



**TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY**  
**REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028**  
**Wednesday, March 6, 2013 – 7:30 p.m.**  
**Council Chambers (Historic Schoolhouse)**

---

**AGENDA**

**Call to Order, Roll Call**

Commissioners McIntosh, McKitterick, Targ, Chairperson Von Feldt, and Vice-Chairperson Gilbert

**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.

**Regular Agenda**

1. *Continued Public Hearing: Application for amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30 for parcel merger and expansion of athletic fields with new track and artificial turf infill at 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory School, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and responses to comments*

**Commission, Staff, Committee Reports and Recommendations**

**Approval of Minutes:** February 6, 2013

**Adjournment:**

**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 ext. 211. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

**AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION**

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.

Copies of all agenda reports and supporting data are available for viewing and inspection at Town Hall and at the Portola Valley branch of the San Mateo County Library located at Town Center.

**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: March 1, 2013

CheyAnne Brown  
Planning Technician

---



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** Planning Commission

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

**DATE:** February 26, 2013

**RE:** Continued Public Hearing, 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, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and responses to comments

### Introduction & Recommendation

On March 6, 2013, the planning commission will continue the public hearing on this application, which was opened at its December 5, 2012 meeting and continue to permit time for comments on the proposed project to be considered and formulated into final staff recommendations. At the March 6 meeting, the commission should receive the staff report, take additional public comments and, if possible, complete action on the application.

As is explained below, the planning commission has considered this project at numerous meetings, as have other town committees and commissions. The following actions are possible and recommendations as set forth herein have been developed for planning commission consideration:

1. Approval of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration;
2. Approval of the project with the attached conditions and any other conditions which the planning commission feels are necessary.

These actions have been shared with the applicant and have been reviewed with the town attorney. The town attorney will be present on March 6 to provide input and answer questions as may be necessary relative to the possible actions.

### Proposed Project

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, underground the utility lines that run along 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 Conditional Use Permit (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 (enclosed or available online):

- Sheet A-1.2, Area Expansion/Lot Merger & Athletic Fields Improvements, 10/2/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture
- Sheet A-1.3, Enlarged Plan of Merger Area, 11/5/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture
- Sheet A-1.3A, Merger Detail, 9/4/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture
- Sheet A-1.4, Merger Detail, 10/8/12, prepared by CJW Architecture
- Sheet A-1.5, Grading Plan at Trail, 11/7/12, prepared by CJW Architecture
- Sheet 1, Sewer Relocation - Context Plan, 8/12, prepared by BKF
- Sheet 2, Sewer Relocation, 8/12, prepared by BKF
- Sheet F-1, Drainage Map, Existing Conditions, 5/12, prepared by BKF
- Sheet F-2, Drainage Map, Proposed Condition, 5/12, prepared by BKF
- Sheet 3, Site Plan, 11/12, prepared by BKF

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

### **Previous Consideration and Discussion**

Both the planning commission and the architectural and site control commission (ASCC) have considered this project at a number of previous meetings, including:

- a joint field meeting of the planning commission and ASCC 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;
- discussion of site issues at the regular Planning Commission meeting on September 19, 2012;
- a joint field meeting on September 24 at Woodside Elementary School to view their natural and artificial turf fields;
- opening of the public hearing before the Planning Commission on December 5, 2012; and
- consideration of the application by the ASCC on January 14, 2013.

The staff reports and minutes from all of those meetings are available online. In addition, minutes from the January 14, 2013 ASCC meeting are attached to this memo. To summarize, ASCC commissioners agreed on the following items:

- The proposed grading was generally acceptable, although it was recognized that a more detailed plan would be provided as part of the application for a site development permit.
- The location and general size and design of the proposed shed were acceptable, although the building should be lowered with a change in roof pitch. In addition, the shed should be no larger than necessary to meet the Priory's needs. Final design details, including clarification of space needs, should be subject to ASCC review and approval to ensure the best possible design to blend with conditions at the proposed location and minimum visual intrusion relative to views from the public trail.
- The facility, location and general approach to design for the proposed track were generally found to be acceptable. ASCC members discussed the color of the track and agreed that either the proposed dark red cinder color or perhaps a tan or medium grey color could be acceptable. The final color should be based on consideration of all site conditions and should be subject to ASCC review and approval prior to installation of the track.
- The landscaping plan was found to be generally acceptable, but a more detailed landscaping plan, including final details for the parcel frontage fencing, should be provided and subject to ASCC review and approval. In addition, there should be a follow-up review of the landscaping with the ASCC approximately 18-24 months after the new plantings are installed in order to determine if additional plantings are needed or if other landscape adjustments should be made.

There were differences of opinion about the proposed artificial turf. ASCC members' comments are summarized on pages 8 and 9 of the minutes from the meeting.

### **Comments Received**

A number of comments were received via letters or emails, during the public hearing at the December 5 planning commission meeting, and during the January 14 ASCC meeting. This section discusses some of the key comments. Comments on the Initial

Study were also addressed in the Response to Comments documents, which is described in the next section of this staff report.

#### ***Clarification of the Proposed Artificial Turf Type***

There have been conflicting statements made at public meetings and in some informational materials provided by the artificial turf manufacturer about the components of artificial turf that would be used for this project. However, the Initial Study for the project and the staff reports have been consistent in the type of artificial turf analyzed and are as confirmed by the applicant. The artificial turf proposed consists of the following:

- FieldTurf's Revolution fiber "blades" made of a proprietary polymer
- Backing consisting of a pile/geotextile fabric
- Infill comprising sand and thermoplastic elastomer (TPE) pellets

The TPE is made specifically for this artificial turf product, and it is important to note that the infill does not include any material from used tires. The TPE proposed for this project is a light green color, although it is also available in tan.

These proposed materials are somewhat different from the materials observed during the field visit to Woodside Elementary School (WES). The artificial turf at the WES field includes an older design of the fiber "blades" and a different infill material.

#### ***Maintenance of Artificial Turf***

More information was requested about the maintenance that would be needed for the artificial turf. According to the manufacturer, a typical maintenance plan would include the following:

- Regular sweeping as needed to remove leaves and other debris;
- Grooming/raking every four to six weeks;
- Brushing, once every six to eight weeks; and
- Aerating, two or three times per year

All of the maintenance is accomplished by a small vehicle, such as a golf cart, which tows a machine behind it to perform the appropriate maintenance task.

This maintenance plan could need to be adjusted based on the amount the turf is used and the weather, as well as the age of the turf. In general, less maintenance will be needed during the first couple of years. Because maintenance is important for maintaining the look of the artificial turf, a condition of approval is recommended that would require the Priory to follow a maintenance plan based on the manufacturer's recommendations. Also, the cart used for field maintenance should be an energy-efficient model and should be electric if possible.

There are various chemicals which can be applied to the field to remove gum, grease, and mold, or to reduce static buildup. The applicant does not plan to use any of these chemicals. A recommended condition of approval would prohibit the Priory from using any chemicals to maintain the artificial turf.

***Mitigation of Heat Impacts***

Due to concerns about heat impacts and enforceability of the draft mitigation measure, we have revised the mitigation measure to make it more practical. This is mitigation measure 3.3-2c, which originally read as follows:

**MM 3.3-2c** When ambient air temperatures are in excess of 85 degrees Fahrenheit, the project applicant shall be required to water the synthetic field, during practice or play, in order to lower the field temperature. If field surface temperatures can not be sustained below 95 degrees Fahrenheit for one hour, play and use of the field by children under the age of 18 years old shall be suspended.

The proposed revised mitigation measure is:

**MM 3.3-2c** The applicant shall install an accurate, easy-to-read thermometer on the shed near the proposed track and turf along with a sign that explains this mitigation measure. The design of the sign shall be subject to the approval of the ASCC, and the wording on the sign shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planner. The thermometer shall be read by the field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party at 20 minute intervals starting before use of the field through the conclusion of field usage. The Priory shall also provide access to an accurate, functioning portable thermometer for any group who will be using the field from June through September; the system for providing this access shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planner. When ambient air temperatures, as shown on the thermometer on the shed, are in excess of 85 degrees Fahrenheit, the field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party shall use the portable thermometer to measure the temperature at three feet above the field surface every 20 minutes during usage of the field. If the field surface temperature (at three feet) exceeds 95 degrees Fahrenheit, use of the field shall be suspended and the entire artificial turf infield shall be watered to lower the field temperature. If field surface temperatures measured at three feet above the surface cannot be sustained below 95 degrees Fahrenheit for one hour, play and use of the field by children under the age of 18 years old shall be suspended. The field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party shall keep a record of the date, time, temperature reading and actions taken, if any. Such log book shall be available to the Town for inspection, upon request.

Commenters have also asked for more information about the accessible shade areas called for in Mitigation Measure 3.3-2b, which states:

**MM 3.3-2b** As part of the final project design, the school shall identify accessible shade areas and drinking water fountains near the field. Given the density of trees along Portola Road that provide relief from the afternoon sun to the west, this area is ideal for shade protection. Final project plans shall call out "shade relief areas" and drinking fountain locations.

