

**Special Field Meeting, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young,
385 Golden Oak Drive, Illich, The Priory School, 302 Portola Road,
Verizon & Sprint Wireless, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Clark called the special field meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. at 210 Golden Oak Drive and noted it was for continued preliminary consideration of the Young project.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes*
ASCC Absent: Warr
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

*Hughes arrived shortly after the start of the field meeting

Others present relative to the Young project:

William Young, applicant
Mark Sutherland, project architect
Tricia Christensen, 50 Alhambra Court
Ken and Carrie Lavine, 185 Golden Oak Drive
Virginia and Lyle Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive
Carrie Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive
Syrus Madavi, 220 Golden Oak Drive

Continued Preliminary Architectural Review, residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young

Vlastic briefly reviewed the comments in the November 5, 2009 staff report on the status of the preliminary review of the subject project. He advised that the purpose of the site meeting was to continue gathering field data in terms of views from surrounding properties, particularly the Madavi property at 220 Golden Oak Drive and parcels across Golden Oak Drive, i.e., west of the project site. Vlastic also noted that the project design team would be making a presentation at the regular evening ASCC meeting on concepts for project changes, including a scaled down, partial two-story design and also a single-story, contemporary house with flat and shed roof forms.

Mark Sutherland reviewed the status of the story poles and noted that while they still modeled a partial two-story form, they had been adjusted to remove elements that were deleted from the project previously, including the rear elevation loggia. He also noted that the ground level changes relative to the master bedroom extension on the southeast side for the single-story option had been modeled with additional story poles.

ASCC members and others present then viewed the story poles from 185 and 205 Golden Oak Drive, i.e., the parcels west of and across the street from the project site. During the course of the visits to these properties, there was discussion of the condition of the existing street frontage trees and clarification of tree removal. It was noted that at this point, only one smaller redwood along the frontage was planned for removal, along with a few other smaller plant materials. It was also pointed out that a cedar that was initially planned for retention with the two-story plan would likely be removed to accommodate a one-story design.

There was some discussion regarding the removal of older pines along the parcel frontage, but it was clarified that, at this point, these trees were not proposed for removal. Clark commented that over time, the pine trees would likely have to be removed due to age and that the final planting plan should provide for appropriate new materials to be in place when such removal became necessary.

During the visit to the Madavi property, views were considered to the story poles for the proposed house and also to the lower swimming pool area. Mr. Madavi reviewed the concerns set forth in his September 30, 2009 letter to the ASCC. He worried over privacy and noise impacts. Mr. Sutherland noted that with the one-story alternative being considered, the rooms near the Madavi property would be mostly bedrooms and that the scope of outside yard space for outdoor activities on this north side would be minimal.

Vlasic commented that in terms of noise, property use was regulated under provisions of the town's noise ordinance. He also noted that the general plan and zoning provisions anticipate and provide for normal outdoor recreational activities on individual residential properties.

Breen referenced a long row of oleanders on the Madavi property that appeared to have been installed relatively recently. She commented that the town's landscape guidelines would discourage such planting. Mr. Madavi advised that he appreciated knowing this and would consider changes with appropriate screen planting.

Tricia Christensen wondered about the recent installation of black plastic or fabric on the existing retaining walls above and below the swimming pool terrace. Sutherland stated he was not certain as to the reason for the black material, but speculated it might be to show the reduction in the scope of the walls that are now being considered. He noted that this reduction would include a two-foot lowering of the downhill wall and lowering and "clipping" of the ends of the uphill wall. (Note: at the evening meeting, it was clarified that the black fabric was to identify the proposed wall modifications.)

After considering views from the neighboring properties, Clark thanked the applicant, project architect and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting. It was noted that preliminary project review would continue at the evening meeting and that at that time ASCC members would offer reactions to the concepts for the revised two-story and alternative one-story house designs. It was clarified that after the evening discussion, project review would likely be continued to either the November 23rd or December 14th ASCC meetings.

Thereafter, at approximately 3:15 p.m., it was noted that the special site meeting would continue at 385 Cervantes Road for consideration of the Illich project as soon as ASCC members could convene at the site.

Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-607, 385 Westridge Drive, Illich

At 3:25 p.m., the following ASCC members and other identified individuals convened at the subject site:

ASCC members: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes, Warr
Planning Commission members: McIntosh, Von Feldt
Staff: Vlasic

Others:

John Richards, project architect
Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect

Vlasic reviewed the comments in his November 5, 2009 staff report on this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property. He explained both the grading and architectural review matters associated with the project and noted that due to the volume of proposed grading, the planning commission is the approving authority relative to the site development permit application. He also advised that the site meeting had been noticed as a joint session of the ASCC and planning commission, but a formal planning commission review was not possible due to the lack of a quorum.

Vlasic referenced a November 9, 2009 email received from Pat Box, 250 Shawnee Pass, commenting on the proposed guest house and views from her property to the guest house. Vlasic clarified that the email requested planting of screen trees to mitigate for potential view impacts. Vlasic also advised that following ASCC discussion at the site and evening meetings project review would be continued to the regular November 23, 2009 ASCC meeting.

Mr. Richards and Mr. Cleaver explained the proposal as described in the statement from applicants Jim and Alyson Illich included with the staff report and presented on the following project plans unless otherwise noted, dated September 16, 2009 and prepared by F. John Richards, Architect:

Sheet A0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet A1.01, Site Plan
Sheet A1.02, House Floor Plan
Sheet A1.03, Construction Staging/Tree Protection
Sheet A1.04, Story Pole Locations
Sheet A1.05, Topo Map/Constraints
Sheet A2.01, Main House Elevations, Guesthouse Plan and Elevations
Sheet L-1, Site Preparation Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
Sheet L-2, Landscape Plan, Cleaver Design Associates
Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Freyer & Laureta, Inc.

Also presented for consideration was the binder containing materials and colors samples for the proposed residence and guest house and cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures. It was noted that the binder was received by the town on September 21, 2009.

During the course of the site inspection, Mr. Richards and Mr. Cleaver referenced the plans listed above and story poles set to model the project. Mr. Richards made use of a revised site plan with notes to address a driveway surface requirement of the public works director and adjustments to the guest house siting. Mr. Richards and Mr. Cleaver offered the following comments and project clarifications, including those explaining the recent site plan revisions.

- A larger sample of the proposed metal roof material was made available for review.
- It was noted that the guest house would be moved slightly to the northeast to avoid the branch of a nearby oak that was encountered when the story poles were installed. It was also noted that this change with possible adjustment of the proposed new landscaping would resolve the view concerns of the neighbors at 250 Shawnee Pass.

- The site plan has been modified to show the driveway paver material only within the parcel boundary and not in the public right of way as requested by the public works director.
- The new house will be in much the same location as the existing house and would likely only be about two inches higher at the new ridgeline.
- In response to a question, it was noted that efforts could be considered to keep some of the existing exotic vegetation along Cervantes, particularly in the public right of way, during the course of the construction and then remove it at the end of the construction process. It is recognized that an encroachment permit will be needed for the work proposed in the public right of way.
- A solar photovoltaic system is being considered, but is not currently part of the project plans.
- The fence plan will be adjusted to conform to fence ordinance provisions and resolve the fencing issues discussed in the staff report.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that the intent was to preserve as many of the existing oak seedlings as possible that are now “buried” in the juniper and other exotic plantings.

Cleaver advised that in response to concerns expressed by the Conservation Committee he would be modifying the landscaping plan to remove the California Pepper as it is not a California native plant. He suggested that in its place, there would be more use of *Prunus ilicifolia* ‘Lyonii.’

Breen commented that she did not necessarily agree with the conservation committee comments. She felt that the California Pepper was a good choice as it had a character that would be more compatible with the willows on the property across Cherokee Way.

ASCC and planning commission members present offered comments generally supportive of the project. Some concerns were expressed over the exposed wall planned on the south side of the infinity edge swimming pool and the massing associated with the upper terraces walls. These matters were discussed in some detail for better project understanding, including how the grading and landscaping would screen views from off site. Some additional comments were offered as follows:

- Some consideration might be given to moving the proposed sanitary sewer facility further south and away from the base of the large pine tree located in the southeast corner of the property.
- The planting along Cherokee Way should allow for some views into the meadow area and not result in a hedge-like condition along the street.
- Consideration should be given to moving the spa closer to the pool terrace and adding screening for privacy.

