

**Portola Valley Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee (AHHEC)  
Committee Meeting Summary: May 2<sup>nd</sup> 2022**

The May 2<sup>nd</sup> AHHEC meeting was attended by over 80 members of the community. The meeting ran just over 5 hours; it began at 4:30 pm and ended at 9:35 pm. A link to the meeting recording can be found [here](#). Here is a link to the [agenda packet](#).

**Housing Sites Inventory and Discussion**

The AHHEC is an advisory committee, and the goal of the meeting was to offer a final recommendation to the Planning Commission and Town Council for a Sites Inventory to meet the Town’s RHNA mandate. This was the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the committee in an 18-month process which began in August 2021, and the 5<sup>th</sup> and final meeting within the process to consider the Sites Inventory recommendation.

Opening remarks from the Chair began [at timestamp 16:10](#). Staff gave a presentation ([timestamp 18:21](#)) on new work product generated by staff and consultants since the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting in response to committee feedback, which included additional maps and analysis of the sites under consideration, as well as updates from the ADU focus group meeting held on April 19<sup>th</sup> and the “Opt-In” up-zoning meeting held on April 21<sup>st</sup>. The Sites Inventory under discussion were a further consideration of the “8 Ideas” from the February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Table A below summarizes the update from the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting on the “8 Ideas,” and Table B summarizes the final Sites Inventory recommendation from the AHHEC to the Planning Commission and Town Council. To listen in, questions from the committee begin at [timestamp 1:15:35](#), public comments begin at [timestamp 2:31](#) and the committee discussion regarding recommendations is from [timestamp 3:31-5:06](#).

**TABLE A: Update on the “8 Ideas”**

	AHHEC Feedback from 2.28 Meeting	4.18 Meeting Outcomes	May 2 <sup>nd</sup> Update
1	Explore new housing sites including further analysis of the Glen Oaks Stanford parcel, the El Mirador parcel behind Town Hall and the Neely property on Portola Road.	Estimated developable land available after mapping creek and scenic corridor setbacks and/or hazards constraints for each site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glen Oaks Stanford - 4.4 acres</li> <li>• El Mirador – 13.2 acres</li> <li>• Neely property – 25 acres</li> </ul> General consensus from the committee was to continue to explore all 3 options; some	Pursue the Glen Oaks site owned by Stanford. Reserve the Neely property for the next housing cycle given the complexities with development at that location. Conclusion that El Mirador is not likely based on the latest information about the ownership.

		suggestion it may be more realistic to reserve Neely/El Mirador for the 2031 cycle given complexities associated with developing those parcels.	
2	Further study the potential for mixed-use in the Town's C-C and A-P zones while preserving local-serving businesses.	Development potential is expected to be limited. Strong consensus to prioritize retention of existing businesses.	Given this strategy would not produce a significant number of units (i.e. Village Square could potentially add 2- 4 units.), this strategy is not recommended.
3	Further study the development potential of the two vacant parcels on Alpine Road as sources of multifamily housing.	Staff/consultants analyzed the development potential of 3 parcels: the parking lot behind Robert's, the vacant parcel next to Robert's, and 4370 Alpine at the corner of Alpine and Nathorst. Committee supported the further pursuit of all three parcels.	General consensus that the 3 Nathorst properties are appropriate for development and rezoning, with caution against concentrating too much density in this area. Recommendation to minimize density and massing; some strong support for limiting development to 2 stories. Support for mixed-use.
4	Explore an "opt-in" approach where property owners could volunteer for upzoning.	Mailers were sent to Portola Valley property owners with parcels 1 acre or larger to identify volunteers interested in upzoning their property. General consensus that single-family upzoning should be a last resort option, and if needed to NOT make single-family "legal nonconforming". Mixed feedback on the efficacy of the opt-in approach. Supporters feel opt-in will help disperse increased density across town. Others are concerned an opt-in approach will exacerbate tensions among neighbors.	Six property owners expressed interest in upzoning their property as a result of the community outreach mailer and meeting. Deer Creek Resources reviewed and flagged potential vegetation management concerns for four of the six locations. General consensus to keep all 6 parcels in the inventory until a further evaluation can be completed by Deer Creek Resources and WFPD.

