

Special Field Joint Field Meeting with Planning Commission

725 Portola Road, Spring Down Equestrian Center, Goodstein, and

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

Chairman Gelpi called the special field meeting to order at 4:12 p.m. at 725 Portola Road, Spring Down Equestrian Center. It was noted that this was a joint meeting with the planning commission as the commission would be the approving authority on the Goodstein request for amendment of conditional use permit X7D-29.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

ASCC Absent: Breen, Warr

Planning Commission: Elkind, McIntosh, Wengert, Zaffaroni

ASCC Absent: McKitterick

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

Others present relative to the Spring Down Equestrian Center request:

Stan Goodstein, applicant

Carol Goodstein, applicant

Phil White, 683 Portola Road

Rick Anderson, Woodview Lane, Woodside

Proposed Amendment to Conditional Use Permit X7D-29, Spring Down Equestrian Center, 725 Portola Road, Goodstein

Vlastic presented the August 23, 2007 staff report on the subject application for amendment to the provisions of the existing use permit. He clarified that the amendments relate primarily to the conditions of the operation after its lease for use of the front two parcels, now owned by the town, terminates in October 2010. He referenced details on the request contained in the August 9, 2007 staff report to the planning commission prepared for and considered at the August 15, 2007 planning commission meeting. He also reviewed the proposal adjustments made since the August 15 commission meeting as described in the 8/23 staff report, including elimination of the plans for enclosing the new riding arena. The staff report was considered along with the following plans and additional materials provided since the 8/15 planning commission meeting:

As noted at the head of this memorandum, a site meeting has been scheduled relative to this request for 4:00 p.m. on Monday, August 29. The planning commission has been invited to participate in the site meeting. The main purposes of the site meeting are to consider the plans for restoration of the front parcels before they are vacated, adjustments to the previously approved plans for the new riding ring, and adequacy of the site to accommodate the density of horses proposed to be kept on the rear, 5.64 acre parcels.

Project plans prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.:

Sheet 1, Topographic Survey (westerly parcels), 7/9/07

Sheet 2, Topographic Survey (easterly parcels), 7/9/07

Sheet C-1, Site Development Exhibit (westerly parcels), 7/30/07

Sheet C-2, Site Restoration Plan, 8/23/07

Support materials:

Applicant's 8/16/07 letter to the town, withdrawing request for arena enclosure

Applicants proposed "Schedule for Transition" for actions prior to the lease termination

Vlasic then discussed the issues identified during the August 15 preliminary planning commission review and noted that he and Leslie Lambert had met with stable inspector Sue Toumanoff regarding the horse density issue. He distributed an 8/27 statement from Ms. Toumanoff regarding this matter, setting forth the factors she felt supported the request. Vlasic also noted that the Woodside stable ordinance does not set a specific limit regarding horses per acre for commercial stables, but bases permitted density on specific factors associated with the stable site and nature of the operation.

In response to a question, Vlasic advised that based on his review and discussions with Ms. Toumanoff, he could not explain the factors that were used to support the current stable ordinance limit of five horses per acre for commercial stables. He noted, however, the stable inspector has pointed out that the Spring Down operation currently "keeps" all 84 horses on the rear 5.64 acres and the proposal would reduce this to 50 rather than the 40 horse limit in the approved use permit.

Vlasic also advised that the proposed plans were still being reviewed by the public works director, as well as other town staff and committee members and, eventually, their comments would be presented to the planning commission at the time the use permit is set for formal hearing.

