

Architectural and Site Control Commission **March 22, 2010**
Joint Special Field Meeting with Planning Commission, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation X7D-170
and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

At 4:05 p.m., the special joint field meeting of the planning commission and ASCC was called to order at the intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Hughes
ASCC Absent: Breen, Clark
Planning Commission: Gilbert, Von Feldt, Zaffaroni*
Planning Commission Absent: McKitterick, McIntosh
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

*Arrived at approximately 4:20 p.m.

Others present relative to the T-Mobile West Corporation project*:

Greg Guerazzi, T-Mobile project representative/manager
Joyt Rai, project Radio Frequency (RF) engineer
Bill Hammett, project acoustical and RF engineer
Holly Kirkpatrick, T-Mobile site construction engineer
John H. McClenahan, project arborist
Fred Rios, representative of California Water Service, project property owner
Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive
Gayle Collat, 30 Holden Court
Beth and Cole Erskine, 285 Cervantes Road
Karen and Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive
Walter Leclerc, 250 Golden Oak Drive
Arlene Tenenbaum, 25 Alhambra Court
John and Dianne Vedder, 285 Golden Oak Drive
Mary Jane Kelly, 10 Peak Lane (arrived near the end of the site meeting and provided a letter dated March 22, 2010, stating concerns with the project.)

*The list of meeting attendees may not be complete, as it is possible some people arrived and left without being formally recognized or commenting on the proposal. Further, when the meeting attendees visited the Kelly site at 10 Peak Lane, Mr. Kelly arrived, but could not participate in the meeting due to a personal conflict. He advised he would try to come to the evening meeting to elaborate on the comments presented in the March 22, 2010 letter provided by his wife.

Continued review of proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

Vlasic reviewed the background on the request as presented in the March 18, 2010 staff report and the March 16, 2010 application submittal provided by Zon Architects. He advised that the purpose of the site meeting was to further consider the potential aesthetic impacts of the proposal and options for the monopole or monopine wireless antenna facilities. He further advised that in developing any proposal for planning commission action on the proposed CUP for pole antenna facilities, or alternative wireless system, a number of

detailed conditions would be recommended including those for site maintenance, removal of any facilities when no longer in use, landscaping, periodic RF monitoring, sound monitoring, etc. He added that most of these matters would not be discussed in detail during the site meeting. He also emphasized that the town attorney had advised that while T-Mobile is the applicant, the town could require Cal Water, as the property owner, to be a responsible party under the CUP, particularly with respect to site landscaping and maintenance and future removal of any facilities that are no longer in use.

Vlasic also reviewed his understanding as to the constraints the town has relative to consideration and action on any such request as outlined in the staff report based on guidance provided by the town attorney. He specifically noted that property value impacts were not an issue that the town could consider, nor could it consider RF health issues, as such health issues were preempted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). He stressed that the main issue the town could focus on was that the proposal was the least aesthetically intrusive and that the improvements would be safe, i.e., from natural hazards. He added that the ASCC could conclude that the aesthetic impacts could not be fully mitigated and so advise the planning commission, but that there should be reasonable options for providing the wireless service.

Vlasic clarified that the ASCC was not responsible for any action on the CUP, but its role in judging the aesthetic impacts of the project would be very important with respect to planning commission consideration of the CUP request. He noted that at least the following should be considered by the ASCC:

- Pole location and design (monopole v. "monopine).
- Collocation options and constraints.
- Alternatives to the pole options for the intended service.
- Size and location of equipment enclosure and ability of enclosure to accommodate the equipment of additional carriers with collocation.
- Measures needed for site security that could have aesthetic impacts.
- Colors and finishes of any new site improvements.
- Landscaping and other mitigation measures to ensure any pole or "tree" would blend, to the extent possible, with surrounding conditions.

Vlasic also advised that the ASCC had been waiting for the arborist's report before it was prepared to complete review of the application and alternatives, as the condition of the existing trees was a critical issue in evaluating the monopole and monopine options.

