



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)  
Monday, November 8, 2010  
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 ASCC FIELD MEETING\***

3:30 p.m. Golden Oak Drive at Peak Lane – Cal Water Tank Site Continued consideration of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, T-Mobile West Corporation (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

**7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA\***

1. Call to Order:

2. Roll Call: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, 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. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Installation of a Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Golden Oak Drive at Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

b. Follow-up Review – Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-614, New Residence and Associated Site Improvements, 121 Ash Lane, Vidalakis/Elsbrand

c. Follow-up Review, Right of Way Improvements – Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-600, New Residence, 4860 Alpine Road, Achermann/Friedman

5. New Business:

a. Proposed Holiday Open House, Fromhertz House, 210 Portola Road, The Priory School

b. Site Development Permit X9H-620, Grading and Retaining Wall Construction, 138 Ramoso Road, Pereyra/Sanislo

6. Approval of Minutes: October 25, 2010

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: November 5, 2010

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning & Building Assistant

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** ASCC  
**FROM:** Tom Vlastic, Town Planner  
**DATE:** November 4, 2010  
**RE:** Agenda for November 8, 2010 ASCC Meeting

**NOTE:** A special ASCC field meeting has been scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on the afternoon of Monday, November 8, 2010. The special meeting is for continued consideration of **Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, T-Mobile West Corporation**. In this case, the meeting is part of the process of implementing conditions of CUP approval and the ASCC has been tasked with a significant role in this implementation process. The site neighbors have been given notice of this site meeting. The specific purpose and focus of the meeting are discussed under agenda item 4a.

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

**4a. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) X7D-170, INSTALLATION OF A WIRELESS COMMUNICATION ANTENNA FACILITY, GOLDEN OAK DRIVE AT PEAK LANE, T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION**

---

As ASCC members are aware, upon appeal of the planning commission denial, the town council acted to grant the subject CUP to T-Mobile West Corporation. The appeal was acted at the October 13, 2010 town council meeting and the formal resolution granting the permit was adopted at the October 27, 2010 council meeting. For background and reference, attached are the October 6, 2010 staff report on the appeal and Resolution No. 2508-2010, granting the CUP and setting permit conditions.

Exhibit A of the Resolution includes the 17 conditions of the use permit. Conditions 2 and 12 specifically set forth the framework for final design and location of the antenna facility and the ASCC role in the process. The site meeting scheduled for Monday afternoon, as noted at the head of this memorandum, is the beginning of this process. The specific purpose of the site meeting is for the ASCC to provide specific direction as to the location for the pole or faux tree and related fenced equipment enclosure.

To facilitate the site meeting, we will have the alternative plans for poles and trees available for reference. Also, the following enclosed or attached data has been

developed for ASCC use in providing final directions relative to pole/tree design and location:

- 11"x17" Site Plan & Elevation, Sheet C-1, 7/22/10, Zon Architects (enclosed)
- Color images of slimline pole and faux tree options (enclosed)
- Optional Floor Plan layouts for fenced equipment enclosure (attached)
- Site Plan showing California Water Service site improvement, 2/18/93 (attached)
- Sheet L-1, Landscape Preliminary Drawing, 9/15/10, Zon Architects

The site plan data on Sheet C-1 shows the current site conditions, and includes topography, tree cover, property line and yard setback data. It also shows the pole/tree location and fenced equipment enclosure most recently considered by the ASCC. As can be seen from the sheet, the equipment enclosure is fully outside of the required side yard setback area.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC develop final directions to the applicant relative to pole/tree design and location of the antenna as well as equipment area. It is stressed the no landscape plan has yet been developed as called for in the conditions of approval. The intent is for this plan to be developed after the ASCC has reached agreement as to pole/tree design and location.

