

APPENDIX A | COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT INPUT

Community engagement is a fundamental ethos of the Town of Portola Valley. Since the Town was incorporated in 1964, the community has prioritized resident participation in the development of public policy. The Town has an extensive resident committee system that makes recommendations to the Town Council on a broad range of issues. That approach has been applied to the Housing Element update. The update process is an opportunity to address what has happened before and look to the future to decide how the community will change throughout the 8-year RHNA cycle.

In addition to conversations focused on Portola Valley, the 21 Elements working group provided additional opportunities for community input. 21 Elements is a multi-year, multi-phase collaboration between all San Mateo County jurisdictions, along with partner agencies and stakeholder organizations, which aims to support jurisdictions in developing, adopting, and implementing local housing policies and programs. Let's Talk Housing is a collaborative effort between all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County focused on increasing awareness of and participation in the Housing Element update process. The 21 Elements working group organized an additional series of introductory meetings about the Housing Element update attended by more than 1,000 community members countywide, an All About RHNA webinar, four Stakeholder Listening Sessions that convened more than 30 groups, and a four-part Creating an Affordable Future webinar series to help educate community members about local housing issues.

The Town held a number of public meetings to discuss various aspects of the Housing Element Update. During the Housing Element update process, the Town posted information on the Town's website, social media, distributed information through the Town's e-Notification system with over 450 subscribers and posted information on the Portola Valley Forum, an active list serve with over 3,600 members. Public meetings related to the Housing Element Update included the following:

- April 13, 2021 | Countywide Community Meeting
- April 22, 2021 | Countywide Community Meeting
- August 16, 2021 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: What is A Housing Element and Why is it Important?
- September 20, 2021 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Existing Housing Element Organization, Housing Affordability Income Categories, Demographic and Housing Trends, and Values Decorum
- September 27, 2021 | 21 Elements Countywide Listening Session #1 (Fair Housing)
- October 14, 2021 | Portola Valley Community Meeting #1

- October 18, 2021 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Sites Selection Possible Scenarios
- October 18, 2021 | 21 Elements Countywide Listening Session (Housing Advocates)
- November 1, 2021 | 21 Elements Countywide Listening Session (Builders/Developers)
- November 15, 2021 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: ADU Presentation
- October-December 2021 | 21 Elements 4-part Let's Talk Housing Webinar
- January 18, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Housing Element Update Timeline & Topics
- January 31, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Affiliated Housing Discussion and SB 9 Ordinance
- February 22, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Housing Sites Inventory and Woodside Fire Protection District Discussion
- February 28, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Housing Element Survey Summary, General Update, and Sites Inventory Discussion
- March 21, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Policies and Programs Discussion
- April 18, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Constraints, Sites Inventory, and AFFH Policies and Programs
- April 19, 2022 | Portola Valley ADU Focus Group
- April 21, 2022 | Portola Valley Opt-In Site Selection Focus Group
- May 2, 2022 | Portola Valley Ad Hoc Committee Meeting: Sites Inventory Discussion
- May 9, 2022 | Portola Valley Community Meeting #2

In 2020, the Town updated the Planning & Building Department section of the Town's website to include a page with basic information about Housing Elements and the Town's timeline and an invitation for people to sign up for a notification list to stay involved. In addition, the Town added a new Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee page under Town Committees where all meeting minutes and agendas related to the Housing Element update are posted. The website is available here: <https://www.portolavalley.net/government/town-committees/housing-element-committee>.

The website includes links and information regarding the project timeline, link to subscribe to updates, links to related documents and related websites, agenda packets and meeting minutes, and Housing Element FAQ.

The Public Review Draft Housing Element was posted on the Town's website and distributed to stakeholders on June 8, 2022 for a 30-day review period. During this time, the draft Housing Element was advertised for public review and comment.

21 ELEMENTS / LET'S TALK HOUSING

21 Elements organized a Let's Talk Housing series of countywide meetings about the Housing Element update and provided community members with an introduction of the Housing Element update and why it matters. More than 1,000 community members attended these meetings. Additionally, Let's Talk Housing held an All About RHNA webinar and a countywide four-part webinar series to help educate and inform San Mateo County residents and stakeholders on regional and local housing issues. The four-part series took place on Zoom in fall of 2021, focusing on the following topics and how they intersect with the Bay Area's housing challenges and opportunities:

- Why Affordability Matters
- Housing and Racial Equity
- Housing in a Climate of Change
- Putting it All Together for a Better Future

The series included speaker presentations, audience Q&A, breakout sessions for connection and debrief discussions. The sessions were advertised and offered in Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese, though participation in non-English channels was limited.

