

**Architectural and Site Control Commission September 10, 2012
**Special Joint Site Meeting of the ASCC and Planning Commission,
302 Portola Road, The Priory School, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California****

Chairs Hughes and Von Feldt called the special Joint ASCC and Planning Commission special site meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The meeting convened in the athletic field area of the Priory School along Portola Road. It was noted that the meeting was for preliminary consideration of proposed amendments to the School's Conditional Use Permit X7D-30.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch
ASCC absent: Warr
Planning Commission: Gilbert, McIntosh, Von Feldt
Planning Commission absent: McKitterick, Zaffaroni
Town Council Liaison: Richards
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Principal Planner Kristiansson,
Interim Planning Manager Steve Padovan, Planning Technician Brown

Others* present relative to the Priory project:

Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect
Mark Sutherland, project landscape architect
Fr. Maurus Neneth, Priory School
Siobhan Lawlor, Priory School
Kari Rust, Priory parent
Sally Ann Reiss, Portola Valley resident
Ching Wu, Portola Valley resident
Doug Moss, Portola Valley resident
Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

*Others may have been present during the course of the site meeting and may not be accounted for in this attendance list.

Continued Preliminary Review -- Application for amendment to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, The Priory School

Vlasic and Kristiansson reviewed the comments in the September 6, 2012 staff reports. It was explained that this was a preliminary review of the proposals for CUP amendment relative to the expansion of the athletic fields, addition of parcel area to the CUP lands and modifications of the turf and other elements of the athletic facilities. Vlasic advised that following the site meeting, the ASCC would continue the preliminary review comment process at its regular evening meeting and the planning commissioners could offer additional comments either by email or at the September 19th regular evening commission meeting. He clarified that a place on the 9/19 agenda had been provided for follow-up comments to the 9/10 site meeting.

Vlasic also noted that a second joint site meeting of the ASCC and Planning Commission would be conducted on September 24, 2012, at the Woodside Elementary School on Woodside Road. He explained that this meeting would be for the purpose of seeing the school's artificial turf facility and obtaining firsthand understanding of the experiences the Woodside School District has had with the artificial turf facility and a natural grass facility, both installed at a similar time.

Kristiansson reviewed the comments in the September 6, 2012 report to the ASCC and planning commission. (Refer to this report for a complete listing of proposed CUP amendment plans and supporting materials.) She explained that the purpose of the site meeting was to consider the physical changes proposed by the plans including the expanded fields, new 2,000 sf storage facility, removal of east side berm and landscape changes. She noted that this data would help in appreciating not only the visual changes of the site work, but also setting a context for considering the visual conditions associated with the planned artificial turf surface.

Kevin Schwarckopf then reviewed the plans and led all present on an inspection of the areas that would be impacted by the project. He made use of the plans as well as story poles installed to model the proposed storage shed and stakes set to identify boundaries for the track and related field changes. During the course of the site inspection, the following information was provided:

- The proposed shed will allow the Priory to store all equipment and materials for field maintenance in a single location. The site was selected due to the screening provided by vegetation along Portola Road and because it would be open to views from the road corridor only for a brief period as drivers and walkers pass by. It was concluded that a shed on the north side of the field at the base of the hill would be open to views from the road corridor for longer periods of time. At the same time, the Priory is willing to consider other locations at the direction of the town.
- With removal of the berm, the cut materials would be used to raise field grades by 10 inches to 18 inches. The grades to transition to the softball field have not yet been worked out. It is, however, intended to keep the softball field for now, likely for practice use, but the full use of the field after the project is completed has yet to be determined.
- There would likely be one light on the shed, and this would be located on the north side, away from Portola Road corridor views.
- Removal of the berm will require relocation of the sewer line in the berm. The plans for sewer line relocation have been shared with West Bay Sanitary District. The District had indicated that the plans are generally acceptable. West Bay has also advised that it is developing plans for improvements to the Georgia Lane pump station, but these plans should have no impact on this project.
- The new shed will be constructed to match the design, materials, and finishes of the existing shed on the north side of the fields.
- In response to a question relative to use of the existing Gambetta/Rutherford house, it was noted that it was not in a condition for any habitation and would likely only be used for storage for the time being. If other uses are being considered, these would be presented with the second phase of CUP amendments to be developed and proposed after the current CUP amendment process is completed.
- In response to questions, the following were noted:
 - The field bleachers would likely be moved to the north side of the track.
 - A drinking fountain would be located at the storage shed if the shed remains in its proposed location.
 - A management plan for the pine trees on the property will be discussed with Priory staff.

