

Vice chair Breen called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the town center Historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Warr  
Absent: Hughes  
Town Council Liaison: Richards  
Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested and none were offered.

**Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-616, new residential development, 300 Westridge Drive, Whitney**

Vlastic presented the January 5, 2012 staff report on this follow-up review. He advised that the ASCC conditionally approved the proposal on July 12, 2010 and that one of the ASCC approval conditions requires full ASCC consideration and that is related to the proposed construction staging plan. He then reviewed the following plans, prepared by Arcanum Architects, Inc., provided to address the ASCC construction staging plan condition:

Sheet A1.1, Site/Roof Plan, F.A.R. Calcs., Const. Staging Plan, 12/01/11  
Sheet TPR, Tree Protection and Relocation Plan, 11/29/10

Vlastic advised that one of the main reasons for having these plans considered by the full ASCC was to ensure that the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) would have a public opportunity to review and comment on the construction staging provisions. He added that the WASC had considered an earlier version of the plan, and issued the October 26, 2011 approval e-mail included with the staff report. Vlastic also advised that since the staff report had been prepared, a communication had been received from Celia Oakley, 348 Westridge Drive, seeking clarification that the oaks just east of the common access easement serving her property, the subject property and 332 Westridge Drive would be protected with tree protection fencing. Vlastic clarified that this comment pertained to the oaks between the Whitney driveway and Westridge Drive and that the plans needed to be modified to ensure tree protection was added in this area.

Vlastic also reviewed the concerns in the staff report regarding the need for the plans to be modified to more completely clarify the details for construction parking on site, with no parking on Westridge Drive, and the timing of early east side screen planting and fencing protection for this early planting.

Applicant Rita Whitney and project architect Tim Chappelle presented the plans to the ASCC. They stressed their intent to protect site trees and to also ensure there was no parking on Westridge Drive. Ms. Whitney noted the care taken in the recent relocation of oaks consistent with the approved landscape plan.

Public comments were requested. **George Comstock, 177 Alamos Road**, sought and received assurance that the plans as currently presented were the same as approved in 2010.

**Celia Oakley, 348 Westridge Drive**, shared her concerns over any parking or staging on Westridge Drive or that would impact use of the joint access easement serving the subject site and her property, as well as the property at 332 Westridge Drive. She stressed the need to keep the access easement clear and that there be no construction parking along Westridge Drive either west or east of the easement area. She also asked that the access easement neighbors be informed, i.e., given early warning, of any times when deliveries might potentially impact driveway access so that neighbors could plan accordingly. She also asked that the contractor be reminded that construction debris, including dirt and mud from the site be cleaned on a regular basis.

**Beverly Lipman, WASC**, stated appreciation for the efforts being made by the applicant and also for staff's identification of the need for more data and clarification relative to the provisions for construction parking.

ASCC members discussed the plans and concerns raised by the neighbors. Members concurred with the concerns over any construction parking or staging that might impact access or traffic flow on Westridge Drive or the joint access easement and the need for more details on the plans relative to these matters. They also concurred with the comments in the staff report on the plans.

After discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Warr and passed 3-0 subject to the following conditions for plan revisions and clarifications to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any building permits:

1. The plans and construction schedule shall provide for early planting, i.e., after site grading, of the required three 48" box size oaks along the easterly property line for screening between the subject site and 121 Ash Lane. The specific timing of this planting shall be set with the project contractor and the installation completed under the direction of a designated ASCC member. Further, the plans shall be modified to clearly provide that construction protection fencing will be placed around these newly planted trees as well as relocated trees 11 and 19.
2. The construction parking notes on Sheets A1.1 and TPR shall be revised to clearly state that construction parking shall not be on Westridge Drive or in the public right of way and shall only be on the subject site unless arrangements are made for off site parking and shuttling to the site, e.g., from Ford Field. Further the plans shall:
  - a. Provide for temporary "no construction parking" signs along Westridge Drive.
  - b. Identify the on-site locations where construction parking will be contained including the specific number of vehicles that can be accommodated on site.
  - c. Provide for protection fencing and/or barriers to ensure that there is no construction parking or staging in or immediately around the joint access easement or the portion of Westridge Drive west of the joint access easement.
  - d. Provide for regular cleaning of and construction debris, particularly in and around the joint access easement and within the Westridge Drive right of way.

3. The construction staging plan shall include specific provisions for early notification to the joint access easement neighbors of any deliveries or construction operations that could impact access to their properties so that they can make alternative arrangements as may be needed.
4. The construction staging plans shall provide for timely repair to any joint driveway easement access improvements if damaged by the construction operations.

**Architectural Review -- proposed residential additions and remodeling, and related yard improvements, 15 Valencia Court, Kieturakis**

Vlasic referenced the January 5, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of plans for additions to and remodeling of the existing single level, 3,372 sf residence, including attached garage, on the subject 1.05-acre, Alpine Hills area property. It was noted that since commissioner Warr was conflicted relative to consideration of this project, review would need to be continued to the January 23, 2012 regular meeting due to the lack of a quorum. It was clarified that Warr was the architect for a house addition now taking place on a parcel immediately across Valencia Court from the subject site.

Based on the foregoing, project review was continued to the January 23, 2012 regular ASCC meeting.

**Staff Report -- City of Palo Alto Referral, plans for new residence, 830 Los Trancos Road**

Vlasic presented the subject referral to the ASCC including the project plans dated 1/11/12 prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects, a visual analysis prepared by the project architects, and the January 11, 2012 Palo Alto staff report prepared on the project. Vlasic advised that he had reviewed the plans and materials and staff report and also visited the project site. He noted that the project seemed generally well developed and that he had identified no significant issues relative to the general siting of the proposed improvements and approach to new residential development. He clarified that it is appreciated that the existing building site would be used for the new project and that the new construction minimizes grading and tree removal and includes a number of new trees and other plantings for screening of views from off site.

Vlasic noted, however, that the proposed lighting plan was more extensive than would normally be found consistent with town policies and standards for exterior lighting. He added that he had already noted this concern in a preliminary note to the Palo Alto staff when he advised them that the ASCC would look at the plans at its January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

ASCC members briefly considered the plans and several noted that they were aware of the specific site and its current conditions. ASCC members agreed that the only concern had to do with the scope of exterior lighting as presented on plan Sheets LE-1 and LE-2. Members concurred that the lighting proposed, particularly on the west side, was extensive and with potential for considerable spill off site if all lighting were on at the same time. Concern was also expressed with the pool lighting, particularly in combination with the other west side lighting. ASCC members supported the wording in proposed condition 5 of the Palo Alto staff report that states, "All site lighting shall be minimal and shall direct light down and shield light away from the surrounding residences and open space lands." Members noted that the scope of lighting shown on the plan sheets and particularly fixtures E2 and E3

(directional spots) seemed to raise issues relative to compliance with the wording in this condition.

Based on the above review, Vlasic was asked to forward the ASCC lighting comments to Palo Alto for consideration in completing action on the project.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0, approval of the December 12, 2011 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

T. Vlasic