The main takeaways identified during the Let's Talk Housing dialogues are listed below:

Topic(s)
Housing affordability is a public health issue: Where we live impacts our health, economic equity, environmental and racial justice
The Three S's: Supply, Stability and Subsidy: Increase housing supply, protect renters and vulnerable households by providing stability, fill the gaps with subsidies
Implement strategies to promote climate-ready housing

Source: 21 Elements.

In addition, Let's Talk Housing sponsored four "listening sessions" with city and county staff and key stakeholders that convened more than 30 organizations and groups with regional experience. By focus area, the listening sessions included presentations and resources from the following:

Topic	Organizations
Building market-rate or affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities ▪ Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto ▪ Housing Equality Law Project ▪ Legal Aid for San Mateo County ▪ Project Sentinel ▪ Housing Choices ▪ Root Policy Research
Addressing fair housing issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing Leadership Council ▪ Faith in Action ▪ Greenbelt Alliance ▪ San Mateo County Central Labor Council ▪ Peninsula for Everyone ▪ San Mateo County Association of Realtors
Advocating for affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MidPen Housing ▪ HIP Housing ▪ BRIDGE Housing ▪ Mercy Housing ▪ Habitat for Humanity – Greater SF ▪ Eden Housing ▪ Affirmed Housing ▪ The Core Companies
Providing housing services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Daly City Partnership ▪ HIP Housing ▪ LifeMoves ▪ Mental Health Association of San Mateo County ▪ National Alliance on Mental Illness ▪ Ombudsman of San Mateo County ▪ Samaritan House San Mateo ▪ Youth Leadership Institute ▪ Abode Services

Source: 21 Elements.

COMMUNITY-WIDE MEETINGS

In order to engage directly with the community, the Town held two (2) virtual community meetings on October 14, 2021, and May 9, 2022, as well as two (2) resident focus groups on April 19 and 21, 2022. In addition, the Town held multiple committee meetings open to the public for the Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee and Ad Hoc Committee of Town Committees, as described below.

During the Housing Element update process, the Town posted information on the Town’s website, social media, distributed information through the Town’s e-Notification system with over 450 subscribers and posted information on the Portola Valley Forum, an active list serve with over 3,600 members.

COMMUNITY MEETINGS

In addition to the distribution networks described above, the Town distributed flyers containing the meeting registration link and a QR code, as well as information on joining the meeting by phone.

Community Meeting #1

The first community meeting occurred on October 14, 2021, from 6:00 to 7:30 pm on Zoom. Participants were asked to pre-register through EventBrite in order for staff and consultants to anticipate attendance; the meeting link was distributed to anyone interested in attending. In total, 120 individuals pre-registered, and approximately 70 attended the virtual workshop. These numbers exclude staff, consultants, and elected and appointed officials.

The meeting used breakout rooms and small in-person group discussions to gather community feedback. During breakout rooms discussions, participants were encouraged to give feedback on Portola Valley's key housing needs and potential solutions through the site inventory and new policies and programs.

Councilmember Jeff Aalfs welcomed participants and provided a brief introduction to the project. Laura Russell (Planning & Building Director) walked attendees through the meeting program and shared a Zoom poll to collect anonymous demographic information. The demographic information is solely used to understand which members of the community are being reached, and who may be missing from participation.

The consultant team then described the background and context for the Housing Element Update during the first half of the workshop. The presentation compared the state, county, and town's demographics and housing needs; described State housing legislations; and provided an overview of the contents and requirements of the Housing Element. Attendees learned about the State mandate for the Town to plan for approximately 253 new housing units and understand criteria for selection of new housing sites.

Following the presentation, Town staff and consultants facilitated six, 30-minute breakout groups of approximately 10 to 12 participants. Staff prepared four (4) questions to guide the breakout group discussions:

1. What are some of the Town's key housing needs and challenges?
2. What ideas, policies, programs and suggestions do you have to meet the Town's housing needs?
3. Would you rather see new units (aside from ADUs) spread throughout the Town or fewer projects in more concentrated locations?
4. Imagine it's the year 2031. What does success look like with this Housing Element update? What words describe the housing in your community now?

After the breakout rooms convened, each facilitator gave a summary of their group's discussion. Refer to the Community Meeting Comments subsection below, which includes a

compilation of the feedback received from residents in response to the questions listed above. The PowerPoint presentation, recording, and meeting summary was also made available on the Town's website: <https://www.portolavalley.net/departments/planning-building-department/housing-element-update-for-2023-2031>.

