

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY, DECEMBER 4, 2013.
SCHOOLHOUSE, TOWN CENTER, 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

Chair Von Feldt called the Planning Commission regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Kristiansson called the roll.

Present: Commissioners Arthur McIntosh, Nate McKitterick and Nicholas Targ; Vice Chair Denise Gilbert
Chair Alexandra Von Feldt

Absent: None

Staff Present: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
Karen Kristiansson, Deputy Town Planner
Ann Wengert, Vice Mayor and Council Liaison
Leigh Prince, Town Attorney

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

REGULAR AGENDA

(1) Study Session: 2014 Housing Element Update [7:31 p.m.]

Ms. Kristiansson noted that the November 27, 2013 staff report includes four components:

- Overview of the Housing Element requirements, including a discussion of the Town's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers

She said that after looking at the numbers, it appears that the Town could meet its RNHA for the 2014-2022 cycle through the second-unit program and affiliated housing at the Priory and (possibly) The Sequoias. This assumption is based on current projections and will need to be confirmed once the county-wide second unit affordability study is completed and discussions have been held with representatives of the Priory and the Sequoias. Other programs could be developed on a longer timeframe, she said, and the Town also may want to consider HIP Housing's shared-housing program and an amnesty initiative for second units, whether those units count toward RHNA numbers or not.

- Information about six potential changes the Town could consider to encourage second units (the main focus of discussion for tonight's meeting)
 - Allowing larger second units (up to 1,000 square feet versus 750 square feet)
 - Floor area accounting for second units
 - Second units in small lot areas (probably on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis)
 - Two second units on larger properties (probably a minimum of 3-3.5 acres)
 - Pre-approved green designs (without ASCC review unless a Site Development Permit is required)
 - Amnesty for illegal second units (for safety or other reasons, such as allowing larger second units or approving them on smaller lots)

Ms. Kristiansson suggested that Commissioners consider not only state requirements but also what would fit best with the Town's goals for housing when evaluating which options may be most suitable.

- Summary of efforts to contact homeowners' associations (HOAs)

Ms. Kristiansson said she called six HOA contacts to advise them about the process, speaking with representatives of Portola Green Circle and Portola Valley Ranch. She sent materials for discussion at their respective HOA meetings on December 12 and December 16, 2013. She also spoke with a representative of the Blue Oaks HOA, which met December 2, 2013, but has received no feedback on their discussion. She left voicemail messages for the Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC) and the Oak Hills HOA, and will continue trying to reach the Hayfields HOA.

- Revised schedule for the Planning Commission work; upon approval, it will be posted on the Town website and possibly distributed via the e-notification system

Upon conclusion of Ms. Kristiansson's report, Commissioner McKitterick noted that the ASCC had requested an opportunity to weigh in on relevant parts of the discussion at some point once the Planning Commission comes up with ideas or questions.

With respect to the amnesty program, Ms. Kristiansson advised Commissioner McIntosh that it would focus on existing illegal units, but for any of them to count toward the RHNA numbers, the Town would have to demonstrate that the units were not part of the RHNA baseline or the existing housing stock. She said she's trying to get clarity on exactly what that means, but is not hopeful that legalized units could count towards the RHNA. However, there could be other reasons for the Town to create a new amnesty program. Vice Chair Gilbert said that the state might make an exception in the case of units that have been unoccupied for a long time.

Commissioner McIntosh asked whether the pre-approved design units would apply to existing homes that have no second units, or new construction. Ms. Kristiansson said both existing homes and new ones could use the pre-approved designs for second units, although since new homes would already be going through ASCC review, it seems likely that the program would be primarily used by owners of existing homes.

Vice Chair Gilbert, projecting that seven second units per year through the 2014-2022 Housing Element cycle would result in 56 of the 64 units required by the RHNA, noted that the Town would continue to rely on second units to meet its obligation. She asked whether second units are almost exclusively occupied by family members. Ms. Kristiansson said that available information suggests a mix – some units rented out through various means, and others occupied by property owners' relatives, groundskeepers or other employees.

Commissioner Targ asked what the distribution among the various income categories would be for second units and affiliated housing. Ms. Kristiansson said she won't have the second-unit information until after the county 21 Elements effort completes and releases its affordability study. She may have a better idea about affiliated housing after she meets with representatives of The Sequoias and the Priory next week. She said that at this time, her projection for 2014-2022 is based on the affordability study and information used for the 2009 Housing Element. Assuming the numbers do not change dramatically, the Town should be able to meet its allocation through the combination of second units and affiliated housing.

