

**Special Site Meetings* 727 Westridge Drive, Wang, and
1260 Westridge Drive, Shorenstein, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

At 2:35 p.m. Warr called the special field meeting to order at 727 Westridge Drive.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Breen, Clark, Hughes

ASCC Absent: Aalfs

Planning Commission: McIntosh, Von Feldt*

Town Staff: Town Planner Tom Vlasic

***Note:** This special meeting was noticed as a joint planning commission and ASCC session. Since only two planning commissioners attended the 727 Westridge Drive part of the special meeting, however, there was not a quorum of commissioners present for consideration of that matter. As noted in these minutes, the second site meeting at 1260 Westridge Drive did have a quorum of planning commissioners, thus that joint meeting could proceed as noticed.

Others present relative to the 727 Westridge Drive project:

Tracy Wang, applicant

Tobin Dougherty, project architect

Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

Preliminary Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment -- new residence, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-623, 727 Westridge Drive, Wang

Vlasic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report on this 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. He explained that the project includes a lower entry level that is partially cut into the site and described as "basement," and that other proposed improvements include a new swimming pool, stone terraces, vegetable garden and associated pathways, and landscaping. He also noted that while the existing driveway intersection with Westridge Drive is to 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.

Vlasic also reviewed the scope of grading and issues associated with tree removal, drainage, existing fencing, and the status of site development committee project review as described in the staff report. He noted that since the report was prepared, the town had received a copy of the December 11, 2010 letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) on the project, identifying questions regarding fencing, location of the sports court, impacts on the trail easement along Westridge Drive, and solar panel location and color details. (Copies of the letter were made available to ASCC members after distribution of the staff report.)

Vlasic advised that since this was a preliminary review of the project, at the conclusion of the December 13th meeting, 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.

ASCC members considered the staff report following project 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)

Also considered were the following materials submitted in support of the plans and received by the town on November 24, 2010:

- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures
- Colors and materials board dated November 23, 2010

Tobin Dougherty presented the project plans to the ASCC and conducted an inspection of the site. He made use of story poles and taping set to facilitate the site meeting and discussed the driveway modifications, tree impacts and drainage proposals. He noted that the drainage plan was being reconsidered by the project engineer to address the outfall concerns of the public works director as noted in the staff report. During the course of the site walk he offered the following clarifications:

- The driveway intersection with Westridge Drive is not proposed to change and the Westridge trail easement will not be impacted. The modified driveway alignment will provide for a more gracious access to the site and house entry and to the modified garage location with less visual impacts on the Westridge Drive corridor.
- By cutting the lower level into the site, the main level can be “lifted” for capturing of views without increasing visual impacts of site improvements. The new house would actually be lower than the maximum height of the existing house to be removed. This height relationship was demonstrated by the story poles set for the site meeting.
- The solar panels would be a relatively dark material but, in any case, would be on roof surfaces that, due to elevation, will not be visible from off site.
- The site plan is being modified to eliminate the sports court and related fencing out of the side yard setback area to address the concerns noted in the staff report and the letter from the WASC.
- The health department has raised issues with the adequacy of the existing septic system. The intent is to make use of the existing system if possible and modify the plans to address health department concerns.

- No new fencing is proposed beyond that associated with the vegetable garden and sports court and these will be adjusted as noted. The intent is to preserve the existing property line fencing, most of which is horse fencing. The solid board fencing along the eastern property line would be preserved for privacy between neighbors. In response to a question, it was noted that no front yard fencing or entry gate are planned.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed natural stone veneer siding would likely be "Montana Stone."
- Consideration is being given to modify the grading plans to keep more dirt on site and allow for less off-haul of materials. This should be possible to allow for a better blending of contours on the rear, southerly side of the site.

Following inspection of the site and plan presentation, ASCC members and planning commissioners present offered the following preliminary reactions and ASCC members noted that additional comments would be offered at the regular evening ASCC meeting:

- In general, the proposal appears appropriate and well thought-out for the site. Further, the rear meadow area has been disturbed previously and the proposed fill should have minimum potential for impact on native grasses. However, the native grasses that are present should be harvested as possible and reused in the erosion control efforts.
- The tree removal appears acceptable, but consideration should be given to moving one existing oak or planting a new oak along the lower portions of the realigned driveway to provide some screening of views from the driveway intersection with Westridge Drive to the main entry area of the house. Caution was offered, however, to not over plant the area and to protect the character of the oak grassland along the parcel frontage.
- More cut material should be placed on site to soften the rear yard fill slopes. This should provide for a more natural appearing transition from the rear patio and pool areas to the southern meadow.
- The drainage plan should be modified to allow for more sheet flow on site and less concentration of storm water flows and to also address the concerns of the public works director relative to the location of the "energy dissipater" and "grassy swale."

