

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Carol Borck  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 8:13 AM  
**To:** Dylan Parker  
**Subject:** FW: Forwarding - Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

---

**From:** Town Center <TownCenter@portolavalley.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 7:55 AM  
**To:** PlanBuild <planbuild@portolavalley.net>; Portola Valley - Planning <planning@portolavalley.net>; Laura Russell <lrussell@portolavalley.net>  
**Subject:** Forwarding - Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

---

**From:** Sam Schillace  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 11, 2021 5:15 PM  
**To:** Town Center <[TownCenter@portolavalley.net](mailto:TownCenter@portolavalley.net)>  
**Subject:** Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

Hi,

I would like to comment on the proposed new Priory CUP discussion that's happening this coming Wednesday. A short summary: there are significant noise concerns with this proposal that need to be addressed.

I've been a resident at 16 Portola Green Circle since 1998. The Priory has been a good neighbor for most of that time, but there has been a steady increase in the activity, and most importantly, the noise and traffic in recent years. There are regularly loud events - parties essentially - they are both more frequent and louder than in previous years. I have not measured these directly, but a neighbor, Craig Herberer, has, and will be providing more specific data. On numerous occasions the noise from the Priory has appeared to violate the local noise ordinance.

It should be pointed out that while many of the events that happen seem appropriate to an educational setting (graduations, pep rallies during the day, etc), the large amplified parties at night with light shows seem in conflict both with the Priory's educational mission and the local, rural character we all cherish.

In the spirit of being a good neighbor, we haven't been complaining when this happens, but it has been getting frequent and bad enough that I've come close on a few occasions. It's been particularly frustrating during the past few years of working at home - I take executive meetings from my house, and my wife teaches music, and there are multiple instances of this being disrupted, as well as several instances of loud noise (itself a violation) going well past 10pm (another violation).

Given this behavior, and the increase in frequency of these events, it's hard to have confidence that an expanded Priory is going to have a positive impact on the surrounding residents. I understand that the recently approved CUP for Spring Ridge Winery has continuous monitoring for noise, and strict noise requirements. At a minimum, this should be a requirement here - this is a far larger, and far noisier neighbor. It would be hard to understand why the town wouldn't require and enforce these same requirements for this business.

We moved here 23 years ago to live in a quiet, rural setting. The Priory seems to be on a never ending quest to expand and change the surrounding character of the town. If they can add students without significantly adding to their impact, that's fine. But at this point, we feel it's necessary and appropriate to have some strong protections in place for the

neighborhoods around them. I'm very concerned that without those conditions as part of the CUP, this issue will only get worse for everyone.

Sam Schillace

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Tom Sabel  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 10:59 AM  
**To:** Dylan Parker  
**Cc:** Craig Hughes; Sarah Wernikoff  
**Subject:** Woodside Priory CUP

Hello Planning Department,

We are writing to comment on the proposed Woodside Priory CUP. In particular, we (and neighbors who use the Sausal Trail) are concerned by the Priory's recent erection of a fence around their baseball field. We do not believe this fence is in the spirit of engagement with the town or with the maintenance of the rural character of Portola Valley.

It is our understanding that this fence was erected without permits and without consultation with the town planning department. We recognize the Priory's right to fence a baseball field and to support their students. However the opaque fabric placed on the fence creates a "construction site" look, and is not aligned with Portola Valley fencing guidelines. While not experts on the fence code, the fence does run next to the Sausal Trail, and large, opaque fences adjacent to trails are contrary to Town fencing code.

Given that the Priory is asking for an expansion of the CUP we believe that adherence to Town fence policies be included in the CUP. At the least the school should have to file permits and not act first and ask permission later.

Thank you for considering our point of view.