- The driveway extension to the track will add about 1,250 sf of impervious surface. It is for emergency vehicle access to the field.
- Given the scope of the project, it would make sense to consider undergrounding of the overhead lines over the berm area with the field improvements, and this will be considered with Priory staff.
- More detailed plans will be prepared for the southeast corner of the track where grading appears to need to extend into the right of way and would also impact the existing public trail.
- The parking area above and north of the berm will not be changed, but the approved CUP master plan allows for an internal drive extension through this parking area.
- The Portola Road split rail fence will need to be extended at least partially along the frontage of the Gambetta/Rutherford property, and the plans will be revised to show planned new fencing.

During the course of the site inspections, the proposed shed, track and berm areas were walked, and viewed, and conditions on the "Gambetta/Rutherford" property considered. Also the trail along Portola Road was walked and potential grading impacts on the trail considered.

At the conclusion of the site inspection, public comments were requested, but none were offered. Planning Commission representatives did offer preliminary comments. **Von Feldt** asked that the plans be referred to both the conservation and trails committee for review and comment, particularly relative to the changes proposed within the area of the town's right of way, including the landscaping adjustments. **Gilbert** commented that she would be looking for considerably greater detail relative to grading, particularly for the track area adjacent to the Portola Road trail.

Following site discussion, it was agreed that ASCC members would offer preliminary comments on the project at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Thereafter, chairs Hughes and Von Feldt thanked the applicant's representatives and others for their participation in the site meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Architectural and Site Control Commission
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

September 10, 2012

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch

Absent: Warr

Planning Commission liaison: Gilbert

Town Council Liaison: Aalfs

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Brown

Interim Planning Manager Padovan

Oral Communications

Breen expressed concern over the increase of "clutter" along the roads in town and, particularly, the utility cabinets and equipment for remote sensing associated with new and upgraded service to properties. She asked that the town consider adding this issue as a future planning task and other ASCC members concurred.

Continued Preliminary Review -- Application for amendment to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, The Priory School

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the September 6, 2012 staff reports on this continuing preliminary project review. He also discussed the events and preliminary comments provided at the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. (Refer to above site meeting minutes.) Vlastic noted that following sharing of any additional comments, the preliminary review should be continued to the special joint site meeting with the planning commission scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on September 24, 2012 at Woodside Elementary School on Woodside Road for review of the artificial turf matters as discussed in the staff report.

Kevin Schwarckopf was present and advised that the Priory had no additional comments to offer at this time, but would be proceeding to consider those offered at the site meeting and any additional comments provided at this ASCC meeting.

Public comments were requested. **Jon Silver, 355 Portola Road**, asked that all those interested in the project, i.e., as noted in the record of previous discussions should receive individual notice of any meetings on the CUP amendment and, particularly, the matter of artificial turf. He expressed concern that there be any suggestion that the physical site changes could be considered separate from the matter of artificial turf as the turf was a significant factor in the visual condition of the project and site changes. He offered that "fake turf" had no place in Portola Valley.