Warr also commented that given the relative large scope of the project, he was concerned with the somewhat light colors proposed for the plaster and cement board siding surfaces. He recommended consideration be given to the use of darker colors.

Lipman advised that the issues noted in the 12/11/10 letter from the WASC had largely been addressed with data presented at the site meeting.

Following site inspection and sharing of preliminary reactions, i.e., at approximately 3:35 p.m., Warr thanked the applicant and Mr. Dougherty for the site presentation and again noted that preliminary discussion of the project would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Warr also advised that the special site meeting would continue at the Shorestein property, 1260 Westridge Drive, as soon as ASCC members could convene at the property.

Preliminary Review – Proposed Subdivision X6D-210, 1260 Westridge Drive, Shorenstein Realty

ASCC members Warr, Breen, Clark and Hughes convened at the Shorenstein property at approximately 3:40 p.m. and were joined by planning commissioners McKitterick, McIntosh, Zaffaroni and Von Feldt. Also present were Tom Vlastic, Town Planner, Howard Young, Town Public Works Director, Town Council Liaison John Richards and the following individuals*:

Jeff Lea, project engineer
Betty Irvine, project representative
Pam Roberts, project representative
Heidi Johnson, project representative
Tom Hart, project representative
Robert Webster, 1255 Westridge Drive
David Kastanis, 1240 Westridge Drive
John and Holly Dissmeyer, 20 Possum Lane
James and Brenda Herrington, 50 Possum Lane
Mary Anna and Frank Matsumoto, 45 Hidden Valley Lane, Woodside
Mary Fiorina, 51 Possum Lane
Linda Lautner, 30 Possum Lane

*This may not be a complete list of all site meeting attendees, as not all individuals spoke or otherwise identified themselves during the course of the site meeting.

Vlastic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report and explained that this is a preliminary review of the subject proposal for a three-lot subdivision of the subject 11.6-acre parcel. He briefly reviewed the comments in the staff report on the project and also discussed the comments offered during the December 1, 2010 planning commission meeting on the proposal. He emphasized that this is only a preliminary review and that considerable application development, including a PUD component, is needed before it would be ready for public hearing as explained in the staff report. He also advised that the site meeting would allow the project team to present the proposal as currently defined to town officials and neighbors.

Vlastic noted that if anyone wishing to comment on the project is not prepared to offer input at the site or evening ASCC meetings, they should forward written comments to the town's planning department either by regular mail or email. He added that there should be ample time for such comments to be considered before the project is returned to the planning commission for formal hearing, likely in late February or April of 2011.

Betty Irvine and Jeff Lea reviewed the subdivision proposal as shown on the four sheet plan set dated October 18, 2010 and prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc. They discussed the location and condition of existing residential improvements and discussed the proposed lot layout identified by tapelines at the site. They also discussed issues associated with site floor area and impervious surfaces and options for distribution of permitted floor area between parcels, under the PUD application, to ensure that, overall, the subdivision floor areas and impervious surfaces would conform to town standards, even if the existing improvements proposed to be retained were left in place. Some discussion also focused on service access to proposed Lot B over the separate Shorenstein parcel north of the subdivision site and the impacts of such an access.

Design team members stressed that the desire is to maintain the entire property in one ownership, but that the subdivision proposal was important to establishing the value of the property as it is now on the market for sale. It was emphasized that the Shorestein estate did not intend to retain the parcel, but hoped that it would be sold to a new owner who would keep it in its current estate condition.

After providing an overview of the subdivision proposal, project team members led all present on a walk around the property to consider existing conditions and the proposed building sites. The walk included review of the proposed adjusted flood plain boundary and conditions along the creek and drainage channels, including the existing "paved" pathway and well and water storage tanks. Neighbors present expressed some concerns over potential visual impacts on the parcels along Possum Lane, tree and vegetation preservation, and also sight distance associated with the added traffic to the driveway intersection with Westridge Drive.

After walking the site, the design team conducted a tour of the existing Shorestein residence and briefly discussed how the house had been used over the years. Comments were offered on the other site structures and the intentions for them as indicated on the proposed subdivision plans.

Following the site inspection, it was noted that ASCC members would offer reactions to the proposal at the evening ASCC meeting. Vlasic again stressed that anyone not able to present comments at the site meeting or attend the evening ASCC meeting should forward written comments to the town's planning department. At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC and planning commission members thanked the design team and neighbors for their participation in the meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:00 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Architectural and Site Control Commission **December 13, 2010**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Breen, Clark, Hughes

Absent: Aalfs

Town Council Liaison: Wengert (arrived at approximately 7:40 p.m.)

Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested. **Breen** offered her concerns over the increasing presence of utility facilities (e.g., PG&E and West Bay Sanitary metering boxes) located on street frontages along residential properties and the visual clutter created by the facilities. She specifically worried over the trend and encouraged the town to pursue any actions possible to allow for minimizing the impacts of the utility facilities.

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

Vlasic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report on the status of this project. He noted that review of this matter was continued from the regular November 22, 2010 ASCC meeting, and at that meeting, the ASCC provided directions for landscape plan modifications, development of the specific plans for the design of the faux tree cell tower and for interaction with the neighbors as the revised plans are prepared.

Vlasic advised that the plan revision and development effort is still in process and the interaction with neighbors has yet to be completed. He further advised that, as a result, staff and the applicant concur that application review should be continued to the January 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the January 10, 2011 ASCC meeting.

Preliminary Review – Proposed Subdivision X6D-210, 1260 Westridge Drive, Shorenstein Realty

Vlasic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report on this 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. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission on the project (see above site meeting minutes) and noted that after discussion at the evening ASCC meeting, project processing would continue as explained in the staff report. He noted that specific dates for further public project review would be identified after the additional

application data is provided and considered by town staff and that future meetings would likely be scheduled in February or March of 2011.

Project representatives Jeff Lea, Heidi Johnson and Betty Irvine were present to offer comments in follow-up to the site meeting. They stressed that they would continue to work with town staff to address the matters outlined in the staff report and the input received from neighbors. In response to a question, Mr. Lea clarified that the project would be served by a STEP sanitary sewer system and that property annexation to the West Bay Sanitary District was in process.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

John Dissmeyer, 20 Possum Lane, expressed concerns over the project impacts on views from the backyard area of his property. He worried over the proximity to the creek, noise associated with traffic on a gravel driveway, added light and the overall site impacts associated with two new residences. He expressed concerns over increased potential for flooding and that the PUD process was to only circumvent town standards. He stressed his objection to any subdivision of the property.

Brenda Herrington, 50 Possum Lane, also expressed concern over the visual impacts of the project on her backyard area. She shared concerns over noise and lights associated with the use of the proposed driveway and the overall change that the project could bring to the site. She acknowledged her disappointment that the property owner would pursue any subdivision proposal and worried over the impacts of construction associated with any new development on the property. She also asked that every effort be made to preserve the established vegetation along the creek and drainage corridors.

Mary Anna Matsumoto, 45 Hidden Valley Lane, Woodside, stressed her concern over protection of the existing creekside environment. She offered that good screening was in place along the creek and that this screening should be enhanced and not impacted by any new development on the property.

David Kastanis, 1240 Westridge Drive, also expressed concerns over potential visual impacts of the project and offered that enhanced screening should be provided, especially if there is any requirement for removal of the non-native oleanders.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary reactions to the project:

- The site meeting was very informative and helpful and it is hoped that the applicant's desire to preserve the property in, for the most part, its current condition is supported.
- The historic nature of the existing house and related structures would have to be evaluated with any proposal to demolish, as they are over 50 years old. It is likely that the use of the structures is more important than the architecture.
- The PUD approach is appropriate, as it will ensure that the property can be held to a higher standard than would be the case with a conventional subdivision. Further, the density is appropriate and consistent with town standards.
- The creek side environment needs to be protected and riparian condition enhanced, particularly along the west side of proposed Lot A. To the extent possible, the existing chain link fence along the top of the creek bank should be removed. It is acknowledged

that the fence in some cases supports native vines and other vegetation and removal could impact screening. Thus, it may be important to preserve some of the fencing. Otherwise, fencing conditions should be brought into conformity with existing town standards.

- While it is acknowledged that existing creekside vegetation is important to visual screening, consideration should be given to removal of the bay trees that increase risk of transmitting SOD to the significant oaks on the property. This risk should be evaluated by an arborist and appropriate actions taken for protection of the oaks.
- The concepts for balancing of floor area (FA) and impervious surface (IS) area discussed at the site meeting and in the staff report should be reviewed to ensure the overall site is within current town standards.
- The proposed adjustments to the current floodplain boundary need to be evaluated to the satisfaction of the town's public works director. This will be important to final FA and IS evaluations and to location of the final building site on Lot A.
- The existing "paved path" along the western end of the property is actually remnant "chunks" of asphalt that should be removed so that they don't count against IS limits.
- Non-native vegetation, including the oleanders and Algerian ivy, are invasive and a phased program should be developed for removal that would specifically ensure appropriate replacement screen planting is provided. In addition, the existing lawn areas should be reduced or converted to a more native meadow condition. Overall, the site landscaping should be modified to transition from its current more formal, non-native condition to a more appropriate native environment as was recently done on the property at Golden Hills Drive in the Oak Hills subdivision.
- There are many existing spot and up lights and lights in the trees on the property that should be removed or otherwise brought into conformity with current town lighting standards.
- The more minimal approach to the access driveway that is proposed and possible with the PUD is supported. The use of a gravel driveway is aesthetically appropriate, but the noise concerns of the neighbors are appreciated. This should be further evaluated as project planning proceeds.
- The driveway extension proposed to Lot A should be modified to avoid the need to use part of the existing driveway circle on proposed Lot B. The driveway extension to Lot A should be south of the existing gravel circle area.

