

Architectural and Site Control Commission* August 9, 2010
Special Field Meeting 302 Portola Road, 945 Portola Road, and 4115 Alpine Road, for Consideration of Conditional Use Permit Amendments X7D-132 (Verizon Wireless), X7D-138 (AT&T Mobility), X7D-160 (AT&T Mobility) and X7D-161 (AT&T Mobility), and Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

The special field meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. at 302 Portola Road (The Priory School) by Chair Warr. The meeting convened adjacent to the west end of the Monastery building at the location of the existing Verizon and AT&T Mobility wireless facilities.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Breen, Hughes
ASCC Absent: Aalfs, Clark
Planning Commission: McIntosh, Zaffaroni*
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic

*The meeting was noticed as a joint session with the ASCC and planning commission. However, since only two commissioners could attend, there was not the needed quorum to call the planning commission meeting to order. Further, Zaffaroni, as a neighbor of the Priory School property, participated in the review of X7D-132 and X7D-138 as a neighbor of the school property and not as a planning commissioner. She did, however, act in her planning commission role during site consideration of the request for amendment to X7D-161, 4115 Alpine Road.

Others present relative to the AT&T Mobility and Verizon Wireless Conditional Use Permit Amendment Requests

Mike Mangiantini, authorized representative for AT&T applications
Laura Boat, authorized representative for Verizon Wireless application

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, AND

Preliminary Consideration of 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

Vlasic presented the August 5, 2010 staff report on these requests. He explained that they were being considered together because of the apparent evolving opportunities for collocation of antenna facilities that would, hopefully, eventually lead to a reduction in the number of antenna on the Priory property and improvement in wireless services, at least in the more southerly part of the town. Vlasic clarified that for the AT&T applications it had been determined that radio frequency data, showing compliance with FCC standards, had been provided for all three CUP amendment requests.

ASCC members and others present considered the staff report, the proposed plans and inspected the existing facilities. Mr. Mangiantini explained the proposal for amendment to X7D-138 and advised that AT&T, in light of comments in the staff report, has been in discussions with Verizon for collocation on a new "monopine" that would eventually allow for replacement of three existing poles (i.e., two Verizon and one AT&T) with the single monopine. Ms. Boat confirmed that the discussions were in process.

Vlasic noted that he had also been advised by the representatives of TowerCo. (CUP amendment application X7D-152), that TowerCo. was in discussions with Verizon for collocation. Ms. Boat acknowledged that she was aware of, but not directly involved with the discussions between TowerCo. and Verizon.

Both Mr. Mangiantini and Ms. Boat noted that AT&T and Verizon would be willing to pursue a phased process whereby the existing poles would be used to support the new antenna to enhance 3G and next generation voice, data, video and messaging services and then commit to a timed program for phasing out of the poles and collocation on a new monopine. It was noted, however, that if all existing carriers at the Priory site were to collocate on monopines, likely two such "pines" would be needed.

At the conclusion of the Priory site visit, ASCC members concurred that a phased program for replacement of the existing poles would be appropriate. It was appreciated that the existing white "whips" on the Verizon poles would be removed with temporary installation of the new antenna panels. Also discussed were the options for mounting of the antenna within the monopine. It was suggested that a horizontal mounting system might permit collocation or more carriers on a shorter "tree" that was somewhat wider or "bushier." It was suggested that this be explored as part of the effort to develop the collocation monopine plan.

At the conclusion of the Priory antenna site visit, all present except Ms. Boat carpooled to the AT&T X7D-161 CUP amendment site at 4115 Alpine Road. ASCC members considered the comments in the August 5, 2010 staff report and were also informed of the view concerns of the neighbor at 50 Bear Gulch relative to views out from the property to the antenna facility. The main issue considered at this site was the plan for stair access from Alpine Road to the base of the existing joint pole and to the proposed equipment cabinet. It was agreed that an alternative access should be explored from the large turnout area south of the pole site. It was noted that there is an old roadbed that appears usable with little grading work needed. It was, however, uncertain as to the width of the right of way relative to the old roadway and it was understood that this needed to be further evaluated. In any case, no one present found the current stair plan acceptable, but otherwise were supportive to the plans for antenna replacement subject to the provision of the additional application data that is needed as outlined in the staff report.

