



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE CONTROL COMMISSION (ASCC)
Monday, September 24, 2012
Special Joint Field Meeting (time and place as listed herein)
7:30 PM – Regular ASCC Meeting
Historic Schoolhouse
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**

SPECIAL JOINT ASCC & PLANNING COMMISSION FIELD MEETING*

4:00 p.m., Woodside Elementary School, 3195 Woodside Road (meet at Main Office)
Consideration of the turf proposal that is part of the request for amendment to CUP X7D-30, Woodside Priory. Purpose of this Field Meeting is to inspect and gain data on the school district's experience with both artificial and natural turf fields installed in 2007. (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. Continued Preliminary Review Of Application For Amendment To Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, The Priory School
 - b. Continued Review And Request For Continuance, Architectural Review For Residential Redevelopment, And Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, Davison *Continued at request of applicant to October 8th*
5. New Business:
 - a. Town Council Referral – Review And Report On Proposals For Driveway And Bridge, Ford Field Access Easement, Kelley
6. Approval of Minutes: September 10, 2012
7. 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: September 21, 2012

CheyAnne Brown
Planning Technician



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: ASCC
FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
DATE: September 20, 2012
RE: Agenda for September 24, 2012 ASCC Meeting

NOTE: As announced at the September 10, 2012 ASCC meeting, the September 24th meeting will include a special afternoon session for consideration of the turf proposal that is part of the request for amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30, Woodside Priory. The field meeting will convene at 4:00 p.m. at the main office at Woodside Elementary School, 3195 Woodside Road. This is a continuation of the preliminary review process and will be a joint meeting of the ASCC and Planning Commission. The purpose of the Woodside School site meeting is to inspect and gain data on the school district's experience with both artificial and natural turf fields installed in 2007. (See discussion under agenda item 4a. below.) ASCC discussion of site meeting findings will continue at the September 24, 2012 regular evening meeting at the Historic School House at the Portola Valley Town Center.

The following comments are offered on the items listed on the September 24, 2012 ASCC agenda.

4a. CONTINUED PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT X7D-30, 302 PORTOLA ROAD, *THE PRIORY SCHOOL*

At the September 10, 2012 meeting, the ASCC considered the September 6, 2012 staff report on this continued review of the proposed amendment to CUP X7D-30 and participated in a special site meeting with the planning commission at the Priory School. At the regular evening meeting the ASCC offered preliminary comments on the proposed CUP amendment plans based on the information in the staff report and findings obtained at the site meeting. The enclosed 9/10 meeting minutes set forth the comments offered at the evening ASCC meeting.

At the conclusion of the 9/10 meeting on the Priory, preliminary review was continued to the September 24th meeting, specifically to the turf field areas at Woodside School as noted at the head of this memorandum. The 9/24 meeting will be a joint session with

the planning commission and is to gain information to help provide a framework for consideration of the proposed use of artificial turf for the field at the Priory. The enclosed September 20, 2012 staff report has been prepared to facilitate Monday's site meeting. Following the afternoon session, ASCC members should offer comments on the observations and findings from the session at the regular 9/24 evening meeting.

As reported previously, the findings and preliminary review comments from both the 9/10 and 9/24 site sessions will be considered as plans are finalized for the CUP amendment public hearing process. The input from the sessions will also be used to finalize the environmental review documents that would be needed in support of any action on the CUP amendment requests.

In any case, the ASCC should participate in the September 24th preliminary review, then offer comments and reactions. When the CUP request is in final form for public hearing the plans will be shared with the ASCC for review and final input to the planning commission. The commission will be the approving authority for the CUP amendment project and the public hearings before the commission are anticipated to be scheduled for later this year.

4b. CONTINUED REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT, AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT X9H-640, 260 MAPACHE DRIVE, DAVISON

On August 13, 2012, the ASCC conducted a preliminary review of this application for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge Subdivision property. The review included an afternoon site session and follow-up evening discussion. While the ASCC was generally supportive of the project, a number of comments were offered on details that needed attention and/or clarification. Project review was continued to the September 10, 2012 regular meeting and then to the September 24 meeting, as the project design team was still working on responses to the preliminary review comments.

