



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, August 9, 2010
Special Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ASCC FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m. 302 Portola Road. Preliminary Consideration of Proposals by AT&T Mobility and Verizon Wireless for modifications to their existing wireless installations. Field session will continue at two other locations where AT&T has proposed changes to existing wireless facilities adjacent to 4115 Alpine Road and 945 Portola Road. (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:
2. Roll Call: Aalfs, Breen, Clark, Hughes, Warr
3. Oral Communications:

Persons wishing to address the Commission on any subject, not on the agenda, may do so now. Please note, however, the Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion or action tonight on items not on the agenda.

4. Old Business:
 - a. Architectural Review for House and Deck Additions and adjustment to Accessory Parking Easement (APE), 1 Fremontia, Portola Valley Ranch, Bower/Shaw
 - b. Follow-up Review – Architectural Review for House Additions and Site Improvements, 219 Wyndham Drive, Blair
 - c. Update and Continued Review of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment X7D-132, Replacement of Existing Wireless Communication Facilities, 302 Portola Road (The Priory School), Verizon Wireless
5. New Business:
 - a. Preliminary Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendments for CUP X7D-138, 302 Portola Road (The Priory School), CUP X7D-160, 945 Portola Road, and CUP X7D-161, 4115 Alpine road, Replacement of Existing Wireless Communication Facilities, AT&T Mobility
6. Approval of Minutes: July 26, 2010
7. Adjournment

*For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE. The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

WRITTEN MATERIALS. Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: August 6, 2010

CheyAnne Brown
Planning & Building Assistant



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: August 5, 2010
RE: Agenda for August 9, 2010 ASCC Meeting

Note: A special ASCC field meeting has been noticed for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, August 9, 2010 and will convene at the Priory School at 302 Portola Road. The location for the start of the meeting is adjacent to the Monastery building on the north side of the campus where there are several existing wireless antenna facilities. The purpose of the meeting is to consider proposals by AT&T Mobility and Verizon Wireless for modifications to their existing wireless installations. After consideration of conditions at the Priory, the field session will continue at two other locations where AT&T has proposed changes to existing wireless facilities. These are at sites adjacent to 4115 Alpine Road and 945 Portola Road. The AT&T Mobility proposals are reviewed under agenda item 5a. and the Verizon request is discussed under agenda item 4c.

The special site meeting has been noticed as a joint session with the planning commission as the commission will be the final approving authority for the AT&T Mobility and Verizon Wireless conditional use permit applications.

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the ASCC agenda.

4a. Architectural Review for House and Deck Additions and adjustment to Accessory Parking Easements (APEs), 1 Fremontia, Portola Valley Ranch, Bower and Shaw

This proposal is for the addition of 562 sf of floor area to the existing essentially single story, flat roof, 2,467-sf residence on the subject 21,693 sf Portola Valley Ranch parcel (see enclosed vicinity map). The project includes minor modifications to the existing deck to accommodate the house additions. Further, the existing detached carport would be converted to a garage with this project. Except for enclosures of existing openings, the basic form of the detached carport with flat roof would not change.

The project includes proposals for some modifications to the existing accessory guest parking easements on the Fremontia frontage of the property. These are explained in

the attached June 14, 2010 letter from project architect William Maston. The changes were developed to enhance opportunities for screen planting on the east side of the addition area in response to concerns expressed by the uphill neighbors, i.e., the owners of the parcel immediately east and across Fremontia. The project plans and the proposed Accessory Parking Easement (APE) changes were approved by the Ranch Design Committee and Board of Directors. The actions were based on analysis of the situation presented later in this report. The Ranch July 20, 2010 approval letter is attached.

(It should be noted that while the project was initially submitted to the Ranch Design Committee and Town in April, the delay in completing reviews and actions had to do with obtaining an up-to-date survey and then addressing the APE and related screen landscaping issues.)

(It should also be noted that we have been informed that ASCC member Jeff Clark served as the peer review design consultant to the Ranch Design Committee on this project and, therefore, would not be able to participate in ASCC consideration of the matter. Mr. Clark did, however, advise that, in any case, he would be on vacation and not attend Monday's ASCC meeting.)

