



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, August 13, 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., 260 Mapache Meeting is for Preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 2.5 acre, Westridge Subdivision property. (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

5:00 p.m., 25 Kiowa Court Meeting is for consideration of a fencing permit proposal that requires special ASCC considerations due to slope. (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. Architectural Review For Fence Permit, 25 Kiowa Court, Lin
 5. New Business:
 - a. Preliminary Review, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, and Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison
 - b. Architectural Review – Carport Enclosure, Portola Valley Ranch PUD Property, 16 Coalmine View, Middleman
 6. Recommendations For Establishing ASCC Policy – Procedures For Conservation Committee Input To The ASCC
 7. Approval of Minutes: July 23, 2012
 8. Adjournment
-

*For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE. The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

WRITTEN MATERIALS. Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: August 10, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: August 9, 2012
RE: Agenda for August 13, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The August 13th meeting will include a special afternoon session for field review of two separate proposals. The afternoon session will start at 4:00 p.m. at 260 Mapache Drive for preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 2.5 acre, Westridge Subdivision property. Review of the proposal is presented below under **item 5a., Davison**. Following this site visit, the special field meeting will continue at 25 Kiowa Court for consideration of a fencing permit proposal that requires special ASCC considerations due to slope. This request is discussed below under **item 4a., Lin**. Consideration of both requests is scheduled to continue at the regular evening 8/13 ASCC meeting.

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the August 13, 2012 ASCC agenda.

4a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR FENCE PERMIT, 25 KIOWA COURT, LIN

This request is for approval of a fence proposed along 140-foot section of the southerly property of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows property. The attached vicinity map shows the property and area conditions. The fence permit application is before the ASCC because the fence will be in the side yard area of the parcel and on slopes that exceed the 20% limit set forth in the fence ordinance. Fences can only be placed on such slopes with ASCC approval and making of specific findings.

The fence proposal is described in the attached statement from the applicant received August 1, 2012. The fence would be located along the southerly parcel boundary starting 25 feet back from the front, Kiowa Court, property line. From there it would run uphill for 140 feet. The fence is to be four feet high and constructed of wood posts and wire mesh. The distance between posts would be 8 feet, but this may vary given topographic conditions.

For the reasons explained below and as noted at the head of this memorandum, the August 13th ASCC review of this request will start with an afternoon, 5:00 p.m. site

meeting. This will facilitate understanding of the proposal and also concerns of staff and those of the neighbor to the south. These concerns are set forth in the attached August 3, 2012 email from Marianne Plunder, 35 Kiowa Court. Markers to identify the proposed fencing alignment are to be in place for the site meeting.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider this application.

1. **Background, objective of the fencing and revised application.** The applicant first contacted staff regarding this proposal in the summer of 2009. Staff did express concerns with it due to the steep slopes along the southerly property boundary common with 35 Kiowa Court. The slopes mostly range from 40-50%+. Eventually, in June of this year, Ms. Lin filed an application for the fence permit. This request called for a 6-foot high, solid board fence running along most of the parcel boundary, but with four foot high fencing in the 50-foot front yard setback area.

This June application was originally scheduled to be considered at the July 9th ASCC meeting, but was continued to the July 23rd meeting due to continuing staff concerns that a number of elements associated with the request would be in conflict with fence ordinance objectives and specific standards. Further staff and the applicant concurred that the town planner and a designated ASCC should meet with the applicant at the site and consider the proposal and possible options to it.

The site meeting with the town planner and designated ASCC member Jeff Clark took place on July 16th and the applicant then submitted the revised fence proposal on August 1. While the proposal includes changes to attempt to address the concerns discussed at the site meeting, it was emphasized by Mr. Clark that there would be significant issues the ASCC would need to consider and that an ASCC site meeting would be essential and the applicant concurred. As noted above, the site meeting has been set for 5:00 p.m. on Monday.

During the course of previous and the July 16th meeting with the applicant, we have been informed that the purpose of the fencing is to define the boundary between 25 and 35 Kiowa court. There apparently has been some past confusion, that has led to some question and both the applicant and neighbor have had surveys conducted to establish the boundary. Both have also advised the town that they are not confident relative to the location of the property line. It is also noted that there are some differences in the way that the applicant and neighbor manage their properties. In general, however, the conditions along the parcel boundary are largely native plants, oaks and shrubs. The area has more of a native hillside character than manicured landscape. In any case, the site meeting will offer the ASCC the opportunity to view the proposed fence alignment and better appreciate the applicant's fencing objectives.