Community Meeting #2

The second community meeting occurred on May 9, 2022 from 7:00 to 8:30 pm on Zoom. While attendees were initially asked to pre-register on Zoom, later publication for the meeting provided the meeting link to remove barriers to participation. The meeting was attended by 139 participants, excluding staff, consultants, and elected and appointed officials.

Community Meeting #2 summarized previous community outreach and provided updates on the selection of potential housing sites under the sites inventory process. After a brief introduction from Councilmember Jeff Aalfs, Laura Russell (Planning & Building Director) walked attendees through the meeting program and shared a Zoom poll to collect anonymous demographic information. The consultant team then provided an overview of the Housing Element Update and summarized findings from previous community outreach and public meetings, including detailed feedback on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), based on community interest. The consultant team further described both the sites inventory process leading up to Community Meeting #2 and identified sites recommended by Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee.

Following the presentation, Town staff and consultants facilitated nine, 45-minute breakout groups of approximately 10 to 12 participants. Staff prepared four (4) questions to guide the breakout group discussions:

1. The Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee's main priorities in site selection included:
 - Safety criteria.
 - Dispersing sites throughout the Town.
 - Providing a voluntary/opt-in approach for rezoning single-family properties.
 - Creating opportunities for affordable housing.
 - Preserving existing businesses.

With these in mind, do you think these sites accomplish these priorities?

2. The Committee supports voluntary upzoning of single-family properties for up to 6 dwelling units/acre. What design features do you think would make a development compatible with the surrounding area?
3. For new multi-family development along Alpine Road in the scenic corridor, new zoning standards will be established. What specific things should be considered as they're developed?
4. For ADUs/JADUs, what other improvements would you suggest? What other assistance would help you through the process? Current improvements under consideration include:
 - Town revise handouts and create office hours.
 - Establish easy process for JADUs.

- Match low-income renters with owners.
- Amnesty program.

After the breakout rooms convened, each facilitator gave a summary of their group's discussion. Refer to the Community Meeting Comments subsection, below, that includes a compilation of the feedback received from residents in response to the questions listed above. The PowerPoint presentation, recording, and meeting summary was also made available on the Town's website: <https://www.portolavalley.net/departments/planning-building-department/housing-element-update-for-2023-2031>.

FOCUS GROUPS

The AHHEC held two focus groups to explore strategies for housing production that community members had expressed interest or support in.

The first focus group, on April 19, 2022, included approximately 66 participants who were interested in or had experience building ADUs/JADUs in Portola Valley. The Town advertised the focus group by direct mail, eNotifications, and the Town newsletter. Any participants interested in attending were allowed to join. In breakout groups, participants were asked about potential barriers and solutions for ADU projects, and how ADUs were intended to be used.

The second focus group, on April 21, 2022, asked approximately 72 participants to provide feedback on a proposed strategy to voluntarily upzone individual properties. The Town advertised this focus group by sending physical mailers to owners of properties potentially eligible for such a strategy (i.e., greater than 1 acre, not located in VHFHSZs, access to adequate evacuation routes)—in total, 594 parcels. The focus groups started with a brief presentation on the Housing Element and density and ended with an open Q&A. Participants who provided their emails were later sent an online survey to gauge their level of interest in a potential upzoning process for their property.

The agendas and recordings for these two focus group meetings were made available on the Town's website: <https://www.portolavalley.net/housingelement>

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee Meetings

The Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee (AHHEC) was formed to provide recommendations to the Town Council on the Housing Element Update, explore options to minimize the impacts of additional housing units, maximize public participation, and communicate information on the Committee's progress and recommendations to residents. AHHEC members included representatives from the Town Council; Planning Commission; Race and Equity Committee; Architectural and Site Control Commission; and community members.

From August 2021 to December 2022, the AHHEC met at least monthly e for approximately 3-6 hours. Meetings were open to the public, and opportunity for public comment was provided. An average of 40 to over 100 attendees participated at each meeting.

Ad Hoc Committee of Town Committees Meetings

According to Town Council direction issued at its April 28, 2021 meeting, planning staff invited committees interested in participating on the Housing Element Update to delegate one to two members to join an Ad Hoc Committee of Town Committees. The purpose of the Ad Hoc Committee was to provide topical comments and questions throughout the Housing Element Update process. Ad Hoc Committee members included members of the Sustainability; Parks and Recreation; Trails and Paths; Conservation; Bicycle, Pedestrian and Traffic Safety; Wildfire Preparedness; and Emergency Preparedness Committees.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Town Committees held two meetings on January 11 and May 16, 2022, both of which were open to the public. Meetings included staff updates on the Housing Element's progress and opportunities for Committee member feedback and public comment, lasting approximately 2.5 hours.

