

Architectural and Site Control Commission **March 12, 2012**
Special Site Meeting Regarding Conditional Use Permits (CUP) X7D-132 (Verizon Wireless) and X7D-138 (AT&T Mobility), Priory School, 302 Portola Road, and Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Hughes called the special site meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at northwestern end of the Monastery building on the Priory School campus, i.e., the area where the Verizon and AT&T wireless facilities are located.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Koch
Absent: Clark, Warr
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others* present relative to the Verizon and AT&T Mobility CUPs:

Jay Gruendle, agent for Verizon Wireless
Leah Zaffaroni, 175 Georgia Lane

Consideration of options for compliance with condition of approval, Conditional Use Permits (CUP) X7D-132 (Verizon Wireless) and X7D-138 (AT&T Mobility), Priory School, 302 Portola Road

Vlastic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report relative to the options for satisfying the collocation requirements of the subject use permits approved in September of 2010. He explained that the permit condition at issue calls for development of a plan for a monopine faux tree antenna that would eliminate the interim Verizon Wireless and AT&T Mobility antenna poles, replacing them with a faux tree, that could accommodate up to three carriers and could be to a height of 65-70 feet. He referenced the March 2, 2012 letter from Jay Gruendle, Verizon Wireless agent, suggesting that other options might be less visually intrusive than a new, 70-foot tall tree.

Mr. Gruendle was present and reviewed the options discussed in the March 2, 2012 letter. He also displayed copies of the 70-foot monopine plan previously shared with the ASCC and other town representatives. He offered that Verizon is committed to satisfy the collocation condition as may be directed by the town and is prepared to install the monopine in a cooperative effort with AT&T as required by both conditions in the approved use permits for both carriers, but did want the town to at least consider the possible options set forth in the March 2nd letter. He also noted that Verizon hoped that if the monopine were to be the preferred option, the scope of screen landscaping would be less than if the "interim" facilities were allowed to remain. He clarified that the height of the interim Verizon and AT&T poles were approximately 30-35 feet. It was also noted that the other nearby antenna poles for Sprint and T-Mobile were roughly 30 feet and 50 feet respectively, and the TowerCo pole further to the northeast was also 50 feet tall.

ASCC members considered the options noted in the March 2nd letter and relationship to other antennas at the site. It was also noted that members would view the antenna area from off site prior to the evening ASCC meeting.

Preliminary reaction of ASCC members at the site, after discussion with Mr. Gruendle and receiving input from neighbor Leah Zaffaroni, was that the faux tree is still the preferred solution, particularly due to distance from viewing points and the dark, evergreen backdrop.

It was noted that this faux tree aesthetic solution would set a precedent to ensure that the other carriers, particularly Sprint and T-Mobile, would also implement a collocation monopine tree antenna so that the existing poles could be eliminated and the number of "poles" at the site significantly reduced. It was also noted that an extensive landscape plan would likely not be needed, but that planting of a few new Monterey pines in anticipation of loss of existing pines would be appropriate.

ASCC members also noted that the existing TowerCo pole, painted a dark brown to satisfy a CUP condition, had faded to a relatively light tan/gray color in a very short period of time. Vlasic advised that staff would contact the TowerCo representative and hopefully have the pole repainted, this time a much darker green color to blend better with site conditions.

After preliminary discussion, ASCC members present agreed they would offer final recommendations to the planning commission at the regular evening meeting. Chair Hughes then thanked the Mr. Gruendle and Leah Zaffaroni for their participation at the site meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Vice Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Warr*
Absent: None
Planning Commission liaison: McKitterick
Town Council Liaison: None
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

*Warr arrived after consideration of the Verizon Wireless/AT&T Mobility matter. He advised that he could not participate in the discussion of the wireless facilities at the Priory School, as his firm is providing architectural services to the School.

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Consideration of options for compliance with condition of approval, Conditional Use Permits (CUP) X7D-132 (Verizon Wireless) and X7D-138 (AT&T Mobility), Priory School, 302 Portola Road

Vlastic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report on this matter and reviewed the discussion that took place at the afternoon site meeting (see above site meeting minutes). He added that the ASCC is not required to take any action on the matter, but is only forwarding recommendations to the planning commission relative to compliance with the collocation condition that pertains to both the subject Verizon Wireless and AT&T Mobility conditional use permits.

Clark advised that while he could not attend the afternoon site meeting, he did have the opportunity to view site conditions and consider views to the antenna from off site. He also appreciated receiving comments from other ASCC members (i.e., as noted in the site meeting minutes), as he was somewhat concerned with the use of an artificial tree.