In response to the comments from Mr. Silver, Vlastic advised that the project had to be considered as a whole and would not be acted on in "pieces." He emphasized that the site sessions were set so that the physical changes could be understood and considered in context with the plans for any turf changes.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary comments in addition to the comments offered at the site meeting:

- Berm removal. This is an important and appropriate part of the project. Landscaping and other changes will need to be done with care to ensure minimum potential for visual impacts. Particularly in terms of views to the track and expanded play fields.
- Grading data. More detailed data are needed, particularly relative to the southeast corner of the track where it will likely extend into the public right of way and the existing public trail. Also, more detail is needed relative to the transition to the upper parking area at the northeast corner.
- Artificial turf. Concur with comments that this must be considered with the other site physical changes as the artificial turf can potentially cause a significant visual impact in terms of views in the Portola Road Corridor.
- Softball field. The plans for continued use of the facility are “vague” and it seems likely that it can’t be used as in the past. If it is not viable for long term softball use, consideration should be made to removing it and making use of the space for the shed and/or, if possible, adjusting the track and field work away from the property line at the southeast corner.
- Storage shed. The need for a 2,000 sf building needs to be fully explained and, if possible a smaller building should be considered. While it was agreed that the proposed location is likely acceptable relative to potential visual impacts, it was agreed that if the softball field is removed, then it might make sense to locate the shed adjacent to the existing storage shed on the north side of the fields.
- Landscape plan. While the plan appears generally acceptable, it needs to be shared with the conservation committee for input. Further, consideration should be given to thinning of the redwood density to help reduce the linear affect of the plantings. Also, it was noted that perhaps there might be more screening along the north side of the track on the Gambetta/Rutherford property. More clarification/details are needed relative to the plans for the drainage channel along Portola Road.
- Monterey pines. A long-term management plan for the pines needs to be developed and implemented that would, over time, replace the trees with more appropriate, long-lived trees and other materials that are also more in keeping with town landscape guidelines and standards. Further, consideration should be given now to removal of the pines at the northeast corner of the track area, and perhaps this would also include consideration of some shifting of the track into the slope where the trees are. This should be considered to pull the track away from Portola Road.
- Bleachers. Revise plans to identify the proposed bleacher locations.
- Undergrounding of overhead wires along the berm. This should be accomplished with the project.
- Irrigation should be kept to a minimum. Irrigation for the new landscaping should be kept to a minimum. The plans should be clarified relative to this, and it is suggested that initial watering be with temporary irrigation.

Following the offering of the above comments, preliminary project consideration was continued to the special 9/24 field meeting with the planning commission at 4:00 p.m. at Woodside School.

Follow-up Review -- Landscape Plan Modifications, 210 Golden Oak Drive, Jones

Vlasic presented the September 6, 2012 staff report on the subject project. He reviewed the background on July 11, 2012 ASCC conditional approval of proposals for modifications to the landscape and yard lighting plans for the subject 1.2-acre Alpine Hills parcel. He also discussed the input provided to project landscape architect Bob Cleaver by ASCC members Breen and Clark at an August 8, 2012 site meeting.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the revised landscape plan Sheet L-1, dated August 20, 2012, prepared by Bob Cleaver. Also considered were the September 7, 2012 email from Mr. Cleaver, with photo attachments, defining the areas for the proposed planting and clarifying that no manzanita shrubs would be placed in the Golden Oak Drive right of way.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

Following brief discussion, Breen moved, seconded by Clark and passed 4-0 approval of the revised landscape plan with the condition that any planting in the public road right of way shall be subject to final review and approval by the public works director.

Prior to consideration of the following request, Breen temporarily left the ASCC meeting noting that she was conflicted from acting on the project due to landscape services she had provided to the applicant.

Review for Compliance with Conditions of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-169, 555 Portola Road, Neely/Myers

Vlasic presented the September 6, 2012 staff report on this request for review for compliance with conditions of approved CUP X7D-169. He advised of the status of the project and that a number of CUP conditions need to be addressed before any building permits could actually be issued. He stressed that at this time the key items that need ASCC direction have to do with the scope of impervious surface area, meadow area fencing, and changes in architectural character for the cabana/entertainment building. He also asked that the ASCC identify two members to participate in the plant removal/thinning subcommittee as discussed in the staff report.