The Priory intends to install drinking fountains on the shed and to preserve the tall redwood trees along Portola Road in order to provide the shade relief areas. The recommended conditions of approval include conditions to implement this measure (see condition #2 relative to the shade relief areas and condition #4 concerning the drinking fountains).

### ***Traffic/Trips***

One question that was raised was whether traffic would increase with the addition of artificial turf. It should be noted that although the Priory would be able to get significantly more use of the field for practices, there would be no increase in traffic as a result of practice use. The only increase in traffic would be from cancelled games, of which there are approximately seven per year.

To address the question of whether the decrease in cancelled games could have a significant traffic impact, we reviewed the traffic study that was completed in 2004 with the adoption of the Priory's Master Plan and arranged for BKF, which had prepared the original traffic analysis, to review the potential traffic impacts from the proposed project. To do this, BKF examined the assumptions from the original traffic study and the levels of service (LOS) at intersections near the school. The report (attached) finds that there would be no significant traffic impact from the use of artificial turf.

### ***Life-cycle Environmental Impacts of Artificial Turf***

Artificial turf would use no fertilizers and less water than natural grass and would require less maintenance once it is installed. However, the question has been raised as to how much water, chemicals and energy are used in manufacturing the artificial turf in the first place, and whether that would offset the savings. To look at this fairly, however, one would also need to consider the water, chemicals and energy used in the manufacture of the fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and seed used for the maintenance of a natural grass field.

As is explained in the attached memorandum from the town attorney's office, this type of life cycle analysis is not appropriate under CEQA. Instead, the assessment of environmental impacts should be focused on local impacts. This is consistent with what the town requires from applicants for other types of projects, and this is what is done in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

### ***General Plan Compliance***

Most of the proposed project—the berm removal, utility undergrounding, grading and drainage changes, installation of a 400m track and landscaping changes—appears to be consistent with the general plan. The track is consistent with the general plan's institutional use designation for the Priory and the existing athletic facilities in that portion of the campus. Both the track and the landscaping changes were considered by the ASCC at their January 14 meeting, and the consensus was that those portions of the project would not have significant aesthetic impacts. Therefore, in both the response to comments document and this report, the discussion about general plan compliance focuses on the artificial turf.

Compliance with the town's general plan needs to be assessed both under CEQA and under the findings required for a use permit amendment. A complete list of general plan



goals and policies that are relevant to the project is provided in the CEQA Response to Comments document. That document discusses the project's consistency with most of the goals and policies. However, CEQA analysis of General Plan consistency is limited to assessing compliance only with plans and policies that were adopted "for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect." The discussion in the response to comments identifies three policies in the general plan that are relevant to the project but are not directly related to avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. Those policies need to be considered to determine whether the proposed project is consistent with the general plan, as consistency with the general plan is one of the findings required for a use permit amendment. Those policies are discussed below.

The first of these is the question of whether the project is consistent with policies that call for the provision of recreation facilities that are supported by the citizenry and that build a sense of community (Major Community Goal 8), and for schools to make recreation facilities available during non-school hours (Section 2147.5). Although the Priory is a private school, it has made its fields available during non-school hours to community groups since its initial use permit approval. The proposed project would not change the terms of the use agreement but would continue to make the field and other athletic facilities available to the community. As a result, the project appears to be consistent with these general plan policies. The type of field surface, whether artificial turf or natural grass, would not affect consistency.

Consistency with the other two policies is more difficult to determine. One policy is Goal 3 of the Major Community Goals, which is "To conserve the rural quality of Portola Valley and maintain the town as an attractive, tranquil, family-oriented residential community for all generations compatible with the many physical constraints and natural features of the area." The question here is whether artificial turf would be inconsistent with the rural quality of the town and natural features of the area. The planning commission has heard arguments on both sides of this question. On the one hand, the artificial turf could be seen as simply the modification of an existing athletic facility. Athletic fields in general, including those with artificial turf surfaces, could then be considered consistent with the town's rural quality. On the other hand, using artificial turf instead of a natural grass could be seen as more urban and therefore raise concerns relative to consistency with the rural quality of the town.

The third policy is an overarching goal from the Sustainability Element: to "strive for an optimum balance among the activities of residents, the built environment and the natural environment so as to maintain and improve the condition of life for future generations." Artificial turf would support the activities of residents by providing a more usable sports field surface, but artificial turf would not support the natural environment in the way that a natural grass field would. Natural grass can provide habitat or food for some animals, at least during some times of the year, whereas artificial turf would not, but natural grass may not support the athletic/recreation activities of residents as well as the artificial turf would.

Based on the foregoing and the analysis in the response to comments, the general plan consistency matter clearly raises value judgments that the planning commissioners will need to make in taking action on the project. There are construction, maintenance and other factors associated with both artificial turf and real grass surfaces, and it appears

from the analysis that it would be possible to find either surface consistent with the general plan.

### **CEQA Analysis and Response to Comments**

The planning commission first reviewed the draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) at its December 5 meeting and provided a number of comments on the draft. In addition, the town received written letters and emails about the draft, and members of the public also had the opportunity to comment on the draft at the December 5 meeting. California law does not require that a “response to comments” document be prepared for a Mitigated Negative Declaration as it does for an Environmental Impact Report, but the town requested that a similar document be prepared in order to ensure that comments are carefully considered. The “response to comments” document includes written responses to comments raised as well as revisions to the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

In particular, the response to comments document includes additional information about consistency with the general plan, potential health risks and environmental hazards, runoff and water quality, soil impacts and subsurface biomes, lifecycle impacts, greenhouse gas emissions, maintenance and disposal impacts, flammability, aesthetics and traffic. Some of those issues were also discussed further in the above comments.

Two mitigation measures were also revised during the response to comments period. One is measure 3.3-2c, which mitigates heat impacts on field users by requiring the temperature to be measured and use of the field to stop if the temperature is over 95 degrees. This measure was revised in order to make it more practical and more likely to be implemented. The second revised mitigation measure is measure 3-17-2, which was revised at the request of the town attorney’s office. This measure sets for the means by which the town can require the applicant to recycle the artificial turf when it is replaced.

As is required under CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) has been prepared for the project based on the recommended mitigation measures. This plan is attached.

The proposed changes to the IS/MND are primarily to provide more information and additional clarity. New significant impacts were not identified and new mitigation measures were not incorporated. As a result, the changes are not a “substantial revision” under CEQA and therefore do not require a formal recirculation period.

The IS/MND, as is required by state law, focuses on the proposed project’s potential impacts on the existing physical environment. The main question the IS/MND is trying to answer is whether the project, as proposed, could have a significant impact on the environment. Based on the analysis presented, the IS/MND concludes that as long as the recommended mitigation measures are required, there is no evidence that the project would have any significant impact on the environment. A draft resolution that the planning commission could use to approve the IS/MND is attached.

### **Planning Commission Consideration**

Before it can take action on the project, the planning commission needs to approve the IS/MND. While additional information could be added to the document, the revised IS/MND meets the requirements of CEQA. Staff therefore recommends that the planning commission approve the IS/MND. This approval would occur prior to considering the findings necessary to act on the project itself.

There are seven findings which are required for action on the project and an amendment to the CUP:

1. The proposed use or facility is properly located in relation to the community as a whole and to land uses and transportation and services facilities in the vicinity.
2. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use and all yards, open spaces, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and such other features as may be required by this title or in the opinion of the commission be needed to assure that the proposed use will be reasonably compatible with land uses normally permitted in the surrounding area and will insure the privacy and rural outlook of neighboring residences.
3. The site for the proposed use will be served by streets and highways of adequate width and pavement type to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.
4. The proposed use will not adversely affect the abutting property or the permitted use thereof.
5. The site for the proposed use is demonstrated to be reasonably safe from or can be made reasonably safe from hazards of storm water runoff, soil erosion, earth movement, earthquake and other geologic hazards.
6. The proposed use will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this title and the general plan.
7. When this title or the town general plan specifies that a proposed use shall serve primarily the town and its spheres of influence, the approving authority must find that it is reasonable to conclude, based on the evidence before it, that the proposed use will meet a need in the town and that a majority of the clientele of the proposed use will come from the town and its spheres of influence within the near future, normally no more than two years. In general, in making such finding, the approving authority shall, in addition to other information, explicitly take into consideration all similar uses in the town and its spheres of influence.

These findings were discussed in the staff report for the December 5 planning commission meeting (attached). As was stated in that staff report, it appears that most of these findings can be made, and the additional data developed since that report was prepared does not change these conclusions.

The one finding that is more difficult is #6, that "the proposed use will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this title and the general plan." Even here, the only part of the project which is in question is the artificial turf; the other parts of the project

are consistent with the general plan. Excerpts from both the zoning ordinance and the general plan are attached, and consistency with the general plan was discussed in detail in the IS/MND and earlier in this staff report. Because the purposes of the zoning ordinance are similar to the goals of the zoning ordinance, that discussion effectively covers both.

If the planning commission cannot make finding #6 for the artificial turf portion of the proposed project, the commission could instead require that a condition of approval be added for the project prohibiting artificial turf. The Priory would then be able to construct the project using natural grass in the inside of the track instead of the proposed artificial turf. A version of the recommended conditions of approval which would include this prohibition is also attached.