The plan revision effort is continuing and the design team is still not ready for further ASCC consideration. Thus, the applicant has requested that project review be continued again, this time to the October 8th regular ASCC meeting. Staff concurs with the request. As a result, it is recommended that the ASCC receive any public input that may be offered and continue project review to the 10/8 regular meeting.

5a. TOWN COUNCIL REFERRAL – REVIEW AND REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DRIVEWAY AND BRIDGE, FORD FIELD ACCESS EASEMENT, KELLEY

At its August 8, 2012 meeting, the town council received and considered the attached August 8, 2012 report from the town planner on the subject driveway and bridge proposals for access through a Ford Field easement (*see attached vicinity map*) to land owned by Ryland Kelley on the east side of Los Trancos Creek in Santa Clara County. As the report explains, the access easement was recorded as part of the process of the town acquiring the Ford Field property. The council concurred with the recommendations in the staff report and has referred the matter to the ASCC for review

and recommendation back to the town council. Mr. Kelley has provided a deposit to cover the review as required by the town council in making the referral to the ASCC. The project is shown on the enclosed following plans and materials:

Sheet: A-1.1, Site Plan, 10/17/11, CJW Architecture
Sheet C-1, Preliminary Driveway Plan, Lea & Braze, Inc., 5/29/12
Sheet C-2, Details, Lea & Braze, Inc., 5/29/12

In addition to the plan sheets, CJW has provided the enclosed computer generated model image of the proposed bridge. The bridge is shown for the design, including abutment, but does not include data on the tree setting or creek environment.

The following comments are offered to assist the ASCC in formulating a report to the town council:

1. **Review process, site meeting.** The review process will start with staff and design team presentations to the ASCC on the proposals and potential issues at the regular 9/24 evening meeting. Following these presentations, public and ASCC preliminary comments should be provided and project review then continued to a site meeting on the afternoon of October 8th, i.e., the next regular ASCC meeting date. Tentatively, this site meeting would be set for 3:30 p.m.

As noted in the report to the town council, the focus of the review is on the design of the driveway, site impacts and, similarly, the bridge design and potential for impacts within the area where it crosses the creek. At this time, the town can only offer reactions to the plans and advise on any modifications that should be considered when actual plans are pursued for development. Since we are not certain of design issues that may grow out of Santa Clara County project review or reviews by other potentially involved agencies, and since the applicant is not applying for actual construction permits, the town can only advise on the design that would be most acceptable given the information that is actually available at this time.

The plans referenced above are also being shared with the public works director, fire marshal, trails committee and conservation committee for review and comment. It is hoped that such input would be received in time for consideration at the October 8th ASCC meeting. Further, when structural plans for the bridge are provided they will need to be considered by the public works director and town geologist. The site is designated, Sun, relatively stable land, on the town's map of land movement potential, but this designation also indicates that slopes are unconsolidated granular material with potential for settlement and soil creep.

2. **LAFCO involvement, lead agency, status of lot development plans before Santa Clara County.** The development of the Kelley lands on the east side of Los Trancos Creek raises a number of issues beyond the matter of driveway and bridge design. Specifically, since the parcel is located in Santa Clara County, but has access from Alpine Road, utilities and services will largely be reflective of the access from the town and San Mateo County. Utilities are to be extended from Alpine Road and suspended from the new bridge. This includes sewer, water, power, etc. Thus, the water and sewer service would be provided by districts in San Mateo County. Further, it is likely that Woodside Fire and the County Sheriff

would be asked to provide services. This will require special actions, likely by the Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCO) in both counties.

Contact with San Mateo County LAFCO was initiated, but is not proceeding at this point. West Bay Sanitary has also been contacted, but for it to provide service to the parcel the land would need to be annexed to the district and this will require LAFCO action. This is the same situation relative to the California Water Service District, Woodside Fire and County Sheriff.

The project architect has advised that the site plan was presented to the Santa Clara County planning and that this agency did not take any significant issue with the design approach, but that plans are not being processed through Santa Clara County at this time. It is the town's position that Santa Clara County should be the lead agency on the project and that the driveway and bridge work should not proceed until the plans for actual Kelley property development have been approved by the county and permits for construction issued. It is also noted that it is not clear from the easement documents or title report data that the access easement is also for public utilities. This would likely need to be addressed in any LAFCO action and may set the need for the town to grant rights for utilities in the easement.

