

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Breen called the special teleconference meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Planning & Building Director Laura Russell called roll:

Present: ASCC: Al Sill, and Jane Wilson; Vice Chair Dave Ross; Chair Danna Breen.
Absent: Commissioner Megan Koch
Town Council Liaison: Councilmember Richards
Town Staff: Planning & Building Director Laura Russell; Assistant Planner Dylan Parker

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Judith Murphy said the Conservation Committee has been looking at the issue of invasives on construction lots, especially construction that goes on for over a year, with particular attention to dittrichia and thistles. She said they have proposed language they'd like added to the Planning Department boilerplate in the same way they have a tree protection plan. She requested this be put on the agenda of the next meeting for discussion. With Planning & Building Director Russell's permission, Ms. Murphy will forward the proposed document to the Planning Department. Chair Breen suggested removing #2 from the proposed document about existing vegetation being preserved because there are often times when they want most of the property to be cleared because of invasives.

NEW BUSINESS

- (1) **Architectural review of an application for an addition, remodel, and associated site improvements to the existing fire station (Station #8), 135 Portola Road, Woodside Fire Protection District, File #PLN ARCH22-2019**

Assistant Planner Parker noted that the applicant has requested that the project proceed to ASCC while the discussion about landscaping and other concerns continue with the neighbors. The project is presented with the anticipation that ASCC feedback may help resolve these outstanding issues. Assistant Planner Parker also noted that an updated landscaping plan was received Friday afternoon, after packet creation. Therefore, no substantial analysis or consideration was conducted on this landscaping plan for this presentation. He said staff anticipates that the project team will walk the ASCC through the updated plan in their presentation of the project. Staff presented the application, the project background, code requirements, project description, reviewing agency/committee recommendations, staff's analysis, and public comments received.

Assistant Planner Parker noted that the proposed maximum height of the apparatus garage is actually 16' 6" and not 16' as noted in the staff report. He noted that the window color was omitted in the staff report, and it is Kelly Moore Leather Satchel, with an LRV Value of 10.24.

Staff recommended that following receipt of staff's report, presentation, and public comments during the meeting, the ASCC could forward a recommendation of approval on architectural and site development review to the Planning Commission or offer comments, reactions, and

direction to assist the applicant to make any adjustments or clarifications that Commissioners conclude are needed to continue discussion of the project and make a final recommendation at a future meeting. Staff noted that if the ASCC moves forward with a recommendation of approval, with regard to the findings presented previously per Section 18.64.010, the ASCC would need to go through each item and identify the findings through discussion so that staff can capture that in the document to forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration of that recommendation.

Staff suggested the ASCC may consider providing guidance and interpretation with respect to the appropriate course of action for the floor area exceedance in order to help resolve this issue. Staff further recommended that if the ASCC forwards the project to the Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation, it is recommended that a condition of approval be the requirement for the landscaping plan to return to the full ASCC for review or be approved by two members of the ASCC with input from the Conservation Committee.

Chair Breen invited questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Ross asked if this application will come back to the full ASCC as a matter of course or if it will have passed all ASCC hurdles at that point of moving on to the Planning Commission. Planning & Building Director Russell said it will not come back as a matter of course unless a condition to that effect is recommended and then approved by the Planning Commission. For example, if the full ASCC wishes to see the landscaping plan, a positive recommendation for the project may be made with the condition that the landscaping plan come back to the full ASCC.

Vice Chair Ross said legal questions have been raised about the viability of the project with regard to consistency with the General Plan. He asked if it is safe to assume, from a Commissioner's standpoint, that those questions are relevant to the Council or the Planning Commission, but not relevant for the ASCC's review. Planning & Building Director Russell said General Plan consistency in terms of the rural character can be found in the policy documents. She said the Zoning Code, the Design Guidelines, the strict Lighting Guidelines, and the Landscaping Guidelines are all designed to maintain rural character. She said staff has not presented an extremely detailed assessment of General Plan consistency, but they do generally find it to be consistent and can provide a more detailed General Plan consistency language to the Planning Commission for their consideration. She said that item should not hold up the ASCC's consideration of this project.

Chair Breen asked how the number of handicapped parking spaces are determined. She said one of the elevations shows two spaces, and she said it seems like those spaces would be usually vacant. Planning & Building Director Russell said accessibility for handicapped people is required by the Building Code at a specific ratio. She deferred to the applicant team to address how that was addressed in this project.

With no additional Commissioner questions, Chair Breen invited the applicant to offer comments.

Carter Warr, the project architect, described the history of this project. He said in 1976 the facility was a dorm-type fire station. In 1992 some minor adjustments were made so that there would be at least some individual sleeping rooms. This proposed project creates sleeping rooms and office space for the staff, for their ever-increasing requirements for training, physical fitness, and reports. Mr. Warr said another significant change is moving the turnout gear storage out of the apparatus bays, due to the associated cancer risks, to a turnout storage room. The third

major change is an addition of an apparatus bay following the same pattern of traffic through the station, entering on the right and exiting on the left. The other revisions provide adequate parking and trash and recycling locations. Mr. Warr said they've met with neighbors virtually and on-site and want to continue to work through the landscape issues. He shared plans showing some of the adjustments that have been made in that regard.

