



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)  
Monday, October 8, 2012  
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)  
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting  
Historic Schoolhouse  
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

---

**SPECIAL FIELD MEETING\***

4:00 p.m., Ford Field Access Easement (meet at Ford Field Parking Lot) Consideration of the driveway and bridge proposals for the Kelley easement across the town's Ford Field property. (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. Continued Review – Architectural Review For Residential Redevelopment, And Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison *Continued to October 22, 2012 Meeting*
  - b. Continued Review, Town Council Referral – Review And Report On Proposals For Driveway And Bridge, Ford Field Access Easement, Kelley
5. New Business:
  - a. Architectural Review And Site Development Permit X9H-642, House Additions, Remodeling And Guest House, 55 Stonegate Road, Hughes *Continued to October 22, 2012 Meeting*
  - b. Architectural Review For Detached Barn And Corral With Fencing, 3330 Alpine Road, Callander
  - c. Proposed Amendment To Blue Oaks PUD X7D-137, Lot Line Adjustment X6D-214, Lots 23-26, 3 & 5 Buck Meadow Drive, Town of Portola Valley
  - d. Architectural Review, Deviation And Variance X7E-134 Applications, 169 Wayside Road, Rollefson
6. Approval of Minutes: September 24, 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: October 5, 2012

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning Technician

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
**DATE:** October 4, 2012  
**RE:** Agenda for October 8, 2012 ASCC Meeting

**NOTE:** The October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting will include a special afternoon session for consideration of the driveway and bridge proposals for the Kelley easement across the town's Ford Field property. The ASCC continued review of this matter from the September 24<sup>th</sup> meeting to the 10/8 site meeting. The site session will convene at 4:00 p.m. at the Ford Field parking lot immediately east of the intersection of Alpine Road and Westridge Drive. Review of this request is discussed below under agenda item 4b.

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the October 8, 2012 ASCC agenda.

**4a. CONTINUED REVIEW -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-640, 260 MAPACHE DRIVE, *DAVISON***

---

As a reminder, on August 13, 2012, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property. While the ASCC was generally supportive of the project, a number of comments were offered on details that needed attention and/or clarification, particularly relative to site grading and grading calculations. Revised plans were eventually prepared and more data on grading developed. ASCC consideration of the project was continued several times while work on the revised plans was underway.

The revised plans have been reviewed, as have the grading calculations. While a number of the ASCC and other comments have been addressed with the plans, the updated grading plans and calculations reveal that over 1,000 cubic yards of grading is now proposed. This will require planning commission consideration and, pursuant to town ordinances and policies, a preliminary review of the proposal by the commission is needed before normal processing of the revised plans can continue. This preliminary review is now scheduled for the 10/17 planning commission meeting.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that ASCC review be continued to the October 22, 2012 meeting. This will allow for the planning commission to conduct its preliminary review and, hopefully, for the ASCC to complete project consideration at the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, taking into consideration any comments that may be offered at the October 17<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that at Monday's meeting the ASCC receive any public comments on the request and then continue review to the October 22, 2012 regular ASCC meeting.

**4b. CONTINUED REVIEW, TOWN COUNCIL REFERRAL – REVIEW AND REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DRIVEWAY AND BRIDGE, FORD FIELD ACCESS EASEMENT, *KELLEY***

---

The ASCC initiated review of this referral at its September 24, 2012 meeting and continued the review to the 10/8, 4:00 p.m. site session as noted at the head of this memorandum. The September 20, 2012 staff report prepared for the 9/24 meeting is attached and the draft meeting minutes are enclosed. As noted in the minutes, with this report we have attached the comments received from Santa Clara County on the status of the Kelley property located on the east side of Los Trancos Creek in Santa Clara County.

At the site session we understand that the project architect will provide more data on the bridge design and also respond to ASCC comments relative to the parameters for driveway design. Based on data gathered at the site meeting and input received at the September 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, the ASCC should formulate a final report to the town council on the driveway and bridge proposals. This should be concluded at the regular evening 10/8 ASCC meeting after receiving any additional input from the applicant and public.

In addition to the above, the attached reports have been received from the fire marshal (10/3/12) and public works director (10/3/12). The comments from the fire marshal include driveway and bridge standards. The comments from the public works director set for site development standards and provisions relative to the public trail, utilities, driveway, landscaping and verification of approval by other agencies eventually involved in the project.