Verizon agent Jay Gruendle was present and reviewed Verizon's commitment to install a monopine pole with AT&T, but hoped that the scope of screen landscaping would be limited in consideration of the aesthetic effort that would be made with the "tree" pole. He also reminded ASCC members of the preliminary tree design and noted that it would be 65-70 feet tall and that likely a second tree for the other carriers, as discussed at the site meeting, would need to be a similar height.

Public comments were then requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, ASCC members discussed the options in Mr. Gruendle's March 2nd letter and findings from the afternoon site meeting. Members concurred that after considering the CUP condition(s) in question, site circumstances and views from off site, the faux tree option should be pursued and implemented. The following comments were offered in support of this position:

1. While, typically, the ASCC would not encourage a faux tree, in this case due to the distance from the tree to any public viewing locations, a tree, even at the anticipated 70-

foot height appears appropriate. It would blend well with the backdrop and help screen views to the existing 50-foot tall Sprint/Nextel and TowerCo antennas located north of the Verizon and AT&T facilities. A key issue will be to ensure that the faux tree color is as permanent as possible and does not fade so as to stand out from the evergreen backdrop, as has been the case with the TowerCo antenna.

2. The faux tree should be pursued with the intention that when the other site carriers seek amendments to the CUPs for their facilities, the precedent will be in place for the collocation tree. A second tree to accommodate the nearby poles of T-Mobile and Sprint/Nextel, as well as a possible third carrier, should be required and this would result in two faux "monopines" replacing at least four individual poles that now exist at the site around the northwest end of the Monastery building. These two faux trees would also screen views to the existing TowerCo pole further uphill and, with repainting of that pole a dark green, the view to the "antenna farm" condition would be mitigated. It was noted that it is likely that other carriers may seek permits at the Priory and the faux tree would have space for additional future collocation.
3. Some additional landscaping should be provided around the base of the Verizon/AT&T faux tree to soften potential views, as the start of the tree branches would need to be somewhat high to avoid conflict with the Monastery building. In addition, a few Monterey pines, perhaps three, should be planted on the hillside below and to the southwest of the faux tree site to enhance screening, and to be in place when some of the existing pines die. It was noted that the ASCC typically does not support planting of Monterey pines, but in this case given the extensive pines on the site, some additional planting appears appropriate to ensure long-term screening of the antenna facilities. (*Chair Hughes commented that perhaps the matter of planting of pines or other screen trees in anticipation of the loss of existing pines should be a Priory school requirement under its use permit. Vlasic noted that the Priory will likely be seeking some CUP amendment in the near future for additional improvements in the central plaza area of the campus and this tree matter can also be considered at that time.*)

Verizon agent Jay Gruendle again advised that Verizon is prepared to move ahead with the collocation tree generally as discussed at the site meeting.

Continued consideration, Architectural Review -- proposed residential additions and remodeling, new guest house, pool, and related yard improvements, 250 Alamos Road, Sclavos

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report on this continuing project review. He discussed how the revised plans and materials listed below respond to the preliminary review input received at the February 27, 2012 ASCC meeting. The plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, have been prepared by Kohlsaas & Associates and have a revision date of 3/5/12. The landscape plans do not include a revision date, but were received with the revised submittal on March 6, 2012:

Sheet A-1, Cover Sheet
Sheet A-2, Plot Plan
Sheet A-3, Site Plan

Landscape Plans -- David R. Fox & Company, Landscape Architecture, 1/20/12:

Sheet L1.0, Landscape Site Plan
Sheet L1.1, Trellis Views
Sheet L2.0, Grading and Drainage Plan, (B.A. Zuhdi, Consulting Engineer)

Sheet L2.1, Erosion Control Plan, (B.A. Zuhdi, Consulting Engineer)
Sheet L3.0, Lighting Plan, 2/8/12
Sheet L4.0, Concept Planting Plan

Sheet A-4, As-Built/Demo Floor Plans
Sheet A-5, As-Built Elevations
Sheet A-6, Proposed Main Floor Plan
Sheet A-7, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
Sheet A-8, Front & Left Elevations
Sheet A-9, Rear & Right Elevations
Sheet A-10, Roof Plan
Sheet A-11, Cross Sections
Sheet A-12, Guest House Plans
Sheet A-13, Guest House Elevations & Sections

Supporting data to revised plans:

- March 6, 2012 letter from the project architect Gary Kohlsaad with letter from David Fox, project landscape architect, both received March 7, 2012.
- Light fixture data “cut” sheets (14 sheets total) for the exterior wall and yard/garden light fixtures, received on March 6, 2012.

