

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Dylan Parker  
**Sent:** Monday, May 10, 2021 1:25 PM  
**To:** Al Sill; David Ross; Jane Wilson; kenny c; megan koch; Sarah Wernikoff; Anne Kopf-Sill  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on 135 Portola

Hi All,

Forward public comments received after packet distribution.

Regards,

Dylan Parker (preferred pronouns: he/him/his) Assistant Planner

Town of Portola Valley  
Tel: 650.851.1700 Ext. 230  
[www.portolavalley.net](http://www.portolavalley.net)

Follow us:

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carol Borck <[CBorck@portolavalley.net](mailto:CBorck@portolavalley.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 10, 2021 7:16 AM  
**To:** Dylan Parker <[dparker@portolavalley.net](mailto:dparker@portolavalley.net)>; Laura Russell <[lrussell@portolavalley.net](mailto:lrussell@portolavalley.net)>  
**Cc:** Judith Murphy <[jammurr123@gmail.com](mailto:jammurr123@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on 135 Portola

Hello Dylan & Laura,

Comments from Judy Murphy for tonight's meeting.

Carol

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Judith Murphy [<mailto:jammurr123@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 09, 2021 7:46 PM  
**To:** Carol Borck  
**Subject:** Comments on 135 Portola

Please pass on the following comments to ASCC:

We are neighbors who were mailed the Notice of the ASCC meeting regarding the renovations of fire station #8. This notice arrived Thursday, May 6, after the deadline for including comments in the agenda package.

The building improvements are needed and well designed and we enthusiastically support.

But the current landscaping and parking proposal is very problematic. Most worrisome - there is NO MENTION of scenic corridor in the staff report. Surely this should be taken into consideration.

The need for parking has been overestimated. It has been increased from the original submission of the plans. An unusually large impermeable coverage is understandably needed for this site to accommodate the large engines, but should not be enlarged beyond what is actually necessary. Personnel overlap that occurs for 1 hour every other day has driven the request for an additional, always present 5 places, and that much extra loss of open ground.

The parking has been moved from the original design and subsequently crafted solely to answer concerns of 2 neighbors, with inadequate attention to the interests of the general public. To move it up front wipes out the vegetated separation of the buildings from the road, sacrifices a majestic old redwood and a native plant garden. It will not be difficult to provide good screening between the parking in the back and the flag lot house.

Staff's report contains an error - there is no planting buffer between front road/parking and driveway other than a 1 foot strip under the fence.

There is a claim that the front driveway is needed for easy egress - but all equipment is parked behind behind this proposed driveway, and is in drive through bays.

Thank you,

Robert Murphy  
Judith Murphy  
8 Portola Green Circle

9 May 2021

Dear ASCC Commissioners:

Ten years ago we purchased our home, specifically choosing Portola Valley to enjoy the rural, quiet, outdoor lifestyle that it offers. For the last two years we have worked with the WFPD and Town Staff to ensure that the improvements the WFPD is making to meet their needs does not adversely affect the enjoyment of our home and its property value.

### ***Parking***

We strongly feel that the design team has created an ideal solution by relocating parking to its present position. This solves many key issues:

1. Lessens the impact of the large increases in floor space, impervious surface, and intensity of use on the surrounding neighbors. It maintains the rear and sides of the property as a buffer zone between the Station's institutional use and the neighbors' residential use
2. Enables a safe turnaround for Fire Department vehicles
3. Prevents further drainage issues on the west and rear sides of the property

In addition, the front parking location is consistent with the other properties of the Nathhorst Triangle Plan. To move any parking--with its noise, lights, exhaust, and drainage issues--further back into the property would be folly and something we are strongly against.

### ***Landscaping***

Since our home looks directly into the area where many large redwoods will be replaced with a new driveway and apparatus bay, we would request several redwoods be replanted and that some taller plants such as Saratoga Laurel be added to the screening mix to replace the lost tree canopy. And because we would need screening immediately we ask that the plants installed are sized to reach maturity in 3 years.

### ***We would ask the Commission to require as conditions of approval:***

1. Taller trees be added to the screening mix
2. Several redwoods be planted near the proposed shed location
3. Plants to be installed are sized to reach maturity in 3 years
4. The health and effectiveness of the landscape screening be evaluated by Town Staff after 2 years and 5 years. Plants that are not performing well would be replaced by the WFPD.

Without these conditions we feel that the project does not meet findings #2, #6, and #7. We hope we can work together with WFPD's landscape architect to improve and arrive at a mutually beneficial landscape plan.

In closing, we thank the WFPD for the collaborative approach it has taken in addressing the expansion. It has been a good neighbor for ten years. The requests in

this letter are intended to allow us to continue to enjoy the property we worked so hard to obtain while allowing the Fire Department to continue providing necessary services to the Town.

Sincerely,  
Bob and Suzanne Schultz