After the Alpine Road site visit, all present except Zaffaroni continued to the 945 Portola Road to consider the changes planned for X7D-160. No major concerns were expressed over this proposal. It was noted however, that public works director Howard Young should review the location proposed for the new equipment relative to the roadway and trail use, and for the trails committee to also consider the proposed equipment cabinets relative to potential impacts on trail use. In general, the reactions were that the equipment boxes should not be a problem, but that these issues should, at least, be checked by Mr. Young and the trails committee in light of the need for an encroachment permit.

Following the 945 Portola Road site visit, Warr thanked Mr. Mangiantini for his help during the site sessions. Thereafter, it was noted that review of the AT&T Mobility and Verizon Wireless proposals would continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:15 p.m. the special field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Warr called the regular meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. in the Town Center Historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Warr, Breen, Hughes
Absent: Aalfs, Clark
Town Council Liaison: None
Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested but none were offered.

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

Vlasic presented the August 5, 2010 staff report on this proposal 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. He explained that the project includes minor modifications to the existing deck to accommodate the house additions and conversion of the existing detached carport to a garage. He clarified that, except for enclosures of existing openings, the basic form of the detached carport with flat roof would not change.

Vlasic also explained that to accommodate the changes, the plans call for some modifications to the existing accessory guest parking easements on the Fremontia frontage of the property. It was noted that these are discussed in the June 14, 2010 letter from project architect William Maston and evaluated in the staff report.

Vlasic advised that project plans and the proposed Accessory Parking Easement (APE) changes were approved by the Ranch Design Committee and Board of Directors. Reference was then made to the July 20, 2010 approval letter from the Ranch Association.

ASCC members considered the staff report, the Ranch approval letter and the following project plans and materials unless otherwise noted dated 3/15/10 and 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
Build It Green (BIG) Checklist, targeting 49 BIG points, received April 23, 2010.

Bill Maston, project architect, presented the plans and materials to the ASCC and offered the following clarifications:

- 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.
- A photo example of the proposed carport enclosure was presented as was an annotated plan showing the location for the two new proposed exterior light fixtures, one at the new side entry door to the converted garage and the other at the north side of the new master bedroom doors to the west side deck.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and while generally supportive of it, did raise concerns over the manner in which the existing oaks around the parcel had been trimmed and otherwise managed. Breen noted that they had been topped and trimmed and otherwise pruned so that they no longer had the appearance of native oaks. She worried that it would not be possible now to manage them so that they could be restored to a more native appearance.

After discussion, it was agreed that a landscape plan should be developed that includes provisions for restoring the oaks if possible; or, if not, to replaced them in a phased manner over time with appropriate materials that would provide screening, but not face the potential for inappropriate trimming for view preservation. It was agreed that the plan should provide for materials to be installed prior to any oak removal so that the new materials would be in place and established for screening when an oak might have to be removed.

Besides the issue of the oaks, ASCC members concurred that the project was acceptable subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report. Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 3-0 approval of the plans as clarified, including the conversion of the existing carport to a garage, 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 plans shall be modified to show the two proposed light fixture locations, including identification of the specific "typical" Ranch fixture to be used.
2. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
3. The boundary for the northerly APE space shall 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. Modification of the easement shall be to the satisfaction of the planning staff and shall take place before the landscaping of the parking space to be removed is completed and the project "finalized."