### **Recommended Actions**

At the conclusion of the public hearing, the planning commission should close the hearing and consider the project. Based on the discussion, it is recommended that the commission act to approve the IS/MND and then reach consensus on the conditional use permit application. This would include a final position relative to use of artificial turf or natural grass for the track infield area. We also recommend that the commission provide specific direction for finalizing the proposed CUP conditions. Review should then be continued to the March 20 regular meeting, but only for final action on the resolution that would confirm the planning commission's consensus from the March 6 meeting.

Attach./Encl.

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

## **Recommended Conditions of Approval for the Project with Artificial Turf**

*(Note: These conditions would be for this requested amendment and would be in addition to the master plan conditions required with the 2005 CUP amendment.)*

1. Prior to removal of any vegetation, a detailed plan for vegetation thinning along Portola Road shall be submitted to the town. The plan should be consistent with landscape concept plan and will be subject to the review and approval of the ASCC.
2. The tall redwood trees along the Portola Road frontage shall be preserved in order to provide shade relief areas for the proposed field. If these trees become diseased or need to be removed for safety reasons, as confirmed by a certified arborist, the Priory shall submit a plan for providing sufficient shade to the town for review and approval by the ASCC.
3. Detailed grading and drainage plans shall be submitted for ASCC review and approval prior to issuance of site development permit. These detailed plans shall be consistent with the Priory's master drainage plan, and verification of consistency shall be to the satisfaction of the town public works director.
4. The final design of the shed, including its size, shall be subject to review and approval by the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit. The shed shall not be larger than 2,000 square feet in area. As part of this review, the ASCC shall also examine the proposed locations and design of the required drinking fountains.
5. The final color of the track shall be subject to the review and approval of the ASCC prior to installation of the track.
6. Prior to issuance of a site development permit for the project, a final landscaping plan shall be submitted to the ASCC for review and approval. The final landscaping plan shall show all existing and proposed vegetation along the Portola Road frontage and in the berm area, as well as all proposed fencing in those areas.
7. Approximately 18-24 months after the new landscaping is complete, there shall be a follow-up meeting to review the landscaping with the ASCC. Additional plantings or other landscaping adjustments may be required by the ASCC as a result of the follow-up meeting.
8. The Priory shall follow a maintenance plan for the artificial turf based on the manufacturer's recommendations. One year after the installation of the artificial turf, and every two years thereafter, the Priory shall submit information to the town summarizing the number and type of maintenance activities that were undertaken for the artificial turf.
9. Equipment used for field maintenance shall be energy-efficient and should be electric if possible.
10. No chemicals shall be used to maintain the artificial turf.
11. The project shall comply with the mitigation measures set forth in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

## **Recommended Conditions of Approval for the Project with NO Artificial Turf**

*(Note: These conditions would be for this requested amendment and would be in addition to the master plan conditions required with the 2005 CUP amendment.)*

1. Synthetic or artificial turf shall not be used as part of this project.
2. Prior to removal of any vegetation, a detailed plan for vegetation thinning along Portola Road shall be submitted to the town. The plan should be consistent with landscape concept plan and will be subject to the review and approval of the ASCC.
3. Detailed grading and drainage plans shall be submitted for ASCC review and approval prior to issuance of site development permit. These detailed plans shall be consistent with the Priory's master drainage plan, and verification of consistency shall be to the satisfaction of the town public works director.
4. The final design of the shed, including its size, shall be subject to review and approval by the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit. The shed shall not be larger than 2,000 square feet in area.
5. The final color of the track shall be subject to the review and approval of the ASCC prior to installation of the track.
6. Prior to issuance of a site development permit for the project, a final landscaping plan shall be submitted to the ASCC for review and approval. The final landscaping plan shall show all existing and proposed vegetation along the Portola Road frontage and in the berm area, as well as all proposed fencing in those areas.
7. Approximately 18-24 months after the new landscaping is complete, there shall be a follow-up meeting to review the landscaping with the ASCC. Additional plantings or other landscaping adjustments may be required by the ASCC as a result of the follow-up meeting.
8. Equipment used for field maintenance shall be energy-efficient and should be electric if possible.
9. The project shall comply with the mitigation measures set forth in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

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

**January 14, 2013**

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Hughes, Breen, Clark, Koch, Ross

Absent: None

Planning Commission liaison: McKitterick

Town Council Liaison: Aalfs

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Principal Planner Kristiansson, Interim  
Planning Manager Padovan, Acting Planning Assistant Borck

**Oral Communications**

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

**Continued Consideration – Request for Amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP)  
X7D-302 Portola Road, The Priory School**

Kristiansson presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on the ASCC's continued consideration of the subject proposal for CUP amendment for a parcel merger and to allow installation of a new track with artificial turf infill. She clarified that the ASCC does not need to formally act on the project but should provide recommendations to the planning commission, which is responsible for acting on the proposed use permit applications and amendments. She also clarified that ASCC consideration and recommendations should focus on the aesthetics and design of the proposed project.

Vlasic advised that the planning commission is scheduled to continue its public hearing on the requested amendments on February 6, 2013, but that it is unlikely that meeting date could be met. He noted that the response to comments process will take longer and that it is most likely the commission hearing would be continued to at least the February 20<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting.

Kristiansson discussed the history of project review to date and that while most of the design aspects of the proposals have not been the subjects of any significant debate, the primary concerns have focused on the plans for use of artificial turf. She then discussed the following revised plans and how they were modified to address input received at the previous planning commission and ASCC meetings identified in the staff report:

Sheet A-1.2, Area Expansion/Lot Merger & Athletic Fields Improvements,  
10/2/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.3, Enlarged Plan of Merger Area, 11/5/2012, prepared by CJW  
Architecture

Sheet A-1.3A, Merger Detail, 9/4/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.4, Merger Detail, 10/8/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.5, Grading Plan at Trail, 11/7/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet 1, Sewer Relocation - Context Plan, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet 2, Sewer Relocation, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet F-1, Drainage Map, Existing Conditions, 5/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet F-2, Drainage Map, Proposed Condition, 5/12, prepared by BKF

Tim Molak, Head of School, and project architects Carter Warr and Kevin Schwarckopf presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered the following comments:

- The basics of the project have been before the town and ASCC for some time. The key design issues associated with the berm removal, track layout, softball field, shed, trail modifications and landscaping have been addressed as noted in the staff report. Further, there appear to be no issues with the proposed parcel merger.
- The drainage issues have been clarified by the project consultants to the satisfaction of the town public works director, including recent communications from project engineering consultants at BKF.
- Concur with the staff suggestion that details associated with the landscaping, final frontage fencing and also final grading details can be addressed through conditions to any action on the request CUP amendment. The ASCC would then be fully involved in working out the details of such plans.
- It now appears that the key issues are those associated with the proposed artificial turf.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the softball field area would be surfaced in dirt and real grass (grass) and not artificial turf (turf). It was also clarified that the turf infield of the track area would be used for soccer and football activities already on-going at the school. It was noted that it could also be used for Lacrosse if that sport was reintroduced at the school.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the tree removal count is for the berm and no significant tree removal along the Portola Road frontage is planned at this time.
- In response to a question regarding the 2,000 sf size of the proposed storage building, it was noted that the structure was to house existing equipment and materials used in association with the fields that are now housed in at least three locations around the campus. It was explained that it could be smaller, but that this would not solve the scope of the current storage problem. It was further noted that the final design could be improved and that structure could be lower, and that the Priory is prepared to work with the town on a final design that addressed any concerns. It was also clarified that the current design has a plate height of eight feet.

**Project FieldTurf representative David Brown** provided samples of the previous generation of his company's product (i.e., as used at Woodside School) and what was identified as the most current generation (as used at the other schools identified in the staff report materials). He emphasized that the older generation had grass blade elements that were more reflective than the current generation and that the "visual improvements" was a result in changes to blade form and color. He also noted that the color of the current generation of infill material was improved over the previous generation and the current turf is much cooler than the version used at Woodside school.

During questioning of Mr. Brown about the turf materials there was some confusion over the sample products being displayed. It was determined that the "current" generation sample had the correct grass blades and included an infill material of the right color, but that was made from recycled tires. The applicant and staff advised that the recycled tire material was



not proposed for the project and/or what has been analyzed in the proposed environmental documents. It was eventually determined that a true sample of the material should be presented to the ASCC and that the correct sample should be available for consideration at the continued planning commission public hearing.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Andy Brown, Portola Valley resident**, stated opposition to the use of turf and stated it was against all the values in town planning documents calling of protecting the natural character of the planning area. He worried about what was done with the old turf materials when they had to be replaced and concluded that this was making the “earth conform to us” rather than living with and protecting the earth.

**Bev Lipman, Westridge resident**, expressed confusion as to what turf was proposed and asked that this be clarified.

**Sally Anne Reiss, Golden Oak Drive**, spoke in favor of the Priory request and stressed that local use of water would be reduced and that she understood that 90-95% of the turf materials were recyclable and that it was a green product. She noted that the town now mandates use of manufactured materials for roofing due to fire safety objectives and that you make adjustments when materials are better suited for the specific location and purpose of use. She noted that her “artificial” roofing, while not the real wood she originally desired, did not detract from the aesthetics of her house or how it fit in the residential environment of the town. She also noted that there is already artificial turf at t locations in the town including a small amount in the children’s play area at the town center.