Project Manager, Mike Wasserman, for the Woodside Fire Protection District pointed out that the proposed modifications to the station are not to create additional capacity, but are to be able to appropriately accommodate the needs of the current station as it is currently operating. He said there is not a plan to add additional apparatus or personnel. He said they have met with neighbors several times and have provided several concessions in an attempt to appease the neighbors and mitigate their concerns.

Woodside Fire Chief Rob Lindner said there has not been a lot of negative feedback with regard to the insides of the building. He said the apparatus room is necessary to meet the Department of Homeland Security recommendation that vehicles and personnel are housed and locked. He said they have 30 vehicles in their fleet and do not have enough parking spaces in the District among the three stations and administrative building. He said there are always vehicles temporarily out of the area being maintained or repaired, but if every vehicle was on-site and every employee was on duty, the parking would be maxed out. He said they do need the parking, but have been willing to make concessions given the feedback they've had regarding proximity to a residence or visual appearance from a first- or second-floor neighbor window. He said the intention is not to increase noise or visual disturbance. He addressed the conversation regarding a proposed Sheriff's Office at the front of the building, saying that this idea was brought up in previous conversations in response to issues happening at that time that perhaps law enforcement should have a more visual presence, perhaps adding an office to the fire station location. He noted that the collaboration is positive, and they have never received a single complaint at either of the two other fire stations. After hearing the neighbors' concerns, while he cannot answer for the Sheriff's Department or the Town, he does not have any issue with not including a Sheriff's Office there. He said, with regard to suggestions to move the parking to the south side of the property, it is not in the best interest to do that from a public safety standpoint. They do not want vehicles and movement on the egress side of a station, and they also do the overwhelming majority of their training on that side.

Mr. Warr presented the proposed landscape plan. He described the screening plan to be compatible to the redwoods along the Shultz side of the property and along the Mountjoy property.

Chair Breen said it was her understanding that the trees on the backside of the plantings would be removed. Mr. Warr said they don't need those trees to be removed, but are removing them due to the request of the neighbor who had concerns the trees are causing damage to her property.

Chair Breen invited questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Wilson asked Chief Lindner why the apparatus garages needed to be adjacent to each other rather than in tandem. She asked Mr. Warr if they had considered a second story on the administrative building. She asked if the bathroom facilities were sufficient with only two toilets and five bedrooms. She asked if the fifth bedroom will be usable by the Sheriff's office because they currently have situations where they don't have places to sleep.

Chief Lindner said there are stations with extra-deep garage spaces where the apparatus line up front to back. Historically, for frontline equipment, that is not desirable because when one leaves and then returns, they must back in or move the other apparatus all the way around to put it back in that spot. He said there is one station where the reserve equipment is stored front to back like that. He said he did not think it was possible on this site because of the turning radius of the vehicles. Mr. Warr confirmed Chief Lindner's description, adding that they would only consider the extra-deep garage if there was no other alternative. Mr. Warr said they did not even consider two stories because the amount of space being added to the fire station is very small and is only a minor addition. Chief Lindner said using the fifth bedroom as sleeping quarters for law enforcement has never been discussed. Chief Lindner said with the shifts they work, there are extra bedrooms available for those who commute in for long distances or for those who arrive the night before their shift starts in the morning, which they also have at the other two stations.

Commissioner Wilson said if the new apparatus room and the existing garage were shifted closer to the administrative building and a second story was added to the administrative building there would be more room for bedrooms and bathroom facilities, and a fitness room, and possibly alleviate the necessity for the extra 10 feet between the engine room and apparatus room. This would shift the access road closer to the main building and possibly alleviate more of the neighbor's concerns regarding the access road going all the way around the buildings.

Chief Lindner said that 10-foot area is currently storage and a shop area, and Mr. Warr simply added a bathroom in an open space that is existing. Mr. Warr said it was not feasible to tear down the existing 10-foot area. They added to the building in a straightforward way rather than considering a larger remodel or large-scale renovation of the existing building.

In response to Vice Chair Ross's question, Chief Lindner confirmed that he did not anticipate increased staffing or increased training, except for emergency situations such as the CZU fire where they would want to staff up to address potential problems.

Vice Chair Ross said the rear drive appears to be an infrequent use. Mr. Warr said that is the intention. Vice Chair Ross asked if that area might be treated differently, perhaps less formally developed, with alternate materials that could stand up to occasional use, even by heavy vehicles. Mr. Warr said there could be a base rock path or even just wheel pads, which could be added to the landscape plan. He said nothing of any height could be planted, but they could provide for the pass through without the formality of a paved driveway.

Vice Chair Ross asked if there would be an opportunity to plant a climbing plant to soften the industrial nature of the south elevation of the new garage. Mr. Warr said the Wildland Urban Interface discourages the growth of plant material on the building. He said if they wanted to create a screen, it makes more sense to create a screen just inside the setback that would be green, and it could be taller than a 6-foot fence, providing complete screening, such as a living wall. He said the building is 38-1/2 feet from the property line.