Best regards,  
Tom Sabel and Jill Helms  
15 Los Charros Lane

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Emily Melton  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2021 12:49 PM  
**To:** Dylan Parker  
**Cc:** Brian Melton  
**Subject:** Planning Committee Meeting: Woodside Priory neighbor comments

Portola Valley Planning Commissioners:

Our property borders the east side of the Woodside Priory Campus, and many local students use a trail easement on our property to walk to the school. We have reviewed the amendments to the CUP and Overall Master Plan Map, and are supportive of the school's plans. As 20+ year residents of the Town, we believe the Priory is a significant asset to our community. We wish them the best in their proposed expansion plans.

Regards,

Emily and Brian Melton

40 Antonio Court

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Laura Russell  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2021 2:27 PM  
**To:** Dylan Parker  
**Subject:** FW: Forwarding - Comments - Amendments to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and Master Plan – Priory School

---

**From:** Town Center <TownCenter@portolavalley.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 1:38 PM  
**To:** Portola Valley - Planning <planning@portolavalley.net>; Laura Russell <lrussell@portolavalley.net>  
**Subject:** Forwarding - Comments - Amendments to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and Master Plan – Priory School

---

**From:** Craig Heberer  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 1:31 PM  
**To:** Town Center <[TownCenter@portolavalley.net](mailto:TownCenter@portolavalley.net)>  
**Subject:** Comments - Amendments to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and Master Plan – Priory School

To: Portola Valley Planning Commissioners:  
Jon Goulden, Judith Hasko, Nicholas Targ, Vice-Chair Anne Kopf-Sill, Chair Craig Taylor

Date: December 13, 2021

### **Re: Comments - Amendments to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and Master Plan – Priory School**

Dear Portola Valley Planning Commissioners:

Below are my comments and request regarding the Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and Master Plan.

#### Comments:

While I agree with the many members of our community that there are numerous good things about the Woodside Priory School (Priory), I am concerned that the proposed amendments to their Conditional Use Permit (CUP) will have negative effects of increased traffic and increased noise. My primary concern is the problem with noise.

My wife and I have been a part of Portola Valley since 2005. We cherish the community and beauty of Portola Valley. We live southwest of Woodside Priory across Portola Road. When we first moved here, and for many years after, the Priory was generally a rather quiet neighbor. There

was the occasional disturbing and excessive noise, however, it was infrequent enough to be overlooked. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case.

In the last 2 to 3 years the noise from the Priory has become more frequent and excessive. In the last year, the Priory has emitted noises of amplified voice and amplified music many times. Of the occurrences of annoying, excessive and disturbing noise, eleven instances of amplified voices and/or amplified music were severe enough for me to take specific note. Particularly notable was an incident that occurred Friday October 22, 2021, between approximately 7:30 pm and 9:30 pm involving excessively loud amplified music accompanied by a sort of light show.

Referring to the noise ordinance, Title 9 Public Peace, Morals and Welfare, Chapter 9.10 Noise Control, these appear to be violations. I realize that it is possible that the Priory is not aware of the noise ordinance and the recent amendments to section 9.10.070. Nevertheless, recent behavior indicates an unfortunate and growing problem with noise.

Request:

Without some specific wording in the Priory's CUP regarding adherence to the noise ordinance and / or requiring measuring, monitoring, and reporting of noise, I'm quite concerned that the problem with noise will continue and may become worse especially with the requested increase in student population in the proposed amendments to the CUP.

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission explore including conditions to the Priory's proposed amended CUP, similar to those introduced recently in the CUP for Spring Ridge Winery regarding noise monitoring that allow for noise levels to be objectively monitored and reported (Ref. 1).

While I don't know if including such conditions in the Priory's CUP will be agreed to, I am confident the community of Portola Valley, the Planning Commission and the Priory can find a good solution to the problem of annoying, excessive and disturbing noise generated by the Priory.