Vlasic also commented that the CUP condition for consideration of additional screen planting for the cabana/entertainment building site would be best addressed after the building is framed and views from off site can more specifically be considered. ASCC members concurred with this suggestion.

ASCC members considered the staff report and following plans prepared by CJW Architecture:

Agricultural Building, May 31, 2012:

Sheet: T-0.1.E, Title Sheet

Sheet: T-0.2, Lighting Selections & Fence Details
Sheet: A-1.1.E, Site Plan – Ag. Building
Sheet: A-2.1.E, Main Floor Plan (and elevations)

Cabana, May 17, 2012, unless otherwise dated:

Sheet: T-0.1, Title Sheet
Sheet: T-0.2, Photos & Lighting
Sheet: A-1.1 Site Plan
Sheet: A-2.1, Floor Plan & Elevations
Sheet: A-2.1A, Cabana Floor Plan & Elevations (as shown on CUP approved plans)

Also considered were the July 23, 2012 documents from the applicant on the Build It Green objectives, the approved CUP plans, and the colors and materials boards for the cabana/entertainment and agricultural buildings. In addition, the ASCC considered the September 10, 2012 email from applicant Dr. Kirk Neely further explaining his desire for the fencing along the southern boundary of his property in the meadow area.

Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect, presented the plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Data on the proposed septic systems for the buildings is now being processed through the health department to ensure compliance with department standards.
- The plans will be modified to conform to the impervious surface limits set with the CUP. It is also noted that the cabana/entertainment building is 300 sf less than shown on the approved CUP plans. It is anticipated that this residual area would be added to the studio approved to the location lower on the property.
- The other CUP conditions would be addressed as described in the staff report.
- The change in cabana/entertainment building design was a result of decisions made on the design for the guest house and studio. The location, scale and massing are much the same as for the original proposal.
- Concurs with the staff recommendation that any additional screen landscaping for the cabana be considered after the building is framed.

Public comments were requested. **Marge DeStaebler, conservation committee**, supported the proposed low post and rail fence along the southerly property boundary with the removal of the plants and trees installed to mark the boundary. She also supported the use of a subcommittee of ASCC and conservation committee members to develop the plan for plant/tree removal and thinning as discussed in the staff report.

ASCC members discussed the request, as clarified, and offered the following conclusions and directions:

- The plans for the cabana/entertainment building are generally acceptable subject to the landscape review after building framing recommended by staff for CUP compliance
- The agricultural building plans are acceptable, but consideration should be given to a more forest green color for the siding.

- Support the proposed fence with removal of the existing trees and signs installed to mark the boundary.

These comments were offered with the understanding that all of the other issues noted in the staff report, including requirements for meadow management plans, would be addressed before building plans were presented to the ASCC for approval. In addition, Clark and Koch were assigned to work on the planting subcommittee.

Following consideration of the above request, Breen returned to her ASCC position.

Site Development Permit X9H-641 -- Grading for Development of Swimming Pool and related Outdoor Terraces, Stairs and Use Areas, 40 Tagus Court, Joondeph

Vlasic presented the September 6, 2012 staff report on this request for approval of a site development permit for grading of 400 cubic yards on the subject 2.0-acre Alpine Hills property. He advised that the proposed earthwork includes 320 cubic yards of cut, 80 cubic yards of fill, with 240 cubic yards of the cut materials to be off-hauled from the site. He clarified that the grading would be for the development of a new swimming pool with related terraces and access steps, and also a BBQ facility and related outdoor spaces.