Greg Guerrazzi presented the revised and updated application submittal dated March 16, 2010. He introduced the other project team members and clarified the role they played in developing the revised application. He offered the following project clarifications:

- It was noted that eight-foot tall tubes were installed to demonstrate the optional locations for the monopole and monopine alternatives. It was stated that the monopine would have a pole/"trunk" diameter of 30 inches and the monopole a diameter of 36 inches. The adjacent trees were referenced relative to the proposed 50-foot pole/tree height. Several trees were identified as having heights near 50 feet with others up to 80 feet in height. These trees and the 8-foot tall tubes were used for reference as the field meeting attendees considered views from on and off site, including several surrounding properties, (i.e., the Vedder, Fanton and Kelly parcels).

- The monopine would require only a 30-inch diameter pole/"trunk" because the pole mounted antenna could be placed on the outside of the pole within the elements of the tree. The maximum "limb" spread from the pole would be 9.5 feet. The photo examples for the monopine were considered and possible tree material presented. It was clarified that a custom tree design for the site could be provided that would ensure blending with existing tree cover to the extent reasonably possible and that this would include "foliage color." (**Note:** *in considering the photo examples, ASCC members reacted that any tree design should not express the antennas as tree top "canisters" and that the Los Altos Hills example had the most acceptable appearance.*)
- The monopole diameter is 30 inches as demonstrated by the eight-foot tall tube. This diameter is needed, as the pole-mounted antenna would be within the circumference of the pole. The pole color would be to the satisfaction of the town. The "proposed" pole location on the northeast side of the water tank was selected based on ASCC direction as to a place that would be within the existing tree cover.
- The two optional locations work as to line of site as shown on the coverage maps provided with the March 16th submittal. Moving an antenna to the southwest side of the site would lower the elevation and would suffer from poor line of sight. The antenna could be moved to the southeast, i.e., toward Golden Oak Drive, but due to the lower ground elevation, the pole would have to be higher than 50 feet.
- The equipment enclosure has been sized for T-Mobile's needs at 15 feet by 15 feet. It would be surrounded by an 8-foot high fence designed to ensure noise from the equipment would not exceed the limits set by the town's noise ordinance. Further, it has been determined that the fence can be reduced to a maximum height of six feet and still meet the noise standards with the construction recommended by the acoustic engineering consultant. Mr. Hammett confirmed this was the case.
- The foundation for the pole would be a structural support of reinforced concrete roughly 5 feet in diameter and 12 to 20 feet deep. The design would be developed based on final engineering calculations and these would be to the satisfaction of the town's building, engineering and geologic peer review professionals. (It was noted that since soils conditions are relatively hard, identified as Sbr on the town's map of land movement potential, i.e., the most stable category, the foundation system might be less deep than would be required in a different soils environment.)
- It was clarified that the equipment enclosure could be located away from the base of the pole, but that measures would still need to be employed for security, particularly to ensure against climbing of the pole/monopine. It was noted that typically this is done with fencing, but that alternatives to fencing could be considered.
- In response to questions regarding adding facilities for other carriers in the future, it was clarified that the current 50-foot tall proposal would allow for the antenna facilities of one additional carrier. It was further clarified that by increasing the pole height to 60 feet, three carriers could be accommodated and that a 70-foot height would accommodate four carriers at the site. It was further noted that the tallest existing "screen tree" adjacent to the currently proposed pole locations was just over 80 feet high. The photo simulations provided by T-Mobile were referenced to show height relationships.
- In response to a question, it was noted that a monopole or monopine on the town's western hillside would not provide the in-building coverage due to distance and local

topographic conditions. It was also noted that the micro-cell system was for coverage along streets, but not for in-building coverage, although it was acknowledged that the system would offer “spotty” in-building coverage as noted on the coverage exhibits. It was also noted that the proposed system was intended to serve increasing in-building data service and not just voice service.

- Mr. McClenahan reviewed his arborist’s report and commented on the life expectancy of the screen trees. He noted that many were not long lived, but that with additional care it could be expected that most would live for 5 years or longer and that if trees did die, this would not be an all at once situation. He also discussed options for additional screen tree planting and offered that the fastest growing trees would not be the oaks most desired by the town. He also offered that it is likely that to ensure growth of new screen trees or shrubs, the planting conditions would have to be specially prepared. T-Mobile representatives confirmed that they were willing to develop a detailed and comprehensive screen landscaping plan that would include “defensive” provisions for possible loss of existing trees around the property and would work with Cal Water on the plan to ensure implementation and long-term maintenance. It was stressed that the applicant is willing to do this as a condition to any CUP approval.
- In response to comments over the lack of vegetation maintenance, Mr. McClenahan commented that given site and area conditions, some maintenance had to have been regularly undertaken or the trees would not have grown to their current heights and would likely be in poorer condition.
- In response to a question, it was noted that a 50 to 70-foot tall antenna pole on the site would not face any Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) restrictions or requirements.