I look forward to the opportunity to engage in that process.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Craig Heberer

**Ref. 1**

Spring Ridge Winery, Spring Ridge LLC, 555 Portola Road, File # PLAN\_USE 4-2018, Exhibit B, TERMS AND CONDITIONS, Town of Portola Valley, Amended Conditional Use Permits X7D-151, SPRING RIDGE LLC (NEELY/MYERS) 555 PORTOLA ROAD, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER: 076-340-110, Additional Conditions of Approval: #20, and #32

20. The applicant shall provide a quarterly report to Town Staff for the first two years of tasting room and event operation. The report shall be directly linked to the metrics outlined in the CUP approval including visitor data, noise monitoring, and household private events. The form of the report shall be determined by the Planning and Building Director in consultation with two Planning Commissioners. The reports will be available to the public on the Town's website and considered as part of Planning Commission's reviews of the project.

32. Noise monitoring. The applicant shall retain a professional noise consultant approved by Planning staff to measure the noise during the first nighttime event and report the findings to the Planning and Building Director. The applicant shall acquire noise monitor equipment and self-monitor noise from nighttime events at the property lines to the north and east for first two years of tasting room and event operations. Events shall be adjusted as needed to comply with the Town's noise regulations. The Town retains the right to conduct independent noise monitoring at any time.

<https://www.portolavalley.net/home/showpublisheddocument/15402/637733650910370000>

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** Laura Russell  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2021 2:27 PM  
**To:** Dylan Parker  
**Subject:** FW: Forwarding - Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

---

**From:** Town Center <TownCenter@portolavalley.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 7:55 AM  
**To:** PlanBuild <planbuild@portolavalley.net>; Portola Valley - Planning <planning@portolavalley.net>; Laura Russell <lrussell@portolavalley.net>  
**Subject:** Forwarding - Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

---

**From:** Sam Schillace  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 11, 2021 5:15 PM  
**To:** Town Center <[TownCenter@portolavalley.net](mailto:TownCenter@portolavalley.net)>  
**Subject:** Comment on upcoming Priory CUP

Hi,

I would like to comment on the proposed new Priory CUP discussion that's happening this coming Wednesday. A short summary: there are significant noise concerns with this proposal that need to be addressed.

I've been a resident at 16 Portola Green Circle since 1998. The Priory has been a good neighbor for most of that time, but there has been a steady increase in the activity, and most importantly, the noise and traffic in recent years. There are regularly loud events - parties essentially - they are both more frequent and louder than in previous years. I have not measured these directly, but a neighbor, Craig Herberer, has, and will be providing more specific data. On numerous occasions the noise from the Priory has appeared to violate the local noise ordinance.

It should be pointed out that while many of the events that happen seem appropriate to an educational setting (graduations, pep rallies during the day, etc), the large amplified parties at night with light shows seem in conflict both with the Priory's educational mission and the local, rural character we all cherish.

In the spirit of being a good neighbor, we haven't been complaining when this happens, but it has been getting frequent and bad enough that I've come close on a few occasions. It's been particularly frustrating during the past few years of working at home - I take executive meetings from my house, and my wife teaches music, and there are multiple instances of this being disrupted, as well as several instances of loud noise (itself a violation) going well past 10pm (another violation).

Given this behavior, and the increase in frequency of these events, it's hard to have confidence that an expanded Priory is going to have a positive impact on the surrounding residents. I understand that the recently approved CUP for Spring Ridge Winery has continuous monitoring for noise, and strict noise requirements. At a minimum, this should be a requirement here - this is a far larger, and far noisier neighbor. It would be hard to understand why the town wouldn't require and enforce these same requirements for this business.

We moved here 23 years ago to live in a quiet, rural setting. The Priory seems to be on a never ending quest to expand and change the surrounding character of the town. If they can add students without significantly adding to their impact, that's fine. But at this point, we feel it's necessary and appropriate to have some strong protections in place for the



neighborhoods around them. I'm very concerned that without those conditions as part of the CUP, this issue will only get worse for everyone.

Sam Schillace

## Dylan Parker

---

**From:** caroline Vertongen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2021 10:55 AM  
**To:** Town Center; Dylan Parker  
**Subject:** Woodside Priory and public safety

Dear Chair Taylor and Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you again for your time and efforts representing and protecting our community.