Vice Chair Ross then asked about the east elevation. Mr. Warr said the glass in the apparatus bay is for providing natural lighting during the day. Vice Chair Ross asked about nighttime light spill. Mr. Warr said the lights would be hung below the windows because the apparatus doesn't reach that height. Vice Chair Ross asked about the elevation of the wall sconces. Mr. Warr said they are approximately 8 feet from the ground and are there to provide access lighting at that end, but could be eliminated and replaced with a path light and step light.

In response to Vice Chair Ross's question, Mr. Warr said the site drainage would be further developed as the landscape plan is completed.

In response to Chair Breen's question, Mr. Warr said the only time the lights are on in the garage is as part of a response. He said those lights are controlled by the response mechanism. Once the crew exits and the doors close, the lights go out.

With no other questions from the Commissioners, Chair Breen invited public comments. Chair Breen asked that comments be kept concise in the interest of time.

Kathie Christie and John Matlock said they have been listening to all of these viewpoints and opinions, and now the Commission gets to listen to the people on all three sides with properties greatly affected. She said she hopes the neighbors will have a chance to voice their viewpoints. Ms. Christie said she does not understand how they can say they are not adding capacity and extra personnel when they are adding a Sheriff's station, with one or two Sheriffs and their vehicles. She said apparently it's not the Town, but the County who has regulations about how a Sheriff's station is run. She said there will be additional vehicles with more sirens. She said they are heatedly opposed to the Sheriff's station. She said they sent an email on November 8 to the ASCC, which Town Manager Dennis neglected to put in the staff packet. She asked if any of the Commissioners had read their comments or the email they got from a real estate agent today. She said they requested an appraisal of how this expansion and addition of the Sheriff's station, personnel, vehicles, and parking would affect their property values. Ms. Christie said she has sold probably 100 properties in Portola Valley in the last 30 years. She asked the opinion of an impressive agent who has sold 800 properties on the Peninsula and knows there is no doubt this will have a negative affect on their property values. She said anyone knows that if you sell a house that backs up to a busy school or a carwash or a fire station with an additional Sheriff's office added, it will have a negative effect on the value of that property, of approximately 10 to 20 percent. She said they do not agree with anything to do with the Sheriff's station. She said her husband has submitted a proposal which was also not included in the packet. She said there is rental space currently available right around the corner with good visibility, parking, square footage, and a bathroom, that does not affect any of the residential properties. Ms. Christie said her understanding is that the Town does not have a Conditional Use Permit for the Sheriff's station. Ms. Christie read requirements for Conditional Use Permits regarding ensuring the privacy and rural outlook of surrounding residences and that the proposed use will not adversely affect the abutting properties. She said these findings cannot be found considering the neighbors will take a 10 to 20 percent hit on their property values, especially with the Sheriff station door staring into their bedroom windows. She was concerned upon hearing that the ASCC can move this forward tonight, yet they have heard nothing back from Project Manager Wasserman or Chief Lindner, who have not addressed nor responded to their issues. She said she has had two appraisals done on her property and will have another one done afterwards if the project is approved. She said the loss on her property value will be considered damages that will be litigated. Mr. Matlock said they've already talked to an attorney about it. Ms. Christie said the Commission can discuss the trees and the color of the paint, but the Sheriff's station has got to go. Mr. Matlock said neither Town Manager Dennis nor Planning & Building Director Russell have responded to their suggestion about the building for lease around the corner. Ms. Christie and Mr. Matlock said they believe something else is going on, and the Town is trying to push this through, and they will take legal action against this. She said there is apparently a neighbor who wrote a letter in support of the station, but the station is not next to her home. Ms. Christie said they can put the station next to that neighbor's house and put a carwash next to that neighbor's house, too, but not next to her house. She said there is no permit for that Sheriff's station, and it will not just get washed under the bridge. She said she wants a response

to her email of November 8 as well as the email from the real estate expert with impressive credentials. Chair Breen acknowledged receipt of those documents, and the Commissioners all confirmed they have read them.

