

EXHIBIT A REVISIONS TO FEIR

Section 1.0 Introduction

Page 1.0-1, third paragraph

The project involves the demolition of the main house and cottage, ~~and~~ relocation and restoration of the aviary and construction on the property of a new single-family home that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code. ~~within the property, to prepare the project site for the eventual construction of a single family residence.~~

Section 2.0 Executive Summary

Page 2.0-1, fourth paragraph

The project involves the demolition of the main house and cottage ~~and, to prepare the project site for the eventual~~ construction on the property of a new single-family residence that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code.

Page 2.0-2, fourth paragraph to Page 2.0-3, fifth paragraph

Cultural-1. ~~Prior to demolition of the house~~ the issuance of the demolition permit, the project applicant shall develop historical and photographic documentation of the Jackling Estate. Photographic documentation shall be undertaken under the guidance of an architectural historian and shall meet Historic American Buildings Survey Photographic Standards. Historical documentation shall consist of Michael Corbett's historic resources evaluation represented in the DPR Primary Record and Building, Structure, and Object Record. The historical and photographic documentation shall be submitted to the Town of Woodside, the San Mateo County Historical Association, the George Washington Smith Collection, and the Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara.

~~The applicant proposes to salvage certain architectural features of the house. The list of the features to be salvaged shall be reviewed by an architectural historian, who shall have the authority (in consultation with the Town) to modify the list.~~

Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall also salvage, at a minimum, the following architectural features of the house (collectively, the "Salvage Features"): the 50 foot tall flagpole near the front gate, the copper mailbox with the name "Jackling" embossed on it, a sampling of Spanish roof tiles, the organ, any other interior decorative tile, stone, woodwork and other features that feasibly can be removed, such as fireplace mantels, light fixtures, mouldings, etc. The list of Salvage Features contained herein shall be reviewed by an architectural historian, who shall have the authority (in consultation with

the Town) to modify the list. The applicant shall contract with a qualified salvage company with experience in the removal and storage of historic materials. Prior to removal from the site, the applicant and salvage company shall notify the Town of Woodside, the San Mateo County Historical Association, and University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, and offer these institutions, in the order listed (Town first, San Mateo County Historical Association second, etc.), an opportunity to select historic materials/features for incorporation into their collections. Each institution will be invited to inspect the property and prepare a list of items it desires to acquire for preservation. The list must be completed and furnished to the applicant and the Town within thirty (30) days of the inspection. The recipient of each item is responsible for obtaining it on site unless other arrangements are made with the applicant.

Page 2.0-5, second paragraph

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would clear the project site for the ~~eventual~~ construction of a new single-family residence.

Section 3.0 Project Description

Page 3.0-1, second paragraph

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The applicant intends that the project accomplish the following primary ~~goal~~ objectives:

- Demolish the existing main house and cottage;
- Construct a single-family home with a modern floor plan and amenities consistent with current standards and expectations;
- Replace the main house and cottage with a smaller home that is of a scale and character that complies with the current Town Code (e.g., approximately 6,000 square feet); and
- Construct a new home that minimizes disturbance of the natural terrain, and reduces overall building bulk and height on the project site.
- ~~Clearance of the primary home and cottage from the site at 460 Mountain Home Road to prepare the site for the eventual construction of a single-family residence.~~

Page 3.0-2, fourth paragraph

D1. Demolition

The project involves the demolition of the main house and cottage ~~and to prepare the project site for the eventual construction on the property for of a new~~ single-family residence that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code.

The garage/water tower structure would remain on the site for at least five years. The foundations of the structures would be removed, and the demolition site would be graded to blend in with the surrounding topography.

Page 3.0-9, fourth paragraph

D5. Construction of a Single-Family Residence

~~Although the Applicant has indicated his intent to clear the site for the purposes of construction of a single family residence, the specific details of that residence have not been submitted to the Town. For this EIR, then, it was assumed that any new residence constructed on the site would meet~~ The applicant has submitted plans to the Town to construct on the site a new single-family residence that complies with the Town planning and zoning requirements. These requirements would limit the size of the residence to 6,000 square feet (excluding basement area) and the height of the residence to 30 feet above existing grade. This EIR analyzes the potential impacts of both demolition of the existing house and cottage and construction of a new home that substantially comports with the location and building envelope indicated on the plans submitted by the applicant. Approval of a new structure would require environmental review.

Page 3.0-9, fifth paragraph to Page 3.0-10, first paragraph

E. APPROVALS REQUESTED

The discretionary approvals requested include a Preliminary Design Review by the Architectural and Site Review Board (Board) and a Site Development Permit by the Town Engineer or Planning Commission. Although the demolition permit required for the project would be considered a ministerial action on its own, the need for the discretionary Preliminary Design Review and Site Development Permit Board review makes the demolition permit discretionary “and subject to the requirements of CEQA.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15268(d)). Prior to acting on the Preliminary Design Review and Site Development Permit, the Town Woodside Planning Commission would consider whether any further environmental review was required for those actions pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines certification of the EIR. No other public agency approvals are required.

Section 4.0 Environmental and Regulatory Setting

Page 4.0-4, sixth paragraph

The current Land Use Map designates the project site as Residential/Environmentally Sensitive Area (R/ESA). The ESA designation is based on the proximity of the San Andreas Fault. The demolition of the main house and cottage, ~~and~~ relocation and restoration of the aviary within and construction of a new home on the project site would be consistent with the current land use designation. Although the applicant has indicated his intent to clear the site for purposes of construction of a single family residence, the specific details of that residence have not been submitted to the Town. It is

~~assumed that any residence constructed on the site would comply with the *General Plan* land use designation.~~

Page 4.0-5, third paragraph

~~The proposed demolition would clear the site to allow ~~eventual~~ construction of a single-family residence. ~~With exceptions not relevant here, Per the Zoning Ordinance,~~ the maximum size of a main residence within ~~the SCP-5 zoning district SCP-5~~ is 6,000 square feet (~~excluding basement area~~). ~~However, an exception may be granted by the Planning Commission for lots that are at least 150 percent of the minimum lot area required in the SR, RR and SCP residential zoning districts. This exception allows for a maximum main residence size within district SCP-5 of 8,000 square feet.~~ In addition, the maximum allowable height for buildings in the Town of Woodside is 30 feet tall.^{4a}~~

Page 4.0-6, fifth paragraph

In the short term, the project would not involve the development of any new uses on the project site. In the long term, the eventual development that could occur would lead to only a minor increase in air quality impacts. The proposed demolition of the two structures and ~~eventual~~ construction of a new single-family residence could create air-borne particulate matter that could result in temporary degradation of the air quality in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the use of equipment for demolition, grading and hauling would result in emissions from the equipment exhaust. However, due to the limited scope of the project, such impacts would be temporary and intermittent. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines focus on particulate matter as the pollutant of concern, and state that as long as feasible control techniques are used, the impact would be less than significant. The Town of Woodside will impose conditions of approval on the project to minimize construction dust impacts. For these reasons, the proposed project would be in compliance with the BAAQMD's 2000 Clean Air Plan.

Page 4.0-7, first paragraph

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was enacted by the State Legislature in order to address traffic congestion in California's urbanized counties. The current CMP for San Mateo County was adopted in 2007 May 2000 (~~a draft update to the CMP was prepared in 2003~~).

Page 4.0-9, Table 4.0-1, Project consistency column, fourth paragraph

Chapter 7.0, Alternatives, of this EIR considers several possible alternatives that involve preservation of the structure. All of the alternatives analyzed (except the

^{4a} Per the Town of Woodside, Municipal Code, Section 153.047 and personal communication with Hope Sullivan, Planning Director, March 30, 2004.

No Project Alternative) involve rehabilitation (to some degree) of the Jackling house. The Town Council will ultimately determine whether such alternatives (i) meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) lessen or alleviate the identified impact to the historic resource and (iii) are feasible, i.e., capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors. ~~Alternatives 2 (rehabilitation) and 4 (on-site relocation and rehabilitation) would be technically feasible and would avoid the significant impacts the project would have on the house as a historic resource. Alternative 3 (rehabilitation and major addition) would be technically feasible and would lessen the impact to the house. Alternatives 2 and 3 would not meet the applicant's objective of clearance of the house from the site; it is unclear whether Alternative 4 would meet the applicant's objective. Depending on their specific design characteristics, Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 might meet the applicant's objectives of construction of a single-family residence on the site.~~

Section 5.1. Cultural Resources

Page 5.1-1, first paragraph

The Jackling house is considered a significant historic resource under CEQA because it meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). The proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing house located at 460 Mountain Home Road ~~to prepare the site for the eventual~~ and construction on the site of a new single-family residence that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code. The demolition would result in significant adverse impacts to the historic significance of the resource that could not be adequately mitigated by the measures in this EIR.

Page 5.1-12, third through fifth paragraphs

Cultural-1. Prior to ~~demolition of the house~~ the issuance of the demolition permit, the project applicant shall develop historical and photographic documentation of the Jackling Estate. Photographic documentation shall be undertaken under the guidance of an architectural historian and shall meet Historic American Buildings Survey Photographic Standards. Historical documentation shall consist of Michael Corbett's historic resources evaluation represented in the DPR Primary Record and Building, Structure, and Object Record. The historical and photographic documentation shall be submitted to the Town of Woodside, the San Mateo County Historical Association and the George Washington Smith Collection, and the Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara.

~~The applicant proposes to salvage certain architectural features of the house. The list of the features to be salvaged shall be reviewed by an architectural historian, who shall have the authority (in consultation with the Town) to modify the list.~~

Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall also salvage, at a minimum, the following architectural features of the house (collectively, the “Salvage Features”): the 50 foot tall flagpole near the front gate, the copper mailbox with the name “Jackling” embossed on it, a sampling of Spanish roof tiles, the organ, any other interior decorative tile, stone, woodwork and other features that feasibly can be removed, such as fireplace mantels, light fixtures, mouldings, etc. The list of Salvage Features contained herein shall be reviewed by an architectural historian, who shall have the authority (in consultation with the Town) to modify the list. The applicant shall contract with a qualified salvage company with experience in the removal and storage of historic materials. Prior to removal from the site, the applicant and salvage company shall notify the Town of Woodside, the San Mateo County Historical Association and University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, and offer these institutions, in the order listed (Town first, San Mateo County Historical Association second, etc.), an opportunity to select historic materials/features for incorporation into their collections. Each institution will be invited to inspect the property and prepare a list of items it desires to acquire for preservation. The list must be completed and furnished to the applicant and the Town within thirty (30) days of the inspection. The recipient of each item is responsible for obtaining it on site unless other arrangements are made with the applicant.

Section 7.0 Alternatives to the Project

Page 7.0-6, third paragraph

Relationship to Project Objective

The No Project alternative would not achieve the project objectives of demolishing the Jackling house and replacing it with a single-family home with a modern floor plan and amenities consistent with current standards and expectations of clearance of the primary home and cottage from the main site, as described in Section 3.0, Project Description, of this EIR. This alternative also would not meet the objective of eventual construction of a single family residence replacing a larger non-conforming home with a smaller home that comports with the Town Code. Similarly, this alternative would not reduce the overall building bulk and height on the project site.