Von Feldt also commented that she understood the conservation committee concerns with the use of California Pepper as it has somewhat of an invasive character and would prefer it not be used.

At approximately 4:05 p.m., Clark thanked the project design team for their presentations and advised that the preliminary consideration of the project would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. He further advised that the special site meeting would continue at the Priory School, 302 Portola Road, as soon as ASCC members could convene at the site relative to the Verizon and Sprint CUP proposals.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment X7D-132, replacement of existing wireless communication antenna facilities, Verizon Wireless and Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Renewal X7D-147 for continuing use of existing wireless communication antenna facility, Sprint/PCS Wireless The Priory School 302 Portola Road

At 4:15 p.m., the following ASCC members and other identified individuals convened at the subject site:

ASCC members: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes, Warr
Planning Commission members*: McIntosh, McKitterick, Von Feldt
Staff: Vlastic
Others:
 Laura Boat, Verizon Wireless representative
 Russ Benson, Verizon Wireless engineer
 Leah Zaffaroni, 175 Georgia Lane

*Shortly after the start of the Priory site meeting, McIntosh had to leave, and this occurred just prior to McKitterick's arrival. Thus, it was acknowledged that although the site meeting had been noticed as a joint meeting of the ASCC and planning commission, it was not possible to convene a formal meeting of the planning commission due to the lack of a quorum.

Ms. Zaffaroni noted that while she is a member of the planning commission, she was present only as a neighbor of the property and that she would not be participating as a planning commissioner in the deliberations on the subject applications.

Vlastic briefly presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on the Verizon and Sprint applications. He noted a number of issues relative to the requests needed to be evaluated, but that the primary purpose of the site meeting was to judge the aesthetic impacts of the proposals. He clarified that based on the November 5, 2009 report from the town attorney, the ASCC should forward comments to the planning commission relative to the aesthetics of each of the proposals. He added that the ASCC review of the proposal should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

It was noted that Sprint was not represented at the site meeting. Vlastic advised that this applicant might be represented at the evening meeting.

Ms. Boat and Mr. Benson reviewed the Verizon proposal and provided visual simulations of both "slimline" pole and "tree" pole options. The simulations include views from Portola Road and from the intersection of Portola Road and Georgia Lane. Reference was also made to the local "examples" of poles and "trees" that were identified for ASCC and

Planning Commission inspection. In particular, the example at Westwind Community Barn in Los Altos Hills was discussed as a good example of a “tree option.”

Both McIntosh and Warr noted that they had seen the “tree” at Westwind Barn and concluded that “up-close” it did have a somewhat “fake” appearance, but at a distance it might be a very good design option.

Mr. Benson also presented the “before” and “after” coverage maps for the proposed Verizon facilities showing a minimum of 20 to 25% increase in coverage. He noted that at this time the only other location that was possibly being considered for another Verizon antenna would be on Sand Hill Road in the Woodside area. He did offer, however, that in the very long-term, Verizon was interested in finding a location along Alpine Road, just to the west of the Alpine Inn, but no specific sites had yet to be identified nor was he aware of any Verizon work plans for identifying such a site.

The Verizon representatives offered the following comments and clarifications:

- In response to sounds heard from existing equipment, it was agreed a sound evaluation would be conducted to ensure compliance with town noise ordinance standards.
- The existing line of sight technology is essentially “state of the art” and, therefore, there is no industry expectation that a different approach to wireless service can be expected in the near or long term. Specifically, some form of tall pole with antenna arrays can be expected in either the form currently proposed, a “tree” version, or the “monopole” design. In any case, most pole options with sufficient height can accommodate collocation of facilities by carriers.
- It is likely that the existing AT&T “whip” antenna pole will be considered for upgrading to a pole similar to what is now being proposed by Verizon or like the existing Nextel pole.
- Other carriers or additional antenna facilities might be expected as efforts are being made to meet the expanding, higher speed wireless “data” transmission needs. For example, “Clearwire” is a data service that is currently expanding the in Western U.S.
- The efficiency of antennas is impacted when located next to trees, particularly wet trees.
- With the currently proposed pole, both the pole and antenna can be painted any color determined appropriate by the town. With a “tree” pole option, the tree color and form can be custom built to fit the setting. Further, in this case, if a tree were used, its branches would need to begin above the roofline of the adjacent building and above the level of the existing enclosure where it would be located.