4. A landscape plan shall be developed for the area where existing APE paving is proposed for removal. This plan shall be presented to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.
5. The new east side stairs shown on Sheet A1.03 of the plans shall be eliminated for the reasons set forth in the August 5, 2010 staff report.
6. In addition to the landscape plan called for in condition 4, a landscape plan shall be developed for restoring the site oaks that have been impacted by excessive pruning. If restoration is not possible, then the plan shall provide for phased replacement of the oaks over time with appropriate materials that would provide screening, but not face the potential for inappropriate trimming for view preservation. The plan shall provide for materials to be installed and established for screening prior to any oak removal. This restoration plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit. Once approved, the plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Follow-up Review -- Architectural Review for house additions and Site Improvements, 219 Wyndham Drive, Blair

Vlasic presented the August 5, 2010 staff report on the subject follow-up submittal. He reviewed the actions completed on the project at the July 12, 2010 ASCC meeting and then explained how the following "Hooper Residence" follow-up submittal plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Florian Architects and dated 7/22/10, addressed the 7/12 conditions of approval:

- Proposed Landscape Plan
- Proposed Staging for Construction
- Proposed Site Plan and Exterior Lighting Plan
- Elevation Details, 7/26/10
- Carport Elevations, 7/26/10
- Materials/Colors Board dated 7/27/10

Vlasic also reviewed the cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, received June 29, 2010, and the comments in the July 28, 2010 email statement from the project architect that discusses the design concepts for the carport. A full set of the 7/12/10 approved house plans were also available for reference.

Project architect Paul Florian was present to discuss the follow-up submittal and advised that he agreed with the comments presented in the staff report. In response to a question, he advised that the applicant was committed to protecting existing site plantings, particularly along the parcel frontage, to the maximum extent possible.

ASCC members briefly reviewed the project and concluded the revised plans, for the most part, addressed the conditions of approval. It was noted, however, that a few matters remained to be addressed prior to release of a building permit, mostly as noted in the staff report. Further, members clarified that any actions to remove, relocate or replace the crape myrtle located to the south of the house would be at the discretion of the applicant.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 3-0 acceptance of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to release of a building permit:

1. The lighting plans shall be modified to eliminate one of the three proposed south elevation wall fixtures and to change the carport fixture to a shielded, down-directed design. The plans shall also clarify switching patterns for all exterior lighting.
2. The final construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided by the project contractor detailing, among other things, measures for construction access, parking, materials storage and site repair after construction.
3. A final landscape plan shall be provided to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member. The plan shall specify plant materials by location and size and be in general conformity with the conceptual plan for landscaping included with the approved architectural review plan submittal.
4. The plans shall be modified to correctly identify the required 35-foot setback line from the 412 elevation "ordinary high water line."

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

Vlasic presented the August 5, 2010 staff report on this request, including listing of project plans, and then reviewed the events of the afternoon site meeting relative to this and the AT&T Mobility applications (see above site meeting minutes.) He noted the applicants agreement to modify the request to provide interim use of the existing poles for the desired new antenna and also to commit to work for a collocation "monopine" with AT&T Mobility and also TowerCo./Nextel, as discussed at the site meeting and in the staff report.

Laura Boat and the Verizon project engineer were present to discuss the proposal with the ASCC. In addition to the comments offered at the afternoon site meeting, they offered the following project clarifications:

- While Verizon is fully willing to work with the town, AT&T Mobility and other carriers to develop and implement a plan for collocation of facilities in one or two "monopines" at the Priory site, it is essential to local service to pursue installation of the new panel antennas as soon as possible. Therefore, the request would be modified to show that the six new antenna panels would be installed on the two existing poles as soon as possible and this would include removal of the two white "whip" antenna sections. This would actually result in lowering of the height of the antennas by the length of the existing "whips."
- It will likely take from six to nine months to work out the details with the other carries for the collocation monopine plans. At this point, it is believed that a minimum height of 70 feet would be needed for a collocation monopine to serve both Verizon and AT&T Mobility. It is possible that with a horizontal mounting and more "bushy" tree design, three carriers could be accommodated and the "tree" height kept as low as possible.