The proposal is shown on the following enclosed project plans unless otherwise noted dated 3/15/10, prepared by William Maston Architect & Associates:

- Sheet A0.01, Title Sheet
- Sheet A0.02, Floor Area Calculations
- Sheet A1.01, Site and Plan
- Sheet A1.02, Satellite View
- Sheet A1.03, As-Built/Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet A2.01, Existing Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.02, Proposed Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.03, Existing & Proposed Roof Plans
- Sheet A2.04, Existing & Proposed Carport Plans
- Sheet A5.01, (E) Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.02, (E) Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.03, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.04, Proposed Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A5.05, Exist./Proposed Carport Elevations

Sheet A1.01, Overlay Existing Site Plan & APEs, June 14, 2010
Sheet C-1, House Location (Site Survey), Lea & Braze Engineering, 6/14/10

The plans note that all addition area materials and finishes would match existing conditions. The siding, trim and window and door frames would match the existing, dark charcoal stained board and batten and other wood elements. The fascia would be wood finished in the existing fascia color, which is a medium to dark taupe. Windows would have bronze aluminum frames, and the overall contemporary Portola Valley Ranch style architecture would be preserved.

The following comments are offered on the request:

1. Project description, background, and proposed modifications to APE spaces.

The subject site is located immediately east of the intersection of Indian Crossing and Sandstone. The building envelope is uphill of this intersection and the parcel is accessed from its east side Fremontia street frontage. The house and associated deck areas are roughly 10 feet lower in elevation than the Fremontia street and views from the street are over much of the lower flat roof portions of the house, particularly in the area of the proposed additions. Story poles have been placed to model the proposed addition areas located on the south side of the building envelope.

The existing carport is at the northeasterly corner of the property and the location and general conditions around it would not change with this project. Further, the basic provisions for house access and the entry area would remain as currently exist.

The site has a number of oaks along the boundary areas adjacent to the streets and a number of native shrubs that also help in screening views to and from the street frontages. For the most part, these would not be impacted by the project. There is, however, some potential for loss of native materials immediately east of the addition area between the addition and one of the existing APE areas. For this reason, the plan for APE space modification has been developed to permit additional landscaping. The specific APE modifications are shown on Plan Sheet A1.01 dated June 14, 2010. Any APE changes on other plan sheets dated 3/15/10 that are not consistent with those shown on the 6/14/10 sheet should be ignored.

The APE adjustments are possible because the northerly most APE area was improved to actually accommodate three parking spaces rather than two. For this cul-de-sac, the two APE areas were each to accommodate two parking spaces for a total of four spaces. The northerly space was improved to accommodate three spaces, so there are now a total of five, where only four were required. Thus, it is possible to eliminate the one space proposed for landscaping and still satisfy guest parking requirements for the cul-de-sac.

The attached excerpt from the recorded subdivision map shows that dimensions for the APEs were intended to provide for only two parking spaces each. This is also confirmed by the data on Sheet A1.01, dated 3/15/10. This site plan is from the original landscape plan for the property. Further Sheet C-1, shows that the northerly APE space was constructed well beyond the limits of the easement line. Thus, while the changes to the APE spaces are possible, the northerly APE boundary should be formally modified to show all of the paved parking area within the APE space since this space is now necessary to meet parking requirements. According to the project architect, this adjustment to the APE area is also something the applicant and Ranch HOA have agreed to pursue. The easement change should take place before the landscaping of the parking space to be removed is completed and the project "finalized."

With the project, a landscape plan will need to be developed for the area where existing APE paving is proposed to be removed. This plan should be presented to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit for the project. The remainder of the landscape issues are primarily to ensure that existing plantings on the site are protected from construction. A construction

staging and vegetation protection plan should, therefore, be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of any building permit.

As noted above, the proposed additions are to extend from the south side of the existing house and would largely be in an area where there is an existing deck. The additions would all match the existing house improvements and house architecture. Minimum grading would be needed for the project.