Vlasic advised that still part of the architectural review package are the following materials provided to ASCC members with the original staff report:

- February 14, 2012 letter to Planning Department
- Color Samples Board, received February 15, 2012
- Perspective renderings of proposed house and guest house improvements received February 15, 2012
- Completed Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, 2/14/12
- Completed mandatory BIG, “Green Building” checklists for the house addition and guest house components of the project received February 15, 2012

Vlasic then reviewed the following communications received since the March 8, 2012 staff report was prepared:

- March 11, 2012 letter from the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) on matters still of concern to the committee.
- March 8, 2012 Project Arborist’s Report, Deborah Ellis, MS
- March 12, 2012 email from Conservation Committee raising concern over redwood trees planted along the southerly Alamos Road frontage of the property. (It was clarified that these trees are actually on the neighboring Cagan parcel and not on the subject property.)

With respect to some of the concerns noted in the WASC letter and, particularly, issues associated with the existing front yard staircase and proposed north side retaining walls at the pool terrace, Vlasic offered the following comments:

- The pool terrace retaining walls achieve heights of almost 5 feet in the 20-foot side yard setback area. The height limit is 6 feet and if a railing were required or desired for safety, the combined wall and railing height could conflict with the six-foot limit. While it is not certain a railing would be required by code, one might be desired due to the drop-off. This should be considered in development of final wall and grading plans and the details need to be shared with the building official.

- The front yard staircase installed with the relatively recent house remodeling project was not considered by the ASCC and is not the type of facility the town would normally encourage or support based on town design guidelines and policies. This is the case due to the steepness of the slope and the amount of slope manipulation and grading needed to install the stairs. It is also possible that safety railings may be needed at the landings due to the adjacent drop-off. There has been some height added with the concrete stairs and this height along with any railing height could exceed the four-foot height limit for entry features in the front yard setback area. Given the scope of the project, the ASCC could consider requiring changes to or elimination of the staircase so that the front yard area would be more in line with town guidelines and policies. Further, if the existing driveway extensions to the street are too steep for walking then a more meandering pathway along the side of the driveways might be considered instead of the existing, fairly steep and formal staircase.
- The arborist's report suggests that the 60-inch oak between the proposed guest house and main house may not have a long life due to poor treatment by the previous owners. The ASCC expressed concern with the tree during discussion at the February 12th meeting. At that time it was made clear that the desire is to preserve the tree as a key asset on the property. The design team should clarify if there has been any change in position since receipt of the arborist report.

Gary Kohlsaas and David Fox were present to review the revised plans with ASCC members. They offered the following comments and clarifications, partially in response to comments in the staff report and questions from ASCC members.

- Although there is concern over the health of the 60-inch oak, the objective remains to preserve the tree and enhance its changes by implementing the recommendations in the arborist's report. If, however, the tree does not survive, even with the new improvements in place, it would be possible to install a replacement tree.
- In response to an ASCC question, it was clarified that if the 60-inch oak had to be removed, the location for the proposed guest house would not change. It was stressed that several options had been considered for the locations, but the proposed site was considered most desirable due to relationship to the main house, the site slopes, potential on and off-site view relationships, etc.
- With respect to the staircase, options can be considered to reduce the visual presence with landscaping and the proposed lighting can be changed to reduce the number of fixtures as long as there is light to ensure safe use.
- There is space along the north side of the pool terrace retaining wall to backfill soil so that the height of the exposed wall and terrace drop-off does not exceed 30-inches. This would help ensure safety and avoid the need for a safety railing or any height conflicts.
- Material for the "vanishing" infinity pool wall (i.e., exposed to the east side) has yet to be selected. The intent is to not use any highly reflective material, but match the stone to be used on other walls on the site.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the property owner had made several attempts to reach out to the property owner to the north, but had yet be successful in establishing communication.

- In response to a question, it was noted that efforts were proceeding on the planned connection to the sanitary sewer system and that easements had been identified to reach the sewer line in Alpine Road. It was noted that an easement adjustment may be needed where a significant oak has grown in the existing easement.

Design team members then reviewed the changes to the plans made since the February 27th meeting, particularly with respect to landscaping and exterior lighting.

