As requested by the ASCC Mr. Stoecker and the town planner met at the site to consider the framework for the site meeting. We considered the proposed May 10, 2012 Site Lighting plan, site conditions and also views from 938 Westridge Drive. Mr. and Mrs. Jack could not be present, but provided permission for our visit to their property. Based on this site meeting and further review of the plans, the following comments are offered:

1. **Site Meeting framework.** We will meet at the site at 8:30 p.m. to view conditions and the light fixtures as identified on the proposed plan. Mr. Stoecker will also explain switching patterns and all meeting attendees will have the opportunity to view the fixtures and understand how they are used, oriented and switched. Since there will still be light at the start of the meeting, this will provide the opportunity to appreciate the driveway surface finish and the landscaping recently installed to help screen views to the driveway. These include the four, 48" box size Arbutus trees, oleanders and lavender.

From the site, the meeting will continue at the Jack property, 938 Westridge Drive. From the rear yard area, views to the subject site and lighting will be considered. We have asked that normal evening interior and exterior house lighting be illuminated. The yard lighting would then be illuminated by zone starting with the

backyard area, then the pathway along the west side of the house followed by the front yard area and then the driveway lighting. In this way, impacts of lighting can be considered by zone and cumulatively. From the Jack property it is recommended that the ASCC members view the lighting from the Lipa property at 125 La Sandra Way, and if ASCC members feel it necessary, repeat the lighting process outlined above.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack will not be home, but they will be represented by their daughter, and Dennis De Broeck of the Golden Hills HOA board will be present to direct ASCC members and others to viewing areas as explained in the attached June 13, 2012 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Jack. Mr. and Mrs. Lipa have also agreed to have ASCC members come to their property to consider their view concerns.

As may be requested during the meeting or, if desired by the ASCC, views from other properties could be considered also. The site meeting will likely take between one and two hours.

2. **Town base map of area.** We will have a copy of the town topographic base map of the area available for reference. It identifies the subject site and the Jack, Lipa and Aldag properties. The following conditions are noted from the base map:
 - The distance from the Jack residence to the Rubin residence is just over 1,100 feet. The Jack residence is roughly 47 feet higher in elevation than the Rubin residence.
 - The distance from the Aldag residence to the Rubin residence approaches 1,400 feet. The Aldag residence is roughly 70 feet higher in elevation than the Rubin residence.
 - The distance from the Lipa residence to the Rubin residence is over 1,600 feet. The Lipa residence is roughly 45 feet higher in elevation than the Rubin residence.
3. **Location/number of proposed lights.** The majority of the proposed lighting is on the south or rear side of the subject residence with a number of pathway lights located along the west side. The west side lights provide for evening access from the driveway/parking area to the rear yard entertainment area. Roughly by zone, there are 48 lights proposed in the rear yard area, 25 in the front yard area and 15 along the driveway. This is a total of 88 exterior lights. One additional bollard light is also proposed.
4. **Options for addressing light spill and driveway reflectivity.** During the meeting between the town planner and project architect, it was suggested that options might be considered for further control of light spill and reflectively associated with the driveway finish. If any such options are identified, Mr. Stoecker will share them with the ASCC at Monday's meeting.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any information provided during the course of the June 25th site meeting. The ASCC could complete action at the end of the site review or identify any issues that may need further attention prior to completion of action. If no action is taken, project consideration should be continued to the regular July 9, 2012 ASCC meeting.

5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR GARAGE ADDITION, 245 CERVANTES ROAD, CHOI

This proposal is for demolition of an existing attached carport and construction, in essentially the same place as the carport, of a new attached garage. The work is part of an ongoing project for renovation of the exiting contemporary design residence and other site features on the subject 1.0-acre, Cervantes Road property. General site and area conditions are shown on the attached vicinity map.

The existing carport occupies an area of roughly 691 sf on the north side of the existing house. The proposed garage would have an enclosed floor area of 607 sf, but with roof overhangs occupy a space of 746 sf, i.e., 50 sf larger than the existing carport area. The total house floor area with the new garage would be 2,861 sf. This is well below both the total and 85% floor area limits for the site.