Bob and Suzanne Schultz, 145 Portola Road. Mr. Schultz said they live on a flag lot with a border against the Station 8 property. He thanked everyone for their comments, but is surprised by some things he's heard. He said the landscape plan was not included in the public packet, and they would like time to review it. He said in dealing with all of this, they have had to hire their own landscape architect, Lisa Moulton. He said at the very least, they would like to review this landscape plan with her. He said they don't want this project to get passed piecemeal with coming back to the landscaping later. He read excerpts from a letter he sent earlier today. He said they are against the southwest corner of the Station 8 lot and have redwood trees, oak trees, and open space that serve as a natural buffer between their home and the fire station. He said their front yard and living room windows look directly out toward the fire station. He said in general they don't oppose the fire station making modifications necessary to serve the community, but suggest it makes more sense to place the improvements entirely on the east side. He said it is more difficult, damaging, and impactful to the neighbors' property values on the south and west sides. He indicated that Section 18.64.60 outlines criteria and findings for approval of the architectural and site development review applications. With regard to Finding 4, "Landscaping, screening, and fencing preserve privacy and mitigate adverse effects on neighboring properties," they believe that the physical improvements, coupled with removal of the vegetation and all of the redwood trees will have an adverse effect on their property. He said there is currently a grove of redwoods that will now be parking areas that not only serve the Fire Department, but also a Sheriff's substation which is a complete jump in the intensity of use, resulting in different users and activity. Mr. Schultz said hedges and opaque fencing are not consistent with the design criteria in Portola Valley, where preservation of existing mature trees in a natural setting is. He said landscaping is inextricably linked to the overall project and should not be evaluated in isolation. Because the public has not officially seen these plans 72 hours prior to this meeting, they would ask for a continuation so they have time to review them. He said there has been no screening plan to properly address the increased noise. He said there are chainsaws and horns testing on Sunday mornings, and lots of car-washing. He said they are concerned about the increased noise and parking with the Sheriff involvement. He said Finding 6 says "Night lighting located and fixtures chosen to promote public safety, but minimize effects on adjoining properties." He said while the proposed lighting is dark-sky compatible, the concern is for future parking lot lighting where a light source is elevated. He said they request a prohibition of additional outdoor lighting. He said with the proposed replacement with the grove of redwoods for parking, the interior lighting will no longer be shielded from their property. He said the submitted plans and renderings show the personnel doors and apparatus bay doors have glass windows much larger than the existing windows, in addition to the already large windows that exist between the roofline and the doors. He said those large windows increase light spill considerably, especially with the loss of screening due to the tree removal. He read Finding 7, "Planting and site design mitigate the problems of drainage and soil erosion." Mr. Schultz said they have met multiple times with Fire Department representatives relative to the drainage concerns in the vicinity of their shared property line. He said puddling is common, and overflow onto their property had occurred. He said the letter of October 10, 2019, from NV5 implies that the stormwater is not adequately addressed. He said the notes of the January 2 Conservation Committee meeting note that there is too much impervious surface for the property. He said the staff report does not provide the amount of existing or proposed impervious surface. He said this, coupled with the removal of mature landscaping to accommodate the new bay, ring road, and parking, does not assure them that the site design will mitigate drainage problems and may even exacerbate them. The meeting notes from a

neighborhood meeting indicated they had not provided input relative to what they want, but Mr. Schultz says they have been providing input, requesting that the existing mature vegetation is preserved and that parking and development moved away. He said they are not landscape architects and designers and cannot prepare the plan. Mr. Schultz said the Sheriff substation was not mentioned in the staff report, but such an addition will bring new noise, flashing lights, headlights, idling cars, talking, more parking, public traffic, and potential danger from arrestees or firearms. He said the substation will create a negative impact to the stability of land values and investments. He said their home is a significant investment that will be damaged if a Sheriff is allowed to exist at the fire station. He said it also creates an addition not properly related to their site, which is fire service, and adjacent uses, which is all the residential neighbors. He said it was difficult for them to write this letter because they truly do appreciate the Fire Department, Chief Rob, and all the staff. He said in general, they have been good neighbors, and they want that to continue, and they believe the expansion to service the Fire Department can be accommodated while meeting all the above findings. He said, however, that the current design does not make the required findings. He said they have spoken with the WFPD relative to the expansion, and they have received plans, but it appears much more work is needed on these plans. He said this is premature to be given to the ASCC for review, and they ask for a continuance.

Valerie Baldwin. Ms. Baldwin said her home is directly behind Ramies Garage. She said she is concerned about the outside lights being put into the plan and did not think they were on the plans shown at the neighborhood Zoom meeting. She asked how the lights would be controlled. She said there was a problem when Ron Ramies Garage was built with a skylight atop the garage glowing at night in their backyard. They worked out a deal with Ron to have the lights off by 6:00 p.m. She asked if there could be the same kind of arrangement made here.

Judith Murphy said she hoped the Conservation Committee's formal review of the landscaping plan is not overlooked, which is usually a part of the progress of plans as they work their way through Town. She said it is a fairly small landscaping plan, but she noticed the previous plans all had details about the front, and the current plans say everything stays the same out front, which is a very public front garden on the Scenic Corridor and should be included in the landscaping review. She said in general the Conservation Committee spends more time looking at the tiny details of the landscaping. She said the consideration of a wheels-only path instead of a paved driveway would help mitigate the concern about the amount of impervious coverage and soften the look of things back there.