Following review of the plans, Mr. and Mrs. Goodstein conducted a tour of the property explaining the current operation as well as how it would be conducted after lease termination. They offered the following comments and clarifications:

- Staking for new arena was in place and it was used to describe changes on the rear portion of the property.
- Horse washing activities would likely be adjacent to the reconstructed workshop, near where they are currently conducted.
- More horses can be kept in the facilities to be preserved than 50. There are actually more than 50 stalls being preserved. The plans would be clarified to accurately show the number of stalls and other existing facilities.
- In response to a question, it was noted that there has never been any water quality issues with the facility.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the "wetland area" at on the front parcels has been in place since prior to the Goodstein ownership. It was also noted that "Sausal Creek" is typically dry this time of year and that the fencing around the wetland area is proposed to remain in place for security associated with the water feature.
- It was explained that the proposed 50 horses was needed to ensure the equestrian facility would remain viable after lease termination and after the horse shows are no longer conducted (or permitted) on the property. In response to question about lease extension beyond 2010, Mr. Goodstein commented that he wanted the currently proposed use permit revisions to protect and ensure the long-term feasibility of the use and believed it was in his and his wife's best interests and those of the use, to scale back the operation at the end of the current lease period. He stressed

his belief that this would be the best in terms of ensuring the continuation of the use and the equestrian services it provides to the community. Mrs. Goodstein advised that she would "love" to see the use continued "forever" in its present condition, especially in terms of the educational experiences it provides to the children of the community, but appreciated the long-term economic and other concerns of her husband.

Public comments were requested. **Mr. Anderson** stated the Goodsteins have been "great neighbors" and offered "full" support for their request. He added that he has experienced no visual or other impacts from the use, and noise has not been a problem.

Planning commissioners and ASCC members offered the following comments:

Elkind:

- Supports Goodstein operation in terms of 50 horses, but concerned with any future owner and how the use permit can be conditioned to ensure proper operation if it was to be operated by a different owner.
- If possible, Sue Tounmanoff should be at PC hearing to explain 5 horses per acre limit and how it relates to this proposal. The main concern would be a precedent setting action by the commission.
- Advice from the town attorney is needed regarding the condition guaranteeing that any future owner demonstrate the ability to properly operate like facility, i.e., like the Goodsteins.
- Advice from the town attorney is also needed regarding a commission action to permit exceeding the 5 horses per acre stable ordinance standard and any potential, precedent setting problems with this.
- The water quality situation and drainage details should be available for planning commission consideration at the use permit public hearing. However, if no major changes are anticipated in terms of the impact of keeping of horses, the Goodsteins should not be burdened with any new water quality reviews or requirements..
- Manure handling/hauling concerns need to be clarified as to existing conditions. (Note: Mr. Goodstein advised that manure was removed weekly and covered until removal to avoid any runoff problems. Vlasic noted that Ms. Tounmanoff had confirmed that the manure handling was exemplary.)

Zaffaroni:

- Shared Elkind concerns re: ownership transfer, drainage and water quality, with same perspectives as stated by Elkind.
- Need advice from the town attorney regarding ownership and permit transfer limitations, particularly with respect to the acceptability of the existing condition on ownership change requirements.

McIntosh and Wengert:

- Supports the modified proposal.
- Concur with the clarifications asked for by Elkind, but feel that some burden with respect to the front parcel conditions, particularly removal of existing exotic vegetation, is on town and not applicant.
- McIntosh suggested that a longer lease term might be beneficial to both the applicant and the town.

Clark:

- Stated support for the “status quo” of the operation and the importance of the equestrian use to the community.
- Deferred to the expert stable inspector re: the horse density issue.
- The time frame for removal of exotic vegetation on the front parcel should be up to and a burden of the town.
- The revised plan is preferred over the plan with previously proposed covered riding arena.

Von Feldt:

- Supports preserving the use in town. It is a community asset.
- Number of horses proposed appears viable given conditions of the site and nature of the existing and proposed operations.
- Wondered about what town might eventually do with front property. This will likely take a more involved planning process if anything is considered other than open space.
- Removal of exotic vegetation on the front parcels should be by town once it has an appreciation of how the property might be used and/or maintained.
- Shared drainage and water runoff cautions offered by planning commissioner Elkind.

Gelpi advised he had no additional comments to offer but did support the continuation of the equestrian operation on the property.

Following the site inspection and sharing of the above clarifications and comments, ASCC members concurred that ASCC project review should continue at the regular evening meeting. Thereafter, ASCC chair Gelpi and planning commission chair Wengert thanked all present for their participation in the site meeting.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:30 p.m. the special joint ASCC and planning commission field meeting was adjourned.