That being the case, Commissioner Targ said, most of the second-unit program changes on the table for consideration would be in the "want to have" rather than the "need to have" category. Ms. Kristiansson emphasized that at this point, both second-unit and affiliated housing numbers are based on projections and assumptions, but it seems likely that the Town will need to increase second-unit production. She said that the Commission should have better projects by January 2014.

Commissioner McKitterick asked whether, if more units were built in the Town than are required by the RHNA, the surplus could count toward requirements for housing element period after that. Ms. Kristiansson explained that the state does not allow a jurisdiction to count a surplus towards the next planning period, but it also generally does not penalize a jurisdiction if the number of units built is less than the number required. The key is for the Town to develop a plan that it believes will meet its share of the housing need and then to carry out its plan.

Commissioner Targ said there are two aspects to consider: compliance with the state requirements and the Town's vision for its future in terms of housing. Ms. Kristiansson agreed and said that while the Town needs to commit to programs that it believes will result in 64 units by 2022, other ideas that might take more time to investigate and explore also could be incorporated into the Housing Element.

Mr. Vlastic said if the economy improves and housing production increases substantially beyond RHNA numbers, not only in Portola Valley but also other locations, the state could reasonably take that into account in the next cycle. This suggests a need for continuing partnership with other communities. That said, he noted that the units the Priory or The Sequoias might add probably would represent only about 20% of the RHNA numbers we're looking at now, so the future focus will continue to be on working with these institutions while concentrating on increasing second-unit production.

In terms of compliance, Commissioner McIntosh said we need realistic, credible projections to work with, but increasing second-unit production to seven units per year does not seem much of a hurdle given current rates of production.

Chair Von Feldt requested clarification about the state's willingness to allow housing for a lower income category to count toward the amount required for a higher income category. Referring to a table in the staff report, Ms. Kristiansson said that if we project more units than required in one category, the state can approve counting the extras toward a higher-income category. For example, she explained that if we project 13 units in the extremely-low income category versus the 11 required, the two extra units may count toward the 10 needed in the very-low income category. However, she said that the state must approve these adjustments as we go through the process.

Chair Von Feldt also asked how the income category for a particular second unit is determined when it is built. Vice Chair Gilbert said the number would be proportional to data from the county's affordability survey, which is being produced by a consultant for the 21 Elements group. Ms. Kristiansson said that is correct. Previously, each jurisdiction had to survey all second unit property owners, but for the 2009 housing element, the state allowed all of the jurisdictions in San Mateo County to estimate affordability based on a county-wide study. This gives a reasonable estimate while saving a lot of work. As a result, the Town simply counts the total number of second units and then assumes that the units will be distributed among the income categories as shown in the county-wide study.

Virginia Bacon, Golden Oak Drive, said she's concerned about the larger questions of what we want our Town to look like in the future and the density issue. She asked where in Town the affordable housing units are located as well as the second units that have been built, because people need a better understanding of that information to do a better job of planning. She cautioned about the importance of taking into account logistical obstacles, such as the need for sewer lines. She also questioned why we'd consider allowing second units up to 1,000 square feet when an increase to 900 square feet would be a more logical progression. She urged stepping back to take a look at the overview before increasing density and the size of second units.

Bud Eisberg, Wyndham Drive, noting that we differentiate between second units and cabañas/pool houses, asked if it would help to increase second-unit numbers if the Town were to drop some of the distinctions. A member of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee, Mr. Eisberg also said that he supports increasing the size of second units to 1,000 sf because of the need for moderate income housing in the town. He pointed out that Woodside allows second units to be up to 1500 sf in size. He added that a bonus of 250 sf may not be enough to provide.

Kathie Ratcliff, Wyndham Drive, asked how the Town monitors the affordability of second units. She pointed out that rent increases may make some previously affordable units unaffordable.

Judith Murphy, Portola Green Circle, said that given the market, a 1,000-square-foot second unit in Portola Valley may not be affordable to a moderate income household, and these units can be very expensive in reality. She also said that having two conversations going on simultaneously – one about RHNA numbers and the second a big-picture of what the Town would like to do – could lead to misunderstandings.. She said that in meetings of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee (of which she was a member), there was considerable support for the

possibility of an amnesty program for second units, but since those units would not go into the “RHNA number basket,” it may not be a path to follow unless it is highly desirable from a safety standpoint.