3. **Project description, preliminary identification of key issues and questions.** As noted in the report to the town council, vegetation in the 30-foot access easement was cleared subject to a site development permit approved by the town last year. No significant trees were impacted and the clearing allowed for ease of easement identification so that driveway design work could proceed. It is was intended that the clearing would facilitate property marketing.

With the removal of brush, the easement is now readily identifiable at the site and easily walked. It is level and the only grading needed for driveway development is for installation of base rock, the AC surface (12 feet wide) and transitions to Alpine Road and the planned bridge abutment. Cutting/trenching would also be needed for the underground utilities. The driveway alignment as shown on the site plan has been modified or "wiggled" to avoid trees, but one larger 24-inch oak and a few smaller trees would need to be removed for bridge installation as shown on the site and engineering plans. No arborist data has been prepared in support of the plans.

The bridge alignment and placement as proposed attempt to avoid any impact within the creek channel and to, hopefully, not trigger any special agency review, e.g., Fish and Game or Army Corp of Engineers. This, however, would be determined by Santa Clara County and likely LAFCO when they conduct their necessary project reviews.

The work planned would also impact the existing town trail along the west side of the creek. The driveway surface would need to meet town standards for the trail crossing. Further, we assume that both the trails committee and conservation committee would want to ensure that the general conditions along the easement area are maintained to minimize impact on the trail, trail experience or general open space character of the property. Further, there should be no gates, fences, lighting or other features to make the driveway a more formal feature in the easement or on the property. Likely, at some point an address sign and mailbox would be needed and the locations and designs should be to the satisfaction of the town.

The bridge design has only been detailed to the extent shown in the computer model image. The proposed materials and finishes need to be described by the project design team and, eventually, the structural design details. Further, details for the proposed utility extensions across the bridge need to be provided.

It is possible that some driveway widening could be necessary for turnouts to meet fire district requirements. It is roughly 200 feet from Alpine Road to the top of the creek bank and typically a turnout would not be needed, but this is somewhat of an unusual case and we look forward to the fire district comments on the proposal. The district, if it is asked to provide service, will also set requirements for vertical clearance, typically 14 feet including above the bridge deck, and bridge load requirements.

The design for the transition to Alpine Road would need to meet town standards and this is being reviewed by the public works director. Sight distance should not be a significant issue, but if the driveway were installed, it would likely be a "surprise" for many drivers and this may need to be highlighted for safety for a period of time. In any case, the input from the public works director will be important here.

Based on the forgoing, it is recommended that at the September 24, 2012 meeting, the ASCC receive a presentation from the project architect on the driveway and bridge designs and then continue project review to a site meeting on October 8, 2012. We will likely have two site meetings that day and this should be scheduled for 3:30 p.m.

(The second site meeting tentatively scheduled for 10/8 is for consideration of changes to the Blue Oaks PUD relative to the four below market rate lots owned by the town.)

TCV

encl.
attach.

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



MEMORANDUM

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

TO: Planning Commission and Architectural and Site Control Commission (ASCC)

FROM: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
Karen Kristiansson, Principal Planner

DATE: September 20, 2012

RE: Field visit to Woodside Elementary School, regarding preliminary application for amendment to CUP X7D-30 for parcel merger and expansion of athletic fields with new track and artificial turf infill at 302 Portola Road, Priory School

The September 24 field meeting will be at Woodside Elementary School to view the school's two soccer fields, one with artificial turf and one with natural turf. The main purpose of the visit is to assess the aesthetics of the artificial turf and identify any additional questions or concerns related to the artificial turf. These questions and concerns will then be used to finalize the Priory's formal application and the CEQA analysis of the proposed project.

Background

The Planning Commission and ASCC have considered this project at a number of meetings, including:

- a joint field meeting at the Priory on February 1, 2011 to consider the original proposed project;
- discussion of the original project on February 15, 2011 at the ASCC;
- discussion of the original project on February 16, 2011 at the Planning Commission;
- informal consideration on June 6, 2012 by the Planning Commission of a revised project with a larger track and less artificial turf;
- a joint field meeting at the Priory on September 10, 2012 to consider site issues related to the revised project;
- discussion of site issues at the regular ASCC meeting on September 10, 2012; and
- discussion of site issues at the regular Planning Commission meeting on September 19, 2012.