**Larry Cagan, Alamos Road**, noted he was an active soccer player and that he supported the Priory plans for use of turf because it will allow the school to play the games and practice at home as intended with the school’s fields. He acknowledged that a perfectly maintained grass field is best for play but this is not practical for anything but the most unusual situations, i.e., like Stanford stadium where there are only 30 games a year. He stressed that for any high use field, grass is difficult to maintain to a proper use standard.

**Jon Silver, Portola Road**, opposed the use of turf and found it to be fully inconsistent with the general plan provisions calling for preserving the natural beauty of the town and its planning area. He stated that the protection of the natural environment should come first even if it is not convenient needs. He took issue with the sample materials provided by the applicant and worried over the true ability to recycle turf when the surface needs to be replaced. He stressed that the samples look fake and that the turf at Woodside school was not only fake looking due to maintenance issues but also due to the design and general character. He concluded that “fake” grass was unacceptable in Portola Valley.

**David Patzer, 350 Cervantes Road**, commented that he supported the use of turf and that this should be a practical decision. He stressed that this was a good solution for the school use and that lawns on residential properties in town were also not consistent with preserving the natural condition of the planning area.

ASCC members considered the staff report, applicant input and public comments. Members then shared the following reactions on matters other than the use of turf:

- **Grading and tree removal.** Members found the proposals generally acceptable. Members concurred that consideration should be given to removal of the large

eucalyptus tree on the Rutherford property, but retention of the olive trees was acceptable. Members also noted that a CUP condition should call for a detailed plan for vegetation thinning along Portola Road consistent with the concepts shown on the landscape plan. It was recognized, however, that all existing materials along the frontage of the Rutherford property are not fully defined on the current plans. Members also were reminded that, eventually, detailed grading and drainage plans would need to be submitted for town approval with a formal site development permit and that this permit process would be recognized in conditions attendant to any planning commission action on the proposed CUP amendments.

- **Shed.** The proposed location and general size and design approach were found acceptable. It was agreed, however, that the building should be lowered with a change in roof pitch and it should be no larger than absolutely necessary to meet the needs associated with the field use. Further, members concurred that the final design details, including clarification of space needs, should be subject to ASCC review and approval to ensure the best possible design to blend with conditions at the proposed location and minimum visual intrusion relative to views from the public trail. Again, it was agreed that such final plan review should be a condition of and action to approve the CUP.
- **Track location and design.** The facility, location and general approach to design were found acceptable. Members discussed possible optional colors for the track surface, but concurred that either the currently proposed cinder color (a specific sample was available for review) or perhaps a tan or medium gray color would be acceptable. It was agreed, however, that final color should be based on consideration of all site conditions and that this also should be subject to ASCC review and approval at an appropriate time in the project implementation process, likely when the berm removal has been completed and the final landscaping plan is under consideration.
- **Landscape plan.** The plan concepts were found generally acceptable, but it was agreed that as a condition of CUP approval, a final, detailed landscape plan, including parcel frontage fencing, should be provided and subject to ASCC review and approval. A particular focus will be on the existing plantings on the Rutherford property and the scope of thinning and removal that would be appropriate. It was understood that this could include more removal of materials not appropriate for the Portola Road corridor frontage and additional planting of appropriate materials, e.g., more valley oaks, for necessary screening and softening of views. Members also concurred that after a period of time when the new plantings are in place, there should be a follow-up ASCC review to determine if additional plantings are needed or if other landscape adjustments should be made to ensure compatibility with the Portola Road Corridor. It was noted that the follow-up review might take place 18 to 24 months after the new plantings are installed.

In general, the ASCC was supportive of the portions of the proposals not associated with the turf matter discussed below, but with the understanding that final details for all project aspects needed to be considered together to ensure the plans achieved the intended site and scenic corridor integration.

Following the offering of the above comments, members offered the following individual inputs relative to the proposed turf material:

**Clark:**

- Has not reached a final position on the appropriateness of the turf. Perhaps the scope of turf use could be reduced if the infield semicircles at either end were in grass leaving the main play area in turf.
- The berm and associated tree removal will open views to the turf area and the landscaping will be important relative to proper visual integration into the road corridor.
- The misunderstandings created with the comments made by the FieldTurf representatives at the ASCC meeting need to be addressed and correct samples provided.

**Breen:**

- The Priory fields are located within the “heart” of the town’s important scenic corridor and the visual sensitivity of this corridor as identified in the general plan encourages preservation of the natural conditions to the extent possible. Use of living grass seems consistent with the intent of the general plan provisions and artificial turf does not.
- The existing turf field examples, including Woodside school, raise serious concerns over the potential visual impacts of a turf surface. Wear, maintenance, light reflection, all are factors that seem to emphasize the artificial condition. In this case, there would be significant views down to the field from Portola Road and the aesthetic impacts on these views appear potentially significant and inconsistent with the natural character called for in the general plan. In addition, part of the aesthetic experience anticipated in Portola Valley is wildlife grazing on real grass fields and meadows. This experience would not be preserved with the artificial turf surface.
- The turf data raises issues over maintenance that seem to conflict with the town’s setting. There would be animals, including deer and dogs, that would cross the turf and create maintenance problems that would appear to conflict with the product data for turf protection. Would fencing eventually be needed to control possible impacts and protect the turf warranty? Would normal use in the area result in the need to replace the turf surface more frequently? Worried over the true ability to recycle the materials.
- Remains concerned over the ability to control runoff of turf materials and impacts on soil and creek water quality.
- Worried that more usable surface would increase use and traffic.
- Based on all the issues, especially significant concern over visual impacts, can’t support the use of turf at this location, particularly within the Portola Road scenic corridor.

**Koch:**

- Concurs with comments offered by Breen. Turf is unnatural and in conflict with the preservation of the town’s natural setting as called for in the general plan. Lawns may not be natural either, but at least provide a living environment.
- Use of an artificial material for “grass” in the scenic corridor “feels” to be a conflict with the natural beauty for the town that the ASCC strives to protect.

**Ross:**

- Based on the data presented, the use of the turf material appears aesthetically acceptable. This is a school and the area in question is essentially for athletic field use consistent with the school’s function. Getting the best use of the facilities in line with school’s basic objectives seems appropriate.
- Once the turf is in place, it likely will not be highly identifiable as an artificial surface. Currently, those passing by the school likely take little notice of the field conditions and after the new landscaping is in place there will be a similar situation whether the surface is turf or grass.
- Maintained ornamental grass or “lawn” surfaces are not natural. Thus, the aesthetic differences between grass and turf fields seem minimal, and a maintained turf field

would appear to look very similar to a mowed grass field. In this case, improved functionality of the field for a school recognized on the general plan appears acceptable.

- Perhaps this provides an opportunity to test the use of a turf field in the town. It could be installed and then reconsidered after a specific period relative to the concerns and use objectives.

**Hughes:**

- Appreciates the various perspectives relative to the turf issue, both the comments in support and those opposed or with significant concerns.
- If turf were permitted, there should be no fencing to control passage of wildlife over the area.
- The first major goals of the general plan are to preserve and enhance the natural features of the planning area and to limit use so that the natural attributes can be sustained over time.
- Turf does not seem to stand the test called for in the basic goals of the general plan. Real grass, while not perfect, appears far more consistent with the objectives of the goals and would result in less impact on the lands than would artificial turf.
- Also remains concerned over the ability of the town to find that the manufacture, use and disposal of turf is consistent with town sustainability goals and objectives called for in the general plan.

Vlasic advised that the ASCC comments would be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration during the continued public hearing process on the proposed CUP amendments. He also advised that since the next ASCC meeting would take place prior to the continued commission public hearing the ASCC would have a chance to review the meeting minutes to ensure that they appropriately reflect the range of comments offered by ASCC members.

**Continued Consideration -- Architectural Review for new residence with detached guest house, tennis court and related site improvements, and Site Development Permit X9H-646, 187 Bolivar Lane, Goldband**

Vlasic presented the January 10, 2013 staff report on the continuing review of this proposal for construction of a new, single-story, contemporary design flat roof residence with attached garage on the subject 3.1-acre Westridge subdivision parcel. He summarized the events of the December 10, 2012 ASCC preliminary project review and then discussed how the revised plans and materials, listed below, address the preliminary review comments:

- 1/7/13 Letter from project architect with 1/7/13 letter from property owners. The letters specifically address each of the 8 points noted in the 12/10 meeting minutes.
- The project revisions discussed in the 1/7/13 letters are presented on the following enclosed plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 1/7/13, prepared by Field Architecture:

Sheet A000, Cover Sheet

Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan and Lighting Plan, Skyline Design Studio

Sheet L-2, Landscape Water Use Plan, Skyline Design Studio

Sheet A050, Site Plan

Sheet A100, Floor Plan

Sheet A101, Construction Staging Plan

Sheet A200, Building Elevations

Sheet A201, Building Elevations

Sheet A202, Guest Elevations



## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Date: February 21, 2013  
To: Kevin Schwarckopf  
From: Jason Mansfield, P.E.