AFFH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT INPUT

A resident survey was conducted by Root Policy Research for the jurisdictions in San Mateo County to support the AFFH analysis of Housing Elements. It explores residents' housing, affordability, and neighborhood challenges and experiences with displacement and housing discrimination. See Chapter 3, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing and Appendix C, Portola Valley Fair Housing Assessment, for a discussion of the survey findings.

HOUSING PREFERENCES AND PRIORITIES SURVEY

The Community Housing Survey, opened from February 10, 2022, until February 21, 2022, allowed the Town to gain a better understanding of community values and priorities. Feedback from the survey served as a foundation for future conversations about possible solutions and housing policies and helped the Town identify housing preferences, needs, and future housing opportunities in the City.

In total, the Town received 707 responses. When asked about home types to meet the RHNA target, participants overwhelming preferred single family homes, ADUs, and clusters of small cottages, and generally supported population- or purpose-specific housing as well. Townhomes received modest support, and multi-family received the lowest level of support. When asked about factors to consider in planning for multi-family housing, participants supported: avoiding areas of high fire and geologic risk; prioritizing affordable housing; and providing incentives for ADUs and rezoning at institutions and businesses.

COMMUNITY MEETING COMMENTS

Community Meeting #1

Breakout Room Discussion Icebreaker Question: What is one thing you value/love about Portola Valley?

- Rural open space
- Low density/lots of trees and open space
- Natural beauty, excellent school system and proximity to peninsula
- Echo all these sentiments and recognize that we have some real challenges that we need affordable housing
- Knowing my neighbors and having relationships to talk through problems
- Natural environment; environment comes first
- Hiking
- Neighbors
- Rural quality
- Quiet
- Great place for family
- Open spaces
- Peace and calm
- Nature revived with COVID
- Rural nature/accessibility to outdoors
- PV is convenient to PA & MP
- Sense of community
- Sense of community
- Uniqueness of the area within Silicon Valley but close amenities
- Natural beauty
- Hiking and bike trails
- Schools

Question 1: What are some of the Town's key housing needs and challenges?

- **Access to Housing**
 - Overall lack of affordable housing

- People that work in PV should be able to live here; applaud Woodside Priory's housing efforts; increasing housing for seniors, interested in other ways to increase housing for people who contribute
- Very little affordable housing for all but the most wealthy, difficult for people who work in town, younger families and seniors with fixed incomes to live here
- Fire fighters/teachers/grocery store workers
- Like to see firefighters to be able to live in PV
- Want to know if town continues to support programs for teachers/public safety workers to live here
- Often some lower wage workers don't want to live here – younger people want more active area – we don't necessarily want to adjust housing
- Key needs: teachers
- used to have teachers/fire fighters living here, but have created an unfair labor market – do these people want to live in PV anyway?
- Need housing for populations with special needs
- Concern about the cost of housing for young families, firefighters, teachers and other essential workers
- Housing for seniors to age in place that is affordable and allows to remain in PV
- School district helped people buy homes
- Housing needs are key – folks that work at the Sequoias have to drive a great distance to PV b/c there is no housing they can afford close by. This contributes to the traffic.
- One group member said she wouldn't be able to afford to live in PV without living with family. We need housing to be inclusive and accessible.
- Finding existing homes that are accessible are hard to find
- Need a place for people to live for those that work in PV (especially given our lack of public transportation)
- **Concerns about Infrastructure/Resources**
 - If there's no vacant land, how will we provide new housing?
 - With this much housing, when will it reach capacity?
 - Infrastructure needs/issues like water, evacuation routes, and more schools all cost money.
- **Environmental Hazards**
 - PV is in a high fire danger area. #1 priority is for people to be safe for residents.
 - Fire dangers, limited amount of available land given scenic corridors, cost of building in this area
 - Drought, fire danger
 - Challenges: safety issues – fire safety/don't have fixed evacuation plan – has to be included;

