



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, June 11, 2012
Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., 274 Corte Madera Field session for *preliminary* consideration of architectural review plans for residential redevelopment of a Brookside Park area property. (ASCC review to continue at Regular Meeting)

7:30 PM - REGULAR AGENDA*

1. Call to Order:

2. Roll Call: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch, Warr

3. Oral Communications:

Persons wishing to address the Commission on any subject, not on the agenda, may do so now. Please note, however, the Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion or action tonight on items not on the agenda.

4. Old Business:

a. Architectural Review For Changes To Original Exterior Lighting Plan, 120 Golden Hills Drive, Rubin

5. New Business:

a. Preliminary Review, Architectural Review For Residential Redevelopment, 274 Corte Madera Road, Byrne/Dickerson

6. Report On Portola Road Corridor Plan, Progress of Taskforce Work And Next Steps

7. Approval of Minutes: May 29, 2012

8. Adjournment

*For more information on the projects to be considered by the ASCC at the Special Field and Regular meetings, as well as the scope of reviews and actions tentatively anticipated, please contact Carol Borck in the Planning Department at Portola Valley Town Hall, 650-851-1700 ex. 211. Further, the start times for other than the first Special Field meeting are tentative and dependent on the actual time needed for the preceding Special Field meeting.

PROPERTY OWNER ATTENDANCE. The ASCC strongly encourages a property owner whose application is being heard by the ASCC to attend the ASCC meeting. Often issues arise that only

property owners can responsibly address. In such cases, if the property owner is not present it may be necessary to delay action until the property owner can meet with the ASCC.

WRITTEN MATERIALS. Any writing or documents provided to a majority of the Town Council or Commissions regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Town Hall located 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA during normal business hours.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Technician at 650-851-1700, extension 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge a proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

This Notice is Posted in Compliance with the Government Code of the State of California.

Date: June 8, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: June 7, 2011
RE: Agenda for June 11, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: The June 11th meeting will begin with a special field session for preliminary consideration of architectural review plans for residential redevelopment of a Brookside Park area property. The site meeting will be at 274 Corte Madera Road and start at 4:00 p.m. The proposal is discussed below under agenda item **5a. Byrne/Dickerson.**

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the ASCC agenda.

4a. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR CHANGES TO ORIGINAL EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN, 120 GOLDEN HILLS DRIVE, RUBIN

This request is for approval of plans for exterior yard and driveway lighting beyond that allowed for with the original 2007 approval of plans for residential development of this, then vacant, Oak Hills subdivision property (see attached vicinity map). The new lighting proposal is explained in the attached June 5, 2012 letter from project architect Robert Stoecker and shown on the enclosed "**Exterior Site Lighting**" plan dated 5/10/12 prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects Incorporated.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC consider and act on this request.

- 1. Background, lighting issues, neighbor and Oak Hills Homeowners Association input.** In 2007 the ASCC approved plans for new residential development of the subject property. These plans were for the previous owner/developer and were also prepared by Stoecker and Northway. The lighting plans approved with the project were minimal and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting. In 2010, after the 2007 approved project was implemented, the ASCC approved plans for an entry "bollard" gate system for the site. These plans were for the current owner/applicant and were also prepared by Stoecker and Northway. These plans too have been implemented and will be available for reference at the ASCC meeting as needed.

As noted in the June 5th letter from Mr. Stoecker, more recently, considerable exterior lighting was added at the site without any further town review or approval. Some of this lighting, i.e., tree up lighting, has been removed, however, considerable yard and driveway lighting remain. This extends over the subject property and along the driveway on the parcel to the east, now also owned by the applicant. The driveway is a joint facility serving both parcels and this joint driveway access was established when the parcels were approved for subdivision by the town. Since the adjoining parcel was purchased by the applicant, the original house on it has been demolished,

The proposal letter explains the enclosed 5/10/12 site lighting plan. It discusses the existing lights the applicant requests be approved for retention and those that are proposed for removal. The letter and plan also discusses levels of illumination and how these relate to town standards.