The proposed garage design is in harmony with the contemporary architecture of the existing house and would take place in the area of existing improvements. No grading or vegetation impacts would occur and, overall, after project implementation, there would be minimum change to site conditions relative to massing or views from off the property. There are, however, a few issues that have been raised in the attached June 19, 2012 email from neighbor Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, that are discussed below as part of project evaluation. For the most part, these do not directly relate to the proposed garage addition.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans:

- Sheet CDA-6, Carport Conversion Plan & Details, McKim Design Group, 5/16/12
- Sheet CDA-7, Carport Conversion Elevations, McKim Design Group, 5/16/12
- Sheet S1, Standards Details, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12
- Sheet S2, Foundation & First Floor Framing Plan, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12
- Sheet S3, Structural Details, BC|A Structural Engineering, Inc., 5/2/12

Also submitted as part of the application are the following:

- An exterior materials sheet, received 6/1/12, that will be presented at the ASCC meeting and is discussed later in this report. A copy of the sheet is attached for reference to color product data stated on it.
- Cut sheet for proposed "Progress Lighting" wall mounted cylinder light fixture, received 6/1/12 (attached)
- Completed Build It Green checklist received 6/1/12 (attached). The checklist targets 32 BIG points whereas a minimum of 25 would be required for this self-certified "Elements" project.

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

1. **Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject 1.0-acre site is located along the southeast frontage of Cervantes Road and approximately 210 feet southwest of the intersection of Cervantes Road and Peak Lane. The existing residence, parking area, attached carport, swimming pool and a small detached,

roofed, accessory garden structure (likely less than 150 sf) are located at south end of the parcel. While the established building site is relatively level, there are some grade changes, accommodated by existing retaining walls, with step increases in height from the north side driveway and parking area to the swimming pool terrace at the southernmost corner of the property. Further, a retaining wall along the southern parcel boundary partially supports the detached garden structure that is fully located within the required 20-foot rear yard setback area.

The front portion of the property has some slope conditions and there is significant tree and other screen vegetation along the parcel boundaries. No grading or vegetation removal would be needed for the garage project and there are no plans for new landscaping. Further, the exiting asphalt driveway that extends along the west side of the property from Cervantes Road to, and beyond the garage site will be preserved.

Data in the town's residential file for this property indicate that the existing contemporary, single story house was constructed based on permits issued in 1959 by San Mateo County, i.e., prior to town incorporation in 1964. The swimming pool was constructed pursuant to County permits issued in January 1963, also prior to town incorporation. Given the materials used for the rear yard roofed garden structure, including the retaining wall materials, it appears highly likely that it too was constructed with the house and pool prior to town incorporation or adoption of town ordinances.

The very low profile residence is currently being renovated pursuant to town permits. The existing pool, located partially in the rear and side yard setback areas, is also being renovated under a town permit. The only planned floor area changes are those associated with the subject garage proposal.

As noted above, the garage will replace the existing attached carport and will provide the necessary covered parking for the site. It will be served by the same driveway access and has been designed to match the contemporary architecture of the existing house. The design, however, incorporates some added height as the current entry to the carport is very low, with heights ranging from 7 to 7.5 feet.

Overall the garage project is fairly straight forward, and should have minimum potential for impacts on or off site. Further, the design is in harmony with the architecture of the 53 year old residence. The house is not recognized as an historic resource in the town. If, however, major changes to the house design were planned, there would need to be further evaluation of its history as it is over 50 years old.

2. **Neighbor concerns.** In the attached email from Mr. Fanton, he advises that the garage project is acceptable, but raises issues with the rear yard garden structure and also with the extent of existing driveway and parking area paving. In particular, he notes that the garden structure is in the setback area and that the driveway/parking surface extends somewhat onto his property. We have conducted a site inspection and annotated the attached site plan to show the approximate location of the garden structure, as well as the additional paving discussed in Mr. Fanton's email.

As can be seen from the annotated site plan, there is considerably more east side paving than shown on the applicant's site plan and this paving does appear to extend onto the neighbor's property. Further, on the east side of the house, in the extended paved area, there is a tall, wooden trellis/fence that is a vehicle screen. This was added in 2000 with a town permit. It was a mitigation required by the town to screen a recreational vehicle parked on the site by the former owner. We are not certain if the current property owner/applicant intends to keep the "screen," but it was authorized by a town permit.