Public comments were requested. **Ms. Zaffaroni** noted that recent removal of pine trees on the Priory property result in opening of views from the Georgia Lane area. She also expressed concern over views from the public trails at the northerly extension of Georgia Lane connecting to Sausal Drive. She suggested replanting, but also noted that in this case a “tree” pole option should be seriously considered.

ASCC members considered the site conditions and data presented at the site meeting. The following reactions were offered:

- The existing Sprint pole appears to be a good color and acceptable in its current condition. Sound from the equipment, however, needs to be evaluated in terms of conformity to the standards of the town's noise ordinance.
- The existing Nextel pole is the most visually present wireless feature and should be painted a darker color to blend better with the surrounding topography.
- The existing white "whip" antennas on the Verizon poles and the white "whips" on the AT&T poles are very visible. With the Verizon request, their whips will be removed. Consideration should be given by AT&T to repainting of their whips or replacing them with darker whips.
- If the proposed pole option were pursued, if painted a dark brown or green color, it would likely be aesthetically acceptable. A "tree" option might, however, be worthy of consideration at this site. It was further noted that from a distance, particularly from the Corte Madera Road area, a tree option would likely be preferable.
- If AT&T proposes a new antenna pole, e.g., like what is now planned for Verizon, a tree option should be considered. This "tree" with a Verizon "tree" would help screen views to the other antennas on the Priory site.

After sharing of the above comments and reactions, Clark thanked the Verizon representatives and others present for the participation in the site meeting. It was also noted that ASCC consideration of the request would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

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

Architectural and Site Control Commission **November 9, 2009**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Clark called the regular meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes, Warr
Absent: None
Town Council Liaison: Toben
Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Prior to consideration of the following project, Warr temporarily left the ASCC meeting room. He noted that he could not participate in the discussion as his firm was providing the architectural services for the Young project.

Continued Preliminary Architectural Review, residential redevelopment and Site Development Permit X9H-605, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Young

Vlastic presented the comments in the November 5, 2009 staff report on the ASCC's continuing preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.2-acre Alpine Hills subdivision property. He discussed the ASCC reactions and recommendations offered at the October 26 meeting and concepts for design changes shared with staff and ASCC members Clark and Breen at a November 3 meeting with the project design team. Vlastic then briefly reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the proposal (see above site meeting minutes).

Vlastic noted that the purpose of the evening meeting was to receive a presentation from the design team on a possible single-story option and an alternative partial two-story plan, both developed to address the concerns raised during the course of the October 26th project review. He advised that if possible ASCC members should offer directions on the concepts that should be pursued to finalize plans for the project.

Mark Sutherland, project architect, and William Young, applicant, presented the partial two-story and single story options. They used plan boards and a PowerPoint presentation to describe the proposals. Data was presented on alternative site plans and house elevations. It was noted that the contemporary single-story design would maintain a low profile, within the 18 and 24-foot height limits, and therefore capture the "single-story," 5% floor area bonus. The following were noted during the presentation in addition to the data offered at the site meeting regarding the design options:

- The single-story option would cover more of the level, upper building area and also push closer to the building envelope setback lines. At the same time, it would maintain a low profile across the top of the property, as requested by the ASCC and neighbors.

- With either option, a basement is proposed. The basement area would be at least 2,300 sf.
- With the single-story option there is less outdoor use area on the upper portion of the site than with the two-story design. At the same time, the key upper outdoor area with the one-story plan can be more sheltered from neighbors using the house and landscaping.
- The black fabric installed at the existing pool walls show the proposed wall reductions that will be proposed with the revised plans. Further design work is proceeding relative to reducing the scope of improvements in the pool area to address ASCC and neighbor concerns. These will be developed when a final direction on the house plans is reached.
- The scope of light wells is also being scaled back with the plan revision efforts.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the plate heights in the one-story plan ranged from 9-14 feet. It was also noted that roof slopes for the shed roof areas were at 1.5:12.