The lighting proposed to be retained is around the house, along the driveway and along a west side pathway. The 6/5 letter explains the intent of the lighting and adjustments that have been made to control potential for off-site spill.

Neighbor concerns over site lighting are noted in the attached June 6, 2012 letter from Ulrich Aldag, 909 Westridge Drive. The letter and previous comments from this neighbor have shared concerns over the "bright concert parking area."

Attached in a May 23, 2012 email from Dennis DeBroeck offering the Oak Hills HOA position on the proposal. As noted in the email, the HOA is choosing not to comment at this time and is relying on the ASCC to consider and act on the plans in conformity with town standards and policies. We have informed the HOA of Monday's ASCC meeting.

2. **Suggestions for ASCC review process and need for night evaluation.** We have discussed the proposal with Mr. Stoecker and we concur that the best way to address the request is with an evening site visit where the actual lighting can be judged in terms of the applicant's needs, off-site light spill and town standards. Bulbs can be removed or other actions taken to extinguish the illumination from the lights to be eliminated and the lights proposed to remain can be considered along with switching patterns and controls and the lights that are on the residence. The residence lighting is also identified on the enclosed lighting plan. From simply looking at the plan, it would seem that the total number of lights to remain exceed what town standards and policies would normally support, but a site inspection would be the best way to fairly consider the applicants request.

With respect to the site meeting, the applicant has expressed concern over security, as also sheared with the ASCC when the bollard gate plan was being considered. He would prefer that a subcommittee of two ASCC members, along with the town planner and project architect conduct the evening review rather than the full ASCC at a noticed public site session. One option would be for the ASCC to delegate the site review to two members, as suggested, and have this ASCC subcommittee report its recommendations back to the full ASCC for final consideration and action at the next June meeting. Alternatively, the subcommittee could be delegated the authority to conduct the site meeting and complete action on the plan and report the final action

to the full ASCC. The first option, however, seems more appropriate in this case as it would ensure that the public, including the HOA, is fully aware of any anticipated action and would have the chance to comment on it before any action is taken.

Prior to deciding on how to proceed with final review of this request, ASCC members should consider the above comments and any new information presented at the June 11th meeting.

5a. PRELIMINARY REVIEW, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, 274 CORTE MADERA ROAD, BYRNE/DICKERSON

This is a preliminary review of this proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject .48-acre Brookside Park area property. The parcel currently contains a vacant single level, traditional Ranch style residence with attached garage and carport, what appears to be an attached guest unit area. The parcel location and general area conditions are shown on the attached vicinity map. The project proposes demolition of the existing house and most other existing site improvements. In addition, most existing ornamental landscaping around the existing residence, particularly between the house and street, would be removed, but the parcel includes a number of significant oaks and these will all be protected.

A new, partial two-story residence would replace the existing house and would be located in much the same place as the current residence. The new building would be of a flat roof contemporary design, have an attached two-car garage and contain a total area of 3,496 sf, or 92.6% of the permitted floor area. Thus, the house would exceed the 85% limit of 3,208 sf by 288 sf. This proposed concentration of floor area is only possible subject to the ASCC making the findings required by Section 18.48.020 of the zoning ordinance (copy attached). The required findings are evaluated later in this report.

In addition to the new house, the plans also propose a detached 278 sf cabana. This is to be located in the rear yard area along with a spa and spa deck, and other outdoor use areas. Most of the rear yard, however, would be treated to preserve the oak and meadow character and measures will be taken to enhance the oak trees.

The project is shown on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated April 30, 2012 and prepared by Feldman Architecture:

- Sheet G.00, Project Info
- Sheet G.01, Build it Green Checklist
- Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, 3/13/12
- Sheet L1.00, Landscape Site Plan, Peter Rosekrans
- Sheet A1.00, Site Plan
- Sheet A2.00, First Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.01, Second Floor Plan
- Sheet A2.02, Roof Plan
- Sheet A2.03, Cabana Plans
- Sheet A3.00, East and West Elevations (front and rear)
- Sheet A3.01, South and North Elevations (left and right sides)

Sheet A3.02, Patio Elevations
Sheet A3.03, Cabana Elevations

In addition to these plans, the project architect and civil engineer have provided the attached letter, and 5/9/12 calculations defining the grading for the project at 90 cubic yards. This is relatively small amount of earthwork, and site development review permit and approval will be under the authority of the public works director. Further, building permit plans will be reviewed by public works and the town geologist.

