

**THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes
October 17, 2016

CALL TO ORDER The meeting of the Woodside Architectural and Site Review Board was called to order on October 17, 2016, at 4:30 P.M. in Independence Hall.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Mah, and Reyering

Members Absent: Member Carlsmith

Staff Present: Jackie Young, Planning Director
Camas Steinmetz, Town Attorney
Sage Schaan, Principal Planner
Sean Mullin, Associate Planner
Corinne Jones, Assistant Planner
Jennifer Li, Deputy Town Clerk

CALL FOR CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Director Young noted a number of desk items:

- Regarding Consent Agenda Item No. 1, 2973 Woodside Road, there are:
 - E-mailed correspondences regarding ADA improvements to the commercial building.
- Regarding Agenda Item No. 2, 349 Manuella Avenue, there are:
 - A neighbor letter of support that was just submitted by the project architect; and,
 - Two color-coded, ledger-sized sheets that note how the structures are divided/separate from the main residence.
- Regarding Agenda Item No. 3, 201 Mountain Wood Lane, there are:
 - A staff memo summarizing the dates of Committee meetings, and recent reviews of the proposed land division; and,
 - A neighbor letter expressing concerns regarding increased intensity.
- Regarding Agenda Item No. 4, 2150 Greenways Drive, there are:
 - A staff memo summarizing the dates of Committee meetings, and recent reviews of the proposed land division; and,
 - A neighbor letter expressing concerns regarding increased intensity.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Lubin acknowledged the recent passing of Susan Crocker. She was on the Town Council in the 1980's, and was a devoted resident of Woodside. She lived in the Woodside Glens, and was a hard-worker on many fronts for Town issues.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

1.	2973 Woodside Road LLC	ASRB2016-0043
	2973 Woodside Road	Planner: Sean Mullin, Associate Planner

Formal Design Review with staff, to remodel an existing commercial building in the Community Commercial Zone. A Condition of Approval from the ASRB Conceptual Design Review requires that this item be placed on the ASRB consent calendar as an informational item.

DISCUSSION

Steve Patrick, representative for neighbor at 2975 Woodside Road, requested that the item be removed from the Consent Item for discussion.

The Board approved the request.

Mr. Patrick said a question came up regarding accessibility, on whether it would be required on one level or both levels. Joanne Kurz, Building Official, determined that access was only necessary from the upper level. He concurred with that if it indeed is a one tenant facility. If two tenants move in there, that would require ADA parking at both levels. He requested that a condition of approval be added to reflect the fact that the ADA review was considered under a one tenant scenario. The site has very little parking. If one doctor moved in, that would be similar to the previous use; therefore, it would maintain the status quo. If two independent tenants (e.g., two doctors) moved in, that would double the parking load.

Director Young suggested rather than trying to predict who may or may not move in there, she acknowledged that the review was based on a one tenant condition. That was noted in Building Official Kurz's e-mail. She read:

“Per myself and two licensed CASP specialists, this application meets the requirements of the 2013 Building Code Section 11.B.202.4. The space has been represented as one tenant, and has the ADA restrooms, required van-accessible space, and path of travel requirements. The public accommodations are all on the floor level facing Woodside Road. The complete plan check will be done upon the Building Permit submittal application. There are some signage requirements that will need to be clarified and modified for ADA at the time of a Building Permit application.”

Director Young said one way to address the neighbor's concern is to add Condition I.b., which notes for the record the contents of Building Official Kurz's determination. In the future, if it's changed to a two tenant space, the ADA review would be different. Also, the review hinges on the dollar value of the improvement, and what scope of ADA improvements can be required.

Chair Lubin said that's reasonable. Would they be required to return just for that?

Director Young said no, it means if there are two tenants, the ADA requirements would be reviewed differently.

ACTION

The ASRB recommended approval of the proposed project, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

- I. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit:
 - a. All project details required for review of a Building Permit.
 - b. Per the Town Building Official, this project meets the requirements of the 2013 California Building Code Section 11B-202.4. The floor plan has been represented as one tenant; and the project includes the ADA restroom, van accessible parking space, and path of travel requirements. The public accommodations are all on the floor level facing Woodside Road. A complete plan check will be done upon submittal of a Building Permit application. Signage for ADA will need to be clarified and modified on the Building Permit application.

- II. Prior to occupancy of the building:
 - a. Any new tenant shall secure a Business License from the Town of Woodside. Staff will review the application for a Business License to ensure parking compliance with parking regulations.
 - b. If the proposed use of the building is Conditional, pursuant to Section 153.026 of the Municipal Code, the applicant shall apply for Planning Commission review of a Conditional Use Permit. Review will ensure compliance with parking regulations.

- III. During construction, the following shall occur:
 - a. Project is to be completed per approved plan. Any deviation from the approved plans requires review and approval of a revision by the Town. "As-built" plans are not acceptable.
 - b. Applicant shall be responsible for compliance with requirements of all other applicable regulatory agencies, including but not limited to State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, OSHA, EPA and Caltrans.
 - c. All construction staging and construction parking shall be located onsite and shall not be located within any right-of-way, ingress/egress easement, access route for other parcels, or within any stream corridor, area with slopes in excess of 35%, area designated to meet the Town's natural state requirements, any areas where it may harm protected trees, or within any other environmentally sensitive area.
 - d. A sign shall be posted in a location readable from the roadway stating the permitted hours of construction pursuant to Municipal Code Section 151.55(B), and a contact name and phone number for the contractor. The sign shall be posted and maintained for the duration of the project, and shall be removed upon approval of the final inspection of all permits onsite.

- IV. Prior to final inspection, the following shall occur:
 - a. All exterior finishes, colors, and materials approved by the ASRB shall be used. Any changes may require further review by ASRB, as determined by the Planning Director.
 - b. Install all approved exterior light fixtures. The bulb or light source shall be entirely located behind a non-translucent surface. No additional lights or alternate fixtures shall be installed without first being reviewed and approved by the Town.
 - c. All construction debris, trailers, material storage containers, and portable restrooms shall be removed from the site.

Motion: Vice Chair Larson/ Second: Member Reyering
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Mah, and Reyering
Noes: None
Absent: Member Carlsmith
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

AGENDA ITEMS:

2. Honeybee Hill, LLC
349 Manuella Avenue

ASRB2016-0042

Planner: Sage Schaan, Principal Planner

Presentation and consideration of a proposal, requiring Conceptual Design Review, to demolish an existing main residence, two carports, a detached garage, a guest house, and other small outbuildings and sheds; and construct a new main residence, a detached bedroom structure, detached guest house/ALQ, detached studio, detached garage, pool, and pool cabana; and to rehabilitate an existing nonconforming ALQ, greenhouse, shed (#3), and barn. The project proposes a second driveway with a vehicle gate. The existing driveway and vehicle gate is proposed to remain if approved by the Fire Protection District.

DISCUSSION

Chair Lubin shared some history of the property. Sue Lindsey, previous property owner, told her that the house is a direct copy of photographer Morley Baer's house in Big Sur. Ms. Lindsey also said the bee house was moved there; however, Chair Lubin had not found any evidence in the archives. John Gish, the school principal lived there.

Member Mah asked why it's called a "bee house."

Chair Lubin said she believes the current property owners named it. It wasn't labeled as the bee house.

Sage Schaan, Principal Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Lubin asked why this proposal did not go to the History Committee for review.

Planner Schaan said none of the structures were eligible for State listing as a historic resource.

Chair Lubin said she's glad they're rehabilitating it. She asked for a copy of the historical report for the archives.

Planner Schaan said the report has already been placed in the History Committee inbox. Staff has asked for some minor changes. Once those changes have been made, staff will place the updated report in the inbox.

Member Mah asked how the day-lighted basement affects the square footage of other structures.

Planner Schaan said it affects the floor area calculations for the main residence. The definition of a basement is a structure that sticks out of the ground no more than two feet. Any portion of a basement that sticks out of the ground still contributes towards overall plate height and floor area calculations. There is a garage square footage deduction that can be used; however, it will still count towards the total floor area allowed for the property.

Chair Lubin invited the applicant to speak.

Steve Simpson, project architect, said the property owners wanted to build a house around a courtyard, and a series of smaller structures scattered around it semi-enclosing the courtyard. They wanted to create an heirloom house that their five kids could come back to visit and stay for awhile. That informed some of the decisions regarding the detached two-bedroom suite. Some of the accessory living quarters are for family. As they dove deeper into the design, they realized that a courtyard house would be more rigid; however, due to the contours on the site, they felt that something more organic would fit in better. As they started to look at how the property laid out, the curves came

into play both in the structures and the assembly. They designed the curves and forms to follow the contour lines. They do mostly in some areas, and not exactly in the main family room wing. It allowed them to tuck the garage into the hillside, in the lower level of the house to minimize mass. The guest house helps break up the monolithic look. They wanted it to relate the guest house to the “bee cottage”. They named it the “bee cottage” because it was full of bees when the property owners bought the property. It was also the inspiration for calling it “Honeybee Hill.” They wanted to relate that structure to something more traditional and rural, and connect that to the oldest structure on the property. They are reducing the number of structures on site from 12 to 10. There’s a lot going on already. Overall, they want the house to fit into the site well. They are choosing a muted materials palette of wood, stone, rusted metal, and living roofs. Their landscape plan goal is to keep the perimeter natural, and hide whatever ornamental planting they propose in the courtyard. The living roofs tie into that vocabulary. It will help blur the lines between the natural and unnatural aspects of the site.

Chair Lubin invited anyone else who wished to speak.

There were none.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Lubin said:

- The overall scale and materials of the house are fitting of the site.
- The Residential Design Guidelines discourage building on top of the hill; however, they’re using the existing pad of the house, so it’s good in this case.
- She’s not sure how it will fit with the neighborhood character as there is such a variety of housing in the neighborhood.
- She’s concerned about the amount of glazing, and the visual impacts off site.
- She’s delighted that they’re keeping the bee cottage. It’s tucked away, and she was happy to hear they’re renovating it. It’s historic to Woodside, even though it doesn’t qualify for State listing.
- She’s concerned about the proposed guest house because it is so close to Manuella Avenue. It will be visible. She’s concerned about the scale. The cupola doesn’t seem to fit the rest of the architecture.
- Second driveways are discouraged; however, those pylons and entry gates are historic. If having a second driveway means they can keep that other entry that would be great because it’s lovely and currently exists there.

Member Reyering said the Community Character will be all about fencing and landscaping. She was pleased to hear that the property owners intend to concentrate formal landscaping internal to the proposed structures. Driving down Manuella Avenue is one of the special qualities of Woodside. It’s a lovely spot. On Page 36 of the Residential Design Guidelines, fences are encouraged to be: minimal with an open design, wildlife friendly, and an open post and rail style. Perhaps the proposed fencing could be placed behind the tree line. There may be some invasive species they would want to remove. It would be easier to construct, as well as allow wildlife to easily get off the road. She requested that they be sensitive to nesting times which isn’t necessarily just April – July. Raptor nests can start as early as January. If they decide to keep some of the eucalyptus trees, they probably do have some raptor nests in them.

Member Mah added, and owls.

Member Reyering said she knows that creates a very small season to remove offending trees; however, she needed to bring that up.

Kelly Bronfman, property owner, said they are planning to keep eucalyptus trees on the south border.

Vice Chair Larson said the project is well thought out. It's interesting and nice. He likes the bee house name, and it fits the character of Woodside. Keeping the bee cottage is fantastic. Regarding the cupola, it is under the maximum allowed height, so he's not sure how they can improve that. It is closer to the gate. He asked how many feet it is from the road.

Planner Schaan said, about 100 feet.

Chair Lubin said the site rises there, and it may be visible.

Vice Chair Larson commended the barn-like look. Also, it is dark which helps reduce visibility. The second driveway seems to be within the guidelines.

Planner Schaan said the applicants would need a Second Driveway Exception. Most of the findings have to do with aesthetics and safety. Normally, second driveways are meant to be low-key. In this case, it will function as the main driveway. The gate design and driveway material will be important going forward.

Vice Chair Larson asked if gravel is part of the total allowed paved surface calculations.

Planner Schaan said gravel is part of surface coverage. Regarding driveways, this new second driveway will be the principal access driveway serving the main residence; therefore, anything within 50' of the house will count. Anything beyond will not count towards total paved surface calculations. Once a driveway is over a certain percentage in grade, they are required to have bound material for fire trucks. Anything steeper will require brushed concrete. He doesn't think it's required in this case.

Chair Lubin asked if they will need to go to the Planning Commission.

Planner Schaan said yes.

Vice Chair Larson said he encouraged using as much gravel as possible. He concurred with Member Reyring on wildlife corridors. We've seen many tall fences around Town. Anytime we can make variations for wildlife access is helpful.

Dan Francis, Manuella Avenue, said he is an adjacent neighbor. He thinks the project is going to be spectacular. He doesn't have concerns and supports everything the property owners are proposing. Since the raptors were brought up, he wanted to mention that he is an enthusiast. He enjoys hearing them every morning from the Folger Estate. He supports tree removal for fire safety. He asked that the one eucalyptus tree be removed as soon as possible. It could destroy his house. He cautioned balancing the choice between removing a eucalyptus tree and saving raptor nests. Regarding the second driveway, it looks like they are trying to maintain the driveway line to the corral without destroying the integrity of the oak tree, which he supports. He hopes they could move the driveway apron a bit to be sure there isn't light coming into their property. It can be solved with proper screening.

Chair Lubin asked if they have discussed the driveway configuration at the neighbor meeting.

Mr. Francis said yes, and they can work it out. He would err on the side of protecting the oak trees over his needs of having a driveway that came in a bit more. He couldn't tell from the plans whether the start of the driveway was at the corral. He thinks it is. Ideally, it would be better to move the driveway up a bit as long as it doesn't ruin the integrity of the oak tree, which is pretty sizeable.

Chair Lubin suggested the property owners and neighbors go out together at night. She sees the way the driveway is oriented. The Town Engineer may want to comment on visibility.

Ms. Bronfman pointed on the projected plans to the eucalyptus tree that Mr. Francis mentioned. They could continue the wood fence to help block some light emission. They originally intended a wire fence that people can see through when entering along Manuella Avenue. They will work it out with Mr. Francis. They have met with all three adjacent neighbors, and have already talked about fencing and screening. They have gone through different types of plants, what the fence would look like, and showed them the house plans. They have tried to be really thorough. Whether they move the driveway, erect a fence, or create another solution and screen it, they will definitely work together and ensure everyone is happy.

Chair Lubin commended them on the driveway. She can see why they did what they did because they are trying to avoid the trees and keep the driveway at a low grade to avoid doing concrete/asphalt.

Member Mah said:

- She walks by the existing house several mornings a week. It's a gracious house and beautiful lot. The overall design of the main residence is respectful to the personality of the existing house. The proposed house would be lower in profile.
- Green roofs are a positive. The materials are great.
- There is a mixture of home styles in the neighborhood, and the homes are all very set back into the property (i.e., the front is very open). That's a part of what makes it a pleasure to drive along Manuella Avenue. It's an iconic part of Woodside. She's concerned about the number of structures proposed to be located near the front. The first time she saw the property was when it was for sale. She was stunned by how many structures there were that couldn't be seen. She didn't even know the bee cottage was there. The way they designed the proposed main residence to hug the topography and the way it is broken up is interesting; however, it will be significantly closer to the front relative to the existing residence. It will be more visible, even though it will be lower. The proposed accessory living quarters has a long side that will be visible from Manuella Avenue. It will be wonderful if it could be moved or adjusted so that the long side is not as visible. All development will be upslope.
- She doesn't understand the free-standing garage that is sort of in the middle of that and the pool house. The pool location seems very public rather than private. The pool is another structure. Those three things are the most problematic.
- Since the bee house is not obviously visible, the agrarian style of the new accessory living quarters doesn't relate as well to the rest of the proposed development. She suggested something lower key that disappears more, minus the cupola. If it's not going to be a barn, it shouldn't look like one.
- Removal of the old driveway is going to be beneficial for the lot.
- When she heard the explanation of the main residence floor plan, the design made more sense; otherwise, even though she is interested in the modular arrangement, it's going to be a long way from the one bedroom structure to the rest of the living quarters. It seemed more of a compound than residence.
- She's concerned about the amount of glazing from the Manuella Avenue side. There currently is a lot of glazing; however, nobody has been living there so it's a little harder to appreciate. Also, the rock wall that is below, where the front part of the proposed residence will be, is probably going to obliterate light emission; however, she imagines it is not going to be retained. That's too bad.

Chair Lubin agreed that it's a nice retaining wall; however, it doesn't look like they can keep it in their current proposal.

Member Reyerling asked about the width of the proposed driveway. It looks like it's about the same width as Manuella Avenue.

Planner Schaan said the driveway is required to be a minimum 12 feet wide per Fire District standards.

Member Mah said the existing gate is about 14 feet.

Planner Schaan said he hasn't done a measurement yet, and the Fire District will have to look at that.

Chair Lubin asked: if they want to retain it, would they then close it off and figure out another way to access the property?

Planner Schaan said that's a possibility. In speaking with the Fire Marshal, 14 feet is what the Code requires. They can provide some exceptions for existing structures. They understand the desire to retain old entries. As long as a fire truck can fit through, and depending on what the driveway is serving, it's possible to grant some exception to that.

Chair Lubin asked if a new conforming driveway would not bypass that.

Planner Schaan said the main thing is it's the only access to this structure. Otherwise, they would need a loop to access the back. That would require more grading and possibly tree removal.

Chair Lubin said the Residential Design Guidelines discourage wing walls and pylons; however, it's lovely and historic. It would be great if they can retain it.

Member Mah said the existing metal gate doesn't look original.

Chair Lubin said no, the hinges in the rock wall appear to have belonged to a previous gate. It could be because the gates are installed the way they are.

Member Reyerling said the driveway is an unusual case. Depending on how it sits on the landscape, if it reads as another road, that's going to affect the experience of the site as well.

Chair Lubin said it has to be a minimum width.

Planner Schaan said staff will further work with the applicant on looking at the Second Driveway Exception findings, and whether it is feasible to minimize that entrance.

Mr. Simpson thanked the ASRB for their comments. He doesn't see anything they cannot address. They'll look again at the driveway, guest cottage, and cupola.

Chair Lubin agreed with Member Mah that the second garage looks like an orphan out there. Maybe there's a way to incorporate it so it's not so prominent.

Mr. Simpson said they're trying to use that as a buffer for the main house. They wanted something that unfolds as they enter the property. Since they only have a two-car garage in the main residence, they thought they needed a bit extra. They can look at ways to integrate it better.

Chair Lubin asked about the orientation of the pool.

Mr. Simpson said they are currently trying to find a project landscape architect. That's just a placeholder.

Member Mah said: if the proposed accessory living quarters was moved or turned a bit, they wouldn't need a second driveway, assuming that a fire truck can get in.

Mr. Simpson said possibly. They tried to locate the fire truck turnaround central to the buildings; however, it's still far from the bee cottage. They like the old gate, and want to keep that and maybe provide secondary access to the property. They didn't want to have the house so visible from the street. They can provide a buffer in front of the second driveway. The topography and trees are challenging. They're trying to keep as much of the meadow open as possible. It may be possible to rotate the structure; however, he doesn't know if they can move it without removing more trees or causing more grading to occur.

Chair Lubin said the bee cottage is more than 150' from the closest access, so you do need to keep that eastern most access.

Mr. Simpson said from a fire safety standpoint, it's a difficult location. They intend to have a low-key, gravel driveway.

Director Young summarized: The ASRB noted that the neighborhood contains a mix of architectural styles, and open spaces iconic to Woodside; and commended the applicant for preserving the existing cottage. The ASRB recommended that the applicant consider the following:

- I. Site Planning:
 - a. The prominence of the siting of the detached garage and Accessory Living Quarters nearest the Manuella Avenue frontage; and,
 - b. Potential privacy issues with the proposed siting of the pool near the Manuella Avenue frontage.
- II. Building Design:
 - a. The light impacts of the amount and placement of glazing.
- III. Landscape Elements:
 - a. The light impacts (from car head lights on the neighbor) of the placement of the proposed driveway;
 - b. The width and materials proposed for the driveways;
 - c. The aesthetic, natural feature, and wildlife impacts of fencing and landscaping; and,
 - d. The timing of any proposed tree removal (outside January-June) to avoid impacts to nesting birds and raptors.

Sam Bronfman, property owner, said the key issue of the driveway is Mr. Francis doesn't want to see car lights turning in. They have committed to ensuring that Mr. Francis is not affected by vehicular lights. The big issue with moving the driveway a bit north towards the school is that there are trees that are going to get in the way. They are trying to keep the trees. If they cannot move the driveway, they will provide more screening. They have gone out together in the evening to look at the light impacts.

Ms. Bronfman said the previous property owner used the paddock a lot, and would park her truck with its lights on facing right into Mr. Francis' house while she fed her horses. The vehicular lights would be on for 30-40 minutes, and Mr. Francis is sensitive to that.

Vice Chair Larson encouraged them to save as many trees as possible.

Ms. Bronfman said they will be very careful.

ACTION

ASRB recommended that the application proceed to Formal Design Review before the ASRB. The application for Formal Design Review shall include the following:

- a. The average slope of the net lot area as defined by Section 153.139(B) of the Municipal Code. If greater than 12.5%, submit a Natural State Plan indicating the areas and percentage that will remain in Natural State.
- b. The Lot Area with and without the Manuella Avenue public right-of-way.
- c. The maximum Total Floor Area shall be adjusted based on 9% of the lot area that excludes the Manuella Avenue right-of-way.
- d. Detailed floor area calculations for the main residence, addressing all comments in Attachment 3.
- e. Revised floor area calculations for the existing ALQ (Bee Cottage) to clarify that the multiplier reduction and garage deduction in the Municipal Code does not apply to this structure.
- f. A Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan prepared and certified by a licensed civil engineer including all existing and proposed drainage facilities and natural drainage patterns; all proposed grading contours and a limit of grading/disturbance/staging area; and all cut and fill grading quantities in cubic yards. The cut and fill quantities shall include a breakdown of all cut and fill activities for basements and that will and will not count towards the Site Development Permit.
- g. A Surface Coverage Plan, including details of the location and quantities of all existing and proposed surfaces that qualify as paved area and surface coverage.
- h. A Landscape Lighting Plan detailing all proposed exterior light fixtures including location, quantity, and manufacturer's specifications.
- i. A Fence/Wall/Gate Plan showing details of the location, type, height, and materials of all proposed fences, walls, and/or gates.
- j. Details of the openness of the vehicular gate, the location and manufacturer's specifications for all mechanical equipment, the location and manufacturer's specifications for any proposed light fixture, and details of the required Fire Department Knox Box.
- k. Plans showing the location of all existing and proposed utility meters and specifications for the location of underground utility lines.
- l. A Preliminary Septic Plan including the location of the septic tank, drainfield, connecting lines, and 100% expansion area, and a statement identifying the number of bedrooms that the septic system can serve.
- m. Determination from the Town Geologist of the necessity for a preliminary review of the project.
- n. An application for Lot Merger.
- o. A revised survey that highlights all slope sin excess of 35% and in excess of 50% if any exist onsite. If no such slopes exist, the survey shall indicate that there are not any slopes in excess of 35%.
- p. A Revised Site Plan and/or Floor Plan that calls out the distance between the detached studio building and the main residence.
- q. A revised floor plan for the Pool Cabana to ensure that the item labeled as "gas" is for a fireplace, and not a stove.
- r. Elevation details for the outdoor kitchen/pizza oven adjacent to the pool cabana.
- s. Elevation details of the proposed infinity edge pool.
- t. A determination from the Fire District that all Fire District access requirements for all structures will be satisfied.
- u. A Revised Historical Report addressing the comments from staff in Attachment 3.
- v. All items outlined in the Formal Design Review Submittal Checklist.

Motion: Vice Chair Larson/ Second: Member Reyering
 Ayes: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Mah, and Reyering

Noes: None
Absent: Member Carlsmith
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

3. Anne Matta LDIV2016-0001
201 Mountain Wood Lane Planner: Sean Mullin, Associate Planner

Review of a Concept Map for a proposal to divide a single RR zoned parcel, which is approximately 8.632-acre (375,996 sf), into two RR zoned parcels, which would be approximately 5.264-acres (229,290 sf) and 3.368-acres (146,706 sf), at 201 Mountain Wood Lane.

DISCUSSION

Sean Mullin, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Member Mah said that proposed Parcels 1 and 2 show a footprint of a main residence. What about outbuildings that could potentially be built on this?

Planner Mullin said the plans do not show outbuildings. The applicants are only required to show a conceptual building envelope. In this case, they chose a 6,000 square foot house being the maximum for that zoning district. The number of outbuildings is based on allowed total floor area. There currently are no construction plans.

Member Mah said, so they could have two accessory living quarters, a main residence, and more.

Planner Mullin said yes, everything that is customary in this zoning district and neighborhood.

Chair Lubin asked if this proposal locks them into those particular house sites.

Planner Mullin said no.

Member Reyering said it's difficult to make a determination about Community Character based on such vague proposals.

Chair Lubin noted that she recused herself at the History Committee when they reviewed this project.

Member Mah noted that she recused herself at the Trails Committee.

Chair Lubin invited the applicant to speak.

Scott Dancer, property owners' representative, said the owners are currently completing the renovation of the historic barn to waterproof and restore it by replacing dry rot and the roof. They have put in a lot of effort to keep the building. It is a clear message to the Town of Woodside, potential residents, and current residents that someone shouldn't be punished for renovations. Rather than applying for a Demolition Permit and then subdividing the property, the property owners decided to first subdivide the property, keep the barn, and have an extra parcel for their children to live on. They eventually want to live on the larger parcel with the stables. They're not in a hurry. Their children are still young. They don't have plans to build right away; however, in five to 10 years, they want to have a family compound. Prior to purchasing the property, they learned that 80 Roberta Drive has had push back

from other neighbors on wanting to limit the amount of access. They had investigated the legal right to use Mountain Wood Lane or Roberta Drive. There is a 50' wide easement along Mountain Wood Lane to Mountain Home Road. The land is very steep from Roberta Drive up to those stables. It would be difficult to get fire truck access from Roberta Drive up to the stables. They prefer to access the property from Mountain Wood Lane. They have the right to an easement there. There are trees, bushes, and hedges along Mountain Wood Lane all the way to Mountain Home Road. The Woodside Fire Protection District might want Mountain Wood Lane widened because it's currently 12 feet of pavement, and the Fire Department might want 16 feet or 18 feet.

Planner Mullin said he's not sure what the Fire Department requires.

Chair Lubin said those hedges along the road have been there forever.

Planner Mullin said the Fire Chief expressed concern with access along Mountain Wood Lane; however, he didn't provide any specific requirements. Any requirements will likely be presented to the subdivision review committees by early November and forwarded to the applicant.

Chair Lubin asked how the Fire District's requirements come into play when they propose development on Parcel 2 if they're only proposing development on Parcel 1 at this point.

Planner Mullin deferred the question to the Fire Department.

Chair Lubin asked if it is determined at the time of subdivision.

Planner Mullin said yes, there is potential nexus there to require upgrades to Mountain Wood Lane at subdivision.

Chair Lubin said there is a road coming out of the courtyard on the left that looks like it used to go to Roberta Drive. Today, it was blocked off. Could that potentially be used in an emergency?

Mr. Dancer said they would need permission from the other neighbor. There is no direct access to Roberta Drive unless they obtain permission from the new development at 80 Roberta Drive or through the vacant parcel that was just sold further up to the west. There is a flag lot at the top of the Mountain Wood Lane, and they are developing plans for a new house. They have no access to Roberta Drive because it's so steep. The Woodside Fire Protection District may want Mountain Wood Lane to be widened when that development proposal comes in soon. It's going to be the same issue as with this property. The easement on Mountain Wood Lane was adjudicated in 1960 by a judge, and is completely legal. An attorney has reviewed it. The trees are about 30 feet apart on Mountain Wood Lane. To widen the road to Fire District standards of 16 feet, the trees could remain in place. They're set back far enough from what would be a widened road; however, it would require removing the hedges and replacing them.

Chair Lubin asked if Mr. Dancer is talking about removal of the hedges on either sides or just one side.

Mr. Dancer said it depends which direction the road widens. There is plenty of room on both sides.

Chair Lubin commended the rehabilitation of the champagne paddocks. They're doing a fabulous job in saving the structure. She asked Mr. Dancer to convey the ASRB's appreciation for that.

Mr. Dancer said the property owners picked a great contractor.

Vice Chair Larson thanked Mr. Dancer for the project background. He asked why they could not create a family compound without subdividing.

Mr. Dancer said that if they did not subdivide it, they would be allowed one house up to 6,000 square feet, and a guest house up to 1,500 square feet. They don't want to live in a 1,500 square foot house.

Chair Lubin asked why they don't wait to subdivide the property when they want to in the future.

Mr. Dancer said because they can. The property owners bought the property with the idea to subdivide it. If the process takes a few years with the Town, they want to proceed now. When they are ready to build, they want to put their application in for a house rather than waiting an additional five years.

Virginia Bamford, Roberta Drive, said that she welcomed new neighbors on the three-acre parcel that is only visible at the lower quadrant. She welcomes the subdivision proposal. The property owners are wonderful people. She hasn't spoken to the property owners yet. Her property is not the three-acre parcel on the far right, but the next house over. She is to the west. She has lived on Roberta for 25 years, and knows the land, traffic, and animals well. She can understand why people want to move in and live here. She supports development in Woodside. Her concern is access from Roberta Drive. She welcomed access from Roberta Drive from the lower quadrant; however, she's concerned about possible access from Roberta Drive on future development of the eight-acre parcel divided into a five-acre piece and a three-acre just because the topography is steep. There are trees and the migration of animals to be aware of. The animals almost exclusively reside in the three-acre parcel (i.e., the hill piece to the west) that will be coming before the ASRB for development. When that land was somewhat cleared within the past couple of years, she felt the brunt of the animal movement. Even without that clearing, the lower part of the parcel is primarily where the animals migrate across Roberta Drive into other areas towards the south. It is a very large migration area. The new development project will be even more pressure on the wildlife corridor. She would hesitate to see pavement, mailboxes, and buildings down where animals are squeezed to go through. Also, there is a horse trail along that property line. Fire access across there probably doesn't work due to the angle of Roberta Drive. Another concern is when Roberta Drive turns to the right, the road goes up a hill. Almost immediately, the hill crests to a point where the sun blinds drivers. At various points along that stretch of the road, that turn is extremely dangerous.

John Hodge, Mountain Wood Lane, said:

- There are 14 homes on Mountain Wood Lane. He is the co-president of the Homeowner's Association. The Town has been great communicating with them.
- Nobody wants to see Mountain Wood Lane expanded due to fire issues. The Woodside Fire Protection District has been very good with keeping the lane intact throughout all the development going on in the area. The proposed subdivision has different requirements. There is a risk that they will have to widen the road. No one on Mountain Wood Lane supports that and will not finance that. The property owners will have to finance that. That is one risk of doing this subdivision. This subdivision would change the character of Mountain Wood Lane. Those hedges are ancient and cannot be replaced. Someone needs to study that.
- The second item of discussion, which is nice to have, but is not as necessary, is whether they can leave the current emergency exit. There is an existing, steep, gravel path that is a single lane width. The existing pavement allows a path around the paddock down to Roberta Drive in case of an emergency. It would be nice to leave that access there because twice in the past 10 years, trees have fallen and blocked traffic on Mountain Wood Lane.

Member Mah said that is not vehicular access.

Mr. Hodge said it is.

Chair Lubin said it's very steep.

Mr. Hodge agreed that it is very steep, and trucks have been able to use it. Some contractors have used it. The current proposal puts the emergency access on the right side of the property. He said:

- He never thought the project site could be legally subdivided into three lots. It would have to go through the entire subdivision process. What is disappointing is the first lot was able to do a Lot Line Adjustment. Then the previous owner sold it. Now there is very dense development going on in the lower meadow. The new owners, the Mattas, are great people. They have bought this lot, and are going to subdivide it. The density has increased. Within this 11-acre property, there will be three main houses that are 6,000 square feet plus the barn, which will be over 9,000 square feet. The entire character of Mountain Wood Lane would dramatically change. He understands the rights of homeowners.
- He understood that this is a conceptual design showing potential footprints. He's not saying that is what the Mattas are going to do, but that's what everyone else has done. If people are given rights, they will develop those rights. Could a restricted condition be placed on the project that only allows development in those footprints to keep density where it is? He is supportive of how the conceptual design looks. The previous owner proposed an 8,000 square foot house plus an 8,000 square foot basement. The Mattas have good taste, and they are not ostentatious. He doesn't know if the Town can pursue that. He is not supportive of a 6,000 square foot house and the ability for them to do numerous accessory structures because then the character of land will completely change. He encouraged the ASRB to limit density.
- Regarding open space, that acreage is probably one of the most beautiful meadows left in Woodside. There are only two left. It should be preserved in any way possible. They're hoping the neighbor below preserves that meadow as well.
- Mountain Wood Lane is probably one of the most private lanes in Woodside. Of the 14 properties along the road, there will be about eight or nine development projects occurring at the same time. He listed the current development projects in the neighborhood. Mr. Hodge has five properties around his property. Four out of five of those properties could be developing at the same time. He recommended the Town determine how to govern that. He is a believer of construction; however, there are real safety (e.g., traffic) issues over a three to five year period. There are non-residents who don't know the Mountain Wood Lane etiquette. A surgeon who lives at the end of the Lane almost missed his procedure because a contractor wouldn't let him get by. There is a fundamental issue going on in Woodside that is not specific to this property and needs to be regulated. He is happy to talk to the Planning Department. There needs to be a scheduling process prohibiting construction occurring at the exact same time. People can't do this amount of construction with this type of density. Secondly, he would like every contractor and general contractor to register all of their employees and the license plates of all of the cars. Property owners need to be responsible for their contractors on their property. Third, there needs to be a staging process that the Town goes through for this construction. The barn renovation may be a simple project; however, there are 35 cars there every day. There is a lot of construction occurring on Mountain Wood Lane.
- In summary, if the Town can impose a density restriction, they would be supportive of the project.

Chair Lubin asked if Mountain Wood Lane is a public road.

Mr. Hodge said no, it's a private road.

Chair Lubin said the zoning has not changed, so it is three acre zoning. They are exercising their right to subdivide.

Mr. Hodge said he understood they have the right to go through the subdivision process.

Chair Lubin said the ASRB is here to review this particular application, and some of the points Mr. Hodge has brought up have to do specifically with the Planning Commission and the Planning Department. The ASRB may not be able to address all of his concerns.

Mr. Hodge said he understood. He's happy to talk to the Planning Department as necessary.

Chair Lubin said when construction is proposed, staff requires a Construction Staging Plan, construction schedule, and vehicle access.

Mr. Hodge said they do for single projects; however, not simultaneously. It isn't addressing staging a private lane and staging multiple projects on a private lane.

Chair Lubin said one could argue that contractors can get all projects done in five years and be over with it.

Member Reyering said the Town does not limit the duration of construction. Many municipalities do, including Atherton, who has a three year construction limit. The Town has had neighbor complaints about long-term projects. It's a quality of life issue.

Mr. Hodge said the Mattas have done the barn renovation very quickly; however, there will be projects that will take longer than three years.

Member Reyering said she doesn't understand what will trigger widening of the street. Will this subdivision itself trigger the requirement?

Mr. Hodge said he understood that a subdivision is a more rigorous process with more hurdles and regulations.

Planner Mullin clarified a difference between a subdivision (5 or more lots) and minor land division (up to 4 lots). This proposal is a minor land division. The proposed minor land division creates a new lot; it's taking one lot and creating two lots. That is reviewed by the subdivision review committee, which includes the Fire Department. They can include requirements to upgrade roads and water lines to ensure adequate service for future development.

Chair Lubin asked if they have equal jurisdiction over private roads (i.e., same requirements for access).

Planner Mullin said yes.

Mr. Dancer asked if they can waive it, and decide a 16 foot width is enough.

Planner Mullin deferred the question to the Fire Department.

Mr. Hodge asked what the difference would be if they decided to do subdivision rather than a land division.

Planner Mullin said a minor land division creates four or fewer lots. This is a minor land division, as this is only creating two lots. A subdivision creates five or more lots.

Mr. Hodge asked how it would be different if they submitted a full development plan.

Planner Mullin said it is still a land division. It would be a component of a plan, just as a Lot Line Adjustment or Lot Merger is a component of a project. In this case, the applicant is simply seeking a land division at this time.

Mr. Hodge asked why the two previous property owners didn't go through this land division process.

Planner Mullin said the land division process is likely perceived to be more onerous than a Lot Line Adjustment. A Lot Line Adjustment involves getting technical documents, title reports in order, sometimes a change in title to

prove lot legality, and then it's recorded with the County. To do a subdivision or a land division requires that the applicant go through the Concept Map, Tentative Map, and Final Map as dictated by WMC Chapter 152.

Planner Schaan said a Lot Line Adjustment is the process used when not creating additional lots.

Vice Chair Larson asked if a Condition of Approval may be placed on a subdivision or land division.

Chair Lubin clarified, regarding limiting development.

Director Young directed attention to the memorandum in the packet. The ASRB's purview is Community Character and Site Planning. In order to create or suggest the creation of a building envelope, the ASRB would need to tie it to one of those review criteria. The creation of building envelopes was done on the recent minor land division on Moore Road in order to make the findings necessary for scenic corridor and biotic resources.

Vice Chair Larson said it can be done, but there are very specific reasons.

Chair Lubin said whether it is in keeping with the character and aesthetics.

Camas Steinmetz, Town Attorney, said the ASRB would need to find that the building envelope is required in order to meet one of those findings of approval.

Member Mah said that she thought the ASRB doesn't have findings.

Director Young said there are design review criteria. WMC Section 153.220 states design review criteria for Community Character, Site Planning, Building Design, and Landscape Elements; however, in this case, there isn't a development project. The ASRB would only be opining on Community Character and Site Planning as it pertains to the land division itself.

Chair Lubin said Mr. Hodge was addressing not necessarily how the property was being divided or where the lot lines are, but the particular conceptual development envelopes. Is that correct?

Vice Chair Larson said preserving the meadow and vistas are good reasons for the conceptual building envelopes. From those respects, that's a good reason to limit density. Also, the rural character is in keeping.

Member Mah said that's related to Item 2, under Section II, Site Planning. Also, to subordinate development to the site's natural conditions.

Member Reyering agreed.

Mr. Dancer said the applicant has no desire to widen Mountain Wood Lane. If it's required, they are willing to finance it. It's up to the Woodside Fire Protection District if they feel the pillars at the end of Mountain Wood Lane, which are 16 feet apart, are too narrowly placed. There are some regulations regarding land divisions. To dictate and decide today (i.e., at this point of the land division process) what can be built and what can't, when the property owners don't even know what they want other than to be held under the same zoning as Mr. Hodge was next door when he designed his house, is unreasonable. To do it now would be setting a new precedent. The property on Moore Road had Highway 280 adjacent to it, noise issues, wetlands, and biological issues with migration of animals. This project is really different. Across the street, there used to be a similar meadow which is now all landscaped. There are 12 acres across the street. It had a little ranch style house on it, and is now an estate property with many buildings. It was done under current zoning. Anne and Horacio Matta want a 3,500 square foot house,

not 6,000 square foot house. The Town requires that they show a feasible building envelope. If there is no feasible building envelope, they cannot subdivide it. Those building envelopes are strictly conceptual, and do not represent where the house will actually be. To decide it now before they know what they want to build in seven years is unreasonable.

Member Mah asked why the Woodside Fire Protection District did not require Mountain Wood Lane to be widened from other projects.

Planner Mullin deferred the question to the Woodside Fire Protection District.

Member Reyring said that when there was a project on Orchard Hill Road, the Woodside Fire Protection District required that they widen that road to a width that is wider than Old La Honda Road. There is that possibility.

Chair Lubin said the three-acre parcel is much smaller than the one on Manuella Avenue. She sees Vice Chair Larson's point about putting restrictions on it now because we don't know if, when, or how it will be developed in the future.

Vice Chair Larson said the concern is, this property could be resold. The new owner may come in with an expectation, and the Town wants to be clear that they understand limitations. It's important to preserve the rural character in Woodside. The scenic corridors and vistas from other homeowners are critical. The ASRB can ensure that the development envelopes are utilized in a way that will preserve scenic corridors, wildlife patterns, and natural features. There are equestrian trails around there. The way the building envelopes are sited will also affect emergency egress. He suggested taking some of these issues back, and see if the property owners have a more definitive idea where they would want to develop. Mr. Dancer may think it is unreasonable; however, it's also unreasonable to approve this proposal with so many unanswered questions.

Chair Lubin said it appears the building envelope for Parcel 2 would be closer to the Paddock than the proposed house on Parcel 1. Since the paddock is such a large and tall structure, it's kind of crowding potential development.

Member Mah asked: isn't there a historical issue?

Chair Lubin said there isn't enough breadth between the barn and the proposed development; however, we don't know if that's where they're going to put it.

Director Young said this is the time to review the conceptual design of the map. The proposal goes to various other committees (e.g., History, Trails, and Open Space). The ASRB is to make a recommendation to the applicant about the proposal that is before them. She's hearing that the ASRB liked what was done on Moore Road, and would like the applicant propose building envelopes.

The ASRB said that would be helpful.

Director Young said it's not the purpose of the evening to come to a conclusion about exactly where the building envelopes will go, but to review the project and what the developer should consider in establishing their building envelope. One consideration that will come up during environmental review for the development of Parcel 1 is that the barn is eligible for State listing. There needs to be sufficient breadth around that structure for it to maintain a reasonable context to the site. The meadow itself is non-native grass, and that was discussed with a previous proposal. It is not a biotic issue; however, it is a separate issue if the ASRB wants to give a recommendation concerning the vista through the area. She encouraged the ASRB to tie recommendations into their normal review criteria. She's hearing that the ASRB wants the developer to come back with a development envelope. The ASRB

would need to provide reasons why they believe a development envelope is needed.

Vice Chair Larson said he doesn't know how equestrian trails may fit into emergency egress.

Member Mah said the ASRB has heard a number of concerns from the neighbors regarding circulation (i.e., widening Mountain Wood Lane and some kind of access to Roberta Drive, should that be necessary). Whether they widen it or not, Mountain Wood Lane would still be fairly narrow. There was a request to have some kind of emergency egress which may conflict with the trail that has been requested by the Trails Committee. With regards to equestrian heritage, it is fantastic they're restoring the barn so well. One of the previous plans had it being deconstructed and reconstructed authentically; however, with a garage underneath. She's very happy they're maintaining the integrity of the structure; however, there is no provision for any future equestrian activity. The barn looks like it's going to be a relic. Should someone ever want to use it as a barn, she doesn't see any provision for a real horse facility. From an equestrian heritage concern, which is related to Community Character, she doesn't see that's being considered. Unlike other historic barns (e.g., the Folger Barn), it is not a living, breathing part of the community anymore. It's just a relic. The current owners may not be horse people, but somebody else might be. If it gets built upon, and precludes or becomes an obstacle from having horses in the future, that should be considered.

Chair Lubin agreed with Mr. Hodge that the way the prior Lot Line Adjustment was done was poor and created strange-shaped parcels. It precluded some of the solutions in terms of how to subdivide remaining acreage in a more reasonable way that might not present the same problems we're seeing today. It's unfortunate, but here we are. She doesn't see any way to reasonably access Parcel 1 from Roberta Drive given the topography. Both parcels would have to be accessed from Mountain Wood Lane.

Member Reyerling said this project spotlights the importance of the subjective review that the ASRB does. The ASRB had concerns about splitting the property up like that when that Lot Line Adjustment was done; however, how do you see into the future? With this land division, we can see a bit more clearly into the future. She agreed with her colleagues' concerns. The ASRB's comments can include meeting the right review criteria of Community Character and Site Planning with specific emphasis on Community Character Items III and IV, and Site Planning I – V.

Chair Lubin appreciated that site constraints and features are listed as Item I.

Member Reyerling agreed on the importance of natural feature conservation, conserving open space, and wildlife. To speak to the neighbor who commented about constrained wildlife corridors, there is a cumulative effect to the neighborhood with wildlife-unfriendly fencing between properties, not just along roadways. She's in full sympathy with her concerns.

Chair Lubin invited anyone else to speak.

Mr. Dancer asked about the horse facility. The owners are not at the design phase yet; therefore, they have no designs for the house and fencing around the barn to show horse paddocks. They have, however, spent the time, money, and effort to obtain a Building Permit to preserve the barn. They love the barn and want to keep it. He had told the property owners that it won't hurt them if they keep the barn. Now he's wondering if the message he should pass on in the future is to demolish everything before applying for a subdivision. That seems ridiculous.

Chair Lubin said that's incorrect.

Mr. Dancer said many proposals have three accessory structures or more. Property owners are allowed to do that, and they might; however, to limit them to one 6,000 square foot envelope at this point will not hold water.

Director Young said this is a concept stage map. The WMC requires the map be reviewed by the Trails Committee, History Committee, Open space Committee, and the ASRB. Each group makes recommendations. The ASRB does not impose conditions on the project; they make a recommendation. Those comments are collected. The project has already been reviewed by the History and Trails Committees. Staff collects all of those comments, and meets with the applicant to go through them. The Town is very appreciative of the property owner's efforts in restoring this very significant historic resource in Town. She has also heard appreciation from the Building Official. The ASRB is interested in seeing the property owners look at the potential building envelope for both of these parcels, specifically giving attention to Community Character review Item III and IV: preserve the character of the natural environment and developing in a way that can facilitate the preservation of equestrian activities. Under Site Planning, Item I: consider the building locations in relationship to the site constraints and natural features. Item II: consider natural features. Item III: preserve rural character. A building envelope should be sited, not a building footprint. Item IV: consider site circulation. There are some questions that would need to be worked through (e.g., widening of Mountain Wood Lane, and emergency access. Whether any emergency access even exists is a legal question). Item V: consider neighborhood compatibility. Building envelopes should be sited in a way that mirrors the neighborhood pattern.

Chair Lubin said no one on the ASRB is implying that the property owners are being penalized for the barn restoration. The ASRB commends them for that. It does enhance the property.

Mr. Dancer said Parcel 2 was sited as such to provide vistas of the open meadow and the barn. It's difficult to decide at this point what they are going to build ten years from now. It's not going to happen.

Director Young summarized that the History Committee commended the applicant for preservation of the Champagne Paddocks. The Trails Committee asked that the applicant voluntarily explore a dedicated trails easement. Since this is a minor land division and not subdivision, it's not a requirement. It's a request which they can consider. The ASRB recommendation is for the applicant to consider Community Character review criteria III and IV, and Site Planning review criteria I-V in designing building envelopes for the two parcels.

ACTION

ASRB recommended that the applicant prescribe building envelopes, considering the following Community Character and Site Planning Design Review Criteria contained in Woodside Municipal Code Section 153.220:

- I. Community Character:
 3. **Natural Environment.** Whether the property is developed in a manner which preserves natural features.
 4. **Equestrian Lifestyle.** Whether the property is developed in a manner that preserves and supports equestrian facilities and the Woodside trails network.
- II. Site Planning:
 1. **Site Constraints and Features.** Whether the building location and site improvements are based on a clear understanding of the property's natural features, regulatory constraints, and relationship to adjacent properties.
 2. **Natural Feature Conservation.** Whether the site development conserves the property's open space, natural features, vegetation, and wildlife by subordinating development to the site's natural conditions.
 3. **Site Usage and Building Siting.** Whether the residential and accessory uses are located to respect and preserve Woodside's rural residential character, and maintain the visual continuity of natural landforms.

4. **Site Circulation.** Whether the driveways, garages, parking areas, trails, and pathways are located and designed to be safe, minimally visible from the roadway, and subordinate to the site's natural features.
5. **Neighborhood and Community Compatibility.** Whether the location, scale, and orientation of site improvements complement and are consistent with neighborhood and community development patterns.

Motion: Member Reyering/ Second: Vice Chair Larson
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Mah, and Reyering
Noes: None
Absent: Member Carlsmith
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

4.	Patrick James Green	LDIV2016-0002; ZOAM2016-0003
	2150 Greenways Drive	Planner: Corinne Jones, Assistant Planner

Review of a Concept Map for a proposal to divide a single SR zoned parcel, which is approximately 1-acre (45,666 sf), into two R-1 zoned parcels, which would each be approximately 0.5-acres in size (22,833sf), at 2150 Greenways Drive.

DISCUSSION

Corinne Jones, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. The accessory structures cannot be full accessory living quarters because it is in the R-1 zone.

Chair Lubin asked if accessory living quarters need to be attached.

Planner Jones said they could be attached; however, they couldn't be detached as they have shown.

Chair Lubin asked if they could be 1,500 square feet.

Planner Jones said if they're attached, then they couldn't be more than 25% of the structure.

Member Mah asked if they could be detached in the R-1 zone.

Planner Jones said they could have a detached structure; however, it couldn't be an accessory living quarter. They can have an attached accessory living quarters.

Member Mah asked what the total floor area they can have on an R-1 parcel.

Planner Jones said they can have a 3,000 square foot main residence, and the total floor area would be 4,200 square feet. 1,200 square feet would be the balance. That would then be the maximum size for any accessory structure.

Chair Lubin said this is a more restrictive size lot. The plan presented shows what might be possible within the setbacks.

Planner Jones said that's correct. They will have a 30 foot front setback, 25 foot rear setback, and 15 foot side

setbacks for each parcel.

Chair Lubin asked if consideration was given to a shared driveway to reduce the amount of paving and driveways. Or would that be another exception?

Planner Jones deferred the question to the applicant.

Chair Lubin invited the applicant to speak.

Carter Warr, project architect, said this lot is a fairly recent addition to Woodside. He asked staff if it has been five or six years.

Director Young said no, it has been much longer than that. Mr. Warr is referring to the fact that the Greenways area was annexed into the Town after incorporation.

Mr. Warr asked if it has been within the past 10 years.

Chair Lubin said no, it has been more.

Mr. Warr said the desk item/neighbor letter is from a property owner that already has a 0.5 acre parcel a little closer to Alameda de Las Pulgas. From a zoning standpoint, it seems odd that a parcel would be bound on three sides by an alternate zoning district. They would like to move forward with this project, which seems pretty simple. They did not consider merging driveways because it's not within the neighborhood character. They wanted to follow the pattern of development. Development is not constrained by septic systems because there is existing public sewer in the street. The utilities are all in the street. They look forward to the ASRB's comments. The proposed building envelopes simply show development viability. It's likely that accessory buildings will be in the back, and principal buildings will be in the front to preserve as much backyard space as possible and to match neighborhood character.

Chair Lubin asked if he understands that those could not be detached guest houses.

Mr. Warr said yes. They take no issues with that at all.

Director Young said it wasn't they couldn't do a detached guest house. They can't do a detached accessory living quarters. She explained the difference: a guest house could have a bedroom and bathroom; however, an accessory living quarters has a place to eat, to sleep, and to bathe.

Chair Lubin asked if they have spoken to the neighbors.

Mr. Warr said no. The applicant owns the adjacent parcel and currently lives there.

Chair Lubin asked if Mr. Warr saw the neighbor letter objecting to this proposal.

Mr. Warr said he has.

Member Mah asked when the other R-1 lots were created.

Mr. Warr said prior to annexation into the Town.

Director Young said the parcels were annexed as they currently exist.

Member Mah asked where they were annexed from.

Mr. Warr said, from San Mateo County.

Member Mah asked how parcels are affected by subdividing after annexation.

Director Young directed attention to the Zoning Map. These lots were already in the configuration that they are. They were given the zoning approximate to the lot size. There are R-1 and SR zones in the area. The proposal sits right on the boundary of SR and R-1. When rezoning a parcel, one consideration is to ensure it doesn't stick out. This project site is immediately contiguous to the zone district.

Planner Schaan said they researched the parcel maps. It looks like there were a number of changes. Many parcels were divided into the same size as the subject parcel. There were a number of these lots on Greenways Drive split over the years before they were annexed into the Town.

Chair Lubin said regarding the neighbor's letter, if they are allowed to do this, what's to keep the two adjacent lots from doing the same thing? It would be a backdoor subdivision.

Director Young said it wouldn't be a backdoor subdivision because these are existing legal lots of record. Sometimes backdoor subdivisions occur, and when you take a larger piece of land and divide it into two, and then divide it into four. The State has laws in the Subdivision Map Act about sequential land divisions. This isn't a sequential land division.

Chair Lubin asked if the adjacent lots are in the same situation. Planner Schaan said because the lot is adjacent to R-1, it would create lots similar to R-1 as opposed to SR. Maybe this would create a domino effect?

Director Young said yes, that's possible if there was a lot large enough to split into two. As you move south, however, the character of the land changes. The configuration of the lots become less uniform. There wouldn't be a fear of marching into SR zoning because they have different access and configurations that couldn't as readily be split.

Member Reyerling said it potentially looks like there will be double the number of houses along the street. Is there a concern about traffic?

Director Young said from a CEQA standpoint, she doesn't think there is a concern about traffic. With CEQA, traffic impact is looked at as level of service. A couple of more homes would not trigger a significant level of service change on the street. The street surface is paved and of adequate width.

Chair Lubin said it's actually only adding one more house.

Mr. Warr said that is correct.

Director Young said by creating another R-1 zoned lot in Town, it is beneficial for the Housing Element. On a smaller lot, there is less total floor area, so it's potentially adding an additional home into the housing stock in the Town's small zoning district.

Chair Lubin noted that she recused herself when this proposal was reviewed at the History Committee.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Member Mah said the character of the neighborhood is conducive to the proposal. It's difficult to fully understand how this proposal compares to what other people may do. She appreciates how it creates housing that is within touching distance of reasonable incomes and proximity to schools. Lower total floor area speaks to sustainability. She suggested that the design not be cookie-cutter to avoid looking like a Townhouse, which it could easily do side-by-side. She urged them to consider creative site planning to give more breathing room. It's a pretty suburban little enclave. This proposal doesn't seem inappropriate.

Vice Chair Larson agreed with Member Mah. This is a project that is completely different from the one prior. It has a pattern of smaller lots and is contiguous with smaller lots. The entrance to this area is completely different. It fits in well with the community character.

Chair Lubin agreed with all of the comments. Regarding the neighbor's concern about traffic, if there was a possibility of a shared driveway, it may open up an opportunity of orienting garages away from the street in a way that it didn't look like a subdivision. Other than that, it fits community character and doesn't have the same constraints that the previous project had.

ACTION

The ASRB recommended that the applicant proceed with processing the application, and consider the option of combining the driveway for the two lots to accommodate non-street facing garages. Neighborhood pattern should be considered when responding to this recommendation.

Motion: Member Reyering/ Second: Chair Lubin
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Mah, and Reyering
Noes: None
Absent: Member Carlsmith
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

REPORTS

Director Young discussed the Director's Report for September 2016.

ASRB MEMBERS' COMMUNICATIONS

Member Reyering asked if the project at 196 Albion Avenue came before the ASRB.

Planner Jones said no. It's an existing nonconforming house that is more than 6,000 square feet. They did floor area swaps (i.e., relocated existing square footage on site). They notified neighbors, as required by the WMC. No neighbors requested forwarding the project to the ASRB.

Planner Schaan said it's a significant remodel that did not trigger ASRB review.

Member Reyering said it triggered permitting. There is a significant amount of deer fencing along the road. Wouldn't the permit process have triggered code enforcement on that?

Planner Schaan said staff does not perform site visits on all Permit applications. We may just not have seen that. Staff reviews the plans they provide.

Chair Lubin adjourned the ASRB meeting at 7:15 P.M.