BKF No.: 20060221-15  
Copies To: Tim Molak

Subject: Woodside Priory School  
Amendment to Conditional Use Permit X7D-30, Artificial Turf  
Parking Review

Woodside Priory Traffic and Parking Impact from Use of Artificial Turf Playing Field

### Background:

The following Report addresses a question from the Town regarding the application for amendment of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-30 for the Woodside Priory School (Priory). BKF was asked to consider the amount of additional traffic that might be added due to the anticipated reduction in the number of cancelled games per year. The baseline considers the existing conditions, which takes into consideration a number of cancelled games per year (recognizing that the same number of games is not cancelled each year). The analysis considers a potential increase in games/use by the Priory that might result from the artificial turf (recognizing that some games may still be cancelled due to weather conditions—e.g. heat or rain). The analysis also considers the potential impact of full use of the field under the existing permits (this takes into account maximum allowable community use).

BKF Engineers prepared a traffic study as part of the environmental documentation in 2004. BKF Engineers further reviewed the Parking Management Plan for the CUP X7D-30 in a technical memorandum dated 4/25/2006.

### Summary of Conclusions:

- The only difference in trip generation between the use of artificial turf and natural turf is that regular trip generation would be experienced more frequently.
- We expect the LOS of the nearby intersections to remain the same for the proposed artificial turf field as what was calculated in the 2004 traffic study.
- With the LOS remaining the same, there would be no significant traffic impact from the use of artificial turf.
- Since the number of students is the same for the CUP Amendment, the parking requirements stay the same – regardless of the type of surface for the playing field.
- The current available parking is sufficient to accommodate the proposed artificial turf field.

Traffic:

In the 2004 traffic study, the proposed traffic impacts were calculated from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual. The manual provides anticipated vehicular trips based on the number of students for a school for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The traffic study found that the nearby intersections would remain at their current calculated Level Of Service (LOS). Since the number of students is the same for the CUP Amendment, the trip generation and LOS stays the same – regardless of the type of surface for the playing field.

Based on input from the school, with the existing playing fields, there are generally about 7 games cancelled each year. The school anticipates about 7 fewer games will be cancelled by changing to artificial turf. There have been as many as 56 games played per year in recent years. Therefore, there could potentially be 63 games played per year without any cancelled games. Games are played in the evening during the week.

In the past, the community has used the field for Saturday AYSO and similar games. The school expects that community use may return if the field is an artificial turf. This use would be consistent with the observations made in 2004. This community use does not impact the weekday AM and PM peak hours and, therefore, has no impact on the LOS at the nearby intersections.

When a game is cancelled, we expect the trip generation for the site to be less. Instead of vehicles arriving for games at home, the school sends students to play at a different site in two vans. With fewer cancelled games, we expect the trip generation to be consistent with what was calculated. The only difference in trip generation between the use of artificial turf and natural turf is that regular trip generation would be experienced more frequently. Game related traffic arriving during PM peak hour would be replaced by two vans departing during PM peak hour.

The field use is assumed to be included in the ITE Trip Generation manual factors used in the 2004 traffic study. For a conservative evaluation, the field use can be evaluated in addition to the trips calculated from the ITE Trip Generation manual. No games are played during the AM peak hour. We expect the trips during PM peak hour to be 25 vehicles for one game. This represents about 16% of arriving vehicles, and about 5% of overall vehicles in the intersection. If the delay were increased by that percentage, the LOS at the intersections remains generally the same at LOS A (and the same LOS B for the Portola Road/Alpine Road intersection). It should also be noted that the AM peak hour delay is generally larger than the PM peak hour delay.

Therefore, we expect the LOS of the nearby intersections to remain the same for the proposed artificial turf field as what was calculated in the 2004 traffic study. With the LOS remaining the same, there would be no significant traffic impact from the use of artificial turf.

Parking:

The following is the parking stall count with the above mentioned Parking Management Plan:

	Total
Covered parking stalls	27
Marked Stalls, not covered	193
<u>Overflow Parking:</u>	<u>110</u>
Total	330

The proposed 330 parking spaces are consistent with the use permit approved Master Plan. In fact, the parking management plan actually provides for five more spaces than anticipated with the master plan documents. Further, The Priory will continue to implement programs (car pooling, van use, walking, biking) that it is hoped will reduce the demand for on on-campus parking.

The proposed parking requirements were obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation manual. The manual provides anticipated parking requirements based on the number of students for a school. Since the number of students is the same for the CUP Amendment, the parking requirements stay the same – regardless of the type of surface for the playing field.

Because using the typical industry standard for estimating the number of parking spaces required reflects no change in the number of parking spaces required, we evaluated the required parking based on the operations of the playing field.

BKF also performed parking studies in October and November 2004 as documented in the Initial Study by Thomas Reid Associates, dated 12/21/2004. Please refer to that document for schedules for use of athletic fields and parking utilization observations. The parking need for this field was anticipated to be 56 parking spaces on Saturdays.

Therefore, the current available parking is sufficient to accommodate the proposed artificial turf field.



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** Town Planner

**FROM:** Town Attorney's Office

**DATE:** January 7, 2013

**RE: LIFE CYCLE**

**BACKGROUND:** A number of comments were received on the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study ("IS/MND") for the Woodside Priory School Parcel Merger and Expansion of Athletic Fields with a New Track and Artificial Turf Infill related to the "life cycle" or off-site impacts from the production of the artificial turf. The question presented is whether the IS/MND is legally required to consider in detail the life cycle or off-site impacts of the production of artificial turf.

**DISCUSSION:** Public Resources Code Section 21060.5 defines the environment as the physical conditions existing within the area that will be affected by the proposed project. See also 14 CCR Section 15360. The project area does not define the relevant environment when a project's environmental effects will be felt outside the project area. See Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors (2001) 91 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 342, 369 stating "the purpose of CEQA would be undermined if the appropriate governmental agencies went forward without an awareness of the effects a project will have on areas outside of the boundaries of the project area." See also Muzzy Ranch v. Solano County Airport Land Use Commission (2007) 41 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 372, 388. These cases, however, provide that the level of detail in the discussion of these off-site impacts depends upon how direct the effects are and the difficulty in predicting those effects with any accuracy.

The case most on point that addresses the level of detail required for off-site impacts and the life cycle analysis is Save the Plastic Bag Coalition v. City of Manhattan Beach (2011) 52 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 155. In this case, the city found that a negative declaration was sufficient because the proposed plastic bag ban would have no impact on the environment. Much like the commenters on the IS/MND, Plaintiffs challenged this conclusion citing life cycle studies arguing that the alternative use of paper bags would have a greater environmental impact than plastic bags.



In upholding the city's use of a negative declaration and high level of analysis rather than detailed discussion of life cycle impacts, the Court stated that CEQA "does not demand an exhaustive comparative analysis of *relative* environmental detriments for every alternative course of action." Save the Plastic Bag Coalition at 172. Because the impacts of the project outside the city were both indirect and difficult to predict, the Court stated that "the city could evaluate the broader environmental impacts of the ordinance at a reasonably high level of generality. The city properly concluded that a ban on plastic bags in Manhattan Beach would have only a minuscule contributive effect on the broader environmental impacts detailed in the paper bag 'life cycle' studies relied on by plaintiff. Given the size of the city's population (well under 40,000) and retail sector (under 220 establishments, most of them small), the increase in paper bag production following a local change from plastic to paper bags can only be described as insubstantial." Save the Plastic Bag Coalition at 174. Furthermore, the Court went on to say "this case serves as a cautionary example of overreliance on generic studies of "life cycle" impacts associated with a particular product. Such studies, when properly conducted, may well be a useful guide for the decisionmaker when a project entails substantial production or consumption of the product. When, however, increased use of the product is an indirect and uncertain consequence, and especially when the scale of the project is such that the increase is plainly insignificant, the product 'life cycle' must be kept in proper perspective and not allowed to swamp the evaluation of actual impacts attributable to the project at hand." Save the Plastic Bag Coalition at 175.

In the Town of Portola Valley, a single artificial turf field will not entail substantial production and consumption and will have only a minuscule contributive effect on the broader environmental impacts detailed in life cycle studies. Therefore, the analysis need only be a high level and need not get bogged down in the life cycle studies.



# MEMORANDUM

## TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY

---

**TO:** Planning Commission

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

**DATE:** December 5, 2012

**RE:** 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, Woodside Priory School, and draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

### **Planning Commission Public Hearing Process**

The December 5 planning commission meeting will be the first formal public hearing before the planning commission on the Priory School's application for a parcel merger and an amendment to their use permit to allow installation of a new track with artificial turf infill. The hearing will also include consideration of the draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that has been prepared for the project.

At this meeting, the planning commission should hear comments from members of the public on both the project and the draft IS/MND, and commissioners should also offer comments. The planning commission cannot take action on either the draft IS/MND or the project at this meeting as the noticed public review period on the IS/MND extends to January 4, 2013. Therefore, after presentation of public and planning commission comments, the public hearing should be continued to the regular January 16, 2013 planning commission meeting.

Ultimately, after the close of the public hearing on or after January 16, the planning commission would need to take two separate actions: 1) adoption of the IS/MND and 2) action on the proposed parcel merger and use permit amendment. Adoption of the IS/MND is required before the commission could approve, conditionally approve or deny the project.