During the course of the site visit and the visit to adjoining properties, the following public input was provided.

Fred Rios, offered the following comments as the representative of the water district:

- After hearing neighbor concerns over the condition of the water district property maintenance, particularly the screen vegetation, Mr. Rios advised that he would be sharing the concerns with local district representatives. He stressed that the district would respond to the concerns identified. (*Note: Vlasic advised in response to a question, that the town was in the process of reviewing conformity with all use permits and that the larger CUPs, e.g., the Priory, Alpine Hills, etc., were being dealt with first. He noted that the Water District CUP would be reviewed in due course, but that the vegetation maintenance issue would be considered as part of the review and action on the T-Mobile application.*)
- The water district has had a security analysis done for the site, as noted in the staff report. There is no plan at this time to propose any new security measures. (*Note: Vlasic advised that the town had been contacted by local water district representatives suggesting that they might want to add some security fencing as was recently installed at the water district tank site on Russell Avenue, but no specific plans had yet been shared with the town.*)
- The water district is sensitive to the fact that the site has been used for walking by neighbors and for this reason is reluctant to do any security fencing if it is not needed.

During the visit to the Fanton property, it was noted that there appears to be low frequency noise, i.e., “hum,” and vibration from the water district’s existing equipment that has some impacts on the Fantons. Vlastic pointed out that this “noise” may be in conflict with the current town noise ordinance and noted that the ordinance requires compliance with the ordinance standards by August 2010. Vlastic asked that Mr. Rios bring this matter to the attention of local water district representatives so that the matter could be evaluated and addressed as determined necessary for conformity with the town’s noise standards.

Mr. and Mrs. Vedder reviewed the concerns expressed in their various communications to the town as identified in the staff report. They expressed concern over the visual impacts on the views from their property and particularly the house entrance and bedroom area. ASCC and planning commission members inspected these views and the relationships to the proposed pole sites and water tank. Mrs. Vedder expressed dissatisfaction with the efforts of the water district to maintain screen landscaping and that the district had failed in its commitments to neighbors to screen the large water tank. She stressed her lack of confidence in the ability to effectively landscape the site and also as to the guarantees to ensure landscaping is established and maintained for the long-term.

Arlene Tenenbaum stated that the pole or monopine would be unattractive and inappropriate for the area. She also worried about the town being forced to consider more poles in the future for other wireless carriers.

Gayle Collat stated she would not be able to attend the evening ASCC meeting, but wanted to comment for the record that either the pole or tree options would be “ugly” and an inappropriate visual burden for neighbors and others in the area. She stated the water tank and lack of site landscaping were enough of a burden for the neighbors. The neighbors were living with this due to the need for water, but there is a serious question as to the need for this proposed facility and that with evolving technology it is likely that wireless phone and data services might be met without the need for tall poles.

Virginia Bacon expressed concern with the project and the visual impact of any tall pole or “tree.” She wondered about the service to the community provided by T-Mobile and how many T-Mobile customers were actually in the town and its spheres of influence. She also expressed concern over any water district security fencing and impacts of fencing on wildlife movement through the area.

Mary Jane Kelly provided the March 22, 2010 letter from her and her husband and stressed that neither of the pole options were aesthetically acceptable.

Karen and Gray Fanton provided copies of a February 3, 2010 email stating concerns with the proposal. They also stated strong concerns over the health of the existing trees on the water district property noting that similar trees on their property were in decline. They shared the concerns of others over the potential visual impacts and noted that the neighbors carried the burdens in terms of aesthetic degradation and impact on property values while the water district would gain financially from the lease to T-Mobile.

After visiting the Vedder, Fanton and Kelly properties and considering views to and from these properties and the proposed antenna sites, ASCC and planning commission members returned to the water district property.

(Note: The above summary of presentations and comments attempts to capture the key project clarifications and concerns offered during the course of the site meeting. It is noted,

however, that several conversations were taking place at various locations around the various properties visited during the site review and, therefore, it is not certain that all comments were recorded.)