It is also noted that due to staff concerns over the proposal in general, we have not asked that the applicant spend more time on development of specific fence plans. If the ASCC, however, finds it can support property line fencing, it should also identify the details it would want for a final fencing plan.

2. **Compliance with fence ordinance provisions.** The subject 1.2-acre parcel is located within the residential estate (R-E), one-acre (1A) minimum parcel area

zoning district. Within this district, domestic fences are permitted within the required setback areas and along property lines, but are not permitted on slopes exceeding 20% without special ASCC consideration and approval. In addition, within the 50-foot front yard setback area, fences can't be higher than four feet, must be setback at least 25 feet from the front parcel line and can't exceed a 50% opacity limit. Side yard fences more than 50 feet from the front parcel line can be up to six feet tall.

The subject application has been adjusted to conform to all of the fencing ordinance limits except for the location on a slope exceeding 20%. Again, as noted above, most of the proposed 140-foot long run of fencing would be on slopes over 40%.

Section 18.43.080.C. sets the authority for ASCC review of fence permits and subsection 3. State:

When a fence permit application demonstrates that the proposed fence cannot conform to the regulations given the conditions on the parcel, the ASCC may grant relief from the fence regulations. In making such determination, the ASCC shall as much as possible ensure that the proposed fence achieves the purpose and principles of this chapter set forth in Section 18.43.010.

Section 18.43.010 is attached and lists four principles that need to be followed in considering fence permit applications. While we appreciate that a fence can't be placed in the setback area where it is desired on a slope of less than 20%, it appears difficult to conclude that proposed fence is "designed with consideration of the open space tradition of the town," or "preserves a sense of shared scenic resources." Further, based on the history relative to development of the fence ordinance, it appears that this is the type of fencing the town was attempting to avoid.

The site meeting will be important for the ASCC to consider the proposal, needs of the applicant, and the concerns of the neighbor at 35 Kiowa Court. The information gained should then be used by the ASCC to determine if findings can be made consistent with the fence ordinance principles to grant relief from the regulations as sought by the applicant.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented during the special site and regular evening August 13th meetings.

5a. PRELIMINARY REVIEW, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-640, 260 MAPACHE DRIVE, DAVISON

This is a preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property. Site and area conditions are generally depicted on the attached vicinity map. The proposal is to replace existing site improvements with new residential development in much the same location as the existing house and accessory facilities. Further, while the existing driveway access will be slightly realigned, the driveway intersection at Mapache Drive will not change and the general driveway location and alignment will be very similar to existing conditions.

The project includes elimination of some existing fencing and also removal of non-native plantings. In particular, three larger redwoods would be replaced with oaks more in keeping the native setting of the site. Other changes include restoration of the meadow area over the northern portion of the site and removal of several ornamental trees and plantings. In addition, the southern slopes of the site currently contain a vineyard that is to be replaced with a vegetable garden.

The proposed new, 5,668 sf residence would replace the existing 4,235 sf house. Like the existing house, the new residence would have a single story profile, but some cutting is proposed on the north side of the established building site to access a lower level garage and basement area. Two existing detached accessory structures would be eliminated and these total 792 sf. Three new detached sheds are planned, and these total 286 sf. Two of these are associated with the proposed swimming pool and one with the planned vegetable garden.

The plans comply with all floor area limits, and no special floor area findings are needed relative to zoning ordinance standards. To accommodate, particularly, the planned driveway modifications and lower level garage access, as well as restoration of slopes under the rear yard accessory building to be removed, 185 cubic yards of grading are proposed. This level of grading requires the subject site development permit and the ASCC is the approval authority for such permits where grading volumes fall between 100 and 1,000 cubic yards. The site development permit plans have been circulated for town staff and committee review pursuant to the requirements of the site development ordinance. Comments received to date are discussed later in this report.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated July 6, 2012 and prepared by Butler Armsden Architects:

- Sheet A0.0, Title Sheet & Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A0.1, Area Calculations
- Sheet A0.2, Story Pole Plan & LEED Checklist
- Sheet A1.1, Existing/Demo Site Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Basement Proposed Plan
- Sheet A2.2, First Floor Proposed Plan
- Sheet A2.3, Roof Proposed Plan
- Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations (North & East)
- Sheet A3.2, Exterior Elevations (West & South)
- Sheet A3.3, Proposed Sections (North/South, Pool & Pool Shed)
- Sheet A3.4, Proposed Sections (North & South courtyards)
- Sheet A3.5, Renderings and Materials

- Sheet L-1.0, Tree Protection and Removal Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-1.1, Landscape Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-1.2, Planting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-1.3, Exterior Lighting Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-2.1, Irrigation Plan, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-2.2, Irrigation legend & Notes, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
- Sheet L-2.3, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12

Sheet L-2.4, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
Sheet L-2.5, Irrigation Details, Lutsko Associates Landscape & DVID, 7/5/12
Sheet C-1, Title Sheet (Civil Plans), Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet C-2, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet C-3, "Preliminary" Grading and Drainage Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet SS-1, Preliminary Septic System Plan, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 7/2/12
Sheet SU-1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 10/31/11, updated 7/3/12

In addition to these plans, the project submittal includes the information listed below. Copies of all, except for the two materials samples, are attached:

- Samples for proposed Exterior plaster siding color and texture and copper roofing, received June 7, 2012
- Cut sheets for the proposed yard lighting fixtures identified on plan Sheet L-1.3. Note, Sheet L-1.3 also identifies locations for wall-mounted fixtures, but proposed fixtures have yet to be determined.
- Urban Tree Management, Inc., arborist report dated June 27, 2012
- Application for tree removal received June 9, 2012 (three redwood trees proposed for removal as identified on plan Sheet L-1.0)
- Completed *Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist*, 7/5/12
- LEED for Homes Simplified Project Checklist

As noted at the head of this memorandum, the preliminary review of this project will start with a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on Monday, August 13th. To facilitate the site meeting, story poles have been placed at the site as indicated on site sheet A0.2.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the site meeting and preliminary review of the application. Following the August 13th preliminary review, including both the afternoon and evening sessions, project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

1. **Site and Project description, grading and vegetation impacts.** The subject 2.5-acre parcel is located on the south side of Mapache Drive. It has a rectangular shape with the short side of the parcel fronting on Mapache Drive. The property has gentle to moderate slopes, but the existing/proposed building pad was graded for original residential development and only minor grading is needed to accommodate this redevelopment proposal, at least in terms of the earthwork counted pursuant to site development ordinance provisions. Further, most of the existing significant tree cover would be preserved, except for removal of the three redwood trees located at the southwest edge of the building pad. These are to be removed and replaced with "native oaks," although the landscape plan does not specifically identify the proposed new trees.

The established building site is within the southern third of the parcel. This house "pad" is roughly 40 feet higher than the elevation of Mapache Drive, and the slopes from the street to the pad are, for the most part, gently sloping oak and grassland. A few fruit trees in this area are to be removed as part of the site restoration effort.

South from the building pad there is a steeper slope that descends approximately 20-25 feet to the southerly, rear parcel line. Much of this slope is currently covered with a vineyard that will be removed and replaced with a new, smaller vegetable garden. The garden is located out of yard setback areas and would be developed with some grading and retaining walls. The walls on the north side of the garden would be as high as six feet, with the downhill wall roughly 1-2 feet in height. Low retaining walls at the top of the building pad slope are being employed to facilitate the pathway transition from the house pad to the lower garden area. Some new fencing and existing fencing is planned for the garden.

Also along the easterly top of the slope between the building pad and vineyard area, minor grading will be used to restore the contours where the existing 365 sf accessory structure is to be "deconstructed." This grading would also repair areas that have been paved around the accessory structure.

Along the west side of the pad there is an increase in ground elevation of roughly 15-17 feet from the pad to the adjacent property line. This area is part of the knoll top that extends from the building side on the parcel to the west. In this "knoll" area there is significant tree and shrub cover, but it also includes the three redwoods to be removed. Restoration planting is also proposed in this area, but it will also accommodate the proposed swimming pool, hot tub and 172 sf pool storage building.