**1. Selection of pole/tree location and whether the facility will be a tree or pole.**

The approval conditions allow the ASCC the latitude to determine the final location for the facility. The specific direction is to move the pole/tree location shown on the enclosed site plan as far toward the water tank as possible and away from the top of the slope along Peak Lane. We suggest that as an alternative to this adjusted location, a site closer to the existing Cal Water generator pad be considered to provide more separation between the facility and the Vedder residence to the northeast. We also believe that this alternate site would result in less overall visual presence. The applicant has advised that such a location faces problems due to the water facility infrastructure and that it would likely require some tree removal. In any case, we believe this alternative site should be fully evaluated at the site meeting. It is possible that other sites, meeting required setbacks, could be considered, but they likely would not reduce the potential visual relationships between the parcels most directly adjacent to the subject site.

Based on ASCC determinations relative to the preferred pole location, a decision then needs to be made on the design, i.e., pole or tree. While we believe that some of the tree examples provided herewith and previously considered are possible, at this point, it appears that a dark, slimline pole might actually draw less visual attention to the facility than a faux tree. Clearly, this would be based on the ASCC preferred site and surrounding conditions, but it appears that the mass of the tree options might stand out in significant contrast to the other site vegetation.

Relative to the issues of height and collocation, the applicant has advised that for a slimline pole to accommodate three carriers at the site shown on the enclosed site plan, it would have to be 70 feet high and have a diameter at the base at roughly the 36-inches previously discussed. The other design factors would be as follows:

- 43 feet to the centerline of the lowest antenna carrier
- Five foot antenna heights

10 feet separation centerline to centerline of antenna  
Foundation base of five feet by five feet

This would result in a distance of 65-66 feet from the ground to the top of the highest antenna of the three carriers and roughly a pole height of 70 feet. If the ground elevation were lower, then the pole would have to be somewhat higher. The ground elevation near the suggested alternative generator area site is four to five feet lower than the currently proposed site. Further, the applicant has advised that the water tank height could impact the height needs of the lowest carrier due to potential for tank interference with antenna function. From the data we have, we estimate that the top of the water tank is roughly 30 feet higher than the ground elevation near the generator and approximately 24 feet higher than the ground elevation of the pole site shown on the enclosed site plan.

2. **Equipment enclosure.** Some fenced equipment enclosure size and design options are provided on the attached sheet provided by T-Mobile. There likely are some variations on these that can be discussed relative to the possible antenna sites. In any case, as with the current proposal, the final equipment pad should be outside of required setback areas. Further, the ASCC should consider how large an area might be needed for the possible two future carriers, as any landscape plan is to provide screening in anticipation of future equipment needs, although security fencing of this "future" area does not need to be provided at this time.

The applicant has advised that they worry about the ability to accomplish full screen landscaping if they have to reserve an area for future equipment. This concern should be fully discussed at the site meeting.

The ASCC should conduct the November 8<sup>th</sup> site meeting and consider the above factors as well as applicant and public input. Based on this data, the ASCC should provide direction for final facility location and tree or pole design. Based on this data, the applicant would finalize the site plans and develop the proposed landscape plan as called for in the CUP conditions. These plans would then be presented to the ASCC at a future noticed meeting for final consideration and approval.

**4b. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-614, NEW RESIDENCE AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, 121 ASH LANE, VIDALAKIS/ELSBRAND**

---

On May 10, 2010 the ASCC conditionally approved plans for new residential development of the subject 3.7-acre Westridge property and the planning commission approved the subject site development permit, including the ASCC conditions, on May 19, 2010. Since May, the project design team has developed the proposed building permit plans and has now submitted the plans listed below to address the few conditions requiring ASCC review and approval. The enclosed plans have been prepared, unless otherwise noted, by Swatt Miers Architects and are dated November 1, 2010:

Sheet DR2, Site Plan  
Sheet DR12, Exterior & Landscape Lighting Plan

Sheet DR13, Exterior & Lighting Plan  
Sheet DR14, Exterior Lighting Cut Sheets  
Sheet DR16, Entry Gate  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control & Construction Operations Plan, Lea & Braze  
Engineering, Inc., 10/12/10  
Sheet L-1, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valeria Remitz, 10/29/10  
Sheet L-2, Landscape/Planting Plan, Valeria Remitz, 10/29/10