Public comments were requested. **Bev Lipman, on behalf of the WASC**, reviewed the comments in the March 11th committee letter. She noted that the committee had visited the site on Saturday, March 10th and was particularly concerned that a number of improvements were made relatively recently by the previous owner, including the front yard staircase, without approval by the WASC as required by Westridge CC&Rs.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans, the arborists report and the additional data presented at the ASCC meeting. The main concerns of members focused on the front staircase, the 60-inch oak, exterior lighting and the exposed east side walls for the infinity pool and the pool terrace. Members supported the efforts to preserve the 60-inch oak and stated that all work to enhance the tree and protect it from construction impacts should be completed under the direct supervision of the project arborist. Members also concurred that they were not prepared to approve the front yard stair case at this time and that additional data should be developed to determine the need for railings, identify minimum lighting for safety and how the staircase could otherwise be modified to be consistent with town zoning requirements, and design guidelines for features in the front yard setback area. Members concurred that if adequate design responses were not identified, the staircase may have to be removed. It was also noted that the final WASC position on improvements within the Westridge easement needed to be provided.

Following discussion of the various issues, Warr moved approval of the plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the planning staff and a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of any building permits for the project:

1. The front yard staircase, staircase lighting, etc., is not approved and will only be considered for approval when the issues identified during the March 12, ASCC meeting are adequately clarified and addressed to the satisfaction of the ASCC. *(Note: This means that building permits for the project will not be issued until the ASCC is satisfied with staircase plans. Alternatively, the staircase could be removed and the slope regraded to essentially its original condition, but plans for such removal would also need to be provided and approved prior to issuance of building permits.)*
2. The material for the pool vanishing wall shall be specified addressing the concerns discussed at the March 12 ASCC meeting.
3. The landscape plan shall be modified to include a few trees below, i.e., north of the pool trellis, for screening of views between neighbors. Further, the plan shall provide for elimination of the oleanders along the parcel Alamos Road frontage, i.e., on the parcel, and treatments for removal of star thistle on the property.

4. Details for the fence and gate extensions between the house and side property lines shall be provided and the manner in which required pool security is to be achieved shall be detailed.
5. The lighting plan shall be revised to:
 - a. Eliminate all lights along the northerly driveway extension to Alamos Road.
 - b. Reduce the scope of lighting along the rear stairs from the upper level to the pool terrace.
6. The grading plan shall be modified to include backfill of soil against the pool terrace wall in the northerly setback area so that the wall has an exposed face of no more than 30-inches to ensure no safety rail is needed and that the wall has minimum visual exposure to views from the east and northeast.
7. The building permit plans shall include all requirements of the project arborist for protection of the 60-inch oak and measures to enhance its vitality. Further, once approved, implementation of these measures shall be under the direction of the arborists with periodic reports to the planning staff verifying that required measures have been properly implemented.
8. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be prepared and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

With respect to developing clarified plans for the front yard staircase, ASCC members advised that this should be a collaborative effort between the project design team and the town with the town represented by the town planner, a designated ASCC member.

Architectural Review -- proposed residential additions, 30 Firethorn Way, Beriker

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of plans for single story additions to the existing single level, 3,750 sf residence on the subject 1.0-acre, Firethorn Way property. He advised that the project includes three small additions, i.e., a breakfast room on the south side of the house and new closet, bedroom and laundry areas in two extensions on the west side. He also explained that the applicant had recently submitted plans for a new swimming pool, pool terrace extension and landscape wall incorporating a pool equipment enclosure and a new trellis element. He shared plans for these other improvements with ASCC members for information and reaction. He clarified that ASCC review of the swimming pool, etc. plans was not needed; but, that staff would be interested in any ASCC comments in light of the proposed house additions and other issues, e.g., the stable structure and fencing, discussed in the staff report.

ASCC members considered the staff report, information relative to the swimming pool project and the following house addition plans dated January 5, 2012, received by the town on February 17, 2012, and prepared by Architect Brian Webb:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan, Vicinity Plan and Sheet Index
- Sheet 2, "A" Floor Plan (breakfast room)
- Sheet 3, Plan "B" & "C" (bath, laundry, closet) and Roof Plan
- Sheet 4, Sections and Elevations
- Sheet 5, Section and Notes

Also considered was a cut sheet for the proposed wall mounted light fixture and a photo image of the proposed ledger stone for the breakfast room addition, both received February 17, 2012.

Mr. and Mrs. Beriker presented their proposal to the ASCC and clarified the project in terms of the new pool proposal. They also offered the following clarifications.