Susan Dworak, Alpine Road, another member of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee, mentioned what she thought were some key points from its mission statement, its executive summary and report to the Town Council that relate to second units:

- Second units are a key way to accommodate new housing and still preserve the Town’s rural character and open spaces.
- Second units provide tremendous opportunity and a variety of options to encourage diversity in population.
- Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the community rather than concentrated in a single area.
- Affordable housing should be located to minimize the impact on wildlife and the environment; the pre-approved green design idea was one that emerged during those discussions.
- The desire to maintain local control over affordable housing and not to use an outside organization was nearly unanimous on the Committee.

Onnolee Trapp, Portola Road, who also served on the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee, said that as we get further into this process, it would help to have a map indicating where affordable housing could be accommodated, and what restrictions the various locations present – geography and topography, setback requirements, etc.

Chair Von Feldt asked Ms. Kristiansson to respond to some of the questions raised:

- Are second units coming primarily from new construction? Ms. Kristiansson said she thought most of them are from new homes, and asked Mr. Vlastic about his perspective. He said that during the recession, the numbers went down and projects were smaller, but individual second units continued to be built. Within the past few years, most new houses and rebuilds have included detached second units, and over the last 10 years, a number of new second units have been added to existing properties.

Not many permits have been issued for attached second units, Mr. Vlastic added. Referring to Mr. Eisberg’s earlier comment about the different types of accessory structures, he said the Town has provisions that define second units. A home addition to accommodate an au pair or live-in help isn’t necessarily a second unit by definition, he said, but it could be converted to a second unit – by adding a full kitchen, for example – if occupancy circumstances change.

Ms. Kristiansson said the state also has a definition of second units that would come into play. For a pool house to count as a second unit, it would require both a bathroom and a kitchen. The Town does not currently permit more than one second unit per se on a property, but it may approve a cabaña, pool house, workshop and/or studio in addition to a single second unit.

- Where are the majority of Portola Valley’s second units located? Mr. Vlastic said they’re distributed on one- and two-acre properties throughout the Town.
- Do the changes proposed for consideration respond to homeowners’ input about obstacles they’ve encountered in efforts to add second units? Ms. Kristiansson said the Town does not have full control over some of the options mentioned, such as sprinkler requirements. Although the Town has the leeway to adopt local requirements that are more stringent than the California Building Code, we cannot permit anything less restrictive.

She mentioned receiving queries about building second units that encroach on setbacks and having separate mailboxes and utility meters, but said that it is hard to get a sense of common barriers, because a constraint on one property may not be an issue somewhere else.

- How does the Town ensure that second units are rented at the appropriate income level? Ms. Kristiansson said that second units do not generally have deed restrictions and owners are not required to rent at a certain level or to any particular tenants. She said that the second unit income-level assignments in the housing element are based on the countywide affordability study and the assumption that the proportions are as applicable in Portola Valley as they are in other San Mateo County communities.

Mr. Vlastic said the only “monitoring” the Town does comes via the Priory’s annual report on faculty and staff occupancy of their units. He also pointed out that one of the Priory’s units carries a deed restriction.

- Is mapping out the possible locations for second units feasible? Ms. Kristiansson said that at this time, we have about 150 permanent second units on lots of one acre or larger. In terms of where second units are feasible, we could look at the zoning map to see where lots of that size are located – practically everywhere except Brookside Park, Woodside Highlands, parts of the Hayfields, and Portola Valley Ranch.

Commissioner McIntosh, acknowledging that the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee felt strongly that there should be no outside entity overseeing housing in Town, said that although there’s been discussion of having outside builders/developers involved, he knows of no case where there was ever any talk of having outside people run the Town’s affordable housing. Commissioner McKitterick said we should not be addressing the issue of control at this time.

Chair Von Feldt invited Commissioner discussion of compliance with state requirements and the Town’s vision for housing, as well as programs they would like to pursue.

Commissioner McIntosh said compliance should be fairly straightforward, with the improving economy and the fact that we are only looking at having to provide for four additional units every three years. At the same time, he said, we would want to be careful not to exceed the RHNA numbers. It is important to look at what the community wants, particularly with respect to people who work in Town wanting to live here, he said, but those people also could live in the units we’re projecting for the Housing Element. He noted, too, that some projects down the road (such as the Stanford Triangle, which may not be built for 15 years) may well provide opportunities to address long-term housing needs.