At the conclusion of the site meeting, Von Feldt requested that the town attorney be present at the planning commission public hearing on the CUP and other planning commissioners concurred. ASCC members advised that they would offer comments on the project and options at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

After gathering of the above information and sharing of above comments, Chairs Gilbert and Warr thanked the applicant representatives and neighbors for their participation in the site meeting. It was also again noted that the ASCC consideration of the request would continue later in the day at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:38 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

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

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Aalfs, Clark, Hughes
Absent: Breen
Town Council Liaison: Derwin
Planning Commission Liaison: Gilbert
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

Continued review of proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-170, Wireless Communication Antenna Facility, Intersection of Golden Oak Drive and Peak Lane, T-Mobile West Corporation

Vlasic briefly reviewed the March 18, 2010 staff report on this request and summarized the events associated with the special afternoon site meeting with the planning commission on the project. (Refer to above site meeting minutes). Vlasic again advised that the ASCC is not authorized to act on the CUP request and, at this point, its primary role is to offer aesthetic comments and recommendations for planning commission consideration. Vlasic added that while the town appears to have limited authority for evaluation of such proposals, if the ASCC concludes that aesthetic impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated, then such a conclusion should be clarified with supporting statements and forwarded to the planning commission. He also noted, however, that if the ASCC finds that one of the alternatives appears reasonable, with whatever aesthetic limitations/conditions may be needed, then this position should be articulated and forwarded to the planning commission.

Greg Guerrazzi, T-Mobile project manager, briefly reviewed the materials in the March 16, 2010 application submittal. He offered the following comments in addition to the clarifications provided at the special afternoon site meeting.

- T-Mobile is willing to provide necessary landscaping, and address all other of the aesthetic issues discussed thus far, including screening of the equipment enclosure. In addition, a final "tree" design would be provided to the satisfaction of the ASCC if the "tree" option is preferred. Further, T-Mobile is committed to long-term maintenance and enhancement of landscaping and maintenance of the "pole" or "tree." Also, it is committed to periodic monitoring to ensure that the facility continues to operate within FCC "RF" standards, as well as town noise ordinance limits. Considerable work will be needed and cost expended to meet all such provisions and, therefore, T-Mobil is seeking conditional approval of the CUP so that it can, with confidence, proceed to satisfy all aesthetic conditions that may be required.
- The proposed facility is specifically to enhance the T-Mobile service to the local community as the coverage maps demonstrate. It would increase the current potential customer base from 1,510 persons by 425 to 1,935 persons. In addition, it would

provide 911 emergency call services to all carriers and residences in the area, thus adding to the public service of the facility.

- The micro-cell alternative does not provide the same level of service as it is largely for on-street, in-vehicle service. The objective of the pole facility is to enhance data service and particularly “in-building” service. Given area topography and other conditions, the micro-cell option would provide “spotty” service and require such “cells” on all power poles in the area. These “cells” add to the scope of equipment on the poles and residents also react to the aesthetics of this added equipment.
- In response to a question, it was stated that a micro-cell or other smaller antenna facility could not be attached to the water tank as any such attachment would compromise the integrity of the water tank and would still not satisfy the required service needs. Fred Rios, water district representative, was present and confirmed that the water district would not allow for an attachment to the water tank. It was also noted that mounting on the water tank would not have the antenna high enough for necessary line of site service.

Public comments were then requested and the following offered:

William Kelly, 10 Peak Lane, reviewed the comments in his March 22, 2010 letter to the ASCC. He specifically emphasized the following:

- Neither pole option works aesthetically. The “fake” tree is inconsistent with other site foliage. A monopole might be acceptable if the surrounding trees were in better condition. The pines are poor to fair and “bent out of shape.”
- Cal Water has not been a good neighbor relative to vegetation maintenance. The neighbors have done a better job with the landscaping on their properties.
- The cycles for planting for replacement and addition to the site landscaping are too long to provide for needed screening.
- The project would yield great economic benefit to the water district with all the burdens of the facility placed on the neighbors.
- Although this is a utility site, the water tank is needed, but there is serious question as to the need for the antenna facilities. There appears to be no need to do this other than to meet the objectives of the cellular company.