As indicated in the Ranch approval letter, the original design was to have a walkway along the full length of the east side of the addition area. This has been eliminated from the plans at the direction of the Design Committee and the uphill side of the addition would be designed to retain the backfill of soil that would be placed to the level of the concrete pathway on the east side of the existing improvements. Thus, the new east side stairs shown on Sheet A1.03 would be eliminated from the plans.

Overall, a number of efforts have been made to address staff concerns and those of the Ranch to allow the project to move ahead. These have included the site survey presented on Sheet C-1 to verify conformity to the approved building envelope for the property. As a result, we are now supportive of the house plans as presented and approved by the Ranch Design Committee.

2. **Proposed carport conversion.** As we have explained previously, over the years, the criteria for carport enclosure at the Ranch have been simplified, largely due to the desires of the Ranch residents and also the significant growth of vegetation around the carports. The key issue now is that the enclosure is done in a manner that is consistent with the architecture of the house and that it will not block significant distant views through the carport. In this case, the proposed enclosure would be accomplished to fully match the existing architecture house. Further, existing openings would be enclosed with windows and significant windows would be provided in the garage doors to allow for some preservation of the small view that currently exists through the carport. Thus, we conclude that the proposed enclosure appears to conform to the more liberal carport enclosure criteria that currently exists for the Ranch.

It should also be noted that the Design Committee required a new side door for the enclosed carport and this door is shown on the south elevation of the enclosed carport enclosure plans.

3. **Conformance with Portola Valley Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) Statement provisions.** Based on the proposed design of the house additions and carport conversion, and related improvements, as evaluated above, we believe the proposal is consistent with the Ranch PUD provisions. A few matter do need clarification and these are discussed below. Also, as explained above, the Ranch Design Committee, as required by the PUD statement, has approved the plans.

We were initially concerned with project conformance with the BE limits, but this concern was resolved with the engineering survey data presented on Sheet C-1. This shows that the addition will actually follow the BE line and be fully within the BE.

The PUD does not include a floor area limit for Ranch parcels, but does set architectural standards and an impervious surface limit (IS) of 30%. Even with the proposed additions, the detached garage and other site improvements, the total coverage is approximately 4,846 sf. The parcel area is 21,693 sf and 30% of that area is 6,508 sf. Thus, this project is well below the IS limit.

The proposed house additions would have a maximum height, when calculated from west side views, of approximately 17 feet. This is well under the Ranch height limits which are more liberal than current town height limits.

The existing deck extends partially into the side yard area, i.e., beyond the BE line, and such extensions are allowed for in the PUD as long as they are approved by the ASCC and design committee. Further, they must extend into the yard area no more than 10 feet and, in any case, no more than one third of the required yard setback.

The existing deck extends only 4 to 5 feet beyond the BE line and is no closer than 25 feet to the parcel boundary line. Thus, it meets the PUD provisions. The small deck addition would follow the line of the existing deck and also only extend 4 to 5 feet into the setback area. It would be no closer than 42 feet to the nearest property line. Thus, the small new proposed deck area would also meet PUD provisions.

4. **Landscaping and Exterior lighting.** Our few landscaping issues were discussed above. As to exterior lighting, the plans do not show new lights, but lights would be needed at the new master bedroom door and the new side door to the garage. The project architect has advised that these would be shown on building permit plans and the fixtures would be the standard “wood box” down-directed Ranch design.
5. **Sustainability aspects of the project.** The applicant has provided the attached completed Build It Green (BIG) checklist for the project that was received on April 23, 2010. As noted above, the application was filed prior to the adoption of the town’s mandatory green building program. The checklist targets 49 BIG points and is evaluated in the attached May 14, 2010 report from planning technician Carol Borck.

Prior to acting on this request, the ASCC should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any other information presented at the ASCC meeting.

4b. Follow-up Review -- ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR HOUSE ADDITIONS AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS, 219 WYNDHAM DRIVE, BLAIR

On July 12, 2010 the ASCC conditionally approved this project for house additions and construction of a detached carport to provide required covered parking on the subject .58-acre Wyndham Drive parcel (see attached vicinity map). The staff report prepared for the July 12th meeting and meeting minutes are attached.