### **Previous Consideration and Discussion**

Both the planning commission and the ASCC have considered this project at a number of previous 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;
- discussion of site issues at the regular Planning Commission meeting on September 19, 2012; and
- a joint field meeting with the ASCC on September 24 at Woodside Elementary School to view their natural and artificial turf fields.

The staff reports and minutes from all of those meetings are available online.

### **Proposed Project**

The proposed project would merge the 1.3-acre 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, underground the utility lines that run along 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 enclosed plans:

Sheet A-1.2, Area Expansion/Lot Merger & Athletic Fields Improvements, 10/2/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.3, Enlarged Plan of Merger Area, 11/5/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.3A, Merger Detail, 9/4/2012, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.4, Merger Detail, 10/8/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet A-1.5, Grading Plan at Trail, 11/7/12, prepared by CJW Architecture

Sheet 1, Sewer Relocation - Context Plan, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet 2, Sewer Relocation, 8/12, prepared by BKF

Sheet F-1, Drainage Map, Existing Conditions, 5/12, prepared by BKF  
Sheet F-2, Drainage Map, Proposed Condition, 5/12, prepared by BKF  
Sheet 3, Site Plan, 11/12, prepared by BKF

These plans include revisions and clarifications that respond to comments made at previous meetings. These include shifting the track slightly so that it is further away from Portola Road and also moving the softball field and backstop back towards the hill and away from the track. In addition, the plans now include undergrounding the utility line that runs along the berm. A drainage report, prepared by BKF, confirms that with the proposed drainage provisions, the project would be consistent with the Priory's town-approved Master Drainage Plan.

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

### **Planning Commission Actions Needed**

As noted above, the planning commission will need to take two actions on this project at its January 16 meeting or a subsequent meeting. First, the commission will need to adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. Second, the commission will need to act on the requested use permit amendment, including the lot merger. Each of these actions is discussed below.

#### ***Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration***

A draft Proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared for the proposed project and has been released for public review and comment. The IS/MND was sent to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies, and information about the project and the availability of the IS/MND was also sent to PG&E and the West Bay Sanitary District. Although the public comment period is only required to be 30 days, in this case the comment period was extended to 45 days because of the holidays and runs from November 21 through January 4.

The IS/MND was prepared by Pacific Municipal Consultants in consultation with the Town Planner's Office. The purpose of the IS/MND, as with all CEQA documents, is to reasonably document and disclose the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project so that the town can then make an informed decision about the project. The IS/MND addresses all of the topics required under CEQA. Below is a list of selected issues that have been mentioned at previous public meetings, with references to the sections and the key pages where those are discussed:

- Source and amount of sand (Project Description, see page 18)
- Air quality impacts from off-gassing from the artificial turf (Air Quality Section, see pages 57-59)
- Surface temperature problems (Air Quality Section, see pages 59-63)
- Impacts on greenhouse gas emissions (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section; see pages 101-105)

- Hazardous materials impact from the artificial turf (Hazardous Materials Section; see pages 109-125)
- Drainage (Hydrology and Water Quality Section, see pages 132-134)

The IS/MND, as is required by state law, focuses on the proposed project's potential impacts on the existing physical environment. The main question the IS/MND is trying to answer is whether the project, as proposed, could have a significant impact on the environment. Based on the analysis presented, the IS/MND concludes that as long as the recommended mitigation measures are required, the project will not have a significant impact on the environment.

The task before the planning commission with regards to the IS/MND is to determine whether the document adequately and reasonably discloses the potential environmental impacts of the project. If so, the commission can act to adopt the IS/MND at its January 16 meeting. If not, the commission needs to provide guidance about what additional analysis would be needed. We have asked the environmental consultants to attend the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to hear comments and provide any responses to questions or comments that can be easily addressed. Likely, however, most comments would be addressed in written responses that would be made available with the staff report that will be prepared for the January 16, 2013 continued public hearing.

Some issues which have been raised at public meetings are outside the purview of CEQA and therefore are not discussed in the IS/MND. For example, members of the public have asked about a comparison of different types of playing field surfaces, and the applicant has provided some information as part of the application. However, this information is not discussed in the IS/MND because it does not relate to the question of whether the proposed project could have a significant impact on the environment. These questions do relate, however, to the question of whether the project is consistent with the town's general plan and particularly whether the project has minimal impact on non-renewable resources and water usage as discussed below.

***Proposed Project: Lot Merger and Conditional Use Permit Amendment***

In order to approve an amendment to a conditional use permit, the planning commission needs to make the seven findings listed below. No additional findings are required for the lot merger because it involves less than four lots. As a result, the lot merger can be acted on as part of the use permit amendment.

Findings required for the conditional use permit amendment:

1. The proposed use or facility is properly located in relation to the community as a whole and to land uses and transportation and services facilities in the vicinity.
2. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use and all yards, open spaces, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and such other features as may be required by this title or in the opinion of the commission be needed to assure that the proposed use will be reasonably compatible with land uses normally permitted in the surrounding area and will insure the privacy and rural outlook of neighboring residences.

3. The site for the proposed use will be served by streets and highways of adequate width and pavement type to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.
4. The proposed use will not adversely affect the abutting property or the permitted use thereof.
5. The site for the proposed use is demonstrated to be reasonably safe from or can be made reasonably safe from hazards of storm water runoff, soil erosion, earth movement, earthquake and other geologic hazards.
6. The proposed use will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this title and the general plan.
7. When this title or the town general plan specifies that a proposed use shall serve primarily the town and its spheres of influence, the approving authority must find that it is reasonable to conclude, based on the evidence before it, that the proposed use will meet a need in the town and that a majority of the clientele of the proposed use will come from the town and its spheres of influence within the near future, normally no more than two years. In general, in making such finding, the approving authority shall, in addition to other information, explicitly take into consideration all similar uses in the town and its spheres of influence.

The proposed track and field would be constructed on an existing school campus located on a major arterial, and the school is already using much of the land for an athletic field. The provisions of the Priory's use permit control the amount of use for the field and related traffic, and these provisions would continue to apply to the proposed track and larger field. As a result, findings 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 would appear to be fairly straightforward to make. Findings 4 and 6 are discussed below in more detail.

***Finding 4: The proposed use will not adversely affect the abutting property or the permitted use thereof.***

The project is located within the Priory campus and not directly adjacent to other uses. As a result, there should not be aesthetic impacts on abutting property associated with the basic changes, although concerns have been expressed over the visual conditions of an artificial surface and how these would impact the rural character, particularly along the Portola Road corridor. The potential impacts on rural quality are discussed further below.

Traffic and parking would be controlled under the existing use permit provisions and therefore should not increase. A neighbor raised the question of drainage at an earlier meeting on the project. The drainage report for the project indicates that the drainage improvements that are proposed as part of the project would improve storm drainage from the existing conditions and be fully consistent with the approved drainage master plan for the school site. As a result, it does not appear that the proposed project would have any significant potential for adverse physical impacts on abutting properties.

***Finding 6: The proposed use will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this title and the general plan.***

The general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance is stated in Section 18.02.020 of the Municipal Code. Section 1010 of the general plan states the general purpose and

intent of the general plan. Both of those sections are attached. The question has been raised at previous meetings as to whether having an artificial turf field could conflict with some of the community's goals. In particular, is having an artificial turf field inconsistent with the rural quality of the town and the natural beauty of the town? The general plan also calls for the town to guide development so as to "minimize the use of non-renewable energy resources, conserve water, and encourage energy conservation and the use of renewable energy sources." These three goals of the town's zoning ordinance and general plan are each discussed below in terms of the artificial turf.

*The rural quality of the town*

The general plan describes preserving the rural quality of the town as generally minimizing man-made features, noise and lighting and ensuring that development remains secondary to the natural features of the town. The key question is whether placing artificial turf on the track infill would be incompatible with this rural quality. The basic athletic field uses have been found to be an acceptable part of the Priory school facilities, particularly with the allowance for outside use of the facilities. Whether an artificial or natural turf is used, the athletic and outside uses would likely be the same, although it appears that the availability of the fields for uses would likely increase due to key drainage concerns being resolved.

*The natural beauty of the town*

This goal gets at the aesthetics of the proposed project. On the one hand, the proposed artificial turf has been designed to look as much like natural turf as possible, especially from a distance. The quality of artificial turf has improved over the years. The turf proposed at the Priory would not be permanently striped, which would help it to blend with the surrounding environment. On the other hand, there is a visible difference between artificial turf and natural turf, especially close up. The question related to this goal is whether the artificial turf would impact the natural beauty of the town and if an artificial surface is compatible with the basic provisions of the general plan seeking to preserve the natural elements of the town to the extent reasonably possible. It appears from the data presented and evaluated that drainage improvements and control of runoff need to be made for reasonable use of the athletic facilities with either a natural grass or artificial turf surface. Both will likely have some use limitations, but there should be more play time with an artificial surface for both the established Priory and outside uses as allowed for in the field use agreement with the town. In acting on the use permit, some decisions will need to be made that address the balance between the recreational needs of the community and the potential aesthetic and other impacts.

