



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, December 13, 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 JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

2:30pm 727 Westridge Drive Preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 2.9-acre Westridge Subdivision, Wang (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

3:30pm 1260 Westridge Drive Preliminary consideration of plans for a three lot subdivision of this 11.6-acre property, Shorenstein (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. Continued Review – Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Installation of a Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Golden Oak Drive at Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation *Continued to January 10, 2011 Meeting*
5. New Business:
 - a. Preliminary Review – Proposed Subdivision X6D-210, 1260 Westridge, Shorenstein Realty
 - b. Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-622, Proposed Residential Additions and Modifications, 95 Cheyenne Pointe, Berman *Continued to January 10, 2011 Meeting*
 - c. Preliminary Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment – New Residence, Swimming Pool and Related Site Improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-623, 727 Westridge Drive, Wang
6. Staff Report – Request for Temporary Trailer use as a Residence during Construction, 3350 Westridge Drive, Miller
7. Approval of Minutes: November 22, 2010
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: December 10, 2010

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: December 10, 2010
RE: Agenda for December 13, 2010 ASCC Meeting

Note: Two special ASCC field meetings have been noticed for the afternoon of Monday, December 13, 2010. Both are for preliminary review of applications and both have been noticed as joint meetings with the planning commission for the reasons explained herein.

The first site meeting will convene at 727 Westridge Drive at 2:30 p.m. and is for preliminary consideration of plans for residential redevelopment of this 2.9-acre Westridge Subdivision property. The plans include a site development permit application calling for just over 2,000 cubic yards of grading and the planning commission is the approving authority for the site development permit request. Since the project is within the Westridge Subdivision area, the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) has been invited to participate in the site meeting. A preliminary evaluation of the project is presented under agenda item 5c., Wang.

Following the Wang site meeting, at approximately 3:30 p.m., the second site meeting is to convene at 1260 Westridge Drive. This is for preliminary consideration of plans for a three lot subdivision of this 11.6-acre property. The planning commission is the approving authority for any subdivision proposal and the ASCC is required to offer comments on the subdivision design to assist the commission in consideration and acting on any subdivision. A preliminary evaluation of the request is presented under agenda item 5a., Shorestein.

In addition to the above, it should also be noted that the December 13, 2010 ASCC meeting is the only December ASCC meeting date. The second meeting in December is annually cancelled due to the Holiday season. **HAPPY HOLIDAYS TO ALL!!**

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

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

Review of this matter was continued from the regular November 22, 2010 ASCC meeting. At the November 22nd meeting, the ASCC provided directions for landscape plan modification and also for development of the specific plans for the design of the faux tree cell tower. Further, directions were provided for interaction with the neighbors as the revised plans are prepared. The ASCC observations and directions are presented in the enclosed draft meeting minutes of the November 22nd meeting.

The plan revision and developed process is still in progress and the interaction with neighbors has yet to be completed. Therefore, staff and the applicant concur that application review should be continued to the January 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting. In addition, if any member of the public wishes to comment at the December 13th meeting, they should be given an opportunity to do so.

5a. PRELIMINARY REVIEW – PROPOSED SUBDIVISION X6D-210, 1260 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, SHORENSTEIN REALTY

This is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for a three-lot subdivision of this 11.6-acre parcel located on the northwesterly side of Westridge Drive generally between Possum Lane and Mapache Drive. The attached vicinity map shows the parcel location. The parcel contains the existing residential estate that until his recent death was occupied by Walter Shoreinstein.

As noted at the head of this memorandum, Monday's review will begin with a 3:30 p.m. afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. The planning commission initiated its preliminary review of the project at the December 1, 2010 commission meeting. Attached is the November 23, 2010 staff report prepared for the December 1st commission review. The report provides a preliminary evaluation of the proposal, as shown on the enclosed plans listed in the report, and offers that as processing continues, it should be modified to include a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application to address the unique characteristics of the property that will be appreciated with the site meeting.

During the course of the planning commission preliminary review, several issues were noted and some additional evaluation has taken place relative to these issues. Thus, the comments that follow should be considered in addition to the data in the attached November 23, 2010 staff report.