To address the conditions of approval, the applicant has provided the following enclosed “Hooper Residence” follow-up submittal plans, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Florian Architects and dated 7/22/10:

Proposed Landscape Plan
Proposed Staging for Construction
Proposed Site Plan and Exterior Lighting Plan
Elevation Details, 7/26/10
Carport Elevations, 7/26/10

In addition to the plans, the applicant has provided a revised Materials/Colors Board also dated 7/27/10 that will be presented at the ASCC meeting. A copy of the board is attached and it is discussed below. Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures are attached and fixture locations are shown on the revised site plan. Attached is an email statement from the project architect that discusses the design concepts for the carport. A full set of the approved house plans will be available for reference at Monday's ASCC meeting.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider the follow-up submittal.

1. **Carport design, creek setback requirements.** Following the July 12, 2010 ASCC action, the applicant and project architect met with staff to review in particular the matters of the carport design and siting, compliance with creek setback requirements, and conformity to the provisions of building code Chapter 7a. Some of the key findings from this review are as follows:
 - The site is located in zoning district R-1 and no on-site guest parking spaces are required in this district, only the two covered parking spaces. Thus, the original plans could be modified to eliminate the provision for on site guest parking spaces (and the plans have been so modified). At the same time, there was space to locate the desired carport and provide for a back-up "hammer-head" type space so that cars leaving the site could do so without backing into the street. The proposed site plan allows for positive on-site maneuvering and also places the carport at a location that works well with the approved house plans and uses the redwood backdrop to help distract visual attention away from the carport and any cars parked in it. Further, the carport, as sited, is over 25 feet from the front property line and over 32 feet from the side property line. It also avoids conflict with the existing leach field lines.
 - The town geologist previously determined that the ordinary high water line for the southerly portion of the site was at elevation 412. This determination was part of review for a project for creek bank work. It was confirmed that the 412 elevation was appropriate for the entire site and, therefore, the proposed carport location avoids conflict with the required creek setback. The enclosed plans have not been updated to show the required 35-foot setback from the 412 elevation "ordinary high water line," but we have attached a portion of the original site plan showing the required setback boundaries.
 - Based on consultation with the building official, it was determined that the recently installed cedar shake roof was acceptable and that the house additions could continue the use of this roof. Other design adjustments to accommodate requirements of Chapter 7a, as discussed with the building official, are set forth on the plan sheet with elevation details, and this plan has been reviewed by the building official and found acceptable. The project architect has also advised

that he will continue to work with the building official to ensure final building permit plan details conform to the requirements of Chapter 7a.

Based on setback requirements, need for separation from the leach field, and preference for vehicles to leave the site without having to back into the street, we support the currently proposed carport site plan. We also concur with the project architect and applicant that the pitch roof design is preferable, particularly considering the architectural relationship to the house, and location with the redwood tree backdrop.

Story poles have been placed at the site to model the carport and these have been set basically at the center of the proposed structure, running northwest to southeast. They demonstrate the height and that the carport would not parallel the street right of way, with the northerly front corner roughly 5 feet further from the street than the southerly front corner. The actual distance from the street for these two corners is approximately 46 and 41 feet respectively.

Placement of the carport as proposed would likely require the removal of one small redwood tree just at the northerly edge of the throat of the entry driveway. The tree and shrub cover that is to be preserved and the fact that the carport angles away from the street will help ensure minimum potential visual impact of the structure in terms of views from the street or from neighboring parcels. In addition, the carport's open design with materials to match those used on the main house will further reduce potential for the structure to call visual attention to itself at the proposed site.

2. **Plan responses to 7/12/10 approval conditions.** The following comments discuss how the current plan submittal addresses the requirements of the seven approval conditions (condition wording is presented in *italics*):

1. *A complete plan shall be provided for the carport that addresses the comments in the 7/8/10 staff report and those discussed at the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting. This shall include conformity with all required setbacks and details relative to driveway access and necessary space for vehicle maneuvering.*

Compliance with the provisions of this condition is largely discussed above. We believe that given site conditions and setback requirements, the proposed carport plans are appropriate as presented.