In any case, the ASCC should conduct the 10/3 reviews and complete a report with recommendations to the town council based on the data that is available at this more conceptual stage of project design and consideration.

**5a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-642, HOUSE ADDITONS, REMODELING AND GUEST HOUSE, 55 STONEGATE ROAD, *HUGHES***

---

The review of the subject proposed applications was scheduled for the October 8, 2012 meeting, but project consideration needs to be continued to the October 22, 2012 regular ASCC meeting. This is the case because story poles were not installed to model the proposed guest house and house additions and such modeling is important for the application review and should be in place for at least 10 days prior to the ASCC meeting. In any case, project review should be continued to the next meeting, so story

poles can be installed, and a full report on the applications will be presented in the packets for October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

**5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR DETACHED BARN AND CORRAL WITH FENCING, 3330 ALPINE ROAD, CALLANDER**

---

This request is for approval of a detached 1,045 sf barn/stable, with associated fenced pasture and corral areas, on the subject 2.5-acre, Westridge subdivision property. The parcel is located on the west side of Alpine Road at the northerly border of the town, immediately south of Ladera, as shown on the attached vicinity map. The property is located within the Alpine Road scenic corridor and subject to the 75-foot scenic corridor setback requirement from the road right of way.

The proposal is shown on the following enclosed plans prepared by The Midglen Studio:

Sheet A1, Site Plan and Site Info., August 16, 2012  
Sheet A2, Floor Plans, Elevations, Fence Plans and Impervious Surface Diagram,  
August 14, 2012

In support of the plans, the following information has been provided:

- Materials and Colors Board, August 16, 2012. This board will be available for review at the ASCC meeting and is discussed below.
- Cut sheets for proposed wall mounted and recessed light fixtures (attached), received August 23, 2012.
- Completed GreenPoint Rated Checklist, received August 23, 2012

In addition to these plans and materials, story poles have been installed at the site to model the proposed barn.

The following comments are provided to assist the ASCC review and act on this proposal:

1. **Project description, architecture, grading and vegetation impacts, exterior lighting.** The subject site contains an existing, single level Ranch style residence with attached carport. The house and carport have a total floor area of 2,892 sf and are located on a graded pad roughly 14-15 feet higher in elevation than Alpine Road. The house is located over 140 feet from the front parcel line and is visually separate from the street by extensive and dense tree and shrubbery cover immediately adjacent to the Alpine Road right of way line. This vegetation extends into the parcel including areas that are located to the west and east of the proposed barn site.

Barn would be located on an existing secondary pad or topographic bench located between the front property line and the existing house. This bench is approximately 6 feet lower in elevation than the house pad and 8 feet higher in elevation than Alpine Road. The site for the barn is immediately north of the existing access driveway and has been sited to allow for ease of access for maintenance, manure removal, etc. In addition, the siting makes use of the existing tree cover for

screening of the barn from the road and also from the main residence. Further, the siting allows for much of the lower site elevations that are more open, level and grass covered to be used for corrals and pasture.

The barn footprint does not include any trees, but there are two large oaks immediately to the west and uphill of the barn. As can be seen when inspecting the story poles, some larger branches of the oak trees will need trimming. We have raised concern with the applicant relative to tree protection and he has requested input from an arborist. This, we understand, will be available for ASCC consideration.

The applicant did look at design options to move the barn away from the trees, but siting is limited due to the required 75-foot setback from Alpine Road, need to have the barn close to the driveway for ease of maintenance access and the desire to maintain more open corral and pasture area on the north side of the barn site. In any case, input from an arborist needs to be provided with guidelines for construction and for any treatments needed to ensure long-term tree health.

As noted above, the Alpine Road frontage includes extensive vegetation that screens views into the property. Some of the vegetation is oaks and native shrubs, but there appear to be exotics too and older pine and eucalyptus trees. Consideration should be given to removal of the pine and eucalyptus trees and trimming of the overgrown understory. This would enhance the open pasture and help return the parcel frontage to a more native condition consistent with the objectives of the Alpine Scenic Corridor plan. While this might open views to the barn and corral area, these too would be consistent with the more rural character called for in town plans. In any case, it is suggested that a plan for thinning and removal of some of the extensive frontage vegetation be considered and shared with the ASCC.

Although there are some potential vegetation impact issues as discussed above, the project can be completed with very little grading. The barn side is essentially level and there are no plans for driveway changes or grading to modify contours for the corral or pasture areas.