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Clark, Gelpi, Von Feldt

Absent: Breen, Warr*

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Technician Borck

*Vlastic advised that Warr had contacted him just prior to the meeting and explained he was ill and could not attend the meeting.

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Follow-up Review – Town Center Project, site lighting, pole-mounted light fixture

Vlastic reviewed the comments in the August 23, 2007 staff report on this matter and explained that the mock up "skirt" had not been installed on the pole-mounted fixture as had been anticipated when the staff report was prepared. As a result, he recommended that the follow-up review be continued to the September 10 regular meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, the follow-up review of the pole light was continued to the September 10, 2007 regular ASCC meeting.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit X6D-165, and Lot Merger X6D-205, 880 Westridge Drive, Lane

Vlastic presented the August 23, 2007 staff report on the subject use permit and lot merger requests. He noted that the proposals are described and evaluated in detail in the August 8, 2007 "preliminary review" memorandum to the planning commission and, specifically, in the July 20, 2007 application letter to the planning commission. He clarified that the proposals are to fulfill requirements of the conservation easement the Lane family established over their 10+ acre Westridge property in 2006. He then provided a summary of the preliminary review comments offered by planning commissioners at the August 15 commission meeting, as described in the 8/23 staff report. Vlastic advised that the ASCC should offer any comments or recommendations for consideration by the planning commission when it eventually acts on the use permit and lot merger applications.

It was noted that the applicant had advised staff he could not be present at the ASCC meeting, but asked that, nonetheless, the ASCC review and comment on the applications.

Public comments were requested but none were offered.

ASCC members stated support for the applications and noted they had nothing additional to offer at this time.

Vlasic advised that the planning commission would be advised of the ASCC review of the applications.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit X7D-166, AT&T "Lightspeed" network upgrade for various locations along mainly the Portola and Alpine Road Corridors, AT&T

Vlasic presented the August 23, 2007 staff report on the subject conditional use permit application for installation of seven (7) new equipment cabinets within the town road rights of way, primarily the Alpine and Portola Road corridors. He explained that the proposed, roughly 5 ft. x 4 ft. x 2 ft. (height, width, depth) above ground equipment cabinets would be in addition to existing AT&T equipment and for the purpose of extending AT&T service that would compete with the current Comcast cable services offered in the area. Vlasic referenced the August 8, 2007 preliminary review report to the planning commission on the application, noting it provided a detailed description of the proposal and interaction with staff as to cabinet siting and colors of the cabinet. Vlasic also presented the comments from the August 15 planning commission preliminary review of the application, as set forth in the August 23 staff report, and photos of the proposed sites for the seven cabinet locations.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the specific comments in the report relative to possible ASCC conditions and recommendations.

Tedi Vriheas, AT&T representative offered the following comments and clarifications:

- AT&T is agreeable to a final field setting of the proposed cabinet with ASCC members as recommended in the staff report. Actually, large size site plans were developed with staff for preferred locations and these can be used to facilitate the final field siting effort.
- Color samples are not available "tonight" but will be made available for ASCC consideration.
- Data on noise associated with the cabinets is also forthcoming.
- There is some latitude in cabinet location, but the new equipment must be at least within 300 feet of the existing AT&T cabinets identified in the photos provided by staff.
- AT&T is willing to install screen planting and maintain it for at least 6 months. If, in one year, the plants do not survive, they would be replaced.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the equipment would be placed on concrete pads poured at the site and that the pads would be roughly two feet larger, on all sides, than the cabinet footprint.
- In response to a question, it was noted that there would be very little need for equipment maintenance and that service trucks would not frequent the site. In response to a comment from council liaison Merk, she noted that service trucks might check the site as little as once per year and that it would be highly unusual for a service truck to be parked at a cabinet site for

any length of time. She also commented that she would advise service technicians to be aware of pathways and not park trucks in pathways when service is necessary and being provided.