- Demands for housing. The challenge is the state telling us what to do especially with SB 9 & SB 10, safety, and wildfire concerns and any density
- Worried about getting out of Town in case of wildfire – especially worried about how Stanford Wedge project will exacerbate the problem because of added traffic
- Concerned about adding new housing in general and traffic impacts – believes housing should be dispersed throughout the Town
- Fire safety – lives on north side of Town, really only one way out in case of a wildfire
- **Community Character**
 - Environmental constraints are a challenge – how can we meet our RHNA and maintain everything we love about PV?
 - Want to not impact rural nature of the area
 - SF has been essential even though has history of discrimination
- **Opportunities for ADUs**
 - Tried to house adult daughter in ADU who worked nearby, but were too short on minimum lot area required by Town – should consider on case-by-case basis to facilitate more housing
 - Should not isolate the lower income housing to only one area – should be disbursed
 - Increasing density hasn't been tracked by town – need to be able to count ADUs toward RHNA – town said they couldn't count them – concerned we have added a lot of ADUs, but we don't track them; some were illegal and now have become legal
 - Was planning to do ADU and asked how many had been built but couldn't get an answer – Town needs to figure this out
 - It's clear from the data that providing for ADUs is relatively easy way to build some extra housing, but the regulations are very excessive and inconsistent with process and follow through. Working on this would be a way to have lesser impact on meeting housing needs or demands, right now is very difficult.
- **Access to Transportation**
 - Lack of public transportation
 - Transportation – only 2 roads in an out, makes getting out a little more challenging
 - Transportation – no/little public transportation; 1 bus/day
 - Don't support public buses coming through – PV was envisioned as a different type of community – almost no places like it left
- **Feedback on Housing Element Process**
 - Addressing housing needs will be a slow process, but believes we'll be able to meet the challenge
 - Building more housing doesn't mean the cost of housing will go down
 - Had at least 3 meetings about housing – have been discouraged – what residents said wasn't properly communicated to Council –

- It's not the residents who decide who should live in PV
- Never had a discussion of what has happened
- Challenge = fighting state's socialistic agenda
- Ladera (outside PV) had discriminatory effects
- How do we assess what our housing needs actually are? Do we respond to the affordability levels the State wants without knowing who wants to live here?
- Disagree entirely with RHNA and it should have been challenged by the Town; biggest concern is safety and geological and RHNA; the denser the housing, the more susceptible we are to wildfire danger

Question 2: What ideas, policies, programs and suggestions do you have to meet the Town's housing needs?

▪ **Multifamily/Affordable Housing**

- Can't meet RHNA without multifamily zoning
- Would love small MF housing – at churches
- Create another group living situation or extend the Sequoias (very successful example in PV)
- More affordable housing programs

▪ **Opportunities for ADUs**

- Provide pre-approved plans and don't make it so ADUs have to match the character of the primary residences. Also make it easier to remove a tree by requiring the homeowner to put money in the bank for planting future trees.
- ADUs help! Need to help streamline the permit process. New construction will help – need to fast track the process and make redevelopment more flexible.
- Question about how do you make ADU's affordable?
- Discussion that ADU's have been hard to build in Town. Also noted, that built a home office and the Town required verification that it would not be used an ADU
- ADU's are helpful to achieve RHNA but not necessarily to achieve affordable housing.
- ADU what are actual numbers that could meet RHNA requirements.
- Much more interested in using ADUs to meet this demand, housing is extremely expensive and many of the properties have several acres to utilize.
- Figure out how many ADUs have been built
- ADUs – people can't get permits/inspections
- Agree – don't understand why ADUs aren't added
- We want to upgrade the ADU that came with the house, but was told we need to wait until 2023

- **Environmental Hazards/Safety**
 - Updating the Safety Element where we could provide input on evacuation routes and guide where we could put houses and high fire. There's nowhere to build right now
 - Addressing wildfire and water needs first. There needs to be more discussion combining the two.
 - Stanford wedge project – great deal of danger because parcel is so steep; story poles didn't show all the buildings
 - In high fire danger area
 - Fire safety – most people lost their insurance because the Town didn't....
- **Feedback on Housing Element Process**
 - Form a coalition with other similar towns such as Mill Valley and present ideas to help educate lawmakers in Sacramento
 - Get the state out of planning housing as a whole. Don't think there's a shortage.
 - Disappointed in today's presentation – didn't hear about disadvantages of building – such a one-sided event
 - Does HE have to make sure units get built?
 - What came out in PV forum – we were only town in SM county that didn't ask for any relief from RHNA – all others asked for reduced numbers.
 - Town didn't address issue with the state at all – PV is along many miles of parkland
 - Town isn't providing realistic approaches
 - Town is being sneaky
 - Have met total RHNA, but not specific categories –
 - Town has spent so much money with HIP and HEART – many are renting a room
 - Very frustrating

Question 3: Would you rather see new units (aside from ADUs) spread throughout the Town or fewer projects in more concentrated locations?