The proposed 1.045-foot barn/stable would accommodate three horses and have a carport for trailer and storage areas. The building is of a simple, design with dark brown/rust asphalt shingle roofing, vertical and horizontal rough sawn wood siding and doors and dark bronze windows and gutters. The vertical siding is to be finished in a natural cedar tone and the horizontal siding would have an "iron oxide" darker brown finish. We assume that the wood doors would have the same finishes proposed for the siding, but this should be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The proposed exterior lighting includes two recessed eave lights on the south side and three wall-mounted, downcast lights associated with stable doors. The locations for the lights are shown on the floor plan and the fixture cut sheets are attached. The number, location and fixture designs seem consistent with town lighting standards, but switching systems should be manual and clarified with the final building permit plans to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

Overall, the siting and design of the barn appear consistent with town standards and guidelines and the proposed structure maintains a rural character consistent with the intended stable use.

2. **Compliance with stable ordinance provisions, Review by Town Stable inspector.** The setbacks shown on the Sheet A1 are consistent with stable ordinance standards as well as the required 75-foot setback from Alpine Road. Further, except for a concern over the use of the 4" wire mesh on the perimeter fencing, the town's stable inspector has issued the attached positive project review dated September 7, 2012. As noted in the email, and on the site plans, there will need to be a final survey prior to any building permit issuance to ensure the 100 foot separation from the residence on the parcel to the south.

The plans will also need to conform to any requirements of the Fire Marshal.

3. **Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) review and neighbor comments.** The town was copied on the attached letter to the applicant from the WASC. It includes comments on tree concerns and also the need to ensure plans have been shared with site neighbors. As to stable maintenance, a permit is required from the town for horse keeping and this includes provisions for periodic inspections to ensure the stable and corrals are maintained to town standards.

One other communication has been received from the neighbor to the north, i.e., Ladera Community Church. The attached 9/24/12 email from Church representatives states support for the project.

4. **Compliance with floor area, impervious surface area, height, and setback standards.** The above comments discuss setback compliance. The barn would have a maximum height of less than 17 feet and therefore is well under the 28 and 34-foot height limits and would also conform to the single story, 18 and 24-foot limits.

The total proposed site floor area is 3,937 sf, including the proposed 1,045 sf barn. This is well under the 7,296 sf limit for the parcel. Further, the main house of 2,892 sf is far below the 6,201 sf 85% floor area limit and the house size will not change with the project.

The proposed impervious surface (IS) area is 5,674 sf. This includes some new IS area with the project and the total area is well under the 12,385 sf IS limit.

5. **Compliance with accessory structure provisions.** Since this is a detached accessory structure, it must conform to the attached town policies for such structures. In this case it is clearly designed for barn/stable use and does not include any bath facilities. Since it is over 750 sf in area, the ASCC must determine that the building can't be easily converted to a guest unit larger than 750 sf. Given the proposed design, it appears that this finding can be made. Further, the periodic inspections by the stable inspector will monitor use of the structure. If it ceases to be used as a stable, any conversion would need to receive approval by the WASC and the town. Further, if a horse keeping permit is not renewed, the town would have a clear basis to check on the status of use of the structure.

6. **Fencing.** The plans call for both corral and pasture fencing as located on Sheet A21. Fence designs are shown on Sheet A2. The post and rail corral fencing is four feet high and mostly outside of all setback areas. The design, however, conforms to town horse fence standards and, therefore can be located in required yard setbacks.

Proposed "pasture" fencing would enclose the northeasterly corner of the parcel and would extend from the corral fencing to the existing fencing on the north parcel boundary and add new "pasture fencing" along the Alpine Road right of way line as shown on Sheet A1. Horse fencing is allowed along all parcel boundaries in the R-E/2.5 acre zoning district in which this property is located.

The proposed pasture fence to be located in the front and side setback area must meet horse fence standards. The proposed design wood post and rail frame are consistent with the standards except that the posts cannot extend above the four-foot height of the top rail. In addition, the wire mesh needs to be changed from the proposed 4"x4" to 6"x6" size to conform to horse fence standards. This should also address the concerns of the stable inspector.

7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, this proposal is considered an "elements" project. Under the mandatory Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint provisions, a total of 25 points is required and the attached checklist targets 25 points. The sustainability aspects of the project are further discussed in the attached August 16, 2012 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

Prior to acting on this request ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information provided at the October 8, 2012 ASCC meeting.