- In response to a question from Vlasic, it was noted that the existing cabinets could be painted to match the new cabinet color, but only the light green or light tan colors were possible for the new cabinets. She also commented that the cabinet at 3195 Alpine Road would be painted to match the new cabinet approved for that location and this would "paint out" the address lettering placed on the sides of the existing cabinet.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Rick Anderson, Woodview Lane, Woodside, advised that he was at the August 15 planning commission meeting when a Westridge resident commented that the existing AT&T cabinet at Westridge and Mapache Roads was very "reflective" at night in terms of car headlights. He added that he drove by the cabinet at night and shined his car lights into it and experienced no significant reflection.

Following discussion, it was agreed that, as recommended in the staff report, a site meeting should be set with two designated ASCC members, staff and the applicant to finalize the locations for the proposed new equipment cabinets and that, at the time of the site inspections, final recommendations be developed as to color, screen planting, and need for painting of existing cabinets. It was agreed that this meeting would be set by planning staff and the recommendations from it forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the proposed use permit.

Proposed Amendment to Conditional Use Permit X7D-29, Spring Down Equestrian Center, 725 Portola Road, Goodstein

Vlasic presented the August 23, 2007 staff report on the subject application for amendment to the provisions of the existing use permit for the equestrian facility located on the 11.89 acre property immediately south of the town center. He reviewed the events of the special afternoon joint site meeting with the planning commission and the comments and reactions provided at the conclusion of the field meeting. (See above field meeting minutes that include a listing of proposed plans and materials.)

Stan and Carol Goodstein were present and advised that they had no additional comments to offer beyond those presented at the site meeting.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members agreed they supported the request with the comments and observations offered during the site meeting. Von Feldt continued to wonder about the process for town review of uses for the property after the Goodstein lease is terminated and the process for modification of more exotic vegetation after the transition.

After discussion, it was agreed that the comments and reactions offered at the site meeting should be forwarded to the planning commission for consideration in acting on the use permit amendment request.

Proposed Conditional Use Permit X7D-164 for small winery, 875 Westridge Drive, Brown

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the August 23, 2007 staff report on this request and advised that consideration of the application should be continued to the September 10, 2007 regular ASCC meeting. He explained that the reason for the continuance has to do with ongoing interaction between the applicant and Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) relative to the "commercial" nature of the use and whether or not it would be in conflict with the basic provisions of the Westridge CC&Rs.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. Thereafter, project review was continued to the September 10, 2007 regular ASCC meeting. (It was noted that the matter would be re-noticed for the meeting if it were actually ready for ASCC consideration. Otherwise, the request would not be placed on the September 10, 2007 agenda.)

Architectural Review for house additions, 333 Willowbrook Drive, Prado

Vlasic presented the August 23, 2007 staff report on this proposal for approval of house additions to the existing single story, 2,855 sf residence on the subject 1.0 acre Willowbrook Drive site. He clarified that all additions would also be single story, totaling 565 sf, and the resulting house floor area would be 3,420 sf, including the remodeled, attached garage. Vlasic added that the total floor is within the 85% floor area limit for the single story house, therefore, no special ASCC floor area findings or review are requested or required.

Vlasic noted that the proposal includes substantial remodeling and modification of the existing residence, change in architectural style, as well as landscape improvements immediately adjacent to the remodeled and added-to house. He also noted that, under a separate application, the property owner is seeking a variance to allow rebuilding of the existing swimming pool on the site that is located within the 50-foot front yard setback area. Vlasic then discussed the issues identified in the 8/23 staff report and the following project plans, unless otherwise noted, dated 8/7/07 and prepared by Elsbeth Newfield AIA:

Sheet A-1, Title Sheet

Sheet A-2, Topographic & Boundary Survey, Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/22/07

Sheet A-3, Floor Plan

Sheet A-4, Exterior Elevations

Sheet L-1, Landscape Conceptual Plans (with lighting), Latker Design Solutions

Sheet L-1, Landscape Conceptual Plans, Latker Design Solutions

Also reviewed were the materials and colors board and the cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received by the town on 8/7/07.