2. *The exterior lighting plan shall be revised to include all lighting required to satisfy building code requirements. The plan shall be modified to eliminate the driveway post light and lighting shall not be on motion switches unless required to be so switched by the building code.*

The revised lighting plan appears to address this condition, including relocation of the low entry driveway post to serve as a pathway light. The final plan, with the building permit should address the switching aspects of the condition. Our only question relative to the house lighting is over the proposed three south elevation wall fixtures. This is the elevation shown on the enclosed "elevation detail." We believe that code requirements could be satisfied with two fixtures rather than three.

While only one fixture is proposed at the carport, we recommend that it either be within the carport or a shielded fixture with light directed downward so that the light source is not highly visible from the street.

3. *A final, complete exterior materials board shall be provided that includes any adjustments necessary to satisfy requirements of Chapter 7a of the town building code.*

The plan elevation detail sheet and the Material/Color Board appear to fully address this condition. They confirm that the new roofing would be cedar shakes to match the existing roof and that the dark stained siding would be installed to meet fire code 7a standards. Further, windows would be metal clad with a "chestnut brown" finish. Again, the building official has found the detail sheet acceptable.

4. *The landscape plans shall be modified to provide screen planting along the southerly parcel boundary to address screening to and from views to the south (i.e., in response to the comments offered in the July 9, 2010 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Eisberg).*

The plan includes provisions for the additional landscaping that the ASCC has clarified can be provided by the applicant as determined appropriate in discussions with the neighbor.

5. *The ability to save or move the crape myrtle shall be evaluated by the project arborist and the landscape plan modified as necessary for consistency with the recommendations of the arborist.*

The plans provide for relocation of the crape myrtle and a final report should be provided by the project arborist with the building permit plans advising on the best procedures for relocation. The project architect has advised that the intent is to provide the arborist report with the building permit submittal.

7. *A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.*

The proposed construction staging sheet identifies the pathway for temporary access of equipment and also provides that the existing on site parking area would be used during the construction period for construction staging and materials storage. In general the plan appears appropriate. Details would be worked out with project contractor during the preconstruction process for the project that takes place prior to actual issuance of the building permit.

Prior to acting on this follow-up request, the ASCC should visit the project site and consider the above comments and any new information presented at the August 9, 2010 ASCC meeting.

4c. UPDATE AND CONTINUED REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) AMENDMENT X7D-132, REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES, 302 PORTOLA ROAD (THE PRIORY SCHOOL), VERIZON WIRELESS

Initiation of this review started in late 2009; and, based on preliminary ASCC and planning commission comments as well as staff review, the applicant was advised that a number of pieces of technical data were needed to make the application complete, and the ASCC also recommended that the request for a "slimline" 50-foot pole antenna facility be modified, for aesthetic reasons, to be a faux tree. The applicant has been considering the tree option and has now suggested that a 70-foot tall monopine might be considered that would permit collocation of up to three carriers, including the desired Verizon facilities. This proposal is shown on the attached five-sheet plan set with April and May dates.

Additional comments on the current monopine proposal are provided below. The August 9, 2010 site meeting will offer the ASCC and planning commission the opportunity to respond to this modification of the original proposal. The hope is that, with input at the August 9th meeting, Verizon could move ahead to final the plans and provide all data to make the revised request complete and in form for planning commission consideration of the proposed use permit amendment.

There is considerable background and other relevant data attached to this report that sets the context for Monday's review of this request as well as preliminary considerations of the AT&T applications discussed later in this report. The attached materials are:

- Vicinity Map that pertains to both the Verizon and AT&T requests
- Original Slimline Monopole proposal, South and East Elevations, 9/1/09
- October 29, 2009 preliminary review report to planning commission
- Staff report for November 9, 2009 ASCC meeting
- Minutes of November 9, 2009 Joint ASCC and Planning Commission Priory site meeting
- December 23, 2009 Town Planner Status Report various Wireless permits and applications. This report sets forth for each active request, additional data needed for application completeness based on the preliminary reviews and the town wireless policy statement. The data needed from Verizon is set forth on page 5 of the report.