Virginia Bacon, 205 Golden Oak Drive, stated Cal Water was a monopoly and that it was a utility service needed by the town. She added that T-Mobile was a commercial business and like any other business should have to prove its service to the community. She offered that the site is “natural as is” and should be left in its current condition. She also stated that since people walk over the property they might now have a prescriptive easement over it.

Mr. Tenenbaum, 25 Alhambra Court, stated that while there may be no “RF” issue due to FCC preemption, no one would likely buy a big home adjacent to an antenna “tower.”

Mrs. Diane Vedder, 285 Golden Oak Drive, stated that some studies had shown that an antenna tower would impact bird migration and that keeping birds away from the property would be an aesthetic impact. She also stated that the suggestion at the site meeting that

possibly planting boxes be used to screen the equipment enclosure would only add to the appearance of structures on the site and was an unacceptable solution.

Gary Fanton, 265 Golden Oak Drive, shared the concerns of Mr. Kelly and others and concluded that the site was not at all aesthetically acceptable for the antenna due to the lack of adequate screen vegetation and poor site maintenance by the water district.

Mary Jane Kelly, 10 Peak Lane, shared the concerns in her March 22nd letter and worried any approval would be the first step leading to more poles on the site and it becoming an “antenna farm.”

Carol Sontag, 280 Golden Oak Drive, stated opposition to the application and particularly to either of the pole options. She stated that people could use the micro-cell system with in-building boosters and avoid the need for a tall pole facility.

Following public input, ASCC members discussed the proposal and options. **Aalfs** advised that he found the monopine more appropriate than the pole, but that he was concerned with the health of the existing trees and that there was need for considerably more screen planting. At the same time, he hoped that other solutions could still be considered that would avoid the need for either of the pole options.

Warr offered that while the applicant had made a reasonable attempt to find an aesthetically acceptable option, he also hoped that more effort would yield a system that could be deployed without a pole. He acknowledged that there is a community need for expanded wireless cellular and data services and that “everyone has a cell phone,” but the pole options carry too heavy of an aesthetic burden for the neighbors. He added, however, if the water district site landscaping had achieved what was hoped for with its CUP conditions, then the site would likely be more accommodating to the pole options. He encouraged the applicant to pursue the micro-cell option to see if it could be made to work and address the concerns of the neighbors.

Clark offered that he still considered the monopole alternative viable, but appreciated the concerns of neighbors and acknowledged that more on site landscaping was needed.

Hughes concurred with the comments offered by Warr. He added that the aesthetics with micro-cells placed on eight or more poles might be more acceptable than the pole options.

After considerable discussion, ASCC members concurred that they were not satisfied with the acceptability of the aesthetics of any of the pole options and would prefer that an alternative approach be pursued, which now appeared to be only some variation of a micro-cell system. It was recognized that this would likely spread the aesthetic impacts over a larger area, i.e., associated with the power poles in the area, and that this would likely not provide the same level of coverage as the pole. At the same time, it was hoped that a micro-cell system would enhance service and perhaps, with in-building boosters, provide coverage to meet T-Mobile’s objectives. T-Mobile was encouraged to provide additional data on such an approach for planning commission and neighbor consideration.

Also after discussion, members concurred that if the town found it had to consider and approve a pole option the following should set the framework for the option:

- The pole should be the “monopine” option with the “tree” design custom prepared to fit the site conditions. The final design should ensure that the tree, form, color and location of mounted antenna call minimum attention to the facility.
- The monopine should be of sufficient height (i.e., likely 60 feet) and design to accommodate collocation of three carriers. This should be the maximum permitted at this site and there should be no other poles or monopine permitted beyond this one facility. Provisions should be made to guarantee maintenance of the monopine so that color and general characteristics of the final design are maintained over the life of the permit. Further, T-Mobile should be required to guarantee allowing collocation for the two other carriers.
- The equipment enclosure should be sized for the three carriers and landscaping provided now in anticipation of the full enclosure size. Specifically, the equipment area should now be identified and screened so that when a future carrier proposes collocation, it can be accomplished without any impact on the established screen landscaping.
- The monopine should be located further to the southwest than the location identified for the monopole and further away from the top of the slope along Peak Lane. The location should be as close to the water tank as possible.
- The final location and design for the equipment enclosure should be selected to minimize its visual presence to offsite views and future collocation conditions.
- A detailed landscape plan should be prepared and implemented that includes implementation of all arborist’s recommendations to improve the condition of existing trees. The plan should enhance screening from particularly the northeast (Vedder side), northwest (Kelly side) and southwest (Fanton side) boundaries. The plan shall include a mix of trees and native shrubs with larger size trees in key view corridors. The intent of the plan should be to not only screen and soften views to the antenna but also fill gaps where there are more open views to the water tank (i.e., achieve more site screening as anticipated with the water tank CUP conditions). The plan should include provisions for planting that include all those necessary to ensure a favorable growing environment for new material. Further, provisions should be made to guarantee landscape maintenance.
- The final plans should ensure that necessary site security measures don’t eliminate the opportunities for the site to be crossed by walkers in the area as has become the normal pattern of neighborhood use.
- Cal Water should be a responsible party to the permit relative to landscaping and site maintenance.