Borck reviewed the proposed "sustainable building" aspects of the project, citing the overview of "green" elements as presented in her August 17, 2007 memorandum to the planning commission and noted on the applications "sustainable buildings" checklist. In this case, she noted that the proposal includes a number of measures beyond what is typically proposed on such an addition project in town and even beyond what is covered by the standard checklist.

Mr. Prado and Elsbeth Newfield presented the proposal to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications, largely in response to issues discussed in the staff report:

- The applicant is willing to remove the "crisscross" fence in the public right of way as suggested in the staff report, but notes it has been there for sometime and would prefer to leave it there. However, the corral fence is most important, and it is likely some additional fencing would be desired near the corral if the "crisscross" fencing is removed.
- The applicant and landscape architect would prefer to replace the existing front yard planting along the property line and in the right of way with native materials and would appreciate any suggestions from the ASCC. Further, the paver material for the driveway has been proposed because it is more pervious than asphalt. Consideration is also being given to a gravel surface.
- The proposed exterior materials finishes will be adjusted to conform to the town's light reflectivity value policy limits as recommended in the staff report. Also, the tile roofing is proposed to be salvaged "aged" barrel roof tiles, if these can be found.
- The building permit plans will include data for compliance with the town's flood hazard ordinance to the satisfaction of the public works director.
- While the proposed light fixtures are capable of containing 100 to 150 watt bulbs, the intent is to use a compact florescent bulb with a rating equivalent to a 75-watt bulb.
- The landscape architect is also considering plans for additional bank stabilization planting in the creek and wonders about town recommendations for such planting.

Public comments were requested. **Council Liaison Merk** commented that he has a gravel driveway and that, while is a good choice for many reasons, it also requires high maintenance, for example for weed control. He suggested alternative surfaces such as permeable asphalt or turf stone.

ASCC members found the project generally acceptable, but did share the concerns set forth in the staff report regarding exterior finishes, light fixtures, fencing and landscaping within the public right of way. Von Feldt commented that she found the variance request appropriate, but offered concerns with any plan for planting within the riparian corridor. She also encouraged modification of the landscape plan to replace proposed more exotic grass species with native grasses.

Following discussion of issues, Clark moved, seconded by Von Feldt and passed 3-0 approval of the architectural review project as proposed and clarified at the ASCC meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. Data shall be provided to the satisfaction of the public works director verifying compliance with the flood hazard protection provisions of the town's zoning ordinance.
2. Any plan for planting within the creek/riparian corridor shall be subject to a separate application and shall conform to the town landscape and planting policies for the creek environment.

3. The project plans shall be modified to include removal of the "crisscross" fencing along the northern, Willowbrook Drive frontage of the property. Further, any plans for new fencing shall conform to the town's fence ordinance and shall be shown on the building permit site plan or final landscape plan.
4. A final exterior colors and materials board and actual materials samples shall be provided that conform to the light reflectivity value policies of the town.
5. The proposed landscape plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Replace proposed exotic grass species with native grasses.
 - b. Provide for phased removal of the existing exotic, linear front yard planting with new native plant materials. The exotic materials in the public right of way should be removed over time as the new native materials, to be installed within the parcel boundary, mature. The new plantings should be selected from the town's recommended list of native plant materials.
 - c. Elimination of the proposed driveway paver materials in the public right of way and final selection of new driveway material to address the driveway paving concerns discussed in the 8/23/07 staff report and the "permeable" design objectives identified by the applicant at the 8/27/07 ASCC meeting.
6. An alternative house mounted light fixture shall be specified that is capable of containing only up to maximum bulb wattage of 75 watts, i.e., incandescent bulb equivalent. This could be a fixture of essentially the same appearance as the design as proposed, but with less maximum wattage capability. The fixture details, including glass material, shall be provided for ASCC consideration. Further, the bulbs in the fixture shall be compact florescent with a maximum rating of 75 watts incandescent bulb equivalent.

Approval of Minutes

Von Feldt moved, seconded by Clark and passed 3-0, approval of the July 23, 2007 meeting minutes as drafted:

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

T. Vlasic