In addition to these materials, attached is a June 11, 2010 memo from the town attorney relative to "local control of cellular towers." This memo as well as the attached required findings to grant a CUP or CUP amendment and the attached town wireless facilities policy statement should be considered in considering both this and the AT&T Mobility requests discussed below.

As to the option for a 70-foot monopine the following comments are offered for additional clarification:

- As a reminder, the original permit for this antenna was issued in 1990 without a time limit. Any action to amend the permit would include a minimum ten-year time limit.

- The coverage with the 70-foot monopine would be roughly the same as with the originally proposed 50-foot slimline pole and would mostly serve the southern portion of the town. A copy of the original coverage map will be available for reference at the 8/9 meeting. Verizon has advised that they are in the process of requesting approval for a new site near Highway 280 on the north side of the highway that would, hopefully, provide better service to portions of the north side of the town.
- The proposal shows that the bottom 26-27 feet of the “tree” would be an exposed “trunk.” We raised concern with this, and were informed that the branches could be lowered to about 15 feet above grade and that the “trunk” could be ordered with bark. Verizon also clarified that the diameter at the base of the “trunk” would be approximately 36 inches and at the top 22 inches. It was noted that, typically, the specific tree is not ordered until there is planning approval. With respect to any tree option, both the ASCC and planning commission should offer comments on the key aesthetic design factors.
- We have attempted to encourage the various wireless carriers to speak to each other to see if they could reduce the number of “poles” at the Priory with more collocation. For example, we tried to have Verizon, AT&T, Nextel/TowerCo. communicate to this desired end. We have had mixed responses, but no solid indication that any real progress has been made. Perhaps Monday’s joint meeting with Verizon and AT&T representatives present might be used as a vehicle to encourage efforts to move ahead. In particular, since both AT&T and Verizon are seeking changes to their facilities next to the Monastery building, they should comment on the possibility of using a single pole or “tree” for the desired facilities.
- Specific CUP approval by the planning commission is required for a pole to exceed 50 feet in height. We would only recommend consideration of added height if collocation could be pursued with the reduction of the number of poles at the site. Since AT&T is seeking to place its new antenna on the existing 35-foot tall pole, we believe that it might be possible to have the existing pole removed and the antenna placed on a joint pole with Verizon. Both AT&T and Verizon should again be asked to consider this.

(In addition to the above, we have just been informed that TowerCo/Nextel – CUP Application X7D-152 -- is “definitely in discussions with Verizon” regarding a multi-carrier “tree” with the intention of trying to build one pole facility that would “accommodate all carriers on property” subject to design approval. Will continue to monitor this and keep the commission informed as we learn more of the process and design options.)

Again, the key purpose of the August 9th meeting is to obtain feedback on the alternative offered for a 70-foot tall monopine for the Verizon facilities that would provide for collocation of up to three carriers including Verizon.

5a. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) AMENDMENTS FOR CUP X7D-138, 302 PORTOLA ROAD (THE PRIORY SCHOOL), CUP X7D-160, 945 PORTOLA ROAD, AND CUP X7D-161, 4115 ALPINE ROAD, REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES, AT&T MOBILITY

This is a preliminary review of these use permit amendment requests for modifications to existing AT&T Mobility wireless facilities at three locations in town identified on the attached vicinity maps. One is for modifications to facilities on the existing antenna pole AT&T has at the Priory (CUP X7D-138) and two are for modifications to antenna on existing utility poles near 945 Portola Road and 4115 Alpine Road. No new poles are proposed with the applications. The proposals, including existing and anticipated overall coverage with the new equipment, are discussed in the attached June 3, 2010 letter from the applicant. Colored versions of the coverage maps are enclosed. As noted in the June 3 letter, AT&T concludes that existing coverage from its facilities extends to over 75% of the town's population. The proposed improvements would, however, specifically enable the delivery of more advanced wireless services to the Town, known as "3G" or "UTMS" Services. The existing and anticipated "3G" coverage is specifically shown on the enclosed colored coverage maps and identifies "indoor," "Good Outdoor," "Outdoor," and "Not Guaranteed," areas. Some clarifying comments on the scope of coverage are provided in the June 3rd letter.

