

**Architectural and Site Control Commission September 24, 2012
**Special Joint Site Meeting of the ASCC and Planning Commission,
3195 Woodside Road, Woodside Elementary 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 at the entrance to the Woodside Elementary School. It was noted that the meeting was for continued preliminary consideration of proposed amendments to the Priory School's Conditional Use Permit X7D-30 and specifically to consider the artificial turf proposal based on the experience of the Woodside School District with both artificial and natural turf fields installed in 2007-2008.

Roll Call:

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

Others* present relative to the Priory project:

Jeff Aalfs, town council
Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect
Brother Edwards, Priory School
Tim Molak, Priory School
Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)
Jon Silver, Portola Valley resident
Tom Kelly, Portola Valley Resident
Marilyn Walter, Portola Valley resident
Patrick Noonan, Woodside resident

*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

Vlastic and Kristiansson reviewed the comments in the September 20, 2012 staff reports. It was explained that this was a continuation of the preliminary review initiated at the September 10, 2012 joint ASCC and Planning Commission site meeting and that this meeting would focus on the experience of the Woodside School District with both natural and artificial turf fields at Woodside School.

Kristiansson provided an overview of the turf conditions as set forth in the 9/20 staff report. She noted that the artificial turf now proposed for the Priory field was somewhat different than the turf used at Woodside School but by the same manufacturer. She clarified that the Priory material is to be with a fiber similar to but improved over the material used at Woodside School. She also noted that the turf infill would be with "thermoplastic elastomer," specifically manufactured for artificial turf and that this material does not include the use of recycled tires. In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed material was one that could be recycled.

Vlasic commented that the town has just received a draft of the revised initial environment study for the Priory field project and that this would be available for public review when the project is finally set for public hearing before the planning commission. He clarified that any additional comments received based on the site meeting would be considered as the environmental study is reviewed and put into form for the public hearing process.

Vlasic also clarified the process following the site meeting and any continued discussion at the regular evening ASCC meeting. He noted that the project plans, application and environmental documents would be revised and finalized for the planning commission public hearing. He noted that the documents for the hearing would go through a final staff, committee, including ASCC, review and then be set for planning commission hearing. He added that any commission hearing would likely be in November or December.

Jon Silver asked that any public hearing be scheduled to avoid conflict with Holidays and also the presidential debates. He requested that anyone who has attended a meeting on the Priory turf issue and identified themselves for the record be sent a notice of any public hearing.

After review of the staff report and schedule, site meeting attendees inspected the natural, sand channel, and artificial turf fields. Views were considered from different directions, i.e., relative to sun angle, and also where possible differing heights, e.g., views considered when standing on top of picnic tables down to the artificial turf field. Also, Kristiansson identified distances similar to those from public viewing points in Portola Valley to the proposed Priory field.

Following the site inspection, the following public comments and reactions were offered:

Patrick Noonan. Advised that while the School District has apparently found the artificial turf field positive for play and maintenance, he felt it was not appropriate for the town of Woodside because it was not “natural,” and because the long-term potential environmental impacts were not fully understood. He also noted that, in his opinion, the experience of playing on a natural “live” field was far preferable to that associated with an artificial turf field. He added that he had several children who had grown up playing on grass fields in Woodside.

Tom Kelly. Commented that an artificial turf field was simply not consistent with the values set forth in the town’s plan and policies. He noted that while an artificial surface may be “more perfect” for maintenance and use, it was not so relative to visual conditions and community values. He also worried over the precedent that would occur with allowing an artificial field in Portola Valley, with potential for such fields at town field facilities and those of the Portola Valley School District.

Bev Lipman. Commented that she and her husband Peter could not believe that an artificial turf field would even be considered for any location in Portola Valley. She expressed visual and environmental concerns, including the ability to actually recycle artificial turf materials at the end of their useful life.

Jon Silver. Shared concerns offered by others and stated that an “artificial” surface would not be in harmony with community values as set forth in town plans and policies. He also wondered if other natural turf fields, without the need for a “sand channel” drainage system

had been considered and offered that they should be looked at as part of any alternatives analysis.

Planning commissioners offered the following preliminary comments:

Von Feldt. Main concerns focus on environmental issues and wondered if there had been any testing of the water quality in the creek after field installation. She also noted that while there may not be a record of any complaints from residents or field users, she has had to deal with the heat, as her son can't play on artificial turf during warm periods due to the impact of the heat from the field surface.

Gilbert. Noted that she was still trying to assemble all data relative to the environmental and aesthetic issues before reaching any tentative conclusions. She offered, however, that she was concerned with the visual impacts associated with the Woodside School artificial turf field, particularly where the sun angle reflected seams or lines in the surface. She was also concerned with the wear of the surface.

McIntosh. Did not worry over visual impacts and or the value questions. Also was impressed with the apparent cost savings relative to maintenance and watering and that community field use was also an important value.