The proposed new house will, for the most part, have a single story profile and, as shown on Sheet A0.2, be within the existing graded house pad. The southerly side of the new house will be largely over the footprint of the existing house, although the overall length will be at least 25-30 feet less, thus increasing the house setbacks from the side property boundaries, i.e., relative to existing conditions. Distances to side parcel lines would be 45 feet on the east side and 56 feet on the west side, whereas a minimum side yard of 20 feet is required.

The new house will have a "U" shaped footprint with the open end of the "U" to the west. This is the "courtyard" area referenced on the plans. The house wings and west side planting and topography screen the courtyard area from off site views and create onsite privacy for the space.

Relative to the existing house, the new house would extend approximately 50-55 feet further north toward Mapache Drive, but would still be over 240 feet from the front property line, whereas a minimum 50-foot setback is required. The distance would also increase somewhat in terms of rear property line relationships. The new house will maintain at least a 100-foot setback from the rear parcel line and only a 20-foot setback is required.

The most significant area of site grading work will be for construction of the north side access to the lower level garage. This grading would cut into the previously graded house pad and create a driveway garage access between two significant

oaks. Retaining walls will be used to limit the grading and create the access to the garage. The easterly side wall would be no more than 3-4 feet in height, but the west side wall would be as high as 9.5 feet, but tapering to the north in concert with the slope.

The taller garage access wall and associated grading are well setback from any parcel boundary, i.e., over 60 feet. They are, however, partially within the dripline of the adjacent significant 60 and 24-inch oaks. The potential impacts of the walls and grading work on the trees are discussed in detail in the attached arborist report. The report concludes that no structural roots would be impacted and that with conformity to the report recommendations these two trees, and the other oaks on the site would not be adversely impacted by the project.

Overall, the approach to proposed site development appears appropriate and makes use of the grading and development associated with the original site improvements. Initially, however, with removal of the redwoods and other ornamental trees and plantings and the two existing accessory structures, there will be more open views to the site. The general approach to landscaping will in time provide some replacement screening, particularly on the rear slope, but the intent of the landscape plan concepts appears to be to restore more of an open, oak grassland condition and not over plant the site. These concepts can be appreciated in the views presented on the rendering Sheet A3.5 of the plans. The final details for the landscaping will need to be defined for consistency with what is suggested on the rendering sheet.

2. **Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) Review.** The attached August 8, 2012 letter from the WASC provides preliminary comments and states several questions that need to be addressed before the committee will take final action on the proposal. The letter also indicates that representatives will attend the 8/13 site meeting to better understand the project.

Relative to the grading volume question in the letter, it is noted that pursuant to site development ordinance standards, excavation for a pool or basement under the house need not be included in the calculations. If, however, any of the excavation material were used for fill on the property, it would count. In this case, we assume that the cut materials would be exported from the site, but this is not specifically stated on the grading plans. It is also noted that the plans call for importing 105 cubic yards of materials. Off-haul of cut materials should be clarified, as should the reason why site excavation cannot be used for the planned 105 cubic yards of imported fill.

We do note that the town geologist has pointed out (attached 7/25/12 report) that the condition of the existing site fill is "undocumented" and this may be the reason it is not to be used. In any case, the grading calculations relative to off-haul and importing of fill should be clarified.

The WASC comments also raise concerns over lighting, the proposed west side fire pit, roofing materials, fencing and site lines. We share concerns relative to lighting and the clarification of landscaping proposals, as we discussed elsewhere in this report. Hopefully, most of these can be addressed at the 8/13 preliminary review sessions or in clarifying submittals provided after the preliminary review.

3. **Site Development Committee review comments.** The following site development committee reports are attached:

Public Works Director, July 24, 2012. The report provides for approval subject to standard conditions.

Town Geologist, July 25, 2012. The report recommends conditional approval. It references a geotechnical investigation prepared for the applicant by Murray Engineers, identifies certain site constraints, but concludes that with the recommended conditions the site development permit is acceptable.

Fire Marshal, August 8, 2012. The report finds the plans generally acceptable subject to, more or less, standard fire district conditions. It does, however, identify needed additional data relative to fire hydrant location and on-site fire truck turnaround. We believe that the hashed line area shown on the site plan at the intersection of the main driveway and access to the lower level garage is intended to be the required turnaround and this area is not associated with any parking spaces. This also can be clarified at the site meeting.