ASCC members then decided to offer preliminary questions and reactions to the presentation then open discussion for public input. The following were then offered:

- The, contemporary, single-story design appears to fit the site and neighborhood better and is more consistent with town design guidelines. Concerns continued to focus on the overall size of the project, particularly with basement area. Members recommended more effort to reduce the proposed floor area.
- Members agreed that more work was needed relative to the pool and pool deck area to address view concerns expressed by the surrounding neighbors. This would include work on the size and design of the proposed cabana/guest house. Breen offered that she would prefer to see the lower retaining wall in the pool area eliminated.
- Some comments were offered relative to the proposed clerestory with the single-story design and potential for light spill. It was agreed, however, that it was a good design feature as long as internal lighting is controlled to minimize potential for light spill.
- The materials and finishes indicated by the PowerPoint presentation for the one-story design appear appropriate and consistent with the architecture and site conditions. (These were clarified by Mr. Sutherland to include fire resistant wood siding with a natural stain, stone elements, and standing seam metal roofing with a bronze patina.)
- Clark suggested consideration be given to removal of one of the frontage stone pines and replacement with more native materials. He also suggested consideration of further grading or cutting the house into the building site.
- Aalfs offered that consideration should be given to possible lowering of plate heights so that somewhat lower roof forms might be possible. It was noted, however, that the single-story design was well below the town's normal height limits and also appeared to meet town standards for the single-story bonus.

Clark then requested public input and noted that ASCC members would, as possible, finalize directions following public input.

Carrie Lavine, 185 Golden Oak Drive, stated appreciation for the single-story design effort, but worried that the project still proposed too much floor area at the “top of the hill.”

Syrus Madavi, 220 Golden Oak Drive, shared the concerns with the project offered at the earlier site meeting and in his previous communications to the ASCC. He commented that too much floor area was proposed, even with the one-story design. He suggested that the town should again review the matter of basement size and that in this case the large basement raised concerns over property use and neighborhood impacts.

Ted Lamb, 190 Bear Gulch Drive, stated that the one-story design was “much better,” but he still worried about the house size with basement, parking impacts, etc. He encouraged a floor area reduction.

Jan Sweetnam, 190 Golden Oak Drive, stated that the one-story design was a better response to site and area conditions. He still worried over the size of the project, potential for light spill and scope of improvements in the pool/cabana area. He suggested more of a ‘U’ shape to the house footprint to enhance screening and privacy. He hoped that more effort could be made to further reduce the scale of the project.

Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive, reviewed the concerns expressed in her previous communications to the ASCC. She encouraged making the house and pool area improvements smaller and a reduction of the scale of the rear staircase from the house to the pool. She offered that the pool walls should be substantially reduced and the design refined so that the pool area blends better, in a more “organic way,” with the native conditions on the lower part of the parcel. She concluded that even with the one-story design the house would be “too big.”

Gavin Christensen, 50 Alhambra Court, presented an 1991 oblique air photo of the pool area and noted that he felt more effort was still needed to reduce the scope of planned pool and pool terrace improvements.

Kristi Corley, 15 Golden Oak Drive, stated that there needed to be sufficient time made available for neighbors to see and understand any revised plans before any ASCC action is taken. She also offered that more work was needed to significantly reduce the scope of improvements planned for the pool and cabana area to minimize view impacts on the Sweetman and Madavi properties and that further lowering of the height of the proposed house should be considered. She also stated that the floor area proposed, even with plan revisions, still seemed too large.

Ann Karney, 120 Golden Oak Drive, worried over the size of the project and particularly the basement. She noted that there could be significant construction impacts with the proposed basement size.

Alex Von Feldt, planning commission liaison, stated that the ASCC should remember town planning policies and guidelines that call for projects to be subservient to the land. She also shared concerns expressed by Breen with the lower retaining wall in the pool terrace area.

Following receipt of public comments, ASCC members confirmed the reactions provided earlier in the evening. Members supported pursuit of the single-story plans and scaling back of the size of the project. After discussion with the applicant and project architect, it was

also agreed that two weeks wouldn't provide sufficient time for the needed plan revisions to be developed and be made available for neighbor and town staff consideration.

After providing the forgoing comments and reactions, project consideration was continued to the December 14, 2009 ASCC meeting.