ASCC members acknowledged that new landscaping would not eliminate views to the higher portions of the monopine, but that with extensive landscaping to screen views along the property boundaries, the overall site condition’s aesthetics would be improved and enhanced.

Mr. Guerrazzi again emphasized T-Mobile’s willingness to address landscape, design and other suggested conditions with CUP authorization.

ASCC members directed that the above comments be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the use permit application.

Request for Re-Issuance of expired Conditional Use Permit X7D-152 (Nextel), Existing Wireless Antenna Facilities at the Woodside Priory, 302 Portola Road, TowerCo

Vlastic presented the March 18, 2010 staff report on this request for re-issuance of the subject use permit for an existing wireless antenna facility at the Woodside Priory and, in particular, reviewed the comments on the application set forth in the January 28, 2010 memorandum to the planning commission. He noted that at this point the planning commission is tentatively scheduled to consider the request for re-issuance of the use permit at its April 21, 2010 meeting.

Vlastic noted that the request calls for no new facilities and that the existing ground based equipment associated with existing pole-mounted antenna are located in a buried vault limiting noise from the equipment. He added that during the ASCC's November 9, 2009 Priory site visit to inspect the various wireless antenna facilities, it was determined that the key issue with the Nextel/TowerCo installation was the color and that a darker color was needed. He added that the applicant was willing to paint the facilities and that optional colors would be presented at the ASCC meeting.

Kathleen Hill, representing TowerCo, presented the proposal to the ASCC. She also shared samples of three possible colors for painting of the existing pole and pole mounted antenna as follows (all Sherwin-Williams color samples):

SW 7020, "Black Fox"
SW 2924, "Woodsy Brown"
SW 2927, "Weather Vane"

It was noted that all were relatively dark colors in brown tones. The color sample for "Black Fox" identified the Light Reflective Value (LRV) as being 8 and the other two samples were of similar LRV, but of slightly different brown color tones.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

After brief discussion, Aalfs moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 4-0, to recommend planning commission approval of the use permit application subject to the following conditions:

1. The a existing pole and pole mounted antenna shall be painted one of the following three applicant proposed colors, with final color selection to be made by a designated ASCC member in the field (all Sherwin-Williams color samples):

SW 7020, "Black Fox"
SW 2924, "Woodsy Brown"
SW 2927, "Weather Vane"

2. The CUP should include a condition requiring the applicant to participate with other wireless carriers at the Priory in a long-term plan for additional screen planting around the wireless antenna facilities.

Condition "2" was recommended based on the understanding that any permit would need to be for a minimum of 10 years and that over that time consideration should be given to a collective approach by the wireless carriers for additional screening of facilities to ensure that the area did not take on an "antenna farm" appearance. The condition was also based on the fact that other carriers are currently seeking re-issuance and/or modifications for their

existing wireless facilities conditional use permits, including those for Sprint, Verizon, and possibly AT&T.

Architectural Review for house additions and remodeling and replacement of existing detached garage with new garage, 170 Ramoso Road, Wick

Vlasic presented the March 18, 2010 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for residential additions and remodeling, including new basement area, and replacement of an existing detached garage and parking area with a new detached garage and driveway apron on the subject 3.1-acre Westridge Subdivision parcel. He clarified that the project includes demolition of a portion of the house to accommodate main level changes and new basement area and that the new garage would have a basement space beneath it.