In addition to the letter, enclosed are the following plan materials for each of the proposed facilities improvements:

CUP X7D-138 (Priory, 302 Portola Road):

Photo Simulations, two sheets, Artistic Engineering
Technical Plans and Specifications, 10 Sheets, prepared by Jeffrey Rome & Associates

CUP X7D-160 (945 Portola Road):

Photo Simulations, two sheets, Artistic Engineering
Technical Plans and Specifications, 10 Sheets, prepared by Jeffrey Rome & Associates

CUP X7D-161 (4115 Alpine Road):

Photo Simulations, two sheets, Artistic Engineering
Technical Plans and Specifications, 10 Sheets, prepared by Jeffrey Rome & Associates

In support of the proposals for 945 Portola Road, the applicant has provided the attached *Compliance Study on Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields Exposure* prepared by TRK Engineering dated 4/30/10. It concludes that the "maximum cumulative power density for the proposed antennas is calculated to be 2.8% of the MPE (maximum permissible exposure) limit." Similar data needs to be provided for each of the other two proposals and, for the Priory site needs to include cumulative data taking into account the other wireless equipment located at the Priory. In addition, we will need data on existing conditions relative to RF exposure verifying that the existing facilities continue to operate within FCC standards.

In response to the notice for the August 9, 2010 meeting, two neighbor responses have been received. Attached is an email dated July 28, 2010 from Amy and Bill Gurley, 188 Georgia Lane supporting the requests and improved wireless service in the community.

Also, the neighbor uphill of the facility adjacent to 4115 Alpine Road discussed the project with Planning Manager Lambert. He expressed concern with the visual condition of the existing pole mounted equipment, but noted that his main concern was to ensure the facility continued to operate with the FCC RF standards.

The comments that follow provide a brief overview of each of the proposals as a basis for the preliminary review to be conducted on Monday, starting with the afternoon site sessions as noted at the head of this memorandum. As discussed above, a number of the attached materials referenced in the earlier discussion of the Verizon Wireless request (agenda item 4c.), including required CUP findings, the town's wireless policy statement and the June 11, 2010 memo from the town attorney, also pertain to and should be reviewed in light of the proposed AT&T applications. Further, the December 21, 2009 status memo provides some additional background on the subject existing use permits, their original life, etc.

1. **CUP X7D-138, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory.** As the enclosed plans show, the existing 35-foot wireless pole is located on the northeast side of the monastery building and includes two white whip antenna extensions. The proposal is to replace the three existing pole mounted antenna with three new antenna panels and to add a second array of three panels for a total of six. No change in pole height is proposed and the existing "whip" extensions would be removed. All new materials would be in a dark brown color. New equipment would be installed within the existing building. As noted above, data relative to before and after RF emissions is needed as is analysis of the sound associated with the existing and proposed equipment to ensure it falls within the town's noise ordinance standards. While some equipment product data is included, we do need it to be analyzed in terms of the town's noise standards. This comments also pertains to the other CUP amendment proposals.

As noted above in the discussion of the revised Verizon Wireless application, we ask that AT&T comment on the ability to move the proposed antenna to a common pole with Verizon (or TowerCo.) so that, with collocation, fewer poles would be needed. This should be discussed at the site meeting and, hopefully, prior to that meeting representatives from both AT&T and Verizon can discuss the option with each other, and perhaps also with TowerCo. representatives.

2. **CUP X7D-161, 4115 Alpine Road.** As the enclosed plans show, this proposal is to replace the existing two pole-mounted antenna with two new, somewhat larger antenna panels. The size and visual change would not be significant. We do, however, need the RF emissions information as noted above, and also noise data associated with existing equipment to remain and the proposed new equipment facilities.