Following consideration of the Young project, Warr returned to his ASCC position.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit X7D-170, "Monopine" Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

Vlasic presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on the ASCC's continuing review of the subject CUP application. He reviewed the concerns discussed at the October 26, 2009 ASCC meeting and noted that, in response, the applicant was to identify local examples of tree and slimline monopole antennas for ASCC inspection. He then reviewed the November 3, 2009 email from ZON Architects, on behalf of T-Mobile Corporation, providing the addresses and color images of local antenna examples that were shared with ASCC and planning commission members.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC should consider the examples and determine if any might be appropriate for the proposed water tank site facility. He clarified that the ASCC review responsibilities on this request are to formulate recommendations for consideration by the planning commission when it formally considers the use permit request and that a date has yet to be set for the formal planning commission hearing. He also referenced the November 5, 2009 report from the town attorney relative to scope of town review for such wireless antenna proposals.

Fred Mausser, project architect, and Greg Guerrazzi, project engineer were present to discuss the proposal and antenna examples with ASCC members. Mr. Gurreazzi advised that either the monopole or tree options could be used at the site, but that the tree options was more accommodating relative to collocation of antenna carriers. He also noted that with the pole option, the pole and antenna could be painted any color the town determines appropriate and that a "tree" could be custom designed to fit conditions in the area.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

William Kelly, 10 Peak Lane, commented that the proposed monopole was aesthetically poor and characterized such a facility at the proposed location as "grotesque." He stated that he had significant aesthetic concerns and that as presently proposed the design did not ensure minimum aesthetic impact on the area. He further noted that the water district should be present at the meetings on this project and advise the town and neighbors of the districts intent relative to any future proposals for wireless antenna facilities on district property.

Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, shared the concerns offered by Mr. Kelly and also worried over the aesthetic impacts of the proposed fenced equipment enclosure. He commented that the warning signs on the enclosure would cause "aesthetic" impacts and that they would likely also impact property values. He wondered about the town attorney's opinion on the potential impacts on property values. He also noted that looking ahead other

carriers might seek permits for antennas at this corner, creating an antenna “farm” condition. He argued that the water district should be represented at the meetings on this matter so that they understand the concerns of neighbors and are also held accountable for the conditions on the property.

Karen Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, said that while the water district has generally been a good neighbor, she is concerned over the health of the existing trees that are being relied upon for ensuring the aesthetics of the project.

Mr. Robertson, 370 Cervantes Road, commented that the site is likely a good one for such wireless facilities, but that sufficient time should be taken to ensure that the project is done correctly, particularly relative to potential aesthetic impacts.

ASCC members discussed the examples that were considered and the aesthetic concerns of the neighbors, as well as those of the ASCC. They then offered the following comments for planning commission consideration in acting on this request:

- There is serious concern over the long-term plans for not only T-Mobile but other carriers in town. The town should now get a good an understanding as possible relative to such long term plans prior to authorizing any new use permit, as this is the only way to judge full potential for aesthetic impacts. At the same time, the water district site is likely a good location for the proposed antenna due to elevation, existing use of the property, and residential areas that would be served.
- In this case, an arborist should be retained to evaluated the existing site trees and with this data a determination can be made as to the need for early planting of replacement trees before existing trees are lost.
- A full sound evaluation should be provided relative to all of the proposed equipment.
- Screen planting should be provided for the enclosure. Further, if possible, consideration should be given to placing the equipment in a bunker, like was done for Nextel at the Priory.
- The site needs to be secure and additional screen planting considered for the entire property.
- A monopole is likely better than a tree pole for this site, but it would be preferred if it could be located closer to existing trees and the equipment enclosure located more out of the area open to views from off site. If it becomes apparent that more carriers will want to locate here shortly, then a tree option might be preferable. If the pole option is used, the color should blend with that of the surrounding trees. The main issue, however, is to ensure the long-term health of trees and provide for replacement and additional screen trees based on final pole location.

Clark suggested that over the long-term the pines should be removed from the site and replace with more appropriate native screen materials.

ASCC members concurred that the applicant should consider the above comments and that they should be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in eventual action on the use permit application.

Preliminary Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-607, 385 Westridge Drive, Illich

Vlasic presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 1.2-acre Arrowhead Meadows subdivision property. He noted that this was a preliminary review of the request and also discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the project. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of proposed plans and materials.) He advised that after discussion of the project, review should be continued to the November 23, 2009 regular ASCC evening meeting.