Vlasic noted that while the project includes considerable work at its conclusion site conditions should not be significantly different than currently exist. He then reviewed the issues noted in the staff report and recommendations for conditions should the ASCC determine it could act on the plans. Vlasic also noted that he had an opportunity to site check the existing light fixtures and concluded that the proposed lighting plan, including preservation/reuse of the existing fixtures, appeared appropriate and that the light fixtures to be reused are actually those approved for the site previously by the ASCC.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed project plans prepared, unless otherwise noted, by Arnn Gordon Greineder, dated 2/16/10:

- Sheet A0-1, Cover Sheet (Index, Drawing Directory)
- Sheet A0.2, Project Data
- Sheet 1, Topographic Survey, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 10/20/09
- Sheet C-1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 2/11/10
- Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan, Giuliani & Kull, Inc., 2/11/10
- Sheet A1.1, Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A1.2, Exterior Lighting Plan
- Sheet A2.1, Existing Floor and Demolition Plan
- Sheet A2.2, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A2.3, Existing Elevations
- Sheet A3.1, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A3.2, Proposed Lower Level
- Sheet A5.1, Roof Level (Plan)
- Sheet A6.1, Elevations (materials)
- Sheet A6.1, Elevations (materials)
- Sheet A6.3, Elevation Showing Existing landscape Screen at Street

Also considered were the cut sheets for the light fixtures received on February 17, 2010, the proposed colors and materials board received 2/23/10, and the completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist showing that 99 BIG points are targeted for the project.

Karen Wick and project designer William Greineder presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following clarifications:

- The design of the existing garage is poor as is the access to it. The modifications will enhance the usefulness of the garage and actually improve views east across the site from the driveway intersection with Ramoso Road.

- The finish materials for the driveway retaining walls will match the stucco finish proposed for the house.
- The garage basement closet and wine cellar will be modified to ensure that interior height does not exceed 7.5 feet, so that these spaces don't count as floor area.
- A landscape plan will be prepared for the areas to the south and east of the exposed parking area and garage retaining walls. Further, the hope is that the existing northeast side olive tree can be preserved, but if not a new olive will be planted in its place.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, ASCC members concurred that the project, while ambitious, would not significantly change the general character and condition of existing improvements as long as the recommendations in the staff report were adhered to. Further, members concurred that the proposed energy efficient changes would result in positive improvements for the site.

Thereafter, Aalfs moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the proposed plans, as clarified at the ASCC meeting by the applicant, subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The "closet" and wine cellar spaces below the breezeway between the garage and house shall be designed so that the finished heights in these spaces do not exceed 7.5 feet.
2. The proposed garage footprint shall be modified so that the extent of encroachment into the front yard setback shall not exceed that of the existing garage that is to be demolished.
3. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be prepared and implemented. The plan shall in particular provide for protection of the landscaping in the public right of way and within the front yard area of the parcel including the areas that buffer the trail easement.
4. Final impervious surface (IS) area calculations shall be provided verifying conformity to the IS limits for the property.
5. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member for landscaping below the retaining walls associated with the expanded parking area fill and along the northeast side of the garage. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Architectural Review for replacement of detached accessory structure/barn with new guest unit, 440 Cervantes Road, Denenberg

Vlasic presented the March 18, 2010 staff report on this proposal for approval of plans for replacing a recently demolished rear yard, 454 sf barn with a new, 746 sf guest house and covered porch extension on the subject 1.0-acre Arrowhead Meadows parcel. He clarified that the project required no vegetation removal, that grading would only be as necessary for

foundation work, that access to the construction area can be easily achieved by a dirt path on the site and that there is ample room on site for construction staging.

Vlasic reviewed the few issues discussed in the staff report relative to the proposal including floor area clarifications, height in the proposed loft area and overall height of the guest house combined with the roofed patio/terrace area. He also discussed the scope of proposed exterior lighting relative to the town's second unit zoning standards. Further, Vlasic noted that since the staff report had been prepared story poles and stringing of the proposed ridgeline of the structure had been installed at the site.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans prepared by Clay Baker Design, LLC and dated 2/26/10:

- Sheet A-0, Project Data
- Sheet A-1.0, Site Plan
- Sheet A-2.0 1st & 2nd Floor Plans
- Sheet A-3.0, Sections
- Sheet A-4.0, Building Elevations

Also considered were the cut sheet, received March 4, 2010, for the proposed exterior light fixture, a colors and materials board also received March 4, 2010, and the applicant completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist showing that 112 BIG points are targeted for the project.