1. Current floor area conditions relative to ordinance standards. At the planning commission meeting, a question was raised as to the current condition relative to floor area (FA) limits and existing development. Applying current FA standards to the entire property and taking into account the proposed amended flood plain boundary (see following comments) would yield a total FA limit for the 11.6 acre parcel of 8,341 sf. This is generated by an adjusted parcel area of 9.36 acres. The 85%, single structure limit would be 7,090 sf. The existing improvements on Lot B total 10,565 sf, and the proposal would be to remove 1,050 sf so that the total would

be reduced to 9,515 sf. In either case, the current improvements, while preexisting, exceed the current floor area limits. In addition, the existing main residence, i.e., largest structure, has a total FA of 8,280 sf. This also exceeds the 85% limit of 7,090 sf.

2. Floor Plain Boundary adjustment. The “surveyed” flood plain line shown on Lot A was generated by use of the flood elevations from the Federal Flood Plain maps. It is less invasive to the parcel than the line drawn on the Federal maps as is clear from comparison of the lines shown on the subdivision map. The applicant is working with the public works director to final a map amendment with the Federal Flood Insurance program.
3. Balancing of floor area between proposed parcels to accommodate existing floor area on proposed Lot B. With the proposed subdivision, each lot would have total floor area limits as follows:

Lot A -- 7,606 sf
Lot B – 7,817 sf
Lot C – 7,523 sf

This is a total FA of 22,946 sf. If the plans preserve the desired 9,515 sf and the floor area between parcels is adjusted so as to not exceed the total 22,946 sf, this would leave 13,431 sf for Lots A and C, or an average of 6,716 sf per parcel. Such balancing of floor area is possible with the PUD approach recommended in our November 23rd report. A similar approach could be taken relative the impervious surface area, but we have not yet pursued adjusted impervious surface area calculations.

4. Storm drainage easement on proposed Lot B. A storm drainage easement exists at the northeasterly boundary of proposed Lot B. Apparently this easement is to the benefit of the town, but it is not clear how far the easement extends. The project engineer and town public works director are looking further into this easement to better understand it and how it might impact the subdivision proposal.
5. Access to proposed Lot B over separate Shorenstein parcel frontage on Mapache Drive in the Westridge Subdivision area. The applicants indicate that they would like to preserve the current maintenance access to the property that crosses the 2.5-acre, separate Shorenstein parcel that fronts on Mapache Drive and is in the Westridge Subdivision area and subject to the Westridge Homeowners Association CC&Rs. Such an access would require an easement and any such access easement area would need to be deducted from the net area of the Westridge parcel. The parcel can't be reduced below 2.5 net acres, thus there would need to be a boundary change between Lot B and the Westridge property to maintain the 2.5 acre required minimum area. There are other issues that would be faced with this change including impacts associated with the Westridge CC&Rs. All of this is being further evaluated by the applicant and the project's legal advisors.

The ASCC should consider the information presented with this report and gained at the site meeting and offer preliminary reactions that can be considered by staff and the applicant as project processing continues. At this point, we do not have a specific date identified for the next review of the proposal.

5b. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-622, PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS AND MODIFICATIONS, 95 CHEYENNE POINTE, BERMAN

This request is for a two-story addition of 1,100 sf to the existing 2,771 sf residence, on the subject 1.0-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property. The proposal includes the site development permit for grading of approximately 180 cubic yards to accommodate the addition and some adjustments to the driveway. The plans have not been fully evaluated by the site development permit staff committee and there are a few issues that still need to be resolved. As a result, the project is not ready for ASCC consideration as was anticipated when it was noticed for the December 13th meeting. It is also noted that a modification to the town's land movement potential map is in process as the proposed addition site is designated Pd on the current map, and unless this can be modified based on more detailed geologic data, the addition project could not proceed.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that the ASCC receive any public input on the proposal that may be offered in response to the notice and then continue project review to the January 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

5c. PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT -- NEW RESIDENCE, SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-623, 727 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, WANG

This is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for construction of a new, two-story, 6,280 sf contemporary style residence with attached garage on the subject 2.9-acre Westridge subdivision parcel that contains an existing two-story residence (see enclosed vicinity map for parcel location). The project includes the lower entry level that is partially cut into the site and described as "basement." This area, however, is included in the total floor area calculations, as is the proposed 771 sf, attached garage. Other proposed improvements include a new swimming pool, stone terraces, vegetable garden and associated pathways, and landscaping. Further, while the existing driveway intersection with Westridge Drive will be preserved, the driveway alignment on site will be modified for conformity to the plans for garage access, guest parking and to generally improve the entry to the building site and access to the front door of the new house.