Jan Mountjoy said she would like to be able to see a more complete plan, especially the landscaping portion. She supports the postponement of a final review and final judgment of the ASCC until the full plans can be reviewed. She was dismayed to find that so little attention has been given to the three neighbors' request to move the parking to the commercial side of the building. She said Chief Rob has mentioned it would be more difficult, because the exit road from the fire station on a call is in that direction and would be against the flow of traffic. She suggested that the traffic be reversed and all the parking be put on the commercial side. She asked if that would cause enormous difficulties. She said she can understand the Schultzes' dismay about how the parking was before and that reducing it by two is a good thing. But how it has been readjusted makes it far worse for her. She said her flag lot has very limited views. She said the front and rear is only 20 feet, and the utility side has 10 feet. She said all of her aesthetic is to that side of the property with a backyard and extensive gardening space, and the parking is right off the area where they would be always outside in the summer. She said they will hear door cars slamming, people talking, radios, etc. She urged them to consider the commercial side of the fire station. She said there is also room for four or five spaces in front of

the building. She said the terrible loss of property values has not been addressed, and she thinks she will suffer in particular with the largest frontage on the property and being closest to the new additions. She said she depends on that privacy screen which currently screens the fire station beautifully and will screen the new apparatus garage perfectly. She said removing that landscaping will put nothing between them, having to wait decades for new plants to provide adequate screening. She said she has spent 40 years growing that privacy screen. She said she is 82 years old and does not have decades to wait for her property to retain some of its value. She said the access road is a nicety and she understands the reason for it but it is not a necessity. She said realtors have told her she will lose a quarter of the value of her property, already being at a disadvantage being a flag lot. She feels strongly that the parking places should be moved from the view area of her property. She said it is not a good place in terms of abutting property, the rural aspect, the noise, the headlight pollution, etc. She also does not like the windows on the new apparatus garage with blasting light spill that will directly affect her. She said path lighting will be a far better solution. She requested a continuance.

Mr. Matlock asked if a Conditional Use Permit had been issued for the Sheriff's Department. Planning & Building Director Russell said a CUP for the Sheriff's Department has not been issued and would need to be considered by the Planning Commission at an upcoming meeting. He asked if the Town would be pushing for the addition for the Sheriff with increased capacity. Planning & Building Director Russell said staff does not have a position on that and has not completed the analysis or drafted findings for the Planning Commission to consider. She said all of that analysis is still upcoming. Mr. Matlock asked if the Town had looked into the retail space for lease around the corner, a 700-square-foot space with a bathroom and great visibility at the corner of Alpine and Portola Road. Planning & Building Director Russell said Town Manager Dennis did respond to the email of November 8 on November 9 to clarify staff's role and position. She said if there is still confusion, staff is happy to discuss it offline, but they do not get involved in private leasing issues.

Mr. Schultz said there were comments about lights being automatically dimmed and low when there is not activity, but he said that is not true at all. He said the photo he provided earlier today is the typical light output of all the windows, which will be increased even more once the new apparatus bay is built. Mr. Schultz said Mr. Wasserman said there would be no staff increases or additional vehicles, yet 13 parking spaces are in the plans, quite an increase from the existing parking. He asked that that be looked at closely. He said there are also two ADA spots listed. He said the electric spot does not need to be marked as ADA and could be used as an additional spot. He said if the Sheriffs are not there, the parking needs would obviously be less.

With no additional public comments, Chair Breen closed the public comment period and returned to the Commission for comments.

Commissioner Sill said it was good to hear from everyone. He said the general plan of adding the apparatus garage and improving the station is reasonable. He would recommend to the Planning Commission that it is okay to exceed the floor area limit in light of the public safety benefit to the community. He said a special condition could be considered that no occupancy of the additional space would be allowed until all of the landscaping, fencing, etc., is completed. He said the height proposed is reasonable for the intended use and was supportive of the general appearance, materials, and finishes. He said a key part will be to preserve as much existing screening as possible to minimize impact. He does not like the rear trash enclosure. He does not like the parking in the rear southwest corner or the extra rear access road. He said it will be incumbent upon the design team to get creative and figure out how to eliminate those items because they are killers for this project. He is concerned about the impervious area and is

disappointed that this is not being addressed at this point. He said the project cannot be recommended without reviewing the numbers for that. He said it does not seem reasonable for the landscape plan to be an add-on with just one or two ASCC members reviewing it at a later date. He was not supportive of the placement of Light Fixture C. He said it is not needed if there is no access road, and he was not supportive of an access road. He was supportive of Light Fixture D and its placement. He said the new landscape plan is an improvement, but still has big issues and needs to be looked at again. He said they don't have a view of the proposed fence which should also be reviewed. He agreed there should be more effort made to look at parking along the Ramies Garage side of the property. He said the Conservation Committee comments are well thought out and should be paid attention to, such as eliminating the gated back driveway and adding more detail to the front landscaping. He said that document includes good suggestions for improvements in the landscape plan. He said there should be more focus on the high impervious surface area and agreed with their tree removal comments. He said the design team needs to be more creative in terms of possibly making the one-way road wider, reversing the direction, trying to think outside the box. He said their proposal is reasonable from their point of view, but very impactful to the neighbors, and the neighbor complaints are valid. He could make Finding 1, 3 and 8. He could not make Finding 2 or 4. He said Finding 5 could be in conflict with Finding 2 and 4. He said Finding 6 is mostly okay, but a couple of the rear fixtures should be eliminated. He said Finding 7 is unclear, and it would be difficult to approve the plan at this point without a better handle on that. He said he is in favor of the basic concept of the proposed changes to the station and addition of a new apparatus garage, but is against the rear access road and locating parking in the southwest corner. He said there should be a new landscape plan with modified roads and parking. He said there is an argument to be made that the Sheriff's substation should be eliminated, which is clearly a significant issue for the neighbors.