In support of the plans, the project architect has submitted that attached November 1, 2010 letter explaining the plans and overall efforts made to address ASCC concerns and those of the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC). It is noted, however, that at the time of preparation of this report we had not received any input on the above plans from the WASC. Will or WASC members will update the ASCC on Westridge review on Monday night.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC complete review of this follow-up submittal:

**1. Background information and planning staff review of building permit plans.**

For background, attached is the May 14, 2010 staff report prepared for the May 19, 2010 planning commission hearing on the site development permit. It includes the staff reports and minutes associated with ASCC project reviews, particularly the original April 21, 2010 staff report, minutes of the April 26, 2010 ASCC meeting and the staff report and minutes for the May 10, 2010 ASCC meeting. The 5/10/10 minutes include the approval conditions. Those that specifically require ASCC consideration are conditions 3 (construction staging plan) and 6 (exterior lighting plans).

In October, the we reviewed the building permit plans for conformity with the approval conditions and the findings from this review are set forth in the attached October 8 and 11, 2010 emails to planning technician Borck. Some comments in these emails address the construction staging and lighting plans and the November 1, 2010 letter from the project architect response to questions we raised on these matters in the emails.

**2. Exterior lighting plan revisions.** While the ASCC found the revised lighting plans generally acceptable at the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, some additional adjustments were needed to resolve concerns of the WASC. As commented on in our emails and in the 11/1 letter from the project architect, the plans have been modified to lower the lumen levels with new recessed soffit fixtures. Further, plan adjustments are being made relative to the dimming of exterior lights and these and other controls will also be developed and implemented for interior lighting. We will have the building permit interior lighting plans for reference at the ASCC meeting and the project design team will further explain the lighting adjustments planned to limit light spill

**3. Construction staging and operations plans.** Sheet ER-1 provides for construction staging and vegetation protection. We completed a review of the plan as presented in our attached October 11, 2010 email. We raised a few questions that are responded to in the 11/1 letter from the project architect. In particular, it is noted that there may be some limited parking along Alamos Road, but that most parking would be on site and that there would be no parking on Ash Lane. Also, it is

noted that a security camera on site is not planned at this time. Further, the 11/1 letter states that the current project contractor estimates that the period of off-haul grading would take 304 weeks and need 107, 12 "in-ground" yard truck trips. This was data requested by the WASC. In any case, the public works director will require a traffic management plan associated with any such grading operation.

4. **Entry gate plan.** Sheet DR16 shows the driveway entry gate design. The gate would be six feet high and set back 51 feet from the Ash Lane right of way (see note on Sheet L-1). Thus, it is not subject to front yard fence height or other design limits. The design with horizontal mahogany boards is consistent with the design criteria suggest by the design team during original ASCC plan review.
5. **Revised fencing plan.** The revised fencing alignment is shown on plan Sheets L-1 and L-2 and is commented on in the 11/1 letter from the project architect. The alignment adjustments are consistent with the changes requested by the ASCC. We are waiting to hear from the WASC on this matter, as there was at least the indication that somewhat more fencing adjustment may be desired by the Westridge committee. It is stressed, however, that all proposed fencing is outside of any required yard setback area, but the existing four-foot high horse fencing closer to the property boundary is shown on the plans to remain.

Prior to acting on this follow-up submittal, the ASCC should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the November 8, 2010 meeting.

**4c. FOLLOW-UP REVIEW, RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-600, NEW RESIDENCE, 4860 ALPINE ROAD, ACHERMANN/FRIEDMAN**

---

This matter is before the ASCC for review and approval of plans for driveway and related improvements only within the Alpine Road right of way on the south side of the subject parcel. The property is located on the northeast side of Alpine Road just to the east of the intersection of Alpine Road and Willowbrook Drive. The attached vicinity map shows the site and area. The Alpine Road right of way in front of the parcel contains an informal parking area used by visitors to the public trails along Coalmine Ridge and within the Windy Hill Open Space preserve of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District.