Demolition of existing residential improvements would precede development of the new project. These include the two-story house, detached garage and patio and driveway/guest parking improvements. Existing fencing along the east, south and west sides of the property would not be removed. A solid board fence exists along the easterly boundary that provides significant privacy between this site and improvements on the parcel to the east. The remaining fencing along the southern and western boundaries is primarily low and of an open post and wire design and likely is within the design standards allowed for horse fencing. Much of the fencing is within areas with shrubs and trees and does not present a strong visual element. The east side fencing is by design a more linear visual feature providing for privacy along this more sensitive boundary. While this fencing is not consistent with current fence ordinance standards, it

appears to. Nonetheless, the ASCC should consider fencing conditions and it is likely that the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee will have some comments on fencing during the course of project consideration.

The project proposes a total volume of grading of 2,030 cubic yards counted pursuant to the provisions of the site development ordinance. This volume requires the subject site development permit, and the planning commission is the approving authority for any such permit where the earthwork exceeds 1,000 cubic yards. It should also be noted that the application proposes a total house floor area that is just under the 85% limit for the single largest structure. Thus, no special ASCC findings are required relative to the floor area proposals.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated November 23, 2010, prepared by Tobin Architects:

- Sheet CS.1, Cover Sheet
- Sheet CV-1, Civil Cover Sheet/Info, Giuliani & Kull, Inc.
- Sheet CV-2, Civil Grading and Drainage plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc.
- Sheet CV-3, Civil Erosion Control Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc.
- Sheet A0.1, Architectural Site Plan (building, hardscape, lighting, septic location)
- Sheet L1, (Landscape) Site Preparation Plan, Cleaver Design, 11/11/10
- Sheet L2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design, 11/11/10
- Sheet A1.1, Ground Level/Basement Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Main/Entry Level Plan – Upper Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations (entry and back, i.e., north and south)
- Sheet A2.2, Exterior Elevations (left and right side, i.e., east and west)

In support of the plans, the applicant has provided the attached cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures and a colors and materials board, received dated November 24, 2010, that is discussed below and will be available for reference at the December 13, 2010 ASCC meeting.

As noted at the head of this memorandum, this preliminary project review is to begin with a site meeting that is scheduled to take place at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, December 13th. Due to the planning commission role on the site development permit, this has been noticed as a joint meeting with the commission. Further, the WASC has been invited to participate in the site meeting. At this point, the WASC has not forwarded any comments to the town on the project.

At the conclusion of the December 13 review, project consideration should be continued to the January 10, 2011 meeting to permit time for full processing of the request, and particularly the site development permit application. This will also allow time for the project design team to address any issues that may result from the preliminary review process. No date has yet been scheduled for the planning commission public hearing on the site development permit.

The comments that follow are offered to assist the ASCC and planning commission in a preliminary review of this project.

1. **Background, Project Description, Grading and Vegetation Impacts.** In 2008, the ASCC considered and approved a project (“Conley,” Duxbury Architects) for this

site that included not only new a new two-story, contemporary Ranch style residence with large basement, and a new south side swimming pool, but also a detached garage with workshop and a 3,343 sf basement. The total floor area with the 2008 project, not counting the basement, was 7,434 sf and this approached the floor area limit for the parcel, which is 7,567 sf. These 2008 approved plans were never pursued to building permit stage and the parcel was recently sold to the subject applicant. *(Some of the comments that follow are from our site analysis conducted in 2008.)*

This 2.9-acre property is located on the south side of Westridge Drive, approximately 250 feet west of the Westridge Drive and Favonia Road intersection. The property has gentle to moderate slopes, and the northern half is mostly in an oak grassland condition. The southern portion of the parcel has some oak cover, but also has more open meadow. Several larger non-native trees on the parcel have grown to considerable size and are proposed for removal with this project. Included are a Monterey Pine and several large eucalyptus trees, pines, elms, a cedar and some ornamentals. The tree removal is shown on Sheet L-1 and tree condition is discussed in the arborist report prepared for the property by McClenahan Consulting, dated November 14, 2006. A copy of this report is attached. It is likely that the applicant would want this report updated to verify the current condition of site trees, particularly the oaks.

To accommodate the proposed driveway changes, noted above, and overall site plan, a few oaks are also identified for removal. These too are shown on Sheet L-1, and discussed in the arborist report. Specifically, oaks 7, 19, 24, 31, 32 and 33 are planned for removal. With the 2008 project, except for trees 19 and 24, these oaks were approved for removal.