Vice Chair Gilbert said she’s concerned about conflict arising between the longer-term vision and compliance issues. Suppose from a long-term perspective we support maximizing the number of employees who can live in Town and develop more aggressive policies to accomplish that, she said, and we exceed the RHNA numbers. These numbers may ratchet up to higher and higher levels that make it more difficult in the future. In other words, doing what seems right for the Town in the long term might unintentionally create additional burdens in terms of compliance. Pointing out that her thinking changed when she realized how close we are to meeting our RHNA obligation, Vice Chair Gilbert said it may not be necessary to get into contentious issues such as density.

Commissioner McIntosh said he’s sure a lot of people who work in Portola Valley live in second units now. Commissioner McKitterick agreed that may be true of people who work for the property owner, but he wonders about those who work elsewhere in Town.

Commissioner McKitterick said Vice Chair Gilbert elaborated well on the good point that Commissioner Targ made earlier, but that said, he is also motivated by other factors:

1. He wants to be sure we will be able to meet the RHNA numbers (based on the results of the affordability study).

2. He wonders whether we shouldn't take up the other issues proposed even if we ultimately reject them, because it would at least give the Town Council the benefit of Planning Commission input.

When Commissioner McIntosh noted that implementing any of the suggestions would lead to increased density to some degree, Commissioner McKitterick said allowing homeowners to tear down a 2,500-square-foot house and replace it with a 5,000-square-foot house – which we do now – also increases density. Commissioner Targ added that it is important to think about what “density” means; our population has been simultaneously decreasing and aging but that does not translate into fewer housing units. He said he personally hopes to see more moderate-income people living in Portola Valley because it would be good for the Town. Trying to “crack the number” is trivial, Commissioner Targ said; the question is whether we can achieve what drives the number.

Chair Von Feldt said she agrees it seems as if it will be relatively straightforward to meet the RHNA numbers for 2014-2022, so maybe we can look at this next cycle as a good time to think through and try out some things without a pressing deadline, to see what we might be able to do to diversify income levels and provide housing for more non-residents who work in Town. Commissioner Targ said he also sees the upcoming cycle as a “grace period.”

One way to meet the goals Chair Von Feldt mentioned, Commissioner McIntosh said, might be to pursue an amnesty program in which participants could sign up to rent second units at a certain income level. Even if these units did not count toward RHNA numbers, they might provide housing for more diverse income levels and reduce the number of “bootleg” units, he said. When Ms. Kristiansson noted that it is not easy to get people to come forward for amnesty to begin with, and requiring them to commit to a certain rental range might be even more of a deterrent to participation, Commissioner McIntosh referred to an amnesty program in Marin County. A brief discussion of that program ensued.

Vice Chair Gilbert suggested that the older, smaller second units that might come out of an amnesty program may have fewer amenities that could justify market-rate rents and therefore could likely be suitable for lower-income occupants.

Ms. Kristiansson reminded everyone of the annual income levels for a household of four, what they translate into on a monthly basis and how much would be available for rent/mortgage (assuming 30% of income for housing). A moderate income household could have an income up to \$123,600 annually and could spend over \$3,000 per month on housing, while a very low income household could have an income up to \$56,550 and could spend about \$1,400 per month on housing.

She also pointed out that the way RHNA is calculated does not consider how much housing is actually being produced. The methodology could change, but to this point, the allocations do not factor the rate of housing production into the equation. Thus, as the law now stands, producing more units than required in one cycle would not be likely to lead to a larger RHNA for the next cycle.

In response to Chair Von Feldt asking how many of the options the Planning Commission should probably consider moving forward with, Ms. Kristiansson suggested two or three.

Chair Von Feldt invited input on **larger second units**.

Commissioner McKitterick said that he would like to consider allowing larger second units, taking into account parking issues, lot sizes and the question of floor area. He said he tends to be more reluctant to change floor area regulations. Floor area was hotly debated the last time it was changed, he recalled, and would be a big discussion. Mr. Vlasic recapped the actions and controversy related to previous changes in floor area, impervious surface area, the balance between them and the issue of basement space.

In terms of larger second units, Mr. Vlasic noted that 1,000 square feet may not be enough space to accommodate a family of four in Portola Valley, and said the anticipated countywide affordability study will be an important determinant in how the housing can be distributed among income levels and the extent to which more second-unit production will help fill the RHNA commitment. He expects increasing the size allowance of second units from 750 square feet to 900 or 1,000 square feet would encourage more production, but not open the floodgates because there are other issues to consider, such as sewer and slope constraints and other factors.