The plan before the ASCC for approval is enclosed, dated 10/26/10, received 10/29/10, and was prepared by Surface Design Inc. It shows the proposed driveway improvements, landscaping and desired timbers to separate the driveway and landscaping from the adjacent parking areas. Also identified is the location for the proposed mailbox and attached is a cut sheet for the desired mailbox.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC act on this matter.

1. **Background, encroachment permit, permit limitations and review of plans by public works director.** In the Spring of 2009 the ASCC approved plans for new residential development of the subject parcel. As ASCC members are aware, after their approval of the project, a dispute developed between the town and property

owner relative to the issuance of the necessary encroachment permit for driveway access through the town's right of way to Alpine Road. The public works director refused to issue the encroachment permit for the desired driveway location as shown on the ASCC approved plans and eventually his denial of the permit was appealed to the town council. The town council eventually approved the permit and set conditions of its issuance. The permit as issued is attached, as are the minutes from the January 13, 2010 meeting setting forth the council's deliberations leading to the permit approval. With approval and issuance of the encroachment permit, house construction permits were issued and site development is now well underway.

The permit and minutes explain the conditions of the approval, which include the location for the driveway in the right of way and distance dimensions from the driveway to the northwest (7 feet) and southeast (34) that are available to the applicant to accommodate sight distance and landscaping improvements. The record also shows that the 34-foot area must accommodate one parallel parking space.

Staff has reviewed the enclosed plan and it is slightly out of conformance with the encroachment permit conditions. The attached 11/2/10 report from the public works director identifies the changes he finds necessary to satisfy the encroachment permit and attached is an annotated portion of the applicant's plan we have prepared to show how the plan needs to be adjusted to meet the dimension and parking requirements of the permit, as interpreted by the public works director. The applicant has specifically asked that staff set forth the changes it will accept to allow the plan to proceed and with the report from the public works director and this report we are responding to this request.

The other plan adjustments required by the public works director include that the driveway surface in the right of way only be standard asphalt paving and that the mailbox only be a postal service standard design on a 4x4 or 6x6 post. He also advised that the mailbox should be further away from the roadway and within the applicant's planting area adjacent to the driveway and that the 4"x8" timber barriers only be 4" high with somewhat more spacing between them than is shown on the plans.

Thus, with the directions from the public works director, the primary focus of the ASCC is on the plant materials that are proposed and these are discussed below.

2. **Landscaping.** The public works director has advised that any planting in the right of way should be consistent with town standards. Section 18.37.020.G of the zoning ordinance states that the permitted right of way planting is "Native grasses, ground covers and native shrubs from the town's native plant list that do not interfere with either existing or planned public trails, paths or streets."

The proposed plantings are native grasses and native shrubs including dwarf ceanothus and red flowering currant (*Ribes*). The plants appear to fall within the town policy, but would likely need some maintenance to make sure they stay within the set planting areas. The ceanothus is similar to 'dark star' and has a height/width range of 3 and 4 feet respectively. The *Ribes* can grow higher than four feet and could have some impact on sight distance. In any case, the plantings would over



time provide a dense and compact buffer between the driveway, parking areas and roadway.

3. **Mailbox.** While, as requested by the applicant, the public works director has clarified his position on the mailbox, Section 18.37.020.F. of the zoning ordinance allows the ASCC to approve mailboxes that are not of the U.S. Government approved type. Any such alternative design, however, cannot block a public trail. There is no public trail, but there is bike traffic and pedestrian traffic through the parking area and we, therefore, concur that the mailbox should be in the council approved buffer planting area. We, however, suggest that with such location, and if an alternative was acceptable to the public works director, the applicant be permitted to use a mailbox of USPS approved design for packages as long as it is a dark color and of a standard design.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should consider the above comments, visit the project site and also consider any new information presented at the November 8, 2010 ASCC meeting.