*Minimal use of non-renewable energy resources and water*

The CEQA analysis finds that artificial turf maintenance at the site would use much less water than natural turf, that no fertilizer or pesticides would be needed, and that the turf would not need to be mowed. However, the artificial turf needs to be manufactured, and the manufacturing process likely uses both water and non-renewable energy resources. In comparison, natural turf would not need to be manufactured, but the fertilizers and pesticides needed to maintain the natural turf would. Those processes also likely use both water and non-renewable energy resources. Researching and documenting all of these impacts would be time-consuming and difficult.

To summarize, the known facts appear to be as follows:

- Once installed, artificial turf uses less water than natural turf and no fertilizers or pesticides
- Once installed, artificial turf requires less maintenance than natural turf.
- The manufacture of artificial turf likely uses both non-renewable energy resources and water, as does the manufacture of fertilizers and pesticides. The amounts of water and non-renewable resources used in these manufacturing processes are not known and would be difficult to obtain.
- Any athletic field requires the use of non-renewable energy resources and water.

The question here is whether having an artificial turf field in particular is incompatible with the goal of having minimal use of non-renewable energy resources and water.

### **Next Steps**

The next steps will be determined based on the comments made at the December 5 planning commission meeting and written comments received. The Priory, town staff and the environmental consultants will consider all of the comments in preparing the staff report and supporting materials for the January 16<sup>th</sup> continued public hearing. The report for the meeting will likely include specific recommendations for planning commission action, and these will be based on the input received at the public hearing and on the proposed IS/MND.

Attach./Encl.

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



## **General Purpose and Intent of the Zoning Code and General Plan**

### **Zoning Ordinance Section 18.02.020**

The zoning ordinance codified in this title is adopted to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare and for the accomplishment thereof is adopted for the following more particularly specified purposes:

- A. To guide, control and regulate the future growth and development of the town in a manner consistent with the general plan;
- B. To protect the established "rural" quality and the stability of private and public areas within the town and assure the orderly and beneficial development of such areas;
- C. To prevent overcrowding the land and prevent undue congestion of population;
- D. To maintain Portola Valley as a major open space preserve;
- E. To obviate the menace to the public safety resulting from the locating of buildings, and the use thereof, and the use of land, in such manner as to cause interference with existing or prospective traffic movements on said streets;
- F. To preserve and enhance the natural beauty of the town;
- G. To provide adequate light, air, privacy and convenience of access to property;
- H. To minimize silting of drains and drainage channels;
- I. To secure safety from fire, inundation and other danger;
- J. To protect the community against excessive storm water runoff, soil erosion, earth movement, earthquake, and other geologic hazards.

### **General Plan Section 1010**

#### Major Community Goals

1010 The goals included below are general in nature and basic to the entire general plan. Goals related to specific aspects of the plan are stated in other appropriate sections. The plan is designed and intended to assist in achieving these major local goals:

1. To preserve and enhance the natural features and open space of the planning area because they are unusual and valuable assets for the planning area, the Peninsula and the entire Bay Area.
2. To allow use of the planning area by residents and others but to limit that use so that the natural attributes of the planning area can be sustained over time.
3. To conserve the rural quality of Portola Valley and maintain the town as an attractive, tranquil, family-oriented residential community for all generations compatible with the many physical constraints and natural features of the area. Rural quality as used in this plan includes the following attributes:

- a. Minimal lighting so that the presence of development at night is difficult to determine, so that the subtle changes between day and night are easily discernible and so that the stars may be readily seen at night.
  - b. Minimal man-made noise so that the prevailing sense tends to be one of quiet except for the sounds of nature.
  - c. Man-made features which blend in with the natural environment in terms of scale, materials, form and color.
  - d. An overall impression of open space, natural terrain and vegetation, interrupted minimally by the works of people.
  - e. Narrow roads bordered by natural terrain and native vegetation.
  - f. Unobtrusive entrances to properties, primarily designed to identify addresses and provide safe access.
  - g. Minimal use of fencing except when necessary to control animals and children on properties and then of a design which is minimally visible from off-site.
  - h. The ability to maintain horses on private properties and to enjoy a trail system throughout the town.
  - i. Paths and trails that allow for easy access throughout the town.
  - j. Agricultural pursuits in appropriate locations.
4. To guide the location, design and construction of all development so as to:
    - a. Minimize disturbances to natural surroundings and scenic vistas.
    - b. Reduce the exposure of people and improvements to physical hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, fire, floods, traffic accidents and to provide evacuation routes for emergencies.
    - c. Protect the watershed of the planning area.
    - d. Ensure that projects complement and are subordinate to their natural surroundings.
    - e. Minimize the use of non-renewable energy resources, conserve water, and encourage energy conservation and the use of renewable energy sources.
  5. To protect, encourage and extend the use of native plant communities, grasses and trees, especially oak woodlands, because they reduce water usage and preserve the natural habitats and biodiversity.
  6. To ensure that growth and development within the planning area is evaluated against required regional environmental standards.
  7. To subject new developments with potential for adverse fiscal and other effects on the delivery of essential public services to an impact analysis to avoid unreasonable financial burdens on the town and other affected local governmental agencies and ensure the continued availability of essential public services.

8. To provide civic and recreation facilities and activities that are supported by the local citizenry and that encourage the interaction of residents in the pursuit of common interests and result in a strong sense of community identity.
9. To provide scenic roads, trails and paths to enhance enjoyment of the planning area and to increase convenience and safety.
10. To encourage the increased availability and use of public transportation and shared private transportation in connecting the town to regional shopping, employment and recreational areas and to the regional transportation network.
11. To provide for those commercial and institutional uses which are needed by the residents of Portola Valley and its spheres of influence on a frequently recurring basis and which are scaled to meeting primarily the needs of such residents. Commercial and institutional uses that meet the frequently recurring needs range from those that most residents of the town and its spheres of influence could be expected to use frequently, typically daily or weekly, to those that, while not frequented so often by most residents, still could be expected to be used primarily by residents of the town and its spheres of influence. Those uses that meet the more frequently recurring rather than occasional needs of the residents are preferred.
12. To limit growth in order to minimize the need for additional governmental services and thereby maintain and preserve the town's predominately volunteer local government, a government which fosters a sense of community.
13. To work with neighboring communities, when appropriate, to identify and develop solutions to interjurisdictional problems.
14. To ensure that development will produce a maximum of order, convenience and economy for local residents consistent with other stated goals and objectives.
15. To foster appreciation of the heritage of the planning area by encouraging the recognition and preservation of important historic resources.
16. To control the size, siting and design of buildings so that they, individually and collectively, tend to be subservient to the natural setting and serve to retain and enhance the rural qualities of the town.

---

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND  
REPORTING PROGRAM**

FOR THE

**WOODSIDE PRIORY PARCEL MERGER AND  
EXPANSION OF ATHLETIC FIELDS WITH A NEW TRACK  
AND ARTIFICIAL TURF INFILL INITIAL  
STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

SCH #2012112047

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY  
765 PORTOLA ROAD  
PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

*Prepared by:*



FEBRUARY 2013

## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### PROGRAM CONTENTS

This mitigation monitoring and reporting program includes a brief discussion of the legal basis and purpose of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, a key to understanding the monitoring matrix, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting matrix itself.

### LEGAL BASIS AND PURPOSE OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resource Code (PRC) 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs whenever certifying an environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration. This requirement facilitates implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research advisory publication, *Tracking CEQA Mitigation Measures*, provides local governments basic information and practical advice concerning compliance with mitigation monitoring and reporting programs. Correspondingly, this document incorporates the suggestions contained within the advisory publication and from research on similar monitoring programs.

### MONITORING MATRIX

The following pages provide a series of tables identifying the mitigation measures proposed specifically for the proposed project. These mitigation measures are derived from the *Woodside Priory Parcel Merger and Expansion of Athletic Fields with a New Track and Artificial Turf Infill Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration* (November 2012). The columns within the tables have the following meanings:

**Mitigation Measure:** Provides the text of the Mitigation Measure identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

**Responsible Party:** References the private entity or public agency or department (Town of Portola Valley) and/or any other agency responsible for implementing the identified mitigation measure..

**Monitoring/Reporting Done By:** Identifies by whom the monitoring or reporting will be done, which may include the applicant, applicant's consultant, contractor, Town or Portola Valley or other public agency.

## **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

---

The agencies listed are responsible for clearing the mitigation measure.

**Timing/Frequency:** Identifies at what point in time, review process or phase of the project the measure will be completed.

**Final Clearance Date:** These columns will be initialed and dated by the individual designated to verify adherence to project specific mitigation.

**Comments:** This column is reserved for any additional explanation or notes made during compliance monitoring, if necessary.

The Mitigation Measures in the matrix represent the final version of the measures to be considered by the Planning Commission.

### **NONCOMPLIANCE**

Any person or agency may file a complaint asserting noncompliance with the mitigation measures associated with the project. The complaint shall be directed to the Town of Portola Valley in written form providing specific information on the asserted violation. The Town of Portola Valley shall initiate an investigation and determine the validity of the complaint; if noncompliance with a mitigation measure has occurred, the Town shall initiate appropriate actions to remedy any violation. The complainant shall receive written confirmation indicating the results of the investigation or the final action corresponding to the particular noncompliance issue.