Commissioner Wilson said she looked at the General Plan Nathhorst Triangle principles, mainly that nonresidential uses shall not adversely affect nearby residential property; noise, sight, odor, and other nuisances shall be held to a reasonable minimum; structure is designed so that all sides are attractive; and equipment noises and emissions shall be minimized. She said the only finding she can agree with is Finding 8 because she was supportive of the materials and colors. She was against building anything into the setbacks, and this proposal has the access road, the trash enclosure, and the four parking spaces going into it, all having been designed within that 20-foot setback from the property line. She said the Nathhorst Triangle plan said that Alpine and Portola Roads may need to be widened. She said she didn't know if that would cause the neighbors even more concerns or if that is something that could be considered when redoing the plans. Commissioner Wilson said it was odd that the only three trees the neighbor requested being removed are the ones the applicants are saying can stay. She was very concerned about the landscape plan which should be reviewed and studied with the neighbors. Commissioner Wilson was in favor of continuing the discussion at a future meeting. She said a lot more thought needs to be put into compacting and condensing as much as possible so the neighbors are not so adversely affected. Commissioner Wilson said the parking is a moot point at this time because the Planning Commission needs to change the CUP, so she is not sure parking should be considered at this time.

Vice Chair Ross said it sounds like one of the major neighbor concerns is the potential for a Sheriff's substation there. He said he does not understand that as being part of this application. He said as he understands it, it is a concept that has been discussed, but is not in the plans. Vice Chair Ross said he agrees with Commissioner Sill that the building construction is fine, but that the site plan and landscape plans need quite a bit of work. He said even without considerations about changes to the site plan in relation to the vehicle traffic, the status of the

landscape design, buffering fence, irrigation, and site drainage issues are incomplete enough to require a return to the full ASCC. He said there is a bit of a dilemma in that another ASCC review may not even be necessary if issues before the Planning Commission get worked out. He said his recommendation is to move this onto the Planning Commission with the requirement that it come back for another full ASCC review assuming the Planning Commission first works out its issues on the project. He said there is no reason to bring the applicants back to the ASCC after more plan development if the Planning Commission will shoot it down. He said the fastest way to get those issues in front of the Town is to refer it onto the Planning Commission. He said he doesn't think it serves anyone to defer those higher-level considerations for more plan development. He said it can be forwarded for Planning Commission's review with the ASCC's transcript, concerns about the circulation on the site and the buffering and mitigating landscaping with the requirement it come back to ASCC for full review. He said the Schultz' photograph was illustrative of what kind of light one could expect from all of the equipment bays. If this project moves forward, Vice Chair Ross recommended retrofitting a system like the one Mr. Warr described, to control the light from the existing facility or to find some way to mitigate that issue. He said there are certainly requirements for lighting and there may be a shade system available, something to prevent light spill both from the existing facility and the new one. Vice Chair Ross said he understands Chief Lindner's explanation for need of the four parking spaces in the southwest corner, but he suggested those places could be held in reserve and landscaped in the meantime. If there was a need for that overflow parking, those spaces could be developed in a less formal way than the other spaces, possibly a semi-paved, gravel, or grassy area where vehicles could park. He said a set of regular parking spaces could be real problem and suggested they be either moved or held in reserve to see if the requirement actually manifests. Vice Chair Ross said that, except when voting was hosted there, he's never seen the parking lot near full. He said the rear parking spaces have the greatest practical impact on neighboring properties. He said the trash enclosure should not be on the rear property line. Mr. Warr said the garbage is being moved, and they are changing to residential garbage bins. Mr. Ross said he had faith that Geotech and civil engineers will address the site drainage issues adequately.

Chair Breen said she finds it an interesting suggestion to first go to Planning Commission. She said the landscape plan is insufficient with inappropriate screening, and the project definitely needs to come back to the ASCC. She has no problem with exceeding the floor area limits. She said the building is good, but there are too many other problems, including the rear parking spaces, and needs to be reworked. She would love to see the Planning Commission answer these questions and thinks it is the most effective way to proceed. She asked what kind of language should be used to move this forward for the Planning Commission to look at the CUP and then bring it back to the ASCC.

Vice Chair Ross said he is comfortable with a motion with a condition that says the project must return to the ASCC for review before the project moves forward to the Building Permit application phase. He said he is also comfortable stating they are comfortable with the building design issues and the floor area question with some fine tuning to things like windows, lighting controls, exterior lighting, and the circulation and landscaping issues.

Commissioner Sill agreed this is a good approach. Commissioner Wilson asked if this means there will only be one more ASCC meeting about it. She said she did not mention all the little things such as blinds and lights that were relevant because the entire design is a bigger issue with so much more to be done. Chair Breen said the ASCC needs to do a thorough review after the Planning Commission provides their feedback. Vice Chair Ross said if it gets cleared through the hurdles of the Planning Commission, then it is subject to further ASCC review, and

if it is not approvable at that point, or with conditions that might require by review of the full Commission, it is up to the ASCC at that point. He said specifying the number of reviews required isn't necessary at this point. Commissioner Wilson asked if the ASCC will only get one chance to review the project after it comes back from the Planning Commission. Vice Chair Ross said it would default to the normal procedure wherein the ASCC would either not approve it or approve it with conditions.