After the sharing of the above comments, Vlastic reminded all present that anyone wishing to offer additional comments on the project should provide them in writing to the planning department at town hall. Vlastic further advised that any future ASCC or planning commission review of the proposal would be meetings for which new notices would be provided.

Preliminary Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment -- new residence, swimming pool and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-623, 727 Westridge Drive, Wang

Vlasic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report on this 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. He reviewed the events of and comments offered at the afternoon site meeting (refer to above site meeting minutes which include a complete listing of project plans and materials), and again noted that since this is a preliminary review, after discussion at the evening meeting, project consideration should be continued to the January 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

Tracy and Fred Wang and Tobin Dougherty, project architect, were present to further discuss the project with ASCC members. Mr. Dougherty, in response to an earlier question, clarified the computer modeling used to determine the location and mounting angle for the planned solar panels. He noted the panels would not be flat on the roof, but would be installed at a low angle that, along with the black color and high roof elevation relative to surrounding properties, should ensure minimum potential for any off site visual impacts.

Also in response to a question about the potential to use the existing driveway alignment instead of the proposed alignment, Mr. Dougherty stated that the change is desired to enhance the relationship between the house and street views and allows for the garage to be better "hidden" from both on and off site views. He also noted that the modified alignment enhances the scope of meadow area between the building site and street frontage, reduces the extent of paving and the steepness of the grade at the second curve of the driveway.

Mr. and Mrs. Wang also noted that they had discussed the project with two neighbors (i.e., the Munks and Kramers) and that they had not offered any significant concerns with the project.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, ASCC members offered the following preliminary reactions in addition to those provided at the afternoon site meeting:

- Overall the landscape plan is appropriate with the addition of strategically placed oaks, or even some low level shrub planting, along the new driveway as suggested at the site meeting, but any additional front yard planting should be limited to avoid blocking views through the trees. It was suggested that any new oak be a Blue Oak and not a live oak to avoid additional "green mass" in the front yard area.
- Suggest that consideration be given to removing the large cedar east of the pool site, along with the current proposals for removal of existing non-native materials.
- The preservation of existing fencing is supported and it is appreciated that no front yard fencing or entry gate are desired or planned.
- While the house siting and massing are appropriate, more consideration should be given to the proposed color palette. Specifically there should be more contrast with use of darker colors to further mitigate for any potential massing impacts.

Members also again emphasized the comments offered at the site meeting to use more cut material on site to soften fill slopes and spread storm water across the property in contrast to concentrating such waters.

Following discussion, project review was continued to the January 10, 2011 regular ASCC meeting.

Prior to consideration of the following matter, Warr temporarily left his ASCC position and the meeting room noting that his firm was providing architectural services on the Miller project.

Staff Report – Request for temporary trailer use as a Residence during construction, 3350 Westridge Drive, Miller

Vlasic presented the December 10, 2010 staff report on this request for temporary use of a trailer/manufactured structure for use during construction on this property that was authorized by a 2009 ASCC approval. He reviewed the December 2, 2010 request letter from the applicant and also the November 11, 2010 site plan prepared by CJW Architecture. Vlasic noted that because there is only one ASCC meeting in December, staff agreed to share the request with the ASCC at the December 13th meeting.

Vlasic advised that under Section 18,36.030.E. the ASCC can authorize “temporary dwelling” use of a manufactured unit during a construction operation pursuant to certain conditions. He noted that the proposed location can be used with the existing site access and also avoids conflict with the construction access and operation. It was further noted that the ASCC can authorize the temporary use for one year, and Vlasic recommended that prior to final approval for placement of the unit the plans be shared with the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) for comment and otherwise modified for conformity with the utility and specific time period provisions of Section 18. 36.030.E. He also recommended that a photo of the proposed unit with clear definition of design and colors be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.

Mr. and Mrs. Miller were present to discuss their request with the ASCC. They concurred with the recommendations of staff. Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and approved 3-0, approval of the temporary use of the proposed dwelling unit subject to the conditions recommended by staff.

Following consideration of the above matter, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0-1 (Hughes) approval of the November 22, 2010 site meeting minutes.

Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the November 22, 2010 regular evening meeting minutes.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

T. Vlastic