John Richards, project architect, and Bob Cleaver, project landscape architect, presented the proposal and offered comments in response to matters discussed at the afternoon site meeting as follows:

- The yellow rope at the site modeled the pool and pool terrace. The majority of the area modeled is the terrace and not the pool. The wall below the pool would be screened from off-site views by the planned grading and landscaping.
- The site plan adjustments include removal of driveway pavers in the Cherokee Way right of way and the moving the guest house to avoid the southwest side oak as discussed at the site meeting.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed grading was to create a more natural transition between the northerly and southerly portions of the property. It was also noted that the house roof pitch would be 4.5:12 to keep the profile low.
- The proposed pool and terrace retaining walls will disappear with the proposed planting, but consideration will be given to ways to further reduce the potential visual impacts of the upper terrace walls.
- Screening of views from the west to the guest house will be achieved with native shrubs and oaks.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed fencing was to keep dogs on the property and not deer out. It was also clarified that pool security would be with a pool cover.

Public comments were requested.

Mr. Robertson, 370 Cervantes Road, requested that the existing junipers in the Cervantes Road right of way area be preserved at least during the construction phase of the project.

ASCC members then commented on the proposal and offered the following comments in addition to those presented at the site meeting:

- The hot tub should be moved into the trellis area and/or more screening provided for privacy.
- Consider more grading or landscaping to screen the terrace walls.

- Consider reducing the size of the trellis feature to reduce visual presence associated with the terrace facilities.
- The final landscaping along Cherokee Way should be adjusted to preserve some views to the meadow area. Perhaps the planting for guest house privacy could be moved closer to the guest house. Also, the planting at the base of the terrace walls should be adjusted so that the terraces don't appear to overlook Cherokee Way.
- Reduce the scope of lighting as suggested in the staff report. There should be no lighted mailbox/address sign and only one light should be used at entry doors.
- There should be no construction or staging near the corner of Cervantes Road and Cherokee Way.

Clark also commented that consideration should be given to more use of stone or corrugated metal on the guest house elevations.

Following sharing of the above comments, project review was continued to the regular evening November 23, 2009 ASCC meeting.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment X7D-132, replacement of existing wireless communication antenna facilities, Verizon Wireless and Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Renewal X7D-147 for continuing use of existing wireless communication antenna facility, Sprint/PCS Wireless, The Priory School, 302 Portola Road

Vlasic presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on these requests and also discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting at the Priory on the applications. He noted that the ASCC was responsible for forwarding comments to the planning commission on the use permit requests and that a number of such comments had been developed and offered at the site meeting. (See above site meeting minutes for comments relative to the site review.)

Vlasic noted that Verizon was represented at the site meeting and had received ASCC comments at that time. He reviewed these and advised that Verizon would likely not be represented at the evening meeting.

Matt Yergovich, FMHC Corporation, was present to represent Sprint. He noted that while the CUP was to be renewed by Sprint, the pole and antenna would actually be owned and maintained by Crown Castle Corporation and that such equipment arrangements were now common in the wireless communications industry. He also referenced state senate Bill 1627 recently signed into law requiring a minimum of 10 years for issuance or renewal of a wireless communication permit.

Mr. Yergovich also noted that other carriers would likely come to the town, and that Clearwire was one company that was looking to expand its broadband data services in California. He also noted that Sprint was a major shareholder of Clearwire, but that they were separate companies.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members reiterated the comments offered at the site meeting, stressing that a "tree" was the preferred pole for the Verizon application. They also offered the following:

- The Sprint pole color is acceptable, but should be repainted as needed. It was noted that the Sprint facility had extra “pipes” for future antennas, and any that are added should be painted the same color as the existing antenna.
- If AT&T seeks a CUP change, their facility should be modified to a “tree” pole.
- If “Clearwire,” or a similar carrier, proposes a local facility at the Priory, any such facility should collocate on the Verizon tree pole or one of the other existing pole facilities.

At the conclusion of the discussion it was agreed that the above comments and those offered at the site meeting should be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the subject use permit proposals.