Health Department, July 20, 2012. This report requests additional data that is to be provided to the health officer for compliance with septic system requirements, including results from soils percolation tests. The proposed new septic system layout is shown on Sheet SS-1 and appears to at least meet the design standards of the project arborist relative to avoiding oak dripline areas.

Comments from the Conservation Committee would be expected to be provided after the preliminary review site meeting and after the regular conservation committee meeting scheduled for later in August. Committee comments on the landscape plan will be particularly important.

4. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** Plan Sheet A0.1 provides detailed FA and IS calculations. The FA calculations include those necessary to support exclusion of basement area as allowed for in the zoning ordinance.

Based on the detailed plan calculations, the total proposed floor area is 5,954 sf and this includes the countable lower level garage space, and space in the three proposed small detached accessory structures. This FA is well under the total limit of 7,307 sf. The area in the main house is 5,668 sf and also under the 85% FA limit of 6,211 sf.

Proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 11,879 sf. This is under the 12,427 sf limit for the site. The driveway materials include chip seal and Terra Pave for the upper guest parking area.

The maximum height of the proposed house above adjacent grade occurs along the easterly elevation at the roof peak over the two-story portion associated with the garage level that does not meet the basement standard. At this point the height is 22 feet, and under the 28-foot height limit relative to adjacent grade. Otherwise most heights relative to adjacent grade are less than 20 feet. The maximum height of the house from the highest roof ridge to the lowest point of contact with finished

grade at the garage entry is just under 28 feet. This height complies with the 34-foot maximum limit.

House compliance with the required 50-foot front and 20-foot side and rear yard setbacks is demonstrated on project site plans and also discussed above under project description. Further, the proposed pool is no closer than 36 feet to the nearest side property line and over 98 feet from the rear parcel line. It, thus, is well beyond the 20 foot required yard areas. The pool storage shed and spa are over 32 feet from the nearest property line and conform to required setbacks.

The only setback question has to do with the pool equipment structure. It is shown to comply with required setbacks on Sheet A0.0 and the civil plans, but it is located within the west side yard setback on the landscape plans. It needs to be out of the setback and the landscape plans should be corrected to be consistent with the other plan sheets.

5. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** The proposed house architecture is of a contemporary Ranch or California style and can best be appreciated from the rendering plan sheet images. The design has very simple, low profile lines and forms and is consistent with the more Ranch style of architecture that is found in the Westridge area. Further, the form and mass of the proposed house design is not intended to dominate the site or call undo visual attention to the structure. Clarification of the siding color and roof materials will be important and it will also be important to ensure that the design details for the six proposed chimney elements are not as visually significant as suggested on the renderings. Color control should help to mitigate potential visual impacts.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include plaster siding in a medium gray/tan finish that has a light reflectivity value (LRV) of 40%, i.e., just at the maximum policy limit. The western end of the house and pool shed would be finished with stained board and batten siding stained in a color similar to the proposed plaster color.

The windows would be steel with a very dark gray natural finish well under the 50% LRV policy limit for trim elements. The roof is to be standing seam copper. The WASC has raised concern with the potential reflectivity of the roof material and if any treatments are to be made to mitigate for this. Several copper roofs have been used in town, and if allowed to weather naturally, have developed a patina that effectively controls reflections, and this does happen relatively quickly, roughly 1-3 years. During the early stages, however, reflection and glare can be significant issues and cause periodic problems for neighbors. This should be considered during the preliminary review process and clarifications provided by the design team.

With respect to the stucco siding, the sample material/color is not fully consistent with what is suggested on the rendering and materials sheet of the plans. The sample appears more "muddy" and gray while the rendering images suggest a somewhat earthier, less gray finish. It is likely that a larger sample should be considered and evaluated at the site.

6. **Fencing and landscaping.** Sheet A1.1 identifies fencing to be removed, including the fencing along the front property line and in the northerly meadow area. No new

fencing is proposed in this northerly area of the site. Sheet A1.1, identifies rear yard vineyard area fencing to remain and to be removed. The landscape plan identifies new fencing to extend from the "fencing to remain" that would connect to the upper garden area retaining wall. A detail for this fencing should be provided and should not exceed 6 feet in height in the yard setback areas. A note on the landscape plan suggests a fence height of 8 feet. The WASC letter states that any fencing should not exceed 6 feet in height to satisfy Westridge standards.