Also submitted as part of the application are the following materials:

- An exterior materials board dated 5/1/12 that will be presented at the ASCC meeting and is discussed later in this report.
- Outdoor water use efficiency checklist, 4/30/12 (attached)
- Arborist Report, McClenahan Consulting, April 4, 2012 (attached)

As noted at the head of this memorandum, the preliminary review of this project will start with a 4:00 p.m. site meeting on Monday, June 11th. To facilitate the site meeting, story poles have been placed at the site and partially extend from the roof of the existing house. This is the case because the existing and new house footprints are very similar. The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC conduct the site meeting and preliminary review of the application. Following the preliminary review project consideration should be continued to the next regular ASCC meeting.

1. Project description, grading and vegetation impacts. The subject .48-acre site is located along the southwest frontage of Corte Madera Road in the Brookside Park neighborhood. The parcels along the west side of the street back onto a private road, and the road's easement, that serves a number of one acre or larger parcels on the east slopes above Willowbrook Drive. The views from the subject site are largely over the private road and the larger west side properties and partially to the western hillsides of the town. On the site, a post and wire fence and screen planting separate the backyard area from the private road.

The property is, for the most part, gently sloping and slope conditions present no constraints to site use. As noted above, however, a number of significant size oaks, as defined in the site development ordinance, and smaller oaks exist on the property and the plan is to preserve and enhance these while removing more ornamental plantings around the existing house. The oaks are identified by number (i.e., 1-11) on plan sheet A1.00 and discussed in the arborist's report. These include Valley, Blue, Coast Live and Black Oaks. They are mostly in fair or fair to good condition, but some are in poor to fair condition. The arborist's report sets forth provisions for tree protection relative to possible construction impacts and also provides directions for actions to be taken to ensure long-term tree health.

Sheet A1.00 also provides a good comparison of existing and proposed site plan elements. As can be seen from the sheet, the existing and proposed driveway and garage are in essentially the same location at the northeastern corner of the property. Thus, street access and area circulation would not be impacted by the proposed redevelopment. In addition, the new house footprint is very similar to that of the existing house and the front door location and pathway to the front door are much the same. The south end of the new house, however, would have less living

area toward Corte Madera Road and be more “pushed” to the rear yard area. This allows for more front yard landscaping but, from a practical standpoint, the relationships to the street would not change in any dramatic way in terms of house massing. There would, however, obviously, be architectural and landscape changes.

While the proposed residence would have a partial second story with the new upper level master bedroom proposed over the south side, this mass is also “pushed” toward the new rear extension and, thus, is not imposing on views from the street. Viewing the story poles will help to appreciate the scope of the new proposal. In addition, existing oaks and other plant materials along the south side help to screen views between properties. Further, there is an elevation break between parcels with the subject building site a few feet lower than the site on the south side property. The site plans show the wood retaining wall that supports the grade change and this wall is to remain with the project. Overall, the most significant changes will result from the more contemporary architectural style than from changes associated with house massing and/or scale.

The rear yard improvements include a 278 sf detached cabana and spa and spa deck along the south side property line and just to the north of and beyond the 20-foot side yard setback area. The spa and cabana, with bathroom, would be linked by a pathway of concrete steps. The cabana is sited almost 70 feet from the house and the spa and spa deck would be located between the house and cabana. The cabana is placed north of a play area on the adjacent parcel and there are more open views between properties at this location as a solid board fence changes to a more open, post and wire design adjacent to the cabana and play structure. The south side of the cabana is to have a bike storage area that would be most visible from the play area on the parcel to the south.

The other rear yard changes include patio and garden sitting areas, including a fire pit, that are all close in to the house. The remainder of the yard would be kept in an oak-meadow condition, with some irrigated lawn as shown on Sheet L1.00. The lawn would be less than 25% of the landscape area.