Planning & Building Director Russell asked Mr. Warr to comment on this suggestion. Mr. Warr said he liked the process. He said this is an important public project, and the mission of the Woodside Fire Protection District is of extraordinary importance to Portola Valley. He does not want to delay the implementation of the improvement project that has been into the Town for approximately a year already. He said the issues being discussed today going to the Planning Commission are extraordinarily important. He said the ASCC should also opine about whether or not the Sheriff should have an office there. He said as an applicant, they are getting mixed messages. From the broader Town, the Sheriff having an office there has been publicly supported; however, at the micro scale with the neighbors, it is very clearly not supported at all. He said maybe it goes to the Planning Commission at this point and does not receive an approval, but a recommendation they could make those findings, then come back and resolve all of the issues with the ASCC, and then go back to the Planning Commission to finalize is something that has been a pretty normal process in Portola Valley's history. He said he is happy to take the project as is to the Planning Commission where there are still moving elements, but with ASCC's support for the program of the project and the concept of potentially having that parking in reserve.

Mr. Warr asked if the District found they had a larger storage need, if the apparatus bay addition turned into a two-bay addition, instead of having the drive-around, if the ASCC would still support that program. Instead of stopping 18 feet from the setback, they would continue the bay to the setback. Commissioner Sill said he would have a difficult time supporting that because of the impact to the rear neighbors. Commissioner Wilson would have a problem with that and also has a problem with the current plan. Commissioner Sill said the findings require that they consider impact on neighbors. Mr. Warr said he's not trying to be argumentative, but suggests there may be two things that would be parked outside that would not be parked inside with an extra bay. He said he's thinking about all of these things and trying to develop a pattern of solutions. He said they don't want a lot of parking in front of the building and are trying to eliminate parking in the corners where there is open space so he's trying to figure out how and where to put these things. The wall of the building, whether it's 20 feet or 38 feet, is close to the same thing. Commissioner Sill disagreed and said it is not close to the same thing. Mr. Warr said the redwoods could remain. Commissioner Sill said the presented plan was that the redwoods would be removed. Mr. Warr said he is indulging the ASCC to try to talk about some things that could potentially be adjusted going forward because he doesn't have an application that says any of these things yet.

Vice Chair Ross moved to refer this project to the Planning Commission for consideration of the relevant issues before them with general support from the ASCC for the building program, the building design, and exceedance of the floor area as required for the building design, noting that the ASCC would have difficulty making several of the findings at this point, and, assuming that the project gets passed through the Planning Commission, it returns to the ASCC for consideration of the revised application based on today's discussion. Seconded by Commissioner Sill; the motion carried 3-1 with Commissioner Wilson voting nay.

Commissioner Wilson said she is opposed because there are so many elements of the design

that are wrong that she is loathe to send it to the Planning Commission because she doesn't know what they could do with it, apart from deciding on institutional and parking. Commissioner Sill said those are the two key things – if they will approve the floor area and parking requirements. Commissioner Wilson said if the Planning Commission does approve that, there is no answer to the neighbors who are very upset about something they feel is being forced through. Commissioner Sill said the applicants need to come back to the ASCC with a plan the ASCC can approve. Commissioner Wilson said normally, their last meeting would be finessing small items like a light bulb or adding automatic blinds; however, this project has large design flaws in a number of areas. Commissioner Sill said all the Planning Commission will evaluate the floor area and parking. Commissioner Wilson said there is the access road, the trash enclosure, the extra parking. Commissioner Sill said that is the ASCC's purview, not the Planning Commission. He said he agrees those are all messed up, but are not Planning Commission issues. He said the ASCC does not need to look at those things if the Planning Commission says they will not even approve the floor area. He said this is to make sure the Planning Commission goes along with the big issues, and then the design team needs to know how many parking spaces they need to have. He doesn't want Mr. Warr to work at figuring out how to put 13 parking spaces if Planning Commission will require 16 or 8. He said the ASCC cannot move forward if the Planning Commission does not approve the floor area. The design team cannot move forward with parking if they don't know how many spaces the Planning Commission will require. Those two issues need to be resolved prior to the ASCC making decisions.

Chair Breen moved the minutes up on the agenda as she recused herself from Agenda Item #2.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(5) ASCC Meeting of October 26, 2020

Commissioner Sill moved to approve the October 26, 2020, minutes as submitted. Seconded by Commissioner Wilson, the motion passed 4-0.

(2) Architectural review of an application for a new trellis in the outdoor seating area, 3915 Alpine Road, Hunter 1988 Revokable Trust, File #PLN ARCH3-2020

Chair Breen recused herself.

Planning & Building Director Russell presented the proposal, as detailed in the staff report. She described the background, the project description, discussion items and findings. Staff recommended the ASCC review the requested Architectural Review of a trellis with seasonal cover at the existing Alpine Inn restaurant, with the recommended conditions of approval.

Vice Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Ross invited comments by the applicant.