Mrs. Denenberg, and Clay Baker presented the proposal to the ASCC offering the following project clarifications:

- The roof pitch and resulting height were selected to accommodate placement of photovoltaic panels at the optimal angle for solar gain. The roof could be lowered as suggested in the staff report, but the preference is to keep the design as proposed for maximum benefit for the planned solar panels.
- The loft area is only for storage and the building permit plans will include adjustments to ensure the height in the loft does not exceed 7.5 feet as recommended in the staff report.
- Final floor area calculations will be provided including all areas in the existing main house and proposed guest house.
- The desire is to have two light fixtures for the large, 12-foot wide door on the south elevation. The width of the door makes use of only one light fixture problematic in terms of adequate lighting at the south side entry points. In addition, the Arroyo Craftsman fixture is fitted with a Night Sky shade that directs light downward.
- The plans have been shared with neighbors and particularly the proposals for minimal window areas on the east and north side. Further, the neighbor to the west was concerned with the upper, west side window, but the concern was mitigated with recognition that the proposed fireplace chimney and roof extension effectively blocked views to the upper window.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. After brief discussion of issues associated with height, lighting and landscaping, members concurred that the design as proposed was generally acceptable. Clark then moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0

approval of the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. A plan for screen planting for the area to the southeast of the guest house shall be prepared and once approved implemented prior to building occupancy. The plan shall include materials from the town's approved planting guidelines and shall be for screening of views from the driveway entry at Cervantes Road to the guest unit.
2. The east side outside closet area exterior lighting shall be modified to make use of only one fixture between the two closet doors. This fixture shall be manually switched.
3. The height in the loft area shall not exceed 7.5 feet.
4. Final floor area and impervious surface area calculations shall be provided demonstrating compliance with the limits for the property.

Review and Evaluation of Story Pole Policy Statement

Vlasic presented the March 18, 2010 staff report on this discussion item. He noted that there has been a question as to the need to have more involved story pole policies and/or requirements. For example, should the town require not only a story pole layout plan, but also surveyor verification of the heights of the poles and a photo analysis of views to the poles from sensitive off site locations? Vlasic noted that this would add to the costs of the review process, that the town would need to determine how the photo records would be best kept and that it would also require very careful documentation of the photo locations including ground elevations and angles of view.

Julie Shepardson, 180 Meadowood Drive, presented a March 22, 2010 letter to the ASCC regarding her concerns over the adequacy of the story poles placed to inform neighbors as to the scope of the improvements now being constructed at 1135 Westridge Drive. She wondered if the poles had been accurately placed. She also noted that not all neighbors whose views might be impacted received notice of the original project review, as their properties were over 300 feet away from the parcel, i.e., beyond the normal 300-foot radius notice area.

Warr noted that the ASCC would likely take up the matter of noticing at a later time, and the discussion therefore focused on the matter of the story pole policy in the design guidelines and changes or additions to the policy statement that should be considered. It was tentatively concluded that providing a viable photo record from all locations of possible concern would be difficult. ASCC members did, however, concur that in some cases a larger notice area may be needed.

As to the story pole guidelines, it was determined that the following changes should be considered further:

- Require that a plan be provided, clearly identifying where the story poles have been placed and the heights of the story poles. This plan and the actual placement of the story poles should be certified by the project surveyor, engineer or architect.
- The story poles should model the proposed ridgeline heights and should outline the locations where the roofs meet the planned wall planes and not the roof eave extensions.

- The tape used to outline the ridges and tops of walls should be tightly strung and have sufficient size and color to be readily identifiable from reasonable distances. Further, the story poles should be of sufficient size, likely 2"x4" or heavier boards, and placed with sufficient support to stand for 10 days or two weeks without leaning so that taping can be as stable as possible during the project review process.

Vlasic advised that a proposed draft modification to the current story pole policies would be drafted and presented to the ASCC for further consideration and approval.

Approval of Minutes

Hughes moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0, approval of the March 8, 2010 regular meeting minutes as drafted.

Hughes moved, seconded by Aalfs and passed 4-0, approval of the March 12, 2010 special meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

T. Vlasic