Our governing documents were established so that we, PV residents, make decisions to protect our values, our rural character, and the general welfare of our residents.

Unfortunately over the last few years consultants and staff have been hired to change that process. They provide you with statements and studies that do not reflect the reality.

That brings me to the issues I would like address in this letter.

I find it concerning that the Neely Project was amended stating:

**WHEREAS, Hexagon Transportation Consultants prepared a traffic analysis for the project dated June 7, 2021, which was considered and analyzed by the Bicycle Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Committee at its October 6, 2021 meeting-**

**Moreover, the traffic consultant testified at the hearing that the VMT analysis for the project was based on an overall annual projection and that shifting the Sunday trips to Wednesday as proposed as a compromise by certain neighbors would not have an impact on the traffic analysis;**

As confirmed through the minutes of October 6, 2021, BPTS allowed the public to share concerns, but the BPTS did not analyze the traffic analysis by Hexagon Transportation and we do not know at what meeting the traffic consultant testified, but it definitely was not on October 6, 2021.

Now you are reviewing the CUP for Woodside Priory.

I find it very concerning that Traffic Consultant Krupka's **professional opinion is that the proposed CUP Amendment will not be substantial relative to existing local street traffic volumes and site parking supply.**

Residents have reported our concerns for increased traffic and increased safety concerns at the main entrance of Woodside Priory School, since 2013.

If I may remind the Planning Commission, Town Counsel Silver, staff and applicant that in 2017 parents again raised safety concerns for the crossings by Woodside Priory, Corte Madera, and the intersection of Alpine and Portola Road.

The Town of Portola Valley approved a traffic study and approved a substantial budget to make the improvements. There were several community meetings to discuss the traffic and public safety issues. Krupka Consulting was hired to conduct a detailed traffic study to improve the public safety for pedestrians and bikers for the Town of Portola Valley.

Krupka Consulting presented his proposal during the Town Council meeting in August 2019. We, residents, who walk, drive, run and cross these roads every day did not agree with many ideas proposed by Krupka Consulting and provided detailed modifications during that Town Council meeting and have done at other meetings including the BPTS meetings.

Since 2019 we have continued to inquire about any progress, we continued to provide solutions, yet nothing except for re-painting some cross walks and adding the very effective flag system, none of our concerns have been addressed.

Woodside Priory added its multifamily housing project and uses the entrance at Gambetta lane for drop off. Again no traffic analysis was done prior to building that project.

Woodside Priory now has 2 entrances that are very dangerous for bikers and pedestrians. We have addressed the issues since 2013, again in 2017, and again 2019 until now in 2021.

The traffic in and out of Woodside Priory does not only create traffic backups, it also encourages drivers to bypass off the road impacting the safety of bikers and pedestrians. Furthermore drivers never stop and look for the pedestrians and bikers crossing the entrances before entering and exiting the driveway. The stop sign at the main entrance does not allow drivers to see the traffic coming from the left and the right; there is no space in the middle of the road for "safely" merging onto Portola Road and/or entering Woodside Priory; the sun often blinds the driver exiting the driveways, and there is a bus halt sign right by the main entrance that should be relocated.

Residents have taken the time to present solutions, but we continue to be ignored.

As we have stated during the last Planning Commission meeting on December 1, 2021, **the newly proposed amendment for Woodside Priory does have serious implications for many residents in town.** This project will again increase traffic and impose more public safety concerns.

I would like to urge Town Counsel Silver, staff and Commissioners to review the traffic study done by Krupka Consulting, review the updates that have been implemented since 2019, and evaluate his professional opinion released for this project.

We hope that the Planning Commission will review all relevant documents and draft requirements that will benefit our public safety and the interests of our community before approving this newly proposed projects for Woodside Priory.

Thank you,

Caroline Vertongen  
100 Palmer lane