- The efforts are needed to meet local demands for improved service for the next generations of wireless technology (i.e., 4G, LTE and LTE advanced). These are due to be commercially launched over the next year or two.
- Radio frequency and noise data relative to the existing and proposed equipment has been prepared and will be provided to the town.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the now modified proposal as well as the findings from the afternoon site meeting. Members concurred that the phased approach, allowing the six new antenna panels to be installed on the two existing poles initially, with a change to a collocation “monopine,” was appropriate and would best serve local needs. Members did, however, stress their hope that collocation could be implemented as soon as possible.

Following discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Breen, and passed 3-0 to forward a statement of support to the planning commission for the modified request for conditional use permit (CUP) amendment subject to the following provisions:

1. The CUP should be renewed with a time line for conversion of the interim pole mounted antenna to a collocated monopine.
2. The antenna color should be dark brown as proposed by the applicant.
3. The collocation monopine, if possible, should be located on the northeast side of the building, essentially in the area of the existing AT&T Mobility pole. This would be a less aesthetically visible location than at the northwest end of the Monastery building where the existing Verizon poles are located.
4. In development of the collocation monopine plan, consideration should be given to a horizontal mounting of the antenna, with a somewhat more “bushy” tree design to reduce height and increase the potential for carriers on one “tree.”
5. A long-term landscape plan for replacement of existing pine trees located between the antenna site and the Georgia Lane area should be developed and implemented by the wireless carriers and Priory. It was clarified that these existing trees are important to minimizing the aesthetic impacts of the antenna facilities, but have relatively short lives, and replacement materials should be installed given the long-term plan for the facilities at the Priory.
6. As much of the ground-based equipment as possible should be placed within the adjacent building to control potential for noise spill and visual clutter.

ASCC members also thank the Verizon and AT&T Mobility representatives for their willingness to work with the town to improve aesthetic conditions at the Priory as they pursue their plans to enhance local wireless service to accommodate the next generations of wireless technologies.

Preliminary Review -- 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

Vlasic presented the August 5, 2010 staff report on this preliminary review of the subject use permit amendment requests for modifications to existing AT&T Mobility wireless facilities at three locations in the town. He noted that the staff report includes a listing of all application plans and materials and then discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting on the proposals (see above site meeting minutes). He noted that the applicant has expressed commitment to pursuit of a plan for collocation of facilities as discussed during the earlier review of the Verizon Wireless application.

Vlasic noted while, during the afternoon site meeting, ASCC members found the three proposals generally acceptable, they did not support the proposed stair access for the improvements planned at the 4115 Alpine Road site (i.e., CUP X7D-161).

AT&T Mobility representative Mike Mangiantini was present to discuss the proposals with ASCC members. He reiterated AT&T's willingness to pursue a phased plan for equipment replacement that would include eventual collocation on a monopine, as discussed relative to the Verizon Wireless application. He advised that the CUP amendment for the Priory facility would be so modified. He also advised that he would explore with AT&T technicians the ability to modify the access plans for the facility at 4115 Alpine Road to address ASCC concerns.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members reiterated the comments on the three applications offered during the site meeting. Following brief discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Breen and passed 3-0 to forward a statement of support to the planning commission for the three proposed CUP amendments subject to the following provisions:

1. CUP amendment X7D-138 (Priory, 302 Portola Road) is supported subject to the modification of the request as agreed to by the applicant and essentially the same six provisions listed earlier in the meeting for the Verizon Wireless application.
2. CUP amendment X7D-160 (945 Portola Road) is supported subject to the conclusions offered at the afternoon site meeting (see above site meeting minutes).
3. CUP amendment X7D-161 (4115 Alpine Road) is supported subject to the conclusions offered at the afternoon site meeting (see above site meeting minutes), particularly with respect to the need for a modified access plan.

ASCC members also thanked Mr. Mangiantini for his willingness to work with the town relative to improving the aesthetics of the various AT&T Mobility facilities.

Confirmation of Rescheduling of date for the Regular Second ASCC meeting

It was confirmed that the regular August 23, 2010 ASCC meeting would be rescheduled for August 30, 2010.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 3-0, approval of the July 26, 2010 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

T. Vlastic