#### **5a. PROPOSED HOLIDAY OPEN HOUSE, FROMHERTZ HOUSE, 210 PORTOLA ROAD, *THE PRIORY SCHOOL***

---

This matter is largely on the ASCC agenda to provide the public, particularly neighbors of the Priory, information about a planned 2.5-hour holiday open house to formally recognize and celebrate the school's acquisition of the 1.2-acre Gambetta/Rutherford property located immediately to the northeast of the Gambetta Lane driveway to the school. The attached vicinity map shows the parcel location and the location of the "Fromhertz" house on the site. The attached October 21, 2010 memorandum from Tim Molak, Head of School, describes the plans for the open house and how activities associated with it would be conducted during the time period of 2:00 to 4:30 p.m. on Sunday, December 13, 2010.

The Priory took ownership of the Gambetta/Rutherford parcel on October 29, 2010. The town was formally advised of this fact and the planned Holiday open house and house blessing during the planning commission's October 20, 2010 annual review of the school's use permit. The attached October 14, 2010 staff report on the annual review provides some additional comments on the parcel acquisition and the zoning ordinance provisions allowing for the short-term open house, i.e., section 18.36.030.C. Since the parcel and house have yet to be added to the lands under the school's CUP, it is not subject to the use permit provisions that would otherwise allow for the open house activity.

The October 21<sup>st</sup> memo from Mr. Molak explains how the school would handle traffic, parking and any short-term lighting needs during the open house. It also discusses use of a temporary tent and the site clean-up that would be done prior to the event. The memo was prepared in response to questions raised by staff. Mr. Molak will also be at the November 8<sup>th</sup> ASCC meeting to offer additional information on the event plans as may be needed.

Overall, given the activity management that the Priory has exercised for its events in the past, we have little concern with the open house plans. We do, however, prefer the Option B parking plan to reduce potential for impact on the meadow areas and would, therefore, recommend use of the shuttle system even if the meadow area is not wet from rains.

In any case, the ASCC should consider the above and attached information and any public input and offer comments and recommendations as may be appropriate to modify the open house plans prior to the December 13<sup>th</sup> event.

**5b. SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-620, GRADING AND RETAINING WALL CONSTRUCTION, 138 RAMOSO ROAD, PEREYRA/SANISLO**

---

This proposal is for approval of 370 cubic yards of fill to be placed uphill of a retaining wall system in support of plans for yard development on the subject 2.6-acre, residentially developed, Westridge Subdivision property. The property location and general area conditions are shown on the attached vicinity map. The proposed grading and retaining wall work is shown on the enclosed six-sheet grading and erosion control plan set dated 9/28/10, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc. Sheets C-1 and C-2 provide the most significant data relative to the grading proposals and location of retaining walls. In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached September 21, 2010 report prepared by UPP Geotechnology, Inc. The primary focus of the report is on the condition and design of the retaining walls.

The ASCC is the site development permit approving authority for projects like this proposal where the total volume of grading is between 100 and 1,000 cubic yards. Provisions of the site development ordinance state that the site development committee is to provide comments and recommendations to the ASCC for consideration in acting on any site development permit.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in its review of this proposal.

- 1. Background, Project Description.** The site is located on the northeast side of Ramoso Road and contains a two-story residence, with driveway parking and other related residential improvements. The upper portion of the parcel has gentle to moderate slopes with steeper slopes along the northerly side of the property. The ground elevations decrease by over 120 feet from Ramoso Road to the northeast boundary of the parcel. The site has considerable tree cover, but recently there has been vegetation removal and the start of the retaining wall and grading work that is "proposed" on the enclosed plans.