With this proposal, the addition of ground mounted equipment cabinets is significant as is the plan for access to the facilities. Complete product data on the equipment, again particularly relative to sound and conformity to town noise standards, is needed. The plan indicates that the equipment cabinets would be painted dark brown, and this should help minimize visual impacts.

The proposed equipment pad and access to it would cause the most significant visual change, relative to the proposed facilities, within the Alpine Scenic Corridor.

After our site inspection, we conclude that the proposed approach for development of the equipment pad and stair access system, apparently requiring retaining walls and using four foot wide stairs, seems excessive and contrary to town policies for improvements in the Scenic Corridor. A revised plan for access should be developed that is in more harmony with the contours, appears more like a trail or pathway and that is far less aesthetically obtrusive. An encroachment permit is needed for the work and we would not recommend that such a permit be issued for the current design. Further, any final plan should include screen landscaping and provisions for maintenance of this landscaping. This landscaping should minimize the visual impacts of both the access system and any new ground-mounted equipment.

It is also noted that this site is within the Alpine Road utility undergrounding district formed by the town council on July 28, 2010. A copy of the resolution forming the district is attached. In taking the action, which, for the most part, excludes and "new" equipment on utility poles within the undergrounding district boundary, the council agreed that modifications and additions to existing wireless facilities on existing poles could be considered and acted on, and this clarification was made understanding of the subject CUP amendment applications. The council, however, also agreed that the underground district was a significant land use matter for improving the aesthetic conditions along Alpine Road. Therefore, the council and town attorney acknowledged that the commission can consider a shorter than 10-year time frame relative to the life of this use permit amendment, that also requests extension of the permit life. The AT&T project representative was at the July 28th meeting and understood and concurred with these town council comments and understandings.

In this case, it appears that the undergrounding district would not be actively pursuing removal of poles for at least five to seven years. Thus, the commission should likely consider a five-year permit life with the possibility of extension to 10 years based on what is known in five years relative to actual implementation of undergrounding plans.

3. **CUP X7D-160, 945 Portola Road.** As the enclosed plans show, this proposal is to replace the existing four, pole-mounted antenna with four new, larger antenna panels in essentially the same location as the existing panels. As with the Alpine Road proposal, the visual change would not be significant, largely due to the amount of equipment, racks and other pole attachments that existing on the pole. Data is, however, needed on the sound from the existing and new equipment demonstrating conformity to town noise ordinance standards.

Additional pole mounted equipment is planned both on the tall joint pole supporting the antenna and on the adjacent lower pole. The equipment boxes are all to be painted a dark brown color, but the site is fairly open to view and not easily screened with landscaping. It will be difficult to mitigate the visual impact of the added equipment. At the same time, the visual change may not be great, again considering the scope of equipment and poles that currently occupy the site.

Our main concern is, however, the potential for impacting use of the existing trail just to the west of the poles. While the depth of the proposed equipment cabinets does not appear large, we have some worry about equestrians safely passing by

the in proximity of the equipment boxes. The boxes should be modeled so that they can be considered in relationship to the trail use.

While the town's underground committee has recommended and, as noted above, the town council has adopted an undergrounding district along Alpine Road, no such action has been, or apparently would be pursued for Portola Road. This is the case due to the limited amount of funds available for undergrounding projects and even those that would be available would not allow for undergrounding along the entire length of the Alpine Road corridor.

Since this is a preliminary review, planning commission and ASCC members should offer comments and reactions to each of three amendment requests and, in particular, identify any additional data, pursuant to the town's policy statement and required CUP findings that is needed to make the applications complete for final CUP consideration. Based on these comments, next steps in application processing would be identified.

Confirmation of Rescheduling of date for the Regular Second ASCC meeting

As most ASCC members were informed last week, staff has asked that the second regular ASCC meeting be rescheduled from August 23rd to August 30th. This rescheduling was acceptable to all ASCC members contacted, including Aalfs, Breen, Hughes and Warr. Clark could not be reached as we understand he was on vacation. The rescheduling will accommodate staff vacation timelines.

TCV

encl.

attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Planning Manager

Town Council Liaison
Applicants

Mayor