Another point to consider, Mr. Vlasic said, is whether the limit for ASCC review could be increased. At this time, for instance, unless significant grading is involved, attached second units adding up to 400 square feet do not need ASCC review but only staff review to ensure they meet performance standards. Mr. Vlasic said the Planning Commission might want to think about increasing that threshold to encourage property owners who might otherwise be discouraged by the ASCC review requirement. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance contains numerous performance standards for second units.

Chair Von Feldt noted that relaxing ASCC requirements would be another option to explore.

In response to Commissioner McIntosh's commenting that it would make sense to approve larger second units on larger parcels, Mr. Vlasic said to really encourage more second units it would be more appropriate to think about a two-acre trip point rather than three acres. Commissioner McIntosh added that this would have the added advantage of providing some variety in the sized of second units.

Vice Chair Gilbert asked whether the maximum discount of 250 square feet from the floor area total would apply to the larger second units only, or to smaller second units as well, and Commissioner McIntosh said his understanding was that the discount would apply only to the larger second units. Vice Chair Gilbert said that allowing larger second units could increase both the overall number of second units and the number that are likely to be occupied by moderate income families.

Commissioner Targ said we should think about what we are trying to achieve. He said he does not know enough about the demand level, or what actions might invite a flood of applications for second-unit permits. If we wanted to avoid a flood, he suggested that the Town could stipulate approving a maximum number of second units over a given timeframe. He also stated that he could see the argument for larger second units but was not sure whether having a size bonus would make sense.

Ms. Kristiansson pointed out that the Town prepares an annual report on Housing Element implementation each April, and that report is brought to the Planning Commission. She also said she did not believe a flood of applications would result from a decision to allow 1,000-square-foot second units on parcels of two or more acres with a 250-square-foot floor-area discount.

Commissioner McIntosh asked about the number of lots over two acres in size. Mr. Vlasic said the number that could readily and reasonably economically accommodate second units would be limited by grading, access and other factors. He said the increased size and some floor-area discount would be reasonable adjustments rather than major changes. Some communities allow 1,500-square-foot second units, he added, but in Portola Valley that would make second units more than what the Town has considered accessory structures, intensify the floor-area question and create a visual issue with other structures on the property. He said second units that are too large in relation to the main house could have a detrimental effect on Portola Valley's rural quality and could be inconsistent with the General Plan's intent.

Chair Von Feldt asked for comments on the idea of a floor area discount. Commissioner Targ noted that would be the equivalent of a 16x16-foot room, and Commissioner McKitterick said that he thought a discount could work on larger lots. Commissioner McIntosh added that it might be possible to experiment on larger lots to see the results. Chair Von Feldt summarized the discussion and stated that she was not hearing a lot of resounding support for the idea of a floor area discount.

Chair Von Feldt turned to the idea of allowing **second units on smaller parcels**, noting previous remarks about parking and density issues. Vice Chair Gilbert said that limiting the smaller-lot units to attached second units would avoid creating any problems with density, and pointed out that the staff report included some ideas to mitigate the parking problem. For instance, the staff report said that on-site, independent parking spaces could be required for the second units.

When Commissioner McIntosh observed that an attached second unit could increase the footprint (and thus the density) of the residence, Commissioner McKitterick said that could occur only within the parameters allowed by floor-area regulations and outside the required setbacks.

Commissioner McIntosh said that parking would be problematic on lots on Santa Maria Avenue or Hayfields Road. Commissioner Targ said that if the second units were required to be attached, they would not increase the visual density, but detached units would change the visual character of the area. He added that parking requirements would be key. He noted that in Woodside Highlands, the main road already has parking issues. He suggested that considering the barriers cited and the effort involved in pursuing this option, it may be better to explore other approaches to encouraging second units instead. Commissioner McKitterick added that there are a few exceptions, with lots in those areas large enough to accommodate second units, but many houses themselves do not have enough parking.

Commissioner McIntosh said there is a good argument for second units on smaller parcels at the Ranch, but they would have to be carved out of the existing footprint. Mr. Vlasic later pointed out that within certain limits, the Ranch does permit expanding the footprint within the building envelope. He sees the biggest opportunity for second units at the Ranch on the downhill lots, where the houses have large crawl spaces that some residents have dug out to add space below. In some cases, he said the improvements include wet bars with expanded facilities, and they could easily be converted to living quarters.