This current work was stopped so that necessary permits could be pursued. Currently the southwesterly side of the property, between the house and southeasterly property line and between the partially constructed retaining wall and Ramoso Road is largely disturbed and exposed earth. It is therefore important that at a minimum, erosion control measures be implemented as soon as possible.

Existing conditions include a Westridge subdivision trail along the parcel frontage and this trail is shown on Sheet C-2 of the plans. The trail is partially in the town's

right of way and also partially in the existing trail easement along the parcel frontage.

In addition to the proposed retaining wall work and fill, the plans include extending the storm drainage system to a new energy dissipator below the grading area. We assume that this is to correct drainage problems experienced with the water that was likely previously released further uphill and below the existing catch basin in the trail easement.

The attached October 26, 2010 report from the Town Geologist discusses the retaining wall work that was initiated without permits. It appears the initial work did not fully appreciate the grade changes and scope of wall construction that would be necessary to accommodate the desired fill and retaining wall improvements. The walls were initially anticipated to be landscape features no higher than 3 feet. In fact, they are to be up to 6 to 8 feet in height, must be properly engineered and, as does the volume of grading, fall within the permit authority of the town.

The area where the grading is proposed and has already started appears to have contained significant vegetation at least within the most recent 10-year period. The town's air photo taken in 2001 shows considerable shrub and tree cover in the area that does not exist today. Further, the retaining wall work that has been initiated has the potential for adversely impacting a 7-inch oak at the planned 90-degree bend in the wall. The oak may have already been significantly impacted by the work that has been completed and its condition may need to be evaluated by an arborist.

The portions of the planned retaining wall that exceed four feet in height are well over 50 feet from the front property line and, therefore, do not face any conflicts with the town's zoning provisions for wall height or location. (The wall alignment is along the existing cyclone wire fence on the southeast side of the house.) Further, since the wall will be mostly exposed to the northeast and within the property, it would not have potential for significant off site visual impacts.

Our primary concerns with the project are that the wall work be done in accord with appropriate engineering standards, the impacts on existing trees be minimized to the extent possible given the work that has already been done, and that a landscape repair plan be developed and implemented for the front yard area disturbed by the earthwork.

2. **Site development committee reports.** The following attached reports have been received from site development permit committee members:

Town Geologist, October 26, 2010  
Public Works Director, October 26, 2010  
Fire Marshall, October 15, 2010 (email)

The fire marshal has no comments on the proposal and the report from the public works director sets standard site development permit conditions. The report from the town geologist makes it clear the higher portions of the "existing" retaining wall will need to be removed and reconstructed according to the criteria called for in the UPP Geotechnology report. Some earthwork will be needed to excavate the

recently placed fill away from the wall so that it can be reconstructed to appropriate standards.

3. **Landscaping and erosion control provisions.** Irrespective of the efforts needed for reconstruction of the retaining wall, erosion control measures need to be installed as soon as possible given that the rainy season is virtually upon us. This should be accomplished to the satisfaction of the public works director.

In additions to any interim erosion control, a planting plan for the area disturbed by grading should be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of the ASCC. Most of the disturbed surface is within the 50-foot front yard setback area. This area should be planted with native materials and the ASCC should provide direction for the scope of planting it deems necessary given site and area conditions. Further, we recommend that a significant planting area be provided along the top of the tall retaining wall to help keep people away from top of wall. While the building code does not require a railing in this case, it would be prudent to make it difficult for people to get close to the top of the wall given the drop-off heights of six feet or more.

4. **Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) Review.** While this project is within the area of the Westridge Subdivision, we have not yet received any comments from the WASC on the proposal. We are checking with the committee and will update the ASCC on the status of Westridge review on Monday night. In any case, we want to move the proposal ahead so that necessary erosion control work can be completed as soon as possible

Prior to acting on this request, ASCC members should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the November 8, 2010 ASCC meeting. Any action to approve should be conditioned on full compliance with the recommendations of the site development committee members.

TCV

encl.

attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison  
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison  
Applicants

Mayor