5	Investigate dispersing housing sites throughout the community via an overlay zone allowing for up to six dwelling units/acre, with the understanding that such units would be market-rate with the potential for a small number of affordable units.	Same as #4.	Same as #4.
6	Revisit the list of Town-owned properties to see if there is development potential.	Staff provided a composite map of Town-owned properties overlaid with hazards constraints to identify viable properties. General consensus was not to include Town-owned fields in regular use. Ford Field was identified as a feasible site with approximately 1.1 acres of developable land. The committee also suggested further analysis of the sub-station parcel at Town Center and the Blue Oaks parcel (only if considered a viable location by WFPD given fire-prone topography and impact to evacuation).	A site concept for Ford Field was presented based on further analysis and input from a large regional affordable housing developer. <b><i>Per affordable housing development standards, projects require a minimum of 50 units for financial feasibility.</i></b> General consensus was the Ford Field site is the best option to meet the Town's low and very low RHNA allocation. The sub-station was removed from immediate consideration due to an easement and lack of funding to develop this site as an affordable housing project. The Blue Oaks parcel was removed from immediate consideration due to wildfire risk and was deemed inappropriate for affordable housing development.
7	Consider using the Town's affordable housing fund to provide incentives for affordable housing (such as multifamily or ADUs).	Broad discussion about the use of the Town's affordable housing fund. General consensus to use the fund to provide incentives for affordable housing.	There was no further discussion about the affordable housing fund at the May 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting.

8	Revisit ADU process to see if additional streamlining is possible	General consensus to use the standard allocation and increase the number of low and very low-income ADUs/JADUs. Some support increase ONLY if paired with strong policies requiring affordability.	Valuable insight was provided at the ADU focus group meeting on April 19 <sup>th</sup> and as a result, the Town will increase ADUs/JADUs as part of the Sites Inventory. The Town will incorporate policy and program suggestions into the Housing Element including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● revised information on the Town’s website</li> <li>● implementing a streamlined process for creating JADUs</li> <li>● matching low-income renters with owners offering affordable ADUs</li> <li>● initiating an amnesty program for unpermitted ADUs/JADUs,</li> <li>● offering ADU office hours for additional applicant support</li> </ul>
NEW		The committee discussed the consideration of 3 additional sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ladera Church (0.5 acre parcel)</li> <li>● Potential for additional units at Stanford Wedge (would be separate and incremental vs. the scope in the current EIR)</li> <li>● Town Center sub-station</li> </ul>	The Ladera church parcel was added to the Sites Inventory per #5 above. The sub-station was removed from consideration per #6 above. Additional units at the Stanford Wedge were not included.

**TABLE B: Sites Inventory Recommendation from the AHHEC**

The table below represents the recommendation from the AHHEC to the Planning Commission and Town Council on the Sites Inventory for consideration to meet the Town’s RHNA mandate based on the outcome of the discussions represented in the third column of Table A (May 2<sup>nd</sup> Update). To meet the 20% buffer requirement, the Town needs 137 additional units. The Town could also consider a 15% buffer which would require 124 units. The AHHEC has prioritized the Ford Field site as an anchor to meet the mandate for the Town’s low and very low-income allocation. The sites on Table B should be considered as the *available options* to meet the requirement (i.e. not all are required).

Category	Location	Acres	Density (units/acre)	Potential Units***	Category	Use
Town Owned	Ford Field	2.48	20	50	Low/Very Low	Residential
Stanford	Glen Oaks	4	8	32	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
Private	4394 Nathorst (empty parcel)*	1.18	6 or 20	7 or 20	TBD pending density	Mixed Use
Private	Nathorst (behind Roberts)	0.86	6	5	Mod/Above Mod	Mixed Use
Private	4370 Nathorst (office)	1.5	6	9	Mod/Above Mod	Mixed Use
Private - Opt-In	4185 Alpine	1.7	6	10	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
Private - Opt-In	3320 Alpine/Ladera Church	0.5	20	10	Low/Very Low	Residential
Private - Opt-In	231-241 Georgia Lane**	1.9	6	11	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
Private - Opt-In	135 Shawnee**	1	6	6	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
Private - Opt-In	148 Ramoso**	3	6	18	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
Private - Opt-In	90 Bear Gulch**	1.2	6	7	Mod/Above Mod	Residential
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>165-178</b>		

\* The committee identified this site as potential for upzoning to 20 units/acre if needed, and if so would be low/very low category.

\*\* Requires further analysis by Deer Creek Resources and WFPD for wildfire risk. Maximized potential units NOT likely.

\*\*\* Final as built units on all sites other than Town owned Ford Field are subject to density bonus.

**Summary of Upcoming Meetings:**

- May 9th -- Community-Wide Meeting at 7 pm via zoom to hear an update on the Committee’s work and provide feedback
- May 24th -- Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee meeting to review the draft Housing Element
- TBD – Draft Housing Element presented to Planning Commission and Town Council