Vlasic reviewed the comments from site development committee members, and the key concerns discussed in the staff report relative to tree protection, construction staging, exterior lighting, fencing, and location of pool and spa equipment. He also reviewed the comments in the September 6, 2012 email on the project driveway from Cecilia Beresford and Herbert Schilling, 18 Tagus Court.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans received by the town on July 28, 2012:

Landscape Plans, Thomas Scherer Associates, 7/11/12:

Sheet L-1, Cover Sheet
Sheet L-2, Construction Layout
Sheet L-3, Construction Details
Sheet L-4, Irrigation Plan
Sheet L-5, Planting/Lighting Plan
Sheet L-6, Irrigation/Planting Details

Civil Engineering Plans, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 6/5/12:

Sheet C-1, Title Sheet
Sheet C-2, Grading and Drainage Plan
Sheet C-3, Grading Specifications
Sheet C-4, Details
Sheet C-5, Details
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details

Also considered were the following materials submitted in support of the plans and application:

Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist, 7/24/12

Eight-page construction materials document received 7/28/12. The document contains descriptions of the materials to be used for the driveway paving, terrace paving, veneer stone, smooth plaster veneer, redwood arbor stain and cut sheets for the path, arbor and step light (light locations shown on Sheet L-5).

Mr. Joondeph and Thomas Scherer presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- New fencing on the property was previously approved by the town and will be added to the final site plans.
- Proposed site improvements and retaining walls have been identified at the site. Further, an arborist report will be prepared as recommended in the staff report.
- Much of the driveway work is completed and the garage work is largely completed. Some grading will be needed for the area in front of the garage, and the plans will be modified to clarify this and the concerns of the neighbors at 18 Tagus Court. The grading would be about 14 inches deep to provide for surface repair and the existing retaining wall will also be repaired.
- The plans are being refined to make use of more permeable surface materials as recommended by the conservation committee.
- One pool and one spa light are being considered and the plans will be modified to identify these lights and address the lighting concerns in the staff report. In response to a question, it was noted that the lights would be oriented toward the house to minimize potential for light spill off site.

Public comments were requested and the following offered. The neighbor at 45 Tagus Court (did not identify himself by name) did not state any project concerns but asked about how best to be informed on the project details. It was suggested that he review the plans and also discuss with the applicant and visit the site with his neighbor to see what had been marked in the field.

Mr. Joondeph commented that the vegetation along the boundary with 45 Tagus Court would not be modified with the project.

Marge DeStaebler, conservation committee, commented on the invasive plant materials on the site and discussed their location along the east side of the house. She also commented on the ice plant.

Mr. Joondeph advised that he would be removing the ice plant and would also remove the invasive materials as identified and recommended by Ms. DeStaebler.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and the input and clarifications offered at the ASCC meeting. Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the project subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of project permits:

1. The lighting plans shall be modified to address the concerns noted in the staff report and identify pool and spa lighting. The scope of lighting shall be significantly reduced and

light switching controls shall be specified. In addition, all existing lighting in trees, etc., shall be removed.

2. The plans shall be modified to increase the use of permeable paving materials.
3. An arborist report shall be prepared addressing the concerns in the staff report and setting forth provision for project staging and construction to ensure tree protection and long-term tree health.
4. The plans shall be modified to clarify the fencing and driveway work described by the applicant at the ASCC meeting.
5. The requirements of all site development permit committee members shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the committee member.
6. A detailed construction staging plan shall be provided and once approved implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.
7. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for removal of existing invasive plant materials and any proposed plant materials with invasive characteristics for consistency with the town's approved landscape plant guidelines and plant list.
8. The retaining walls proposed below the BBQ terrace shall be modified to a form that is more consistent with the site contours as recommended in the staff report.

Minutes

Breen commented that while she had no specific corrections relative to the August 13th minutes, she wanted to clarify the comments made at the meeting relative to conservation committee input to the ASCC. She advised that she had heard that some persons took the ASCC comments to suggest that conservation committee input may not be valued. She stressed that this was not the case at all and that she was very appreciative of the committee's input. She added that the only concern was the potential for a more formal process to add time to application processing and potential for duplication of review efforts. She added that she hoped the committee would continue to maintain awareness of applications and offer input to the ASCC as members find appropriate.

After offering the above comments Breen moved, seconded by Koch, and passed 4-0 approval of the August 13, 2012 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

T. Vlastic