#### **5c. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BLUE OAKS PUD X7D-137, LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT X6D-214, LOTS 23-26, 3 & 5 BUCK MEADOW DRIVE, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY**

This is a review of the subject proposed applications, which have been developed to assist in implementing the provisions of the town's State certified housing element of the general plan. The planning commission is the approving authority relative to the applications and, pursuant to town zoning and subdivision provisions, the ASCC is to forward comments to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the proposals. The planning commission conducted a preliminary review of the requests at its October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting and, tentatively, is scheduled to hold a public hearing on them at its November 7<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.

The enclosed September 27, 2012 staff report prepared for the October 3<sup>rd</sup> preliminary planning commission review provides a detailed review of the proposals and also includes a vicinity map of the lots subject to the PUD changes. Specifically, as explained in the report, the proposal would merge the town's four below market rate lots into two market rate parcels and set new building envelopes for the two modified properties. Further, new descriptions are proposed for the PUD to guide development for the market rate parcels, and these have been drafted to be consistent with the



descriptions for other residential lots in Blue Oaks. Further, all PUD design standards would apply to the two modified parcels in the same manner that they apply to any other residential lot in Blue Oaks.

The following additional comments are offered to facilitate ASCC review and eventual preparation of a report to the planning commission on the proposals:

1. **Planning Commission October 3, 2012 preliminary review.** At the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the commission received public comments on the proposals and offered preliminary reactions. The following is a summary of the public and commission comments, mainly as they relate to design issues:

Public. Public input ranged from concerns over the handling of the below market rate parcels relative to town affordable housing requirements to design issues associated with the modified parcels. In particular, the Blue Oaks homeowners association (HOA) provided the attached October 3, 2012 letter requesting that the lot line adjustment result in only one market rate lot, rather than two, and also listing a number of design questions and concerns. Staff has started discussions with HOA representatives to clarify and address the design concerns and to consider the factors associated with a one-lot option. The number of parcels as currently proposed, however, is based on input from real estate professionals as to what would be necessary to generate sufficient sales returns to cover purchase of property for development of the affordable housing elsewhere in town and, particularly, the funds needed relative to the sales agreement the town council has entered into for 900 Portola Road. At the Commission meeting, staff noted that if a one-lot alternative could satisfy the financial requirements of the town to achieve housing element objectives, it would be one that could be supported and we will be working with the HOA to respond to their concerns.

Planning Commission. Planning commissioners did not reach any preliminary consensus on the question of one or two lots and recognized that any final design would need to meet the sales objectives of the town council to assist in implementing the housing element's affordable housing provisions. Members appreciated the concerns raised by the public and HOA and understood that staff would be reaching out to the HOA to address the concerns in the October 3<sup>rd</sup> letter.

We will offer additional input on the 10/3 commission meeting on Monday night. In light of the above, however, we recommend that the ASCC schedule a site meeting on the proposals that would allow for the HOA concerns to be fully considered. We hope to have options for a site meeting date based on further interaction with HOA representatives and will suggest dates on Monday night. Also, we have tentatively scheduled a working session with HOA representatives for late next week or the week after, and would anticipate having additional data for the ASCC to consider prior to any site meeting. We also will inform the planning commission of the site meeting date, once confirmed, so that any interested commissioner can also attend. If more than two desire to be involved, it would have to be noticed as a planning commission meeting too.

2. **Focus of ASCC review.** Based on the above, the focus of the meeting on Monday night is to inform the ASCC of the proposals, take public input and then, hopefully, set a time for a site meeting. Nonetheless, as the project review process evolves,

the primary focus of the ASCC evaluation should be on the building envelope (BE) proposals and the descriptions to guide development of the modified parcels. The proposed building envelopes for the two-lot design are shown on Exhibit A of the attached September 27, 2012 report and the descriptions are contained in Exhibit B. In addition, the property boundaries and building envelopes have been staked and marked at the site for ease of inspection. The HOA input on a possible one-lot configuration, including both design and use development descriptions, would be available for discussion at the site meeting.