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Number	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring/ Reporting Done By	Timing/ Frequency	Final Clearance Date	Comments
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>						
<b>MM 3.3-1</b>	<p>During construction, the project applicant shall implement BAAQMD’s basic construction mitigation measures from Table 8-1 of the BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines, which include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</li> <li>2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</li> <li>3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</li> <li>4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</li> </ol>	Applicant/ Contractor	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Periodically during construction.		

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Monitoring/ Reporting Done By</b>	<b>Timing/ Frequency</b>	<b>Final Clearance Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	<p>7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</p> <p>8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p>					
<b>MM 3.3-2a</b>	Following field installation, the school shall educate field management staff, coaches, athletic staff, field users, and parents of the potential for heat-related illness, and how to recognize and prevent heat-related symptoms and illness. Education may include but not be limited to: training, handouts, postings, and signage.	Applicant/ Field Manager	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Prior to and during field use during the life of the project. Training materials to be provided to Town.		
<b>MM 3.3-2b</b>	As part of the final project design, the school shall identify accessible shade areas and drinking water fountains near the field. Given the density of trees along Portola Road that provide relief from the afternoon sun to the west, this area is ideal for shade protection. Final project plans shall call out "shade relief areas" and drinking fountain locations.	Applicant/ Architect	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Prior to issuance of building permit.		
<b>MM 3.3-2c</b>	The applicant shall install an accurate, easy-to-read	Applicant/	Town Building,	Installation of		



**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Number	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring/ Reporting Done By	Timing/ Frequency	Final Clearance Date	Comments
	<p>thermometer on the shed near the proposed track and synthetic turf field along with a sign that explains this mitigation measure. The design of the sign shall be subject to the approval of the ASCC, and the wording on the sign shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planner. The thermometer shall be read by the field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party at 20 minute intervals starting before use of the field through the conclusion of field usage. The Priory shall also provide access to an accurate, functioning portable thermometer for any group who will be using the field from June through September; the system for providing this access shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planner. When ambient air temperatures, as shown on the thermometer on the shed, are in excess of 85 degrees Fahrenheit, the field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party shall use the portable thermometer to measure the temperature at three feet above the field surface every 20 minutes during usage of the field. If the field surface temperature (at three feet) exceeds 95 degrees Fahrenheit, use of the field shall be suspended and the entire artificial turf infield shall be watered to lower the field temperature. If field surface temperatures measured at three feet above the surface can not be sustained below 95 degrees Fahrenheit for one hour, play and use of the field by children under the age of 18 years old shall be suspended. The field manager, referee, coach or other responsible party shall keep a record of the date, time, temperature reading and</p>	Field Manager	Planning and Engineering Department	<p>thermometer prior to building final inspection.</p> <p>Reading of thermometer prior to each game during the life of the project in warm weather.</p> <p>Submit records upon request by the Town.</p>		

### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Number	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring/ Reporting Done By	Timing/ Frequency	Final Clearance Date	Comments
	actions taken, if any. Such log book shall be available to the Town for inspection, upon request.					
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
<b>MM 3.5-1a</b>	<p>Prior to issuance of building/grading permits, the Town of Portola Valley Planning Department shall require the project applicant to include on all final construction documents (plans and specifications) the following wording:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"If any archaeological (i.e. arrowheads), and/or paleontological (i.e. fossils) resources are discovered during construction activities, all work in the immediate vicinity must stop and the Town of Portola Valley Planning Department (Planning Department) shall be immediately notified.</i></p> <p><i>An archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate mitigation measures for the inadvertently discovered archaeological resources. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate mitigation for the inadvertently discovered paleontological resources.</i></p> <p><i>The Planning Department will consider the mitigation recommendations of the qualified archaeologist/paleontologist and shall consult and</i></p>	Applicant/ Architect          Contractor	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Wording on plans prior to issuance of building and grading permit.       Follow instructions of the wording during construction.		

## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Number	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring/ Reporting Done By	Timing/ Frequency	Final Clearance Date	Comments
	<p><i>agree upon implementation of a measure or measures that are deemed feasible and appropriate. Site specific mitigation shall be designed in accordance with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery or other appropriate measures."</i></p>					
<b>MM 3.5-1b</b>	<p>Prior to issuance of building/grading permits the Town of Portola Valley Planning Department shall require the project applicant to include on all final construction documents (plans and specifications) the following wording:</p> <p><i>"If human remains are discovered during construction activities, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, the Town of Portola Valley Planning Department and the County Coroner must be notified pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed."</i></p>	Applicant/ Architect  Contractor	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Wording on plans prior to issuance of building and grading permit.  Follow instructions of the wording during construction.		
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>						
<b>MM 3.7-1</b>	Prior to issuance of any permit, measures to reduce GHG emissions during construction shall be identified	Applicant/	Town Building, Planning and	Wording on plans prior to		

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Monitoring/ Reporting Done By</b>	<b>Timing/ Frequency</b>	<b>Final Clearance Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	<p>and specified on the final project plans. Recycling and diversion of construction waste and demolition materials, as required by Chapter 8.09 of the Portola Valley Municipal Code, shall be one of the measures. In addition, at least one of the following two measures recommended by the BAAQMD shall be identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative-fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; and/or,</li> <li>2. Local construction materials (within 100 miles) of at least 10 percent.</li> </ol> <p>In lieu of either of these measures, an alternative measure at least equivalent to these may be identified subject to the review and approval of the Town Planner.</p>	<p>Architect/  Contractor</p>	<p>Engineering Department</p>	<p>the issuance of any permit.  Implement measures during construction.</p>		

## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Number	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring/ Reporting Done By	Timing/ Frequency	Final Clearance Date	Comments
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>						
<b>MM 3.9-1</b>	The project applicant shall design the sub surface drainage system consistent with the recommendations provided in the <i>Drainage Report for Woodside Priory Multi-Purpose Field Improvements, Portola Valley, California</i> prepared by BKF Engineers in November 2012 ( <b>Appendix D</b> ). Recommendations include providing a retention layer that is 1,300 feet long by 3.25 feet wide and 3.0 feet deep and contains ¾-inch course angular drain rock below the invert of the perforated pipe and providing detention layer that is 1,300 feet long by 3.25 wide by 2.25 feet deep and contains ¾-inch drain rock around a 12-inch perforated pipe. A 1.5-inch diameter orifice opening shall restrict the flow line of the perforated pipe with another 1.5-inch diameter orifice opening one foot higher. At the downstream end, an inlet with a side opening as the overflow weir 4-inches deep and 12-inches wide shall be provided.	Applicant/ Engineer	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Prior to issuance of grading permit.		
<b>NOISE</b>						
<b>MM 3.12-1</b>	During construction activities associated with berm removal, the project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified on-site building professional to monitor the vibration levels and effects of construction at the Fromhertz House located on the Rutherford parcel at 210 Portola Road. If vibration is observed to result in negative impacts to the integrity of the structure, vibration generating activities shall cease and alternate	Applicant/ Building Professional/ Contractor	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	During berm removal.		

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Monitoring/ Reporting Done By</b>	<b>Timing/ Frequency</b>	<b>Final Clearance Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	construction equipment and methods shall be employed to mitigate vibration to levels that will not comprise the structural integrity of the historic resource.					
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>						
<b>MM 3.17-1</b>	Prior to final design approval, the project applicant shall contract with a professional engineer to prepare a detailed sewer survey prior to the final design approval. The detailed sewer survey will confirm the diameter and material of the existing and proposed sewer pipelines and lift station located downstream from the proposed pipeline. If existing sewer pipelines or the pump lift station are found to have insufficient capacity for ultimate CUP flow capacity, they shall be upgraded to ensure that the final design will provide adequate service.	Applicant/ Engineer	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Prior to final design approval.		
<b>MM 3.17-2</b>	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the project applicant shall record a legal agreement with the Town of Portola Valley that requires the applicant and any successor/assign to recycle the turf at the end of its lifespan, to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney.	Applicant/ Town Attorney	Town Building, Planning and Engineering Department	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit.		

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_-2013**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE FIELD REPLACEMENT PROJECT AT THE WOODSIDE PRIORY SCHOOL**

**WHEREAS**, the Woodside Priory School has proposed to replace an existing athletic field at the school with a 400 m track and field (“project”); and

**WHEREAS**, an Initial Study, Notice of Preparation and Mitigated Negative Declaration (“CEQA documents”) were prepared based on substantial evidence analyzing the potential environmental impacts of the project and was released for public comment starting on November 21, 2012; and

**WHEREAS**, the public comment period on the CEQA documents extended until January 4, 2013, and

**WHEREAS**, although not required by California law, a response to comments documents was prepared and was released on February 26, 2013, and

**WHEREAS**, the CEQA documents, public comments, response to comments and all other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission’s decision is based are on file with the Town of Portola Valley Town Clerk; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission finds that the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration is complete and adequate pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), and that the Planning Commission has considered and reviewed all information contained in it; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission held duly noticed public hearings on December 5, 2012 and March 6, 2013 on the Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and proposed project, and considered all information presented at those hearings; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before it that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the Town’s independent judgment and analysis; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town adopts a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, be it resolved that the Planning Commission approves the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Town of Portola Valley on March 6, 2013.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Alexandra Von Feldt, Chairperson

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Padovan, Secretary