It is also noted that the site is served by the sanitary sewer line in Corte Madera Road. Thus, development is not constrained by any on-site septic system. Further, utility service to the new house will have to be underground.

2. **Cabana compliance with accessory structure policy statement.** The proposed 278 sf cabana must be considered under the provisions of the town’s attached *second units and accessory structures* policy statement. The primary issue is that it must not be configured as a second unit, as second units are not permitted on parcels of less than one acre. In this case, the proposed structure is clearly secondary to the main house and accessory to it. The bath has only outside access and the location of plumbing fixtures makes an internal connection difficult. Also, it has only one main room. Thus, we conclude that the design does appear to fully conform to the provisions of the policy statement.
3. **Floor Area (FA), Impervious Surface (IS) Area, height and setback limit compliance.** The total proposed floor area is 3,774 sf and this is precisely at the floor area limit for the site. This total floor area in the single largest building, i.e., the

new house, is 3,496 sf and 92.6% of the limit. Thus, as noted above, it is 288 sf over the limit and the ASCC needs to consider and make findings to permit the 85% limit to be exceeded. The necessary findings are evaluated in the next section of this report.

The maximum height of the proposed two-story portion of the house, i.e., the highest point of the overall structure, is just over 22 feet. This “high point” along the south side of the house, however, measures just under 19 feet above adjacent grade, and with the flat roof design, maintains a relatively low profile in terms of views from the south. Beyond the south side partial two-story area, roof heights are 16 feet or less and, again maintain a low profile with the flat roof form. In any case, the house heights are well below the maximum height limit of 34 feet and the 28-foot limit relative to height above adjacent grade.

Proposed impervious surface (IS) area is detailed on Sheet L1.00. The total permitted IS area is 4,499 sf and the project proposes an IS area of 3,016 sf.

Compliance with the required 20-foot front rear yard setbacks and the 10-foot side yard setback is demonstrated on the site plan sheets. All setbacks are satisfied and setback averaging is not necessary for compliance. In addition, the elevation sheets demonstrate compliance with the daylight plane height limit/setback line that applies to properties in the R-1/15M zoning district in which this parcel is located.

4. **Findings needed to support the request to concentrate more than 85% of the permitted floor area in the single largest structure.** To permit the proposed concentration of 92.6% of the floor area in the proposed new residence, the ASCC must make the findings set forth in attached zoning ordinance Section 18.48.020. Only one of the findings needs to be made under Subsection A.

Subsection A.1, states that the proposal for the “larger building” should be a superior design for the property in terms of grading, tree removal and use than would be possible without the concentration of floor area. This is the only possible finding under Subsection A, as the site is not constrained by steep slopes or geology. The key issues then become the location of the oaks and, in this case, the desire to maintain as much of the rear yard area in its oak and meadow condition.

In fact, the first plans provided for the project included a larger, two building cabana area in the same area as the current much smaller cabana. (A note on “scope of work” on Sheet G.00 still makes reference to this original “two new accessory buildings” design.) This plan would have had more conflicts with trees and would have encumbered more of the open backyard. The site meeting will provide the ASCC the opportunity to judge the current design solution and whether or not it is superior to a design with more detached floor area in the “backyard.”

If the ASCC based, on the site meeting, determines that the concentration of floor area is superior to additional detached structures, or a larger cabana, then it must also conclude that the building will not impact significant views of neighbors, will not negatively affect neighboring properties and will be in keeping with the neighborhood. In this case, we believe that the scale and massing of the new house is controlled with the flat roof forms, and that the design could be found

consistent with the other required findings. The site meeting will, however, allow the ASCC to further consider conditions and if the necessary findings can be made.

5. **Architectural design, exterior materials and finishes.** As noted above, the proposed house would occupy roughly the same location as the existing house and would gain both vehicle and pedestrian access the same way. The architecture would change from a traditional Ranch style to a more contemporary design. The proposed contemporary forms have, however, been kept simple and the design concepts are similar to other recent contemporary and modern designs that have been constructed in the Brookside Park neighborhood. In fact, the neighborhood has a number of different architectural styles. Unifying elements include relatively simplified detailing, control of colors and materials and changes from ornamental to a more natural approach to landscaping. These elements are being employed with this project.