Deke Hunter said the tent originally was to be made in Wuhan, China, but the tent never came so they rented a tent last year. He said they have submitted a revised lighting plan, making all the recommended adjustments. He said the trellis will have an historic look, is modest in size, fits within the setback, allows them to hang lights aiming down, and allows them to hang heaters aiming down. They propose to seasonally use a corrugated metal roof consistent with what is on the shed buildings to provide some protection from weather. He said with COVID, they could not even use the tent this year, and they would be forced to close. He said the town has just lost

another restaurant last week with the Portola Valley Kitchen closing. He said this modest trellis will allow them to keep approximately one-third of their seating and the beer garden covered when the heavier rains come, gives protection from the sun, and allows them to address the other detailed initiatives.

Vice Chair Ross invited questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sill asked if there was any significance to the 90-day time. Mr. Hunter said they just picked that number randomly, and he would prefer 120 days. Commissioner Wilson asked staff if there would be any issue extending the time to 120 days. Planning & Building Director Russell said there would not, but the Commission may want to consider issues of impervious surface and trying to limit impervious surfaces in the area. She said it is a balance for the ASCC to strike for what they think is appropriate.

Vice Chair Ross asked if the water runoff from the temporary cover would simply go onto the ground. Mr. Hunter said that, for ADA reasons, even with the decking under the trellis, it is spaced as such that it sits over drain rock and is also considered pervious surface. Last year with the tent, or even now, there is a French drain around the storage, and it has all absorbed into the beer garden. He said they are not looking to add any additional impervious surface. He said when the rain falls off of the corrugated roof, it will tie into the French drain, which is basically a drywell drain.

Vice Chair Ross invited comments from the public. Hearing none, Vice Chair Ross brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Wilson said the proposal is a good design solution. She would hate to see money wasted putting up and taking down a tent every year. She agreed with Commissioner Sill's suggestion to provide the option of up to 120 days because all businesses need as much help as possible right now. She was supportive of the proposal.

Commissioner Sill said it is an incredibly good solution. He said it is far superior to the tent. He said the outfit running the Alpine Inn has been completely professional, and this is a creative solution that meets the setbacks and makes sense. He likes the way the heaters work. He was supportive of the lighting plan. He said it is a great way to keep a valuable town resource operating year-round.

Vice Chair Ross agreed with the other Commissioners. He said this proposal is a very fine solution to the need. He said this will probably be more opaque and in those instances when it is fully lit and the roof is in place, that will cut down on light spill even more than the tent solution. He appreciates the downlighting aspect of the trellis. He said they discussed downlights hanging from trees last time, which is something he would not support. He said this is a very elegant solution and he was supportive of the project.

Commissioner Sill moved to approve the proposal for a trellis with seasonal cover at the existing Alpine Inn restaurant, with staff's recommended conditions of approval, and the adjustment that the corrugated roofing may be used up to 120 days per year instead of 90. Seconded by Commissioner Wilson; the motion carried 3-0.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(3) Commission Reports

Vice Chair Ross is in the process of conducting additional project review for the revised landscape plan at 848 and 850 Portola Road.

Planning & Building Director Russell and Chair Breen conducted a staff discretionary review of an ADU at Paso del Arroyo and Portola Road. Chair Breen had initially made some recommendations about reducing access to the Scenic Corridor. They had a very productive meeting and the applicants reduced the path and lighting that would have been out to the Scenic Corridor, and the ADU was approved with those conditions.

(4) Staff Report

Planning & Building Director Russell said that on October 6 they discussed conceptual reviews and a process to go to the meeting of Mayor and Chairs. She said staff thought about that a bit more and preferred to have a test run of this proposal so they can see how it might work and help them develop more procedure and policy. She said staff offered a completely optional conceptual review before ASCC, and there are three projects that accepted the offer. They are aware they are the test projects that will be heard on December 7 at a special meeting. The projects will be 77 Palmer, 85 Palmer, and 35 Possum. She said they will generate a brief staff cover memo, explaining what they know so far about the project in terms of compliance with the development standards and will share any staff questions or issues and applicant question or issues. Staff will then bring that feedback to the meeting of Mayor and Chairs and propose an actual process moving forward.

Planning & Building Director Russell said there have been a number of questions coming through ASCC members and residents regarding 880 Westridge. Staff offered them the conceptual design review as well, but they contacted staff and indicated they are not pursuing a project at this time. Planning & Building Director Russell said her understanding is that the project is on hold. She said if it comes back in, they will regroup, but are not expecting it to come forward to the ASCC any time soon.

Planning & Building Director Russell said there was an interest expressed about seeing a project list so the ASCC knows what projects are upcoming. She said staff is working on that now and that project list will be provided to the ASCC on a regular basis, which will let the ASCC and the residents know about active upcoming projects.

Commissioner Wilson said a few years ago they had a pre-conceptual site visit on two properties on Wayside. She said this has been in this system, but nobody has asked for it in the last couple of years.

Commissioner Wilson asked if December 7 will be the only meeting in December. Planning & Building Director Russell was not yet sure if there would be a meeting December 14.

ADJOURNMENT [6:42 p.m.]