Chair Von Feldt said it might be appropriate to follow up on this option with the Ranch. Adding second units there also would allow more residents to “age in place” while contributing to the Town’s diversity. Mr. Vlasic said the Ranch environment also has more opportunities to address the parking issue than places such as Brookside Park. Ms. Kristiansson said she would provide information to the Ranch’s HOA prior to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Von Feldt asked for thoughts about allowing **two second units on larger properties**.

In response to Vice Chair Gilbert’s inquiry about the number of properties in the Westridge neighborhood, Mr. Vlasic said he believed there were approximately 300.

Commissioner McIntosh said that he thought two second units could be allowed on parcels 3.5 acres or larger, with one unit attached. Mr. Vlasic said that at that lot size, this program would provide less visual change and be consistent with the Town’s overall objectives and General Plan. He said that he would expect significant feedback from Westridge and the WASC on the density issue, even if one of the units is attached to the main residence. Ms. Kristiansson added that she had left a message for WASC Chair Rusty Day. Commissioners agreed that this idea should be pursued.

Shifting to the idea of exploring **pre-approved green designs for second units**, Chair Von Feldt said she likes this as an affordable option, because many of the second-unit projects the Commission has been discussing might be fairly expensive for homeowners to build. Commissioner McKitterick said there must be a company that makes “plug-and-play” California-approved units.

Commissioner McIntosh said this proposal has some appeal, and suggested that it may be most effective with residential additions and remodels rather than new home construction projects. Mr. Vlasic said a creative design solution that is good in terms of sustainability and aesthetics could be good for either type of project. Ms. Kristiansson said San Luis Obispo County and the City of Santa Cruz have pre-approved design programs, but not for green or pre-fabricated units. They held design competitions for architects, and residents can choose from a selection of winning plans, she explained. Commissioner McIntosh suggested that as an alternative to the pre-fab units Portola Valley could take the same approach but with the green design element built in.

Commissioner Targ said the lower cost is a big reason he favors the pre-fab idea, particularly in the context of affordable housing. Commissioner McIntosh said that when he looked into prices, pre-fab costs weren’t as low as he expected them to be.

In response to Commissioner McIntosh’s questions about sewer-related costs, Ms. Kristiansson said that properties on septic systems that have sewers nearby would need a sewer hookup only if they could not demonstrate that the septic system could handle the additional dwelling unit.

On the subject of **amnesty**, Commissioner McIntosh asked whether it would be feasible for the Town to pursue it partway into the next Housing Element cycle if the numbers are not where we want them to be. Ms. Kristiansson

said the status would be assessed each year in the annual Housing Element report, and if appropriate, the Planning Commission could recommend that the Town Council consider an amnesty program.

Ms. Kristiansson indicated that the 21 Elements group would meet on December 5, 2013, and although the affordability study is on the agenda, she does not know whether it is for discussion or distribution. The group comprises representatives of the 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County, working together to streamline processes and minimize the burden as they work through their Housing Element updates, she explained. The group has both a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a Political Advisory Committee (PAC) – with Vice Mayor Ann Wengert representing Portola Valley on the PAC. She said that 21 Elements also tends to get quicker responses from the state than any single community would.

To follow up on ASCC's request to be in the loop, Ms. Kristiansson said she would provide information on the discussion about the pre-approved design proposal at the ASCC meeting on December 9, 2013. She said, too, that she would summarize the Planning Commission's discussion tonight and continue sending information on all of the Planning Commission's study sessions on the Housing Element to everyone who has signed up to receive e-notifications about housing issues.

Commissioners had no issues with the proposed schedule for the remaining Housing Element study sessions.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS [9: 20 p.m.]

Ms. Kristiansson said the Planning Commission will have its Portola Road Corridor Plan study session with the Town Council at 6:30 p.m. (one hour earlier than usual) at The Sequoias on January 22, 2014.

Mr. Vlastic said Woodside and Portola Valley will meet with the Woodside Fire Protection District on January 29, 2014, to discuss prohibitions on new wooden roofs. At this time, wooden roofs with Class A assembly (treated wooden shingles that meet certain standards) are approved. He said few proposals for such roofs have been submitted in the last several years; several good alternatives are now available.

In response to Chair Von Feldt, Ms. Kristiansson said candidates for the vacant seat on the Planning Commission would be interviewed on January 8, 2014. Interviews for a new member of the ASCC member would be on either January 8 or January 22, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT [9:24 p.m.]

Alexandra Von Feldt, Chair

Karen Kristiansson, Deputy Town Planner