Proposed exterior materials and finishes include medium dark stain horizontal wood siding, dark bronze/black anodized metal window and door frames and a medium gray membrane flat roof. The stain siding has a light reflectivity value (LRV) of less than 15%, and well below the policy maximum of 40%. The window/door frame finish has a LRV of under 10% and that is far below the 50% maximum for trim elements. The gray roof material has a LRV of approximately 35% and under the 40% maximum for roof finishes.

The plans also propose a metal and glass garage door and stone chimney, but details for these features need to be provided. Also, we assume that the new entry wood fence and wood trellis elements would be finished to match the house siding, but this should also be clarified to the satisfaction of the ASCC.

6. **Fencing and landscaping.** The plans indicate that the existing property line fencing would remain and be repaired as necessary. Currently there is perimeter fencing along most of the southern property boundary line and along the full west and north boundaries. Much of the fencing is solid board with a height of 6 feet, but some has a lower height, 3-4 feet, mainly along the eastern side of the north boundary. Much of the rear yard area has more open post and wire fencing, and the eastern side of the south boundary, i.e., in the front yard area, is unfenced.

The only new fencing that is proposed is to help define the front yard entry and provide privacy for the entry courtyard. This 5.5-foot high, resawn cedar fencing would be located over 20 feet from the front property line and is detailed on plan sheet L1.00. It would extend from the garage to the 10-foot setback line on the south side of the front yard.

The landscape plan proposes to enhance the oak and meadow environment and make use of mostly native materials. While some lawn area is planned, much of the rear yard would be meadow with "mow free sod." Overall the approach to landscaping appears consistent with town guidelines.

One of the important issues with this project will be the development and implementation of complete tree protection and construction staging plans. The tree protection plan should implement the provisions called for in the arborist's report.

7. **Exterior lighting.** Proposed exterior yard lighting is shown on Sheet L1.00 and the sheet includes the descriptions of the proposed path and step/wall fixtures. Overall, the number, design and location of the fixtures seem consistent with town guidelines and would be for specific tasks, i.e., lighting of pathways or around the spa, etc., and not ornamental objectives. Plans for house lighting have yet to be provided and will need to be defined to the satisfaction of the ASCC.
8. **"Sustainability" aspects of project, Build-It-Green (BIG) Checklist.** Plan Sheet G0.1 contains the mandatory BIG checklist prepared by the project architect. The checklist targets 129 BIG points, which is well over the 94 points required under the town's green building standards. The checklist and "green building" proposals are discussed in the attached May 2, 2012 memorandum from planning technician Carol Borck.

The ASCC should consider the above comments, conduct the preliminary project review, including the afternoon site meeting, and offer comments to assist the applicant and staff in assembling the application in form for eventual ASCC action. Project review should then be continued to the June 25, 2012 regular ASCC meeting.

6. REPORT ON PORTOLA ROAD CORRIDOR PLAN, PROGRESS OF TASKFORCE WORK AND NEXT STEPS

The Portola Road Corridor Taskforce met on June 6th and Breen represented the ASCC at the meeting. She offered input provided at the last ASCC meeting, see enclosed minutes, and can report on the June 6th meeting on Monday night. A summary of the 6/6 meeting is being prepared and, if finished in time, will be included with the ASCC meeting packets. If not, the notes will be distributed at Monday night's meeting.

The next step in the plan process will be a presentation of the taskforce findings and preliminary recommendations to the planning commission. This presentation will be made in a report to the commission that will be considered at the July 18, 2012 regular planning commission meeting.

TCV

encl.
attach.

cc. Planning Commission Liaison
Town Council Liaison
Mayor
Applicants
Planning Technician



Portola Road Taskforce

Meeting 2: June 6, 2012

Attendance

Jeff Aalfs, Danna Breen, Judith Hasko, Leslie Latham, Nate McKitterick, Judith Murphy, Gary Nielsen, Howard Young, Tom Vlasic, Karen Kristiansson

Meeting Summary

The meeting started with a review of the agenda, which was:

- Feedback from committees
- Review & refine goals
- Discussion of issues
- Next steps

The meeting closely followed this agenda. Discussion about each of these areas is summarized below.