The garden structure appears to be a preexisting, nonconforming structure. It can continue as such, but cannot be enlarged or otherwise modified to increase the yard area encroachment. If, however, the structure crosses the property line, this would be an issue between property owners. The town would only become involved if significant changes were proposed to the structure, specifically the scope of yard encroachment, or the neighboring property owners sought a solution that would require town involvement, e.g., a lot line adjustment. At this point, we understand no changes are planned for the structure and there is no specific data that indicates the structure crosses the property boundary with the Fanton parcel.

As to the east side pavement extensions, we don't have data on the history of the paving improvements. While the paving over the property line would typically be an issue between property owners, in this case we do have some concerns with the site conforming to town impervious surface (IS) limits that could impact the scope of paving. We don't have complete IS calculations, but it appears that site paving, including the east side extensions and any paving changes with the ongoing pool and yard renovations, may exceed the 7,330 sf IS limit. Complete IS calculations should be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff and plan adjustments made as may be needed. In any case, we would strongly recommend that the applicant remove any paving over the property line, particularly given the scope of the current renovation efforts.

- 3. Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height, and setback limit compliance.** The total proposed floor area in the house with added garage is 2,861 sf and well within the 85% limit of 4,270 sf for the single largest structure. With the detached garden structure, the total floor area on the property is no more than 3,100 sf and well under the total site limit of 5,020 sf.

The maximum height of the house, low point of contact with finished grade to the highest ridge, is roughly 16 feet and well below the 34-foot maximum limit. Most heights relative to adjacent existing grade are 12 feet or less, and well below the 28 foot height limit. Impervious surface conditions and issues are discussed above.

Garage addition compliance with the required 50-foot front and 20-foot side and rear yard setbacks is demonstrated on the site plan sheets. All setbacks are satisfied and setback averaging is not necessary for compliance.

- 4. Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** As noted above, the proposed garage has been designed to conform to the character of the existing contemporary house architecture. The only changes are those necessary to enclose the new space and to make height adjustments to reflect the needs for

contemporary access. The general character of new roof forms and architectural detailing are to be similar to existing conditions.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include wood and cement plaster siding. The wood is to match existing wood siding and the cement plaster would have a smooth finish with control joints. Some existing CMU house walls are to also be covered in the smooth cement plaster material with control joints.

The siding color is to be "Graystone" with a light reflectivity value (LRV) of approximately 35%, and well below the policy maximum of 40%. The window/door frame finish is a taupe color with a LRV of under 20% and that is far below the 50% maximum for trim elements. Other trim elements will be finished in a light tan color with a LRV that is at the 50% policy limit. The plans do not specify the finish for the new garage doors and this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

4. **Fencing and landscaping.** No new fencing or planting is proposed and none appear needed. Further, there is adequate area on site for construction staging.
5. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior lighting is only identified associated with the garage addition. The plans propose to use the cylinder fixture (attached cut sheet) in five locations. It is not clear from the plans if the down light only version is proposed, but this should be the choice to conform to town standards. Further, we recommend that only one or two lights be used on the front garage elevation. At the same time, in order to properly judge the garage lighting plans, they should be considered in concert with the plans for overall site lighting. Thus, we recommend that any action on the garage proposal be conditioned on a comprehensive house and site lighting plan being provided to the satisfaction of a designed ASCC member and that the plan conform to town lighting policies and standards. This condition is appropriate given the scope of the overall house and site renovation work.
6. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green (BIG) Checklist.** As noted above, the project BIG checklist targets 32 points. This is over the mandatory minimum 25 points required under town's green building standards for this "Elements" project. In this case, compliance would be "self-certified" prior to finaling of the project building permit.

The BIG checklist notes that points are to be captured through, among other things, protection of topsoil, use of flyash in the foundation concrete, low water use landscaping, fire resistant roofing, insulation, low VOC paints, and thermal mass flooring.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 25, 2012 ASCC meeting.

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Town Council Liaison
Mayor
Applicants
Planning Technician