McKitterick. Shared others' concerns relative to conformity with community values, particularly as expressed by Mr. Kelly. Asked the town council to consider a town position on artificial turf, but the mayor advised that this would not be taken up while the PRIORITY application was in process. Will wait to get environmental documents, but the value question is a big issue and also concerned with the potential visual impacts based on inspection of the Woodside School field.

ASCC members offered the following comments:

Breen. Need to review all environmental data and would like information on water quality testing and bacteria control relative to the Woodside School field. Also, concerned with the sand channel field and where the sand comes from. Concur with Gilbert re: visual impacts of the Woodside field, but concerned with the water and fertilizer use for the natural grass fields.

Clark. Look forward to reviewing the environmental documents. Concerned over the potential visual impacts and difference between the "crispness" of the artificial vs. the visual character of the natural turf. Also, the lines or seams seen in the artificial turf are of concern, particularly given the visual sensitivity of the Portola Road corridor.

Koch. Struggle with both the environmental and visual concerns expressed by others. Also concerned with the heat of the surface and its safe playability for all field users.

Hughes. Share others concerns with the visual impacts and also environmental concerns. Also, from a sustainability perspective, the environmental costs of manufacture of the artificial surface materials needs to be considered. While there may be water savings at the site, the water used to manufacture the materials may be far greater. Further, other resources to manufacture and deliver the product to the site, and recycling of turf materials, need to be considered to determine if the material is truly consistent with town and reasonable sustainability objectives.

ASCC members agreed that they would offer additional comments at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Vlastic asked planning commissioners to forward any additional comments they may have to the planning department at town hall.

Following site discussion, 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 5:00 p.m.

Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:31 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 Vlasic, Planning Technician Brown

Interim Planning Manager Padovan

Oral Communications

Steve Padovan informed ASCC members that those with terms expiring at the end of the year to send a letter of interest in continuing to serve to the town council as soon as possible. It was noted that this includes Chair Hughes and members Breen and Warr.

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

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the September 20, 2012 staff report on this continuing preliminary project review. He also discussed the events and comments provided at the afternoon Woodside School site meeting with the planning commission on the matter of experience with artificial turf. (Refer to above site meeting minutes.) Vlasic advised that any additional public and ASCC comments should be provided tonight and then project processing would continue as outlined at the site meeting.

Tim Molak, Priory Head of School, and Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect, were 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 afternoon site meeting, any additional comments provided at this ASCC meeting, and the other comments provided at previous meetings, including those provided at the September 10, 2012 meeting.

Public comments were requested. **Jon Silver, 355 Portola Road**, did not repeat his comments offered at the afternoon meeting, but provided materials relative to an alternative natural turf with long roots that would hopefully avoid the need for a sand channel base drainage system. He also highlighted other comments relative to environmental concerns shared at the site meeting and noted that earthworms introduced from Europe have caused change in soils conditions. In any case, he stressed the need to consider alternative natural grass surfaces.

Tom Kelly, Portola Valley resident, reviewed the concerns expressed at the site meeting and stressed his concerns that "plastic grass" did not fit Portola Valley values and that any decision to support "plastic grass" would set an unacceptable precedent in the town.

Andy Koontz, Portola Valley resident, appreciated the concern over natural vs. native surfaces, but noted that the School is a private use and that it is not public land.

Tim Molak advised that the Priory had considered the “long root” turf suggested by Mr. Silver and had determined it had not been used for school play fields, that water usage was “huge,” and that there was no experience with use for children’s or other heavy use play fields. He added that the alternative is evaluated in the revised draft initial study environmental document just delivered to staff for their review.

Vlasic advised that the Priory fields were used by public groups pursuant to the conditional use permit required “field use agreement.” In response to a question from Chair Hughes, Vlasic advised that the scope of public use would be summarized in the materials prepared for the public hearing on the proposed CUP amendment.

ASCC members then offered the following preliminary comments in addition to the comments offered at the site meeting and at the September 10, 2012 meeting:

Clark.

- Concurred that additional data on the field use by public groups should be provided.
- Noted that the future softball field use needs to be clarified.
- Understood that the artificial turf field would be marked seasonally and not permanently.
- Shared concerns over the precedent of any decision on the artificial turf.
- With berm and tree removal, public views to the field and track will be opened across the “Rutherford” parcel and this needs to be carefully considered. This will be a “big” change visually.
- Other types of natural lawn need to be considered.
- A possible CUP condition should address any future proposals for converting natural turf fields to artificial turf.

Koch:

- Views from the Portola Road corridor to the artificial turf field are of significant concern due to the character or the surface.
- Concern over the impacts of surface heat for field users and limits on use that this could cause.
- Artificial turf does not “feel” right in Portola Valley. Children could lose the experience of playing on a natural turf field, a loss of a community value.
- How “sustainable” is an artificial turf field? This needs to be assessed.