Feedback from Committees

Judith Hasko had expressed concern before the meeting that the Trails Committee had not yet had a chance to discuss the corridor plan. Karen Kristiansson said that although another taskforce meeting is not planned, she would be able to get comments from the Trails Committee and make sure that they are incorporated into the report to the planning commission. In addition, taskforce members and committees will be able to continue to participate throughout the corridor planning process. Taskforce members will become liaisons between their committees and the corridor plan. Tom Vlasic added that the planning commission could potentially ask for another taskforce meeting in the future to address certain issues.

Leslie Latham reported that the Transportation Committee had focused on two issues: parking on Portola Road at Windy Hill and the possibility of widening Portola Road and/or putting in bicycle lanes. In terms of addressing the parking at Windy Hill, the committee felt that the town should start with small steps and increase efforts if those don't work. The first step could be a sign inside the Windy Hill parking lot informing people that overflow parking is available at town center. The Committee had concerns about using signs to prohibit parking. Howard Young said that signs would need to be installed every 150', but there may be alternatives to using signs for particular situations. Nate McKitterick added that church parking is another problem along Portola Road. Tom Vlasic mentioned that church parking is something the town could control through the churches' use permits.

In terms of bicycle lanes, the Transportation Committee felt that Portola Road should be widened but was split as to whether designated bicycle lanes should be installed. The advantages of putting in bicycle lanes include providing a consistent experience for bicyclists, sending a message about sustainability, and improving safety. The disadvantages include potentially increased liability for the town, creating the expectation for motorists that bicyclists would be restricted to the lane, and the aesthetic impact of the signs. Howard Young added that bicycle lane signs need to be installed every quarter-mile, so there would be eight along Portola Road. Danna Breen mentioned that she had heard studies that indicate that people behave more safely when there are more different types of users (motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, pedestrians) on and near the road. In general, people may be more careful if they see and expect to have to accommodate other types of users.

Gary Neilsen mentioned that, although the Open Space Committee won't be able to discuss this until their meeting on June 12, there are a few things he felt that the committee would likely support. One would be thinning vegetation to improve significant views. In some places, such as at Spring Down, however, some vegetation should be preserved because it screens trails and users from traffic. The important thing will be to provide openings here and there, and to get rid of hedges.

Judith Murphy reported that the Conservation Committee felt that views of the hillsides should be paramount and that vegetation should be removed, trimmed and otherwise thinned significantly to open up these views. The berm adds to the variety of the experience along the road, and removal would not be cost-effective. Underbrush under the big oaks should be removed; redwoods along and oaks in the meadow should be removed; and eucalyptus that have been taken down and are now regrowing should be removed. Clumps for habitat are desirable, but these should be thick shrubs, not tall trees. The corridor should be planted mostly with native vegetation, which should not be planted in or thinned into straight lines. The town has a responsibility to allocate the money needed to do this. The Conservation Committee would also support increased amounts of open space along the corridor.

Nate McKittrick said that he had discussed the corridor with the planning commission and they were looking forward to hearing from the taskforce.

Danna Breen discussed the ASCC's comments on the project, starting with the importance of not losing touch with the equestrian identity of the town. Paths should not be paved, but could reflect the diversity of the town. The ASCC also believes that trees should be removed to open views, and the commission would generally support approaches that would involve less signage. Removing non-native vegetation is also important. Tom Vlasic added that the ASCC commented that trail connectivity along Portola Road was also important and could help get kids to school. Lighting has become brighter with changes in technology, and this needs to be addressed.

Review and Refine Goals

The taskforce reviewed the three goals that were drafted at the last meeting and made some changes, as is shown below:

Goal 1: Open and natural views, especially of the western hillsides, should be protected and improved wherever possible while preserving critical habitat and variety of experience for all users.

Goal 2: Encourage more pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian use along the corridor, by improving the experience, ~~and to~~ make users ~~people~~ more comfortable.