The parcel's developed building site is roughly in the central part of the its northern half. This site is somewhat of a local knoll top, and the existing house on it is roughly 100 feet back from the front parcel line along Westridge Drive. The house, existing detached garage and main parking area are accessed by a driveway that meanders through the oak grassland along the parcel frontage increasing in elevation to the building site. The building site is approximately 13 to 14 feet higher in elevation than the elevation along Westridge Drive.

The existing driveway, guest parking and auto court areas would be modified to accommodate the desired access and guest parking area and to essentially hide views to the garage doors and garage access apron from the front of the house and Westridge Drive. The new driveway and guest parking areas are not dramatic departures from existing conditions but allow for an improved overall entry, with the drive still meandering through the oaks on a relatively gentle grade. Considerable landscape enhancement is proposed along the house frontage to soften views to and from Westridge Drive and create a more attractive area of arrival to the front door of the house. The approach to landscaping in this area appears fully consistent with town planting guidelines. Further, low boulders are proposed to retain the grading for the guest parking area. This approach along with existing and planned oak plantings will minimize the impacts of earthwork and views to the parking area from the Westridge Drive corridor.

The proposed construction is in much the same location as existing improvements. The new house will have a somewhat larger footprint than the existing house, but will be located in essentially the same place on the property. The new attached garage will be on the east side whereas the existing garage is more to the northwest side of the building site. Nonetheless, the scope of the developed area would not change significantly with the proposed site redevelopment, but grading is proposed to cut the lower level of the house into the knoll.

All of the improvements planned in and around the established building site benefit from the screening to adjacent properties afforded by the existing, mainly, oak tree cover and separation by large distances from parcel boundaries and nearby residences. In fact the nearest residence is over 100 feet east of the building site and there is considerable screening provided by the trees along the eastern parcel boundary. The houses to the south and west are at least 150 feet or more from the existing/proposed building site. While there are more open views toward the house to the south, the house is almost 300 feet distant and its key views are not directly back to this subject building site. It is noted, however, that the two large eucalyptus trees that are to be removed are along the southern parcel boundary and there will be somewhat more open views in this area until the proposed landscape plan is implemented. The two large eucalyptuses were approved for removal with the previous project.

At the time of the 2008 project review, the site also contained a swimming pool and small pool house in its southeastern corner, actually somewhat below and southeast of the proposed rear yard pool. As noted on the enclosed site plan, these features have been removed since approval of the 2008 project.

The grading proposed is largely for development of the planned driveway modifications, excavation for the "basement" portion of the house and development of the rear, south side terraces and pool area. Actually much of the cut and fill is to develop the landscape areas adjacent to the south side of the house and between the house and pool terrace. A small amount of fill would be placed in the lower meadow area to reduce off-haul of materials, but this would not change contours in any significant manner. The total proposed off-haul of cut materials is 980 cubic yards.

Overall, the scope of site improvements, and even the proposed tree removal, should not result in significantly different visual relationships in the area, particularly if the existing tree cover that is to be preserved is protected from construction impacts as proposed on plan Sheet L-1.

- 2. Site Development Committee Review.** To date, comments have only been received from the town's public works director and the health department. A brief, 12/3/10 email from the health officer is attached advising that more data is needed from the applicant before the plans can be evaluated for continued septic system use. It is likely that improvements to the existing system will be needed.

During a recent staff meeting, the public works director has advised that the plans are generally acceptable but that he has encouraged the project engineer to consider moving the proposed southwest side drainage dissipater further away from the property line. It is anticipated that reports from other site development

committee members should be available for consideration prior to the January 10, 2011 ASCC meeting.

3. **Compliance with Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface Area (IS), height and yard setback limits.** The total proposed floor area is 6,280 sf and well below the 7,476 sf limit for the property. The floor area of the main house, including the attached garage, is all of the proposed floor area, and totals 6,280 sf. This is 160 sf under the 85% limit of 6,440 sf.

The total proposed impervious surface (IS) area is noted as 7,388 sf and this is well under the 13,438 sf IS limit. The plan notes, however, suggest that this includes the house footprint, which does not need to be included in the IS calculations. At the same time, we don't have a complete breakdown of the 3,200 sf of IS that is estimated beyond the house footprint and would need this to complete our IS analysis. In any case, it appears that the project is well within the IS limits for the property.

As demonstrated by the plan elevation sheets, house heights conform to the 28-foot and 34 foot height limits. Specifically, heights above adjacent grade range from 20 feet or less to roughly 24 feet. The maximum overall height is approximately 27 feet and well under the 34-foot maximum height limit. These heights are actually somewhat lower than those for the house approved in 2008. Much of that house had heights that were closer to the 28-foot height limit.