Page 7.0-12, first paragraph

Relationship to Project Objective

Under this alternative, the Jackling house and cottage would not be demolished, the garage/water tower would remain on the site, and the aviary would not be relocated. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not meet the project objectives of replacing the Jackling house with a smaller single-family home that comports with the Town Code and contains a modern floor plan and amenities consistent with current standards and expectations. Similarly, this alternative would not reduce the overall building bulk and height on the project site. —of clearance of the

~~primary house and cottage from the project site. Depending on its specific characteristics, Alternative 2 might meet the objective of eventual construction of a single family residence.~~

Page 7.0-18, fourth paragraph

Relationship to Project Objective

Under this alternative, the Jackling house and cottage would not be demolished, and the aviary would not be relocated. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not meet the project objectives of demolishing the Jackling house and replacing it with a smaller home that comports with the Town Code. While this alternative would include some elements of a modern home, overall, the alternative would not meet the basic projects objective of constructing a single-family home with a modern floor plan and amenities. ~~of clearance of the primary home and cottage from the project site. Depending on its specific characteristics, Alternative 3 might meet the objective of eventual construction of a single family residence.~~

Page 7.0-25, second paragraph

Relationship to Project Objective

Under this alternative, the Jackling house, cottage, and aviary would be moved from their present locations and sited on another portion of the project site. Therefore, it is unclear whether the alternative would meet the objective of ~~clearance of the primary home and cottage from the site.~~ Depending on its specific characteristics, Alternative 4 might meet the objective of replacing the Jackling home with a modern single-family home with a conventional layout. However, this alternative would not comply with the Town Code in terms of minimum lot size and maximum square footage allowed for residential development and would exacerbate the overall building bulk and height on the project site. ~~eventual construction of a single family residence.~~

Page 7.0-26, last paragraph to 7.0-27, first paragraph

Relationship to Project Objective

Under this alternative, the existing residence would be relocated to another location. Therefore, the alternative would meet the project objectives of replacing the Jackling home with a smaller single-family home that comports with the Town Code and contains a modern floor plan and amenities consistent with current standards and expectations. In addition, this alternative would achieve the project objective of reducing building bulk and height on the project site. ~~of clearance of the primary home and cottage from the project site, and could meet the objective of eventual construction of a single family residence.~~ As stated earlier, though, the feasibility of this alternative is not known.

Section 8.0 Other CEQA Topics

Page 8.0-1, third paragraph

A2. Discussion

The project site is already developed with a main house, cottage, garage/water tower, and an aviary. Demolition of the main house and cottage and relocation and restoration of the aviary would result in a short-term increased use of non-renewable resources. Although demolition would prepare the site for the construction of a single-family residence, ~~no details on its construction have yet been determined. However,~~ the additional resources that would be used as a result of this project such development would be minor. The project site is already developed, and redevelopment of the site ~~(if it occurs)~~ would result in construction of one single-family development; therefore, there would be no or minor irreversible long-term environmental changes related to such development.

Page 8.0-2, fifth paragraph

B3. Growth Inducement Potential

The project would not require the establishment of any public services, and no off-site roadway extensions would be required to support the proposed project. Access and services are already provided to the project site. The site is designated and zoned for residential uses, and the project would not change the *General Plan* land use designation or zoning. The project would result in the partial clearing of the property; to accommodate the construction of a new single-family home in accordance with the and the General Plan and zoning designations for the site. ~~would allow development of the site in residential use (with the appropriate permits). At this point it would be speculative to state whether such development would occur, or how such development might affect other properties in the area.~~ Redevelopment of the site with a single-family house would not in itself be considered growth inducing because the site currently has a single-family house on it.

Page 8.0-3, second paragraph

The proposed project has no potential to result in economic growth. The proposed project includes the demolition of the main house and cottage, ~~and~~ relocation and restoration of an aviary and construction on the project site of a new single-family home that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code. The proposed project would not result in a population increase that could lead to economic growth nearby.

Section 12.0 Responses to Comments

Response B-4, first paragraph

The comment refers to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378, which defines a “project” as “the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably indirect physical change in the environment ...” The EIR (project objectives, discussion of less-than-significant impacts, and alternatives analysis) has been revised to reflect that the project objectives include the ~~eventual~~ construction on the project site of a new single-family residence on the project site that comports with the standards set forth in the Town Code. Please refer to ~~Section 13.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR.~~