As explained in the 9/27 report, the modified BE area is significantly smaller than the original BE area and has been adjusted to have greater separation from the developed residential parcel to the east and also from the Buck Meadow Drive and Redberry Ridge frontages. Further, while the proposed descriptions recognize that some trees will need to be removed, as would have been the case with the current PUD, the proposed BEs include adjustments to protect the grove of oaks adjacent to the intersection of Redberry Ridge and Buck Meadow Drive. In addition, the permitted development, in terms of floor area and impervious surface area limits, is considerably less than current PUD provisions for the parcels and, again, the BE area is smaller offering more potential for tree protection and preservation.

Relative to the lot line adjustment, it is noted that Exhibit A identifies existing utility vaults on Lot B. These may impact designs for driveway access and could result in the need to relocate the vaults or adjust the dividing lot boundary line to accommodate driveway access without the need to move the vaults. In any case, if the vaults remain in their current location, an easement for them will likely be needed. The public works director is interacting with the utility companies so that the town can determine how best to proceed relative to the vaults.

Based on the foregoing, on Monday night the ASCC should consider the above comments and any public input and then set a time for a site meeting. As noted above, we hope to have optional dates for the site meeting available for ASCC consideration on Monday.

**5d. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW, DEVIATION AND VARIANCE X7E-134 APPLICATIONS, 169 WAYSIDE ROAD, ROLLEFSON**

---

These applications have been filed in support of proposed house additions and site changes for the subject .705-acre Wayside Road property. The deviation and variance applications, project site conditions, including vicinity map, and house addition proposals are discussed in detail in the attached September 27, 2012 report to the planning commission. The proposals are shown on the following enclosed plans dated September 4, 2012 prepared by Banuazizi Associates Architects:

- Sheet A-0, Cover Sheet
- Sheet C-1, McCloud and Associates, 7/8/11
- Sheet A-1, Proposed Partial Site Plan
- Sheet A-2, Existing Floor Plans Demolition Plans
- Sheet A-3, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A-4, Proposed Garage Level Floor Plan

Sheet A-5, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A-6, Sections  
Sheet LA1, Proposed Landscape Plan  
Septic System Repair Plan, S.R. Hartsell, REHS

The following information has been provided in support of the architectural review request:

Materials and Colors Sheet, received March 21, 2012 (copy attached with color descriptions, actual "color" board to be available at ASCC meeting.  
Cut sheets for entry column, wall mounted and pendant lights received March 21, 2012 (attached)  
Completed Build It Green Existing Home Checklist, March 21, 2012. The checklist targets 75 points for the project.

As noted in the September 27<sup>th</sup> report to the planning commission, the ASCC is also being asked to make findings to permit over 85% of the permitted floor area to be concentrated in the single largest structure. The subject request seeks to place 95% of the permitted floor area in the single largest, and only residential building on the property. The constraints impacting the parcel are discussed in the report to the planning commission and the findings that must be made to permit the proposed concentration of floor area are attached (zoning ordinance section 18.48.020) and evaluated below.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC address the architectural review application and offer comments on the variance application. The deviation is a matter for planning commission review and action, and the key issues with it are the construction access, grading and staging operations, and details for these have yet to be provided.

1. **Overview, Planning Commission consideration.** An overview of the plans, site conditions, constraints, and the proposal for slope stabilization is contained in the attached report to the planning commission. The report was prepared for the October 3<sup>rd</sup> preliminary planning commission review (see next section). Included in the report are discussions of floor area, height, yard setback conditions and a preliminary evaluation of the proposed yard setback and height variances. The report includes tentative conclusions in support of the deviation and variance requests. With deviation approval the maximum calculated floor area for the site is possible, but this also reflects necessary floor area reductions as a result of the Pd slope stability designation over most of the property.

As evaluated in the commission report, the proposed house additions and floor area adjustments are focused in the area of the existing northeast side "garage." This is the area where the slopes are to be stabilized to achieve the safety factors associated with an "engineered design" solution as allowed for in town's geologic safety resolution. Further, due to existing site conditions, the only area where the garage and new upper level living space can be safely located is mostly in the 50 foot required front yard setback area. Further, due to the steep slopes under the existing house, and need to accommodate driveway access to the new garage, a slight extension over the 28-foot height limit is proposed and this is the subject of the requested height variance.

2. **Planning Commission October 3, 2012 preliminary review.** At the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the commission received public comments on the deviation and variance proposals and offered preliminary reactions. The following is a summary of the public and commission comments:

Public. The only public comment received was the attached October 3, 2012 email from Jen Hanley, 158 Wayside Road. The comments note parking, including construction parking, landscaping and lighting.