Compliance with required yard setbacks is demonstrated on plan Sheet A0.1. The proposed house improvements are over 120 feet from the front parcel boundary and well beyond the required 50-foot front setback. The house improvements are over 70 feet from the east side property line and over 130 feet from the west side property line. Further, setbacks from the southwesterly and southerly boundary lines are at least 190 feet. In all cases, except for the 50 foot required front setback, required yard setbacks are only 20 feet.

4. **Project Design and Exterior Materials.** The proposed house architecture is of a contemporary style and similar in character to other houses Mr. Dougherty has proposed and received approval for in town. The design makes use of flat roof forms, and architectural character and variation in forms is achieved with different heights, window patterns and the manner in which a variety of exterior materials are to be applied on the house elevations.

Exterior materials include horizontal cedar siding, cement plaster siding, cement board siding, and natural stone veneer. Window and door materials have not been clarified, except that the garage doors appear to be in the cedar proposed for the part of the siding.

The tan finish proposed for the plaster and cement panel/board siding appears to be just at the 40% light reflectivity policy limit for siding. Again, the window frames and doorframes and trim materials need to be specified for checking against the town's color reflectivity policy limits.

The roof is to be a "cool," energy efficient design in a color that is lighter than the 40% light reflectivity policy limit for roofs. In this case, however, the roof is at the

high point of the area and would not be seen from any surrounding parcels. The plans also indicate that solar panels will be located on the roof. The energy objectives for this system and the "cool" roofing are discussed in the attached December 6, 2010 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck that addresses the sustainable elements of the project and the mandatory BIG checklist.

Overall, the design and proposed materials appear appropriate for the site and in conformity with the general character of the neighborhood. In particular, the houses on the parcel to the east and on the parcel across Westridge Drive are of more contemporary designs. Also, the house that is being replaced is of a two-story contemporary design with large window areas, but is fairly inefficient and dated in terms of current design and building standards.

5. **Landscaping and fencing.** The landscape plan is directed at enhancing existing site conditions, achieving needed screening, and keeping new plantings close to the building site. The majority of the property would be preserved in the existing meadow and oak woodland condition. The plans do not appear over planted and, both in design and selection of materials, seem to conform to the town's planting guidelines.

The existing fencing conditions to remain are discussed above. The only new "fencing" that is planned is shown on Sheet L-2 and includes fencing and walls associated with the storage area, vegetable garden and basketball backstop. These features extend into the side yard area and are not permitted as designed in this 20-foot required side yard setback area. Thus, some plan adjustments would be needed to move the walls and fencing out of the required yard area.

6. **Exterior Lighting.** The proposed yard lighting is shown on Sheet A0.1 and house lighting on the floor plans Sheets A1.1 and A1.2. The cut sheets for the proposed lighting are attached. The number and distribution of lights is not excessive and the fixtures appear to conform to town lighting standards. The proposed E-1 fixture is a wall mounted design that is shielded and directs light down. While the fixture could have the potential to wash wall surfaces, its use is limited. The other fixtures for the house are recessed soffit lights and this fixture use is also limited. Yard lighting is with a few step and pathway lights that are located for specific tasks and not for landscape decoration.
7. **"Sustainability" aspects of the project.** Attached is the mandatory BIG checklist submitted by the applicant for the project. It is evaluated in the attached 12/6/10 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck. The report notes that the checklist shows how the mandatory 171 BIG points would be achieved and that the final design effort will likely result in a higher point total.

The ASCC should conduct the preliminary review, including the site visit with the planning commission and offer comments, reactions and directions to assist the applicant and project architect modify plans as may be necessary to allow for eventual final action by the ASCC on the architectural review application. As noted above, project review should then be continued to the January 10, 2010 regular ASCC meeting.

STAFF REPORT – REQUEST FOR TEMPORARY TRAILER USE AS A RESIDENCE DURING CONSTRUCTION, 3350 WESTRIDGE DRIVE, MILLER

Staff has just received the attached request for temporary use of a trailer/manufactured structure for use during construction on this property that was authorized by a 2009 ASCC approval. Because there is only one ASCC meeting in December, we agreed to share the request with the ASCC at the December 13th meeting. More information on the proposal will be presented at that time, including options for ASCC action.

TCV

encl.

attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor