Special Field Meeting, 3 Oak Forest Court, *Taran* Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the special ASCC field meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. at 3 Oak Forest Court.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Aalfs, Clark, Gelpi

Absent: Warr

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Others present relative to the Taran project:

Randy Taran, applicant
Dan Sanchez, project gate contractor
Steve Joynes, project manager
Leitha Spetzler, 2 Oak Forest Court

Aalfs was welcomed to the ASCC and congratulated on his December 10, 2008 town council appointment to the commission.

Architectural Review for Driveway Entry Gate, 3 Oak Forest Court, Taran

Vlasic presented the December 12, 2008 staff report on this request for installation of a new driveway entry gate at the subject Oak Forest court property, located on the west side of Los Trancos Road. He reviewed the background on the request, history of previous ASCC reviews and actions relative to proposals for house, fence and gate additions on the property, as well as zoning ordinance and Portola Glen Estates PUD provisions pertaining to the proposal. He also referred to the November 30 and December 16, 2008 letters from Carl and Leitha Spetzler, 2 Oak Forest Court, on the proposal and their history of issues with improvements on and proposals for the Taran property, as well as issues associated with the lack of a functioning homeowners association for the Portola Glen Estates PUD.

The limitations and options for installation of a gate and related fencing were considered, as set forth in the staff report. Site conditions were inspected and the project options discussed, including needs and desires of the applicant, zoning and PUD limitations and concerns of the neighbors. The gate plan prepared for building permit submittal by A&D Automatic Gate and Access, received by the town on November 17, 2008 was also reviewed.

Following discussion and based on staff recommendations, Gelpi moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0, approval of the proposal for installation of a new driveway entry gate subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant has the option to locate a four-foot high automatic gate where the gate posts have been installed without permit (the existing gate posts do adhere to the 25-foot setback requirement), or to move the automatic gate to the 50-foot setback line, at which point a six-foot high gate would be permitted of the design shown on the proposed gate permit plans prepared by A&D Automatic Gate and Access. If the decision is to use the gate posts as installed, not only shall the gate be no

higher than four feet, but a revised design shall be provided that adheres to the 50% maximum opacity limit. (The current gate design may be used as a basis for the four-foot gate with the lowering in height and removing some of the horizontal elements so as to meet the 50% opacity limit.) If the four-foot option is selected, the revised design shall be provided to the satisfaction of staff and a designated ASCC member. If the six-foot option is selected, a plan shall be provided showing how any front yard fencing would tie to the gate. (See also condition 2a below.)

Note: It was stated by the applicant and understood by the ASCC that there would be no lighting associated with either of the gate options. Further, if the 50-foot setback location is selected, the existing gateposts shall be removed as a condition of issuance of any gate permit. The gateposts would not, however, have to be removed prior to permit issuance.

- 2. After a gate option is selected and found acceptable (per condition #1 above) and prior to issuance of the gate permit, the following shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of planning staff:
 - a. All existing five-foot+ high post and wire fencing within the 50-foot front yard setback area shall be modified to adhere to the four-foot height limit. Further, any new fencing to extend from the existing fencing to a gate at the 50-foot setback shall match the existing fencing and be no higher than 4 feet. The plan for any new fencing shall be provided with the final gate plan.
 - b. All existing fencing located in the open space area (i.e., Parcel A) on the north side of the parcel shall be removed. Any new "replacement" fencing along the north side of the parcel shall be within the subject property and otherwise conform to the conditions associated with the 2005 ASCC gate and fence plan approval.
 - c. At the northernmost corner of the parcel, the existing fencing that essentially follows the parcel boundary and is highly visible from the Spetzler parcel shall be removed. Any replacement fencing in this area shall conform to the conditions associated with the 2005 ASCC plan approval to the satisfaction of planning staff.
 - d. The pole mounted driveway security light recently installed without a permit or ASCC approval shall be removed. A replacement light may be considered if it conforms to town lighting policies and standards and a plan for it is provided to the satisfaction of a planning staff and a designated ASCC member.
 - e. A bond or cash deposit to the satisfaction of planning staff, shall be provided guaranteeing the plant removal and completion of native landscaping as required with the 2005 ASCC gate and house addition plan approval. (**Note:** as a point of clarification, the wire cages around the non-native plants along the property line common with the Sptezler property do not have to be removed prior to issuance of the gate permit. Their removal, as well as removal of non-native plants, would be covered by the required bond or cash deposit.)

Mrs. Taran indicated her concurrence with the ASCC action and likelihood of pursuing the six-foot gate option. Mrs. Spetzler also indicated general support for the ASCC action.

(**Note:** At the conclusion of the ASCC meeting, Vlasic discussed the above conditions with Mr. Sanchez and Mr. Joynes. They advised that they would hope to immediately proceed to remove the fencing as called for in conditions 2b. and 2c., and also modify the fencing as called for in condition 2a. They advised that depending on timing they may not propose any replacement fencing at this time, as they desire to install the driveway gate as soon as possible.)

Adjournment

At approximately 4:40 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

T. Vlasic