Goal 3: Create trails that are separate from the road, clearly delineated, and that encourage are optimized for use by different kinds of users.

Taskforce members also agreed that Goal 3 is secondary to Goal 2. Goal 3 really talks more about ways to implement Goal 2. Goals 1 and 2 best present the overall vision for the corridor.

Goal 2 also relates to the desire to increase non-auto trips by residents. The corridor plan should perhaps reference this and the connection to the Sustainability Element.

Discussion of Issues

The taskforce discussed the issues and options that were raised in the background report on the corridor. Notes below are organized by issue.

Trail conditions

Multi-use corridor

The taskforce agreed that there should be a multi-use corridor along Portola Road. However, members felt that the surface of the trail could be an issue. Asphalt would not be supported and there could be problems with a hard-pack surface. Dirt generally works well except in wet weather. Some amount of mud may be acceptable, and perhaps drainage could be improved to help the dirt surface work better.

Trail improvements

Taskforce members felt that it would make sense to prioritize areas for improvement. Some areas that particularly need improvement are:

- From Morshead to Christ Church
- In front of the White property (the Chilean Woodchopper's House)
- From Willowbrook to the sewer station
- From Grove to the creek

In some places, the taskforce agreed that the town might need to be creative and seek licenses or easements, or perhaps buy land along the road. The town can also obtain easements to turn existing private trails into town trails, which could benefit both property owners and the town. These kinds of solutions should be considered for problem areas and to improve the trails system.

Widening the road shoulders and/or creating a designated bicycle lane

Widening the road

The road shoulders should be widened where needed to accomplish Goal 2. However, care should be taken that widening the road does not impact the trail along the road. Taskforce members agreed that they did not want to sacrifice the trail in order to widen the shoulders of the road. Howard Young stated that, in the recent study which identified places where the road shoulders would need to be widened to meet the minimum width for bicycles, the wider shoulders would not eliminate the trail in any of those places.

Creating a designated bicycle lane

Taskforce members felt that more study is needed to determine whether a formal bicycle lane should be designated. There are advantages and disadvantages which need to be carefully weighed.

Parking along the shoulders of Portola Road

The taskforce agreed that parking should be discouraged along the road as unobtrusively as possible. Rocks or logs could be used in some places where appropriate. A sign in the Windy Hill parking lot directing people to overflow parking at town center would be a good place to start for that problem. Signs may be needed in some places on parts of the road, but should only be used as a last resort. Rather than prohibiting parking for the entire length of the road, it makes sense to prioritize places with regular problems. Occasional instances of parking along the road may be acceptable, but regularly parking along the road becomes a problem.

Vegetation obscures views

The town should thin vegetation in the right of way and should also work with MROSD and the Sequoias to thin vegetation on their properties. Other private property owners, particularly on the west side of the road, should also be encouraged to thin their vegetation and open views to the hillsides.

Utility lines

Taskforce members agreed that the Cable and Undergrounding Committee should look at the possibility of undergrounding along Portola Road once they have finished their study of Alpine Road. Poles that are in the middle of the trail should be the priority for removal, followed by poles that affect views of the hillsides. Care should be taken with the placement and number of above-ground utility cabinets and equipment associated with undergrounding.

Fences and landscaping that is inconsistent with town policies

Code enforcement should be undertaken for structures that affect views. There is no point in having codes if the town doesn't enforce them. However, the town should consider the costs and benefits before undertaking code enforcement activities. The town should also consider establishing time limits to eliminate legal non-conforming uses such as fences.

Acquisition of open space

The Open Space Committee has been working to acquire properties along Portola Road and will continue to do so. Task force members supported these efforts and also agreed that the town should consider acquiring some land for optimum trail creation.

Next Steps

Karen Kristiansson will put together notes from this meeting and get them out by the end of the week. She will get comments from Judith Hasko and Gary Neilsen after the meetings of the Trails Committee and the Open Space Committee. Using the information from those comments and the two taskforce meetings, Karen will then draft a report to the planning commission. She will send it out to taskforce members by the end of next week, and members will then have two weeks to review the report and suggest changes. The revised report will then go to the planning commission for their July 18 meeting.