Planning Commission. Commissioners appreciated the constraints impacting options for site improvements and were generally supportive of the applicant's efforts to solve site problems. Concerns were expressed over potential construction impacts and more construction staging and process data were requested relative to the findings needed both for the deviation and variance. Further, commissioner Zaffaroni noted that her view on the variance would be influenced by neighbor input as to potential impacts of the additions, and commission Chair Von Feldt suggested that the plans be reconsidered if possible to eliminate the need for the height variance. Also, the commission has asked for more data on the proposed "decommissioning" of living area in the existing lower level of the house. This will be developed based on town floor area and building code provisions and such data will be provided to the commission when the project is returned to the commission for public hearing.

3. **Findings needed to support request to concentrate more than 85% of the permitted floor area in the single largest structure.** To permit the concentration of 95% of the floor area in the single largest building the ASCC must make the findings set forth in attached zoning ordinance Section 18.48.020. Only one of the findings needs to be made under subsection A. In this case, the site is constrained by geology and steep slopes and the permitted floor area is significantly reduced due to geology and slope factors. Thus, it appears that both findings A2. and A3. could be made. While there will be some added height with the proposed living area over the garage, the height should not impact distant views from neighboring parcels, but it will be more present to those traveling along Wayside Road. In any case, with color controls, we believe the findings can be made to support the concentration of floor area, and the applicant will be considering options to address planning commission comments on the height variance matter.
4. **Architectural and design considerations.** Given the circumstances discussed above and in the report to the planning commission, there are very few options for house additions on this property that would be supported by a slope stabilization effort. The plan is to maintain the existing traditional Ranch style of architecture with the proposed house additions and remodeling, including horizontal wood siding, asphalt shingle roofing and paned windows and shutters. Dormer features are proposed to break up the roof form over the garage.

(With the proposed addition, the height over the existing garage roofline would be increased by roughly 8 feet and this height is approximately 3.5 to 4 feet higher than the roof line of the main house that would not be changed with the project. We have asked that the new ridgeline over the garage area be modeled at the site for ASCC consideration.)

Finishes included a dark charcoal asphalt shingle roof matching the existing roof, wood siding painted a medium warm gray tone, with a light reflectivity value (LRV) that appears slightly over the 40% policy limit and off white trim, with a LRV well over the 50% policy limit. The shutters are to be almost a black tone and well under the 50% LRV limit for trim.

Assuming the variance and deviation proposals are approved, we would recommend that the final color palette be adjusted to conform to town LRV standards and this should include specifications for garage door finish and all trim elements, including the trellis feature over the garage and new front entry elements.

5. **Landscaping, fencing and entry features.** No new fencing is proposed and, in general, the landscape concepts shown on LA1 appear consistent with town standards and policies. At the same time, the ASCC should consider the comments in the neighbor's 10/3 email relative to the need for more planting along the road frontage. Also, the driveway paver finish should also be identified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

The proposed low wall and columns with lights to identify the driveway limits, and that extend into the front yard area, are not consistent with town standards or guidelines and should be eliminated from the plans. We have advised the project architect of this matter.

The main landscape concern is to protect existing site trees from the impacts of the slope stabilization project and a detailed, comprehensive construction plan needs to be provided to the satisfaction of town staff and the ASCC. This plan should be developed prior to the time the planning commission is asked to complete action on the deviation request as commented on in the attached September 26, 2012 report from the town geologist and focused on during the discussion at the 10/3 commission meeting.

6. **Exterior lighting.** The lighting data on the plans is incomplete and a more complete lighting plan is to be presented by the project architect at the October 8<sup>th</sup> ASCC meeting.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of project.** Pursuant to town green building requirements, this proposal, when first filed, was considered an "elements" project. Under the mandatory Build It Green (BIG) GreenPoint provisions, a total of 25 points would be required. A checklist was completed that targets 75 points, but that was prior to development of the most recent plans. While the attached March 21, 2012 report from Carol Borck evaluates the original checklist, the checklist should be updated based on the most recent plans. Further, when building permit drawings are provided, it may be that this project would no longer fit the "elements" category and that there could be the need for a higher level of BIG compliance. This will be monitored by staff and appropriate adjustments made prior to release of any building permits.

Prior to acting on the architectural review request or forwarding any comments to the planning commission on the variance application, ASCC members should consider the

above comments and any new information that may be provided at the October 8, 2012 meeting.

TCV

encl.  
attach.

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