The staff reports and minutes from all of those meetings are available online, except for the September 19 meeting for which minutes are still being prepared.

Proposed Project

As was described in the staff report for the September 10 field meeting, the proposed project would merge the 1.3 acres former Rutherford/Gambetta ("Rutherford") parcel, now owned by the Priory, with the existing Priory land, remove the berm between the Rutherford parcel and the softball field, relocate the sewer line that is currently located within that berm, and install a regulation-sized track facility with 2.39 acres of artificial turf on the interior. With the parcel merger, the total Priory land covered by the CUP would be 50.4 acres.

Cut from the removal of the berm would be placed on the field and used to raise the track and field area by approximately 10 inches; none of the cut from the berm will be removed from the site. An additional 8 inches of specialized fill will be needed under the track and artificial turf infill for drainage and proper support of the track and turf, so the track and turf will have an elevation approximately 18 inches higher than the existing field.

The project is shown on the following revised plans prepared by CJW Architecture unless otherwise noted. These are the same plans referenced for the September 10 meeting:

- Sheet A-1.3- Enlarged Plan of Merger Area, Revised 4/26 and 8/3
- Sheet A-1.3A- Merger Detail (Landscape Concept), April 26, 2012, Revised 7/3 and 9/4
- Sheet 1- Multipurpose Field Improvements Sewer Relocation – Context Plan, BKF, 08/12
- Sheet 2- Multipurpose Field Improvements Sewer Relocation, BKF, 08/12

If the conditional use amendment is approved, a site development permit would be needed for the grading and tree removal. More detailed plans would be submitted as part of that process.

Woodside Elementary School Fields

In 2007, Woodside Elementary School proposed replacing both of its soccer fields with artificial turf fields. Both fields had been used as sites for portable buildings and related uses for some time. Due to controversy from parents and the public, the school decided to use artificial turf on only one of the fields. The other field was finished as a natural turf field. As a result, the school has an artificial turf field and a natural turf field approximately the same age, and therefore provides an opportunity to see both.

We spoke with staff at Woodside School about the fields and were told the following:

- The artificial turf field can be used more than the natural turf field, especially during the wet season.
- There have been no complaints about the artificial turf field since it was installed; there have been more complaints about the condition of the natural turf field.
- There have been no injuries to students from the artificial turf.
- For maintenance reasons, they don't allow food or drink on the field.
- Water usage has been drastically reduced for the artificial turf field. The only water needed has been during hot weather to cool the field off, and that has only been needed a couple of times since the field was installed. The school did not have records of the water reduction available.
- The artificial turf also does not need any of the fertilizers that are needed for the natural turf field.
- Maintenance for the artificial turf has been significantly less.

The maintenance supervisor at Woodside School will likely be available at the field meeting to answer questions.

To get a sense of the water and fertilizer use, we obtained information from town staff about Rossotti Field. That field is a 1.86 acre sand channel natural turf field. Sand channel fields have a dense drainage system that removes water quickly, allowing turf to be playable sooner after rain. As a result, however, sand channel fields also use a great deal of water and fertilizer. Average annual water use for Rossotti Field over the last seven years has been 3,200 CCF or about 2.4 million gallons, and about 4,500 pounds of fertilizer are used per year. If a similar type of natural turf field were installed on the inside of the proposed track at the Priory, it would be 2.39 acres and therefore would likely use more water and fertilizer. Maintenance of Rossotti Field includes overseeding, mowing and irrigation repairs, as well as top dressing every other year or when needed; similar maintenance would be needed for a natural turf field at the Priory.

The artificial turf at Woodside School was made by the same manufacturer (FieldTurf) and should be similar to what is proposed for the Priory, but is an older version. According to a document that the field advisory committee prepared, the infill at Woodside Elementary includes rubber recycled from athletic shoes and cryogenically processed recycled rubber tires. For the Priory, the proposed infill is thermoplastic elastomer (TPE) which is specifically manufactured for artificial turf and does not include material from recycled tires. The fiber part of the turf is apparently similar but has been improved since the Woodside School field was installed.