As mentioned above, the landscape concepts suggested on the renderings appear to be consistent with town guidelines. We, however, have concerns that some of the design objectives suggested on Sheet L1.2, particularly the apparent linear plantings along the western property line, might be more than the ASCC would typically encourage. In any case, we look forward to Conservation Committee input and also clarifications of the plans by the project landscape architect at the site and regular 8/13 ASCC meetings.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior lighting is shown on Sheet L1.3 and cut sheets for the yard, step and pool/spa fixtures are attached. Cut sheets for wall-mounted fixtures have yet to be selected. The scope of pathway and trellis lighting appears significantly greater than would be encouraged by town design standards or the ASCC. Of particular concern is the lighting planned around the 60-inch oak, in the trellis features and along the pathway to the gas fire pit terrace. In any case, the design team should explain the plans to the ASCC and receive input and direction from ASCC members.
8. **Construction staging.** Sheet L1.0, provides tree protection fencing details. A final construction staging plan, incorporating all of the arborist recommendations, needs to be prepared and provided with the building permit plans. The staging plan should include normal data relative to location of construction parking, storage of materials, portable bathroom, etc. It also needs to provide for protection of the trail along Mapache Drive.
9. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Proposed LEED Certification.** The applicant and project design team are proposing to achieve LEED for homes certification rather than GreenPoint rating. This approach is allowed under the town's green building ordinance. The required LEED certification level is silver and the applicant is aware of this threshold.

The ASCC should consider the above comments, conduct the preliminary project review, including the afternoon site meeting, and offer comments to assist the applicant and staff in assembling the application in form for eventual ASCC action. Project review should then be continued to the September 10, 2012 regular ASCC meeting.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – CARPORT ENCLOSURE, PORTOLA VALLEY RANCH PUD PROPERTY, 16 COALMINE VIEW, *MIDDLEMAN*

This proposal is for enclosure of the existing shed roof design, detached carport located on the subject parcel at the westerly end of Coalmine View in Portola Valley Ranch. The subject property and relationships to adjoining parcels and improvements are

generally depicted on the enclosed vicinity map. The proposed enclosure would be accomplished with the installation of a new automatic panel “roll up” metal garage door on the entry elevation. The closing of the side openings would be with vertical siding matching existing carport materials and clear glazing in the upper areas near the peak of the shed roof. The same enclosure detail would be applied on either side of the existing carport. All new siding and the metal garage doors would match the finish on the existing carport, which is a medium chocolate brown solid stain.

The proposal is described on the enclosed three sheet “Carport Conversion” plans received July 9, 2012, prepared by the applicant. The plans include a site plan, existing and proposed carport/garage elevations, and details for the side elevation window installations. In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached statement on the proposed finish, i.e., approved PV Ranch Color Kelly-Moore, “Loam 413.” The statement notes that a similar, completed carport enclosure is located at 10 Valley Oak and can be viewed for comparison to this proposal.

Also submitted are color and materials samples of the proposed finish color and metal garage door material. The metal has a wood grain character, similar to the surface of the carport siding. In addition, the specifications sheet for the C.H.I. overhead garage door has been provided and is attached.

The application submittal includes the attached letter from the Portola Valley Ranch design committee dated July 6, 2012 approving the proposal. The approval is for the application “as submitted.”

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC to evaluate this request:

1. **Project description and design.** The existing subject carport is located east and uphill of the existing residence and immediately southwest of the Coalmine View cul-de-sac bulb. The shed roof carport has side openings, but no opening on the rear elevation as the rear side of the carport accommodates storage closets. There are no apron parking spaces in front of the carport, but a number of accessory easement parking spaces are located in the immediate vicinity.

Significant vegetation exists around the carport. This vegetation, along with the carport design and siting, limits distant views through or around the carport. There is some more distant view over the carport, but this view would not change with the proposed conversion. Further, the only more distant view through the carport is from locations virtually within the existing structure through a small portion of the north side opening.

No vegetation would be impacted by the construction. Further, the proposed glazing is largely to provide light inside the new garage space and not for any view preservation.