Architectural Review for detached garage/Workshop, 245 Grove Drive, Walker

Vlasic presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on this request for approval of plans for construction of a new, detached garage and workshop on the subject 1-acre, Grove Drive property. He explained that the proposed structure would be single-story with a simple Ranch style form and has a total floor area of just 999 sf. He added that the project can be accomplished with essentially no grading or vegetation impacts and there is ample room on site for construction access and staging. Vlasic identified only a few concerns with the proposal, as discussed in the staff report, including flood hazard/creek setback boundaries, driveway access plans, and finish of the proposed siting.

ASCC members considered the staff report, attached 11/1/09 project statement from the applicant and the following plans received 11/2/09:

- Engineering Site Plans, Sheets C-0, C-1, C-2 and C-3, dated 8/21/09, prepared by T.R.L.
- Architectural Plans Sheets C-S, 1-5 and D, prepared by Pacific Modern Homes and dated 9/3/09
- Structural Plans Sheets SC.1, SC.2 and SD.1, dated 9/2/09 and prepared by Norman Scheel Structural Engineer

Also considered were the following materials provided by the applicant in support of the plans:

- Cut sheet for one proposed exterior light, “Smoky Mtn. Sconce Large,” received 11/2/09
- Site Plan Addendum, updated 11/1/09 with impervious surface area and floor area data
- Colors and materials board, received 11/2/09

Further, ASCC members had before them a November 2, 2009 email from Craig Buchsbaum, 31 Tintern Lane. It was clarified that the comments in the email support the project as designed and note that the design and location have been developed based on interaction between neighbors. The email also commented that landscaping along the common property line would be appropriate.

Mr. and Mrs. Walker presented their plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to information in the staff report:

- The preference would be to not have a deed restriction on the property relative to the potential conversion of the workshop. If, however, this were a normal requirement, then there would not be opposition to it.
- The siding will be finished with a flat paint. The sample submitted to the town is the correct color, but not the finish. Again, the finish will be “flat.”
- No fencing or new driveway from Tintern Lane is planned. The access will be by way of the existing driveway along the south side of the garage attached to the main house.
- The creek and flooding conditions on the site have been previously discussed with the town geologist. There is confidence that the plans conform to the creek setback provisions relative to the ordinary high water mark. The applicant is agreeable to the condition that this be verified to the satisfaction of the town.
- The landscaping for the area west of the new structure will be worked out with Mr. Buchsbaum. Other site landscaping has been mainly to remove invasive and non-native materials and replace these with native grasses and other plants appropriate for the creek side site.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members briefly discussed the project and found it generally acceptable with the clarifications offered by the applicant. Thereafter, Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 approval of the project subject to the following conditions to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff:

1. Compliance with required creek setback and flood hazard boundaries shall be verified to the satisfaction of the town geologist and/or public works director.
2. The plans shall be clarified to state that the building siding shall have a flat finish.
3. A deed restriction shall be recorded against the property to the satisfaction of the town attorney to ensure against the conversion of the structure to a guest house larger than 750 sf.
4. A landscape plan shall be prepared and implemented for the area along the northwest side of the new structure that is adjacent to the Buchsbaum property.

Staff Report -- status of construction and tree protection. Lefteroff Project, Site Development Permit X9H-494, 5922 Alpine Road

Vlasic presented the November 5, 2009 staff report on the status of this project. He recommended that a meeting be held at the site to ensure the site conditions and tree protection measures are understood and maintained over the remaining life of the construction effort. He stated that this meeting should be attended by the project arborist, public works director, building official, project contractor, deputy town planner and an ASCC representative.

ASCC members concurred with the recommendation for an on-site meeting and Breen agreed to be the ASCC representative to the meeting. Vlastic advised that he would set the meeting as soon as possible.

Approval of Minutes

Aalfs moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0-1 (Warr), approval of the October 26, 2009 meeting minutes with the following corrections:

Page 7, correct the ASCC attendance to show that Hughes was present at the regular evening meeting

Page 12, correct the spelling of "Breen" in the first line at the top of the page.

Hughes also noted that following the October 26, 2009 meeting Planning Commission liaison McIntosh had transmitted an October 29, 2009 email to ASCC members Clark, Aalfs, Breen, Hughes and the deputy town planner raising concerns with the Young project for 210 Golden Oak relative to town design guidelines. Hughes noted that the email included a statement that it should be made part of the public record and, for this reason, Hughes wanted the November 9th minutes to acknowledge receipt of the email.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

T. Vlastic