Issues to Consider at the Field Meeting

One issue that was raised, and which will likely be a key item to be considered at the field meeting, is the aesthetic effects of the artificial turf and its impact on community character. This was discussed at the June 6 planning commission meeting and should be assessed at the field meeting. One aspect of this is how the field will look from Portola Road. Current plans indicate that the artificial turf would be 38 feet from the trail

and 65 feet from Portola Road at its closest point, and will be somewhat screened from both the trail and the road by vegetation. We will visit Woodside School prior to the field meeting to identify one or more vantage points at similar distances from the artificial turf field from which commissioners can view the field.

In previous meetings about the artificial turf, a number of questions were raised about the potential environmental impacts of the turf, especially water quality impacts from leachate from the turf and air quality impacts from off-gassing from the turf. These are being looked at in detail in the CEQA analysis that is being prepared for the project. A draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared for this project in August 2011 and is being updated for the revised project and to address concerns that have been raised about the project. Consideration of air and water quality issues should be set aside until the IS/MND is completed.

Follow up to the September 10 Field Meeting

A number of issues were raised at the September 10 field meeting and the regular ASCC meeting on that date. Minutes from those meetings are enclosed. As a result, we have requested that the applicant consider the following items as part of finalizing the application:

1. Determine how the softball diamond will work given its relationship to the proposed track. Will the diamond need to be raised? Should it be removed?
2. Describe how the utility pole and wires along the berm will be handled. Undergrounding might be the best solution.
3. Does the shed need to be 2,000 sf or can it be smaller? Either way, if the softball diamond is removed, the shed may be better located near the existing shed.
4. Consider whether the track could be moved further away from Portola Road, even if additional grading were needed to fit it into the hillside.
5. Show on the plans where the bleachers will be located.
6. Provide more detail about the proposed grading, although engineered grading plans aren't needed at this point.
7. The redwood trees along Portola Road may need to be thinned.
8. Non-native vegetation on the Rutherford parcel could be removed and replaced with more appropriate plantings.

In addition, commissioners requested early input from the Conservation Committee and the Trails and Paths Committee on the project. Preliminary comments from the Conservation Committee, dated 9/20/12, are attached. Comments from the Trails and Paths Committee have not yet been received, although one member did submit a comment that the plans for the trail improvements do not mention equestrians.

Next Steps

Following the September 24 field meeting, the Priory will submit its revised and complete formal application, including an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. There will then be a 30-day CEQA comment period on the environmental analysis, followed by public hearings and action on the application by the planning commission.

The complete application with supporting data will be shared with the Planning Commission, ASCC and other town staff and committees as called for in the CUP provisions of the zoning ordinance. That input will then be used in preparing the staff report and tentative recommendations on the CUP amendment application. A specific timeline for the public hearing process will be set after the field meetings and receipt of the formal application.

Attach./Encl.

Cc: Steve Padovan, Interim Planning Manager
Carol Borck, Planning Technician
Sandy Sloan/Leigh Prince, Town Attorney

PRELIMINARY 9/20/12

Conservation Committee Comments on Priory Plans

1. Removal of trees in bermed area central to entire proposal and approved.
All other notated removals OK.
- Suggest additional removal of Eucalyptus and olives (unless these are sterile) while tree crews working.
2. Keynotes under Proposed Developments look good except D and F – consider leaving more open views across this essentially open space. Already there is too dense a screen planting along the road frontage.
-Discourage the topping of frontage trees into unnatural hedge – especially the oaks. Allow trees to grow into natural high canopy.
3. Proposed storage shed more appropriately place at rear of field area where buildings already exist. No less convenient to fields, and much more visually pleasing.
4. Clearing of non-natives from the channel much appreciated. This area will require continued maintenance to protect from regrowth of broom, etc.
5. Meadow extension appreciated
6. Preserving views of hilltops behind Priory important.
7. Planting lists appropriate.
8. Underground as much wiring as economically feasible.
9. Serious consideration needs to be given to the environmental and sustainability aspects of artificial turf.
10. We await arborists report and data about artificial turf.

Judith Murphy