Overall, this is a very straightforward proposal that should not impact the general character of conditions along the street or the basic design objectives of Portola Valley Ranch. It is also noted that the two immediately adjacent parking structures are enclosed garages with similar site conditions to the subject proposal.

2. **Conformance with PUD Statement provisions.** The existing carport conforms to the PUD siting requirements and the location was approved by the ASCC prior to house construction. The current proposal does not call for enlarging the carport, only for enclosure of the front and sides as described above. No other changes to the site are proposed and, thus, the plans do not raise any yard encroachment or other PUD siting issues. Further, as noted above, the Ranch design committee has approved the proposal.
3. **Carport enclosure, conformance with approved 1999 design criteria.** The ASCC approved Ranch design criteria for carport enclosures and remodeling are attached. The design guidelines provide that the enclosure conform to the architectural style of the house and use architectural elements to make it more interesting if it is in a more visually prominent location, e.g., very close to the street right of way.

The criteria (Section 3.8.1.1) also provide that a conversion plan “attempts to preserve views of distant hills and valleys.” This wording was developed to relieve the burden for preserving significant views through a carport that was part of the original design criteria for the Ranch and modified based on the findings articulated in Section 3.8.1.1.

In this case, the proposal is to maintain the architectural character of the existing carport and the enclosure details are based on the criteria set forth in the 1999 document. Also, there are no significant views through or around the carport as the only openings are on the side elevations and surrounding vegetation also limits more distant views in the area.

4. **Exterior lighting.** No new exterior lighting is proposed.

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

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ESTABLISHING ASCC POLICY – PROCEDURES FOR CONSERVATION COMMITTEE INPUT TO THE ASCC

For a time there has been concern on the part of conservation committee members that some significant residential projects have not been referred to the committee for input. In particular, these are for projects that proposed significant changes to existing conditions or full residential redevelopment. Also, in some cases, when a project is referred to the conservation committee, committee members have not been certain as to what information and input would be of most use to the ASCC in fulfilling its project review and approval responsibilities.

Recently, staff met with conservation committee chair Judith Murphy to discuss concerns and consider options for resolving them. Based on that meeting, the following comments and recommendations are offered.

1. **Matters now specifically referred to the conservation committee and zoning ordinance provisions.** Currently, the formal involvement of the conservation

committee is only required when a site development permit is applied for. In a number of instances a project for significant house and site landscaping changes won't trigger formal site development permit requirements and the conservation committee is not, therefore, formally involved. Further, building permits that must go to the ASCC, but that don't involve substantial grading, are not routed to the conservation committee for input even though they may include, for example, significant landscaping or water efficiency concerns.

Under the ASCC review criteria in the zoning ordinance (Section 18.64.060), landscaping, and protection of site conditions are significant elements and ASCC and staff review, as well as applicants, would benefit from conservation committee input on the criteria. Further, Section 18.64.080 of the ordinance allows the ASCC to request reports when from other town entities when necessary to help the ASCC evaluate the required decision making criteria.

2. **Conservation Committee input and key expertise.** Based on staff review and the meeting with Judith Murphy, we have concluded that the ASCC review process would benefit from conservation committee input and recommendations for all more significant projects that would significantly impact site conditions even if substantial grading, as defined in the site development ordinance, is not proposed. In particular, the committee input should focus on the ASCC criteria associated with:

- Preservation of existing vegetation
- Minimizing disturbance to the natural terrain
- Landscaping and conformity with town planting guidelines
- Planting and site design so as to minimize problems of drainage, soil erosion and water usage

On the other hand, the conservation committee should not need to spend time in dealing with more architectural plan issues, e.g., lighting, colors and materials, site circulation, etc.

3. **Recommended procedures.** Pursuant to the provisions of the zoning ordinance, it is recommended that the ASCC approve the procedure whereby it would as a matter of course seek a report from the conservation committee for all architectural review projects that include significant site changes whether or not a site development permit is needed. Major house additions or accessory structures that would impact significant site areas and landscaping should be included. Conservation Committee input should be focused as suggested above.

If the ASCC concurs with the above, staff would work with the conservation committee meeting schedule to ensure that application processing takes into account time necessary to accommodate conservation committee review and input.

The ASCC should consider the above comments and any additional data provided at the August 13th meeting and, if found appropriate, concur with the recommended procedures outlined above.

encl.
attach.

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