- No landscape lighting is proposed, but the overall plans will be clarified to address the lighting concerns noted in the staff report.
- Except for the flat roof and ledger stone to be used on the breakfast room addition, the proposed house additions would be finished to match the existing site improvements. These include medium brown/taupe colored asphalt shingles for the pitched roof elements and stucco siding and molding/trim painted the same medium to lighter brown/tan color of the existing siding.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and concluded it was generally appropriate given site and area conditions as evaluated in the staff report. Following brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Koch and passed 5-0 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 for the proposed house additions:

1. The existing stable building shall be evaluated in terms of building permit requirements and any such requirements determined necessary shall be satisfied.
2. Complete and accurate floor area and impervious surface area calculations shall be provided and shall include all existing and proposed improvements including the stable structure and new swimming pool project with pool equipment structure.
3. A comprehensive exterior lighting plan shall be provided that addresses the lighting comments in the staff report and includes any new lighting associated with the swimming pool project.
4. Existing, recently installed fencing and any proposed fencing shall be consistent with town fence ordinance standards. Data shall be provided as required by staff to verify such consistency.
5. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
6. Data on site lawn area shall be provided and such area shall be consistent with town water conservation and landscape standards.
7. Final Build-It-Green checklist calculations shall be provided and adhered to with the house addition building permit project.

Architectural Review for House Additions and Remodeling, 5 Quail, Portola Valley Ranch, Feldman

Vlasic presented the March 8, 2012 staff report on this proposal for the addition of 1,463 sf of floor area to the existing single-story, pitched roof, 2,241 sf residence on the subject Portola Valley Ranch parcel. He explained that the project includes bedroom, common area and stair additions on the existing main level that total 661 sf, that remodeling of existing spaces on the main level is also planned, and that the new stairs in the main level addition would provide access to the proposed lower level recreation, workshop, bath and storage spaces containing 802 sf.

Vlasic advised that the project is very similar to, but somewhat less extensive than, a project approved by the ASCC in 2009 for the previous owner of the property. He noted, however, that the current plans call for replacement of all existing wood siding on the house with new stucco siding. He noted the detached garage would remain wood sided, but the paint color changed to match that planned for the house stucco.

ASCC members considered the staff report, background to the project and the following plans dated February 27, 2012 and prepared by Greg Miller Designs:

- Sheet A1, Site Plan
- Sheet A2, Floor Plan - Main Level
- Sheet A3, Floor Plan - Basement
- Sheet A4, Elevations (North and South)
- Sheet A5, Elevations (East and West)
- Sheet A6, Roof Plan

Also considered were the cut sheet for the proposed exterior light fixture received February 28, 2012 and the completed BIG GreenPoint Rated checklist targeting 39 BIG points. Further, it was noted that the project has received approval from the Ranch Design committee as stated in the December 2, 2011 letter from Dana Rhine of the Portola Valley Ranch Association.

Applicant Brian Feldman and project designer Greg Miller presented the proposal to the ASCC and also displayed a sample of the proposed "nutmeg" color for the stucco siding. It was explained that the sample was not exact, as the intent was to have a "mottled" treatment with more texture. It was also noted that, if desired, the one light fixture proposed on the upper level north side deck extension could be removed as recommended in the staff report, but the intent was to only use the light if activities might take place in this area of the deck.

Mr. Feldman also clarified the landscape comments in the letter from the Ranch design committee. He noted that a landscape plan was not required or planned, but if any landscaping was to be pursued Ranch design committee approval would be necessary.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion Warr moved, seconded by Clark and passed 5-0 approval of the project subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff, unless otherwise noted, prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. The plans shall be modified to remove the exterior light fixture proposed on the upper level north side deck extension.

2. Verification shall be provided that the foundation plans have been found acceptable by a certified arborist to ensure the health of the 36-inch blue oak tree adjacent to the addition site. Further, any trimming of the tree shall be under the direction of the arborist.
3. The final exterior stucco color shall be identified to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member.
4. A construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Miscellaneous comments

Breen expressed concern over the Lovazzano project currently under construction on Westridge Drive, particularly relative to the finish of the roof skylights. She asked staff to ensure that the finish was a bronze tint to minimize light spill.

Approval of Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 5-0 approval of the February 27, 2012 meeting minutes with correction of the spelling of name "Cagan" (i.e., with a "C" and not a "K") in the record of the review of the Sclavos project at 250 Alamos Road.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

T. Vlasic