Breen:

- Shared all of the concerns expressed over artificial turf, but also has concerns over the work needed for a natural turf field, for example, where will the sand for the drainage channels come from? Remains open to consider options at this time but complete data on impacts of alternatives need to be considered relative to environmental impacts and sustainability considerations.
- Share concerns over opening of view across Rutherford parcel to the expanded facilities. Support removal of the mound, but the view impacts need to be carefully considered, particularly with the artificial turf surface.
- The Woodside facility when viewed from even a few feet higher in elevation looks worn and “tired” like a carpet, and this is even after just 5 years. This is a significant concern relative to views from the Portola Road corridor.
- The value concerns and emotional issues are also significant, for example loss of the experience of bare feet on grass.

Hughes:

- The public (or semi-public) vs. private use of the facility needs to be clarified.

- The psychological and aesthetic issues/values that have been raised associated with artificial turf need to be considered along with the environmental and sustainability issues. Perhaps there is too much “artificial stuff.” Also, will an artificial surface lead to restriction for dogs or food? How will this impact field use for the “public.”
- Share other’s concerns with the visual impacts.
- The town’s sustainability coordinator might be asked to look into the artificial turf in terms of overall sustainability.
- Much more data on the proposed product is needed and look forward to the analyses that would be provided in the project environmental documents.

Following discussion, Chair Hughes thanked ASCC members and other for their preliminary project comments.

Continued Review and Request for Continuance, Architectural Review for Residential Redevelopment, and Site Development Permit X9H-640, 260 Mapache Drive, *Davison*

Vlasic presented that September 20, 2012 staff report on the status of this project. He advised that the project applicant and design team are still in process of addressing preliminary review comments and have asked that project review be again continued, this time to the October 8, 23012 regular ASCC meeting.

Public input was requested, but none was offered. Thereafter, project consideration was continued to the October 8, 2012 regular ASCC meeting.

Town Council Referral – review and report on proposals for driveway and bridge, Ford Field access easement, *Kelley*

Vlasic presented the September 20, 2012 staff report on this August 8, 2012 referral from the town council requesting a report from the ASCC on the subject driveway and bridge proposals for access through a Ford Field easement to land owned by Ryland Kelley on the east side of Los Trancos Creek in Santa Clara County. Vlasic noted that a number of questions and issues would need to be resolved before any actual building plans were developed or processed for entitlements and that, at this time, the applicant is seeking conceptual reactions from the town to guide development of final plans for the driveway and bridging of Los Trancos Creek.

ASCC members considered the staff report and following driveway and bridge 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, ASCC members considered a computer generated model image of the proposed bridge prepared by CJW Architecture. It was noted that on the image the bridge is shown for the design, including abutment, but does not include data on the tree setting or creek environment.

Vlasic advised that it recommended the ASCC receive a presentation on the project, and then continue review to a site meeting, tentatively scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Monday October 8, 2012. He noted that the project architect had provided data from the Santa Clara

County planning department relative to the status of the Kelley parcels in the County and that this data would be included with the report prepared for the October 8th meeting.

Kevin Schwarckopf, project architect, was present to review the driveway and bridge proposals with ASCC members. He stressed that the owner is seeking sufficient review and actions by the various agencies that would be involved in any project for development of the property in Santa Clara County to at least show that the parcels are “viable.”

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Martin Miller, 3350 Alpine Road**, expressed concern that the driveway and bridge would be developed without development of the residential parcels and that it could become a service driveway to the tree farm on Stanford lands. He raised concerns over the viability of residential development of Kelley property and the noted that the tree farm is frequently accessed by large trucks late at night or early in the morning resulting in considerable noise spill to neighboring residents.

Vlasic advised that the town’s position should be that the driveway and bridge only be developed in conjunction with actual residential development of the Kelley property.

ASCC members briefly discussed the proposal and agreed that the site meeting would be in order to fully understand and react to the proposal. The following preliminary comments were, however, offered:

- In general, bridge of the creek is less of a visual impact issue to the Portola Road corridor than the planned driveway. The bridge would not be highly visible, but the driveway surface and connection to Alpine Road will be very visible at the entry to the town.
- The driveway and surface should be as minimal as possible. It should appear more as a gravel or dirt service road than a formal driveway. Suggest that the surface be something like tan, dirt colored decomposed granite.
- Any mailbox should be of a simple design and there should be no lighting or other driveway entry features, formal landscaping, etc.
- The trail crossing and other issues discussed in the staff report need to be addressed and resolved.

Following discussion, plan consideration was continued to October 8, 2012, and this review would include an afternoon site meeting with the time to be finalized by staff in setting the agenda for the 10/8 ASCC meeting.

Minutes

Breen moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 3-0-1 (Hughes) approval of the September 10, 2012 meeting minutes as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

T. Vlasic