- **Mix of Both**
 - This depends on the demographic we are trying to cater to. Woodside Priory (?) is a good example
 - Look at both options – some concentrated housing and others spread out. More senior housing is needed. The Sequoias has about 200 units. We need more “affiliated housing” for care workers at the Sequoias.
 - Spread out personally, but for safety: everything new would be concentrated near exit routes
- **More Concentrated**
 - Fewer locations and close to the exit routes
 - Concentrated for walkability and proximity to transit

- Would like PV to be more walkable with mixed-use buildings with retail on the bottom. More opportunities to walk and bike are needed.
- **More Dispersed**
 - The condo building with 2 stories and 6 units in PV is a good example of more dense housing that fits in with the area.
 - Build more clustered/ranch style housing with shared facilities where vacant land is available (although it's hard to find!). We don't want anything to look denser than it is today.
 - No high-rise is desired.
 - Need to preserve scenic corridors
- **Other Comments**
 - Teachers, firefighters, etc. need more options. In 1968, there were 900 children in PV and the population was mostly young families in the 1960s!
 - How does State law maintain/know the cost that landlords are charging? How will they know that landlords aren't jacking up the prices? Deed restrictions?

Question 4: Imagine it's the year 2031. What does success look like with this Housing Element update? What words describe the housing in your community now?

- **Community Character**
 - It looks like it does now
 - New housing fits into the existing Town environment, it's not too dense, less than four stories high
 - Town's parkland and recreation areas are intact
 - New housing blends into the landscape and allows a good mix of people to live in Town
- **Housing Location/Options**
 - Housing is built along Alpine and Portola roads, (location of Town's flattest land and closest to public transit)
 - Housing is located at the corner of Alpine and Portola roads to create more of a hub; there's apartments or condos next to Roberts Market
 - Community room for the elderly community, there are more places for seniors to meet, housing that's walkable
 - There's housing that serves populations in need such as seniors, disabled people and staff housing because pure affordable housing projects are difficult
 - There's a good variety of housing options to meet different needs
 - Hopes in light of SB9 and SB10 that common sense will prevail
- **Safety**
 - It's safer, with an emphasis on fire safety

- Wants new housing not to put new (or existing) residents in danger
- Given fire danger, hopes the town is still standing; want to see infrastructure improvements
- **Other Comments**
 - More public transportation
 - Taken a fresh look at underutilized office space – made decisions based on what’s changed over the years and looked outside the box (especially in light of Covid, work-from-home)

Community Meeting #2

Question 1: The Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee’s main priorities in site selection included safety criteria, dispersing sites throughout the Town, providing a voluntary/opt-in approach for rezoning single-family properties, creating opportunities for affordable housing, and preserving existing businesses. With these in mind, do you think these sites accomplish these priorities?

- **Comments on Site Selection**
 - The sites that have been chosen indeed meet all the criteria
 - Concerned about scenic/rural community
 - Wants a longer-term approach to how we want our community to look and be, not just how to build more houses. Do we want to be more transit friendly? Pedestrian friendly?
 - This seems like a fire drill to find more places for people to live
 - But we have the opportunity to make PV more of a 21st century community
 - Those who are most fearful of damage to their property/investment people are trying to restrict housing to only certain parts of town. The entire town needs to be considered. Baseball Field should not be eliminated or moved. Don’t like state mandates but does like having people of varying incomes living in the town. Need to look at good of town to people generations coming after.
- **Comments on Site Distribution**
 - Want units spread more around town
 - One person supported the dispersed approach to locating multi-family housing.
 - Agreed with dispersal of sites
 - Concerns regarding dispersal
 - Sites have been dispersed well
 - Seems we rushed to a conclusion with the sites discussion starting in March. We could achieve more dispersal of sites.
- **Comments on Opt-In Approach to Upzoning**
 - Speakers not in support of the single family upzoning
 - The opt-in program should be time limited

- Don't agree with including voluntary or involuntary upzoned sites
- One person felt the voluntary upzoning process felt ad-hoc and not well thought out. Several people had concerns that the opt-in sites included too much wildfire risk.
- Several speakers concerned about the Nathhorst site and Bear Gulch sites due to congestion in the area
- Opt in approach is spot zoning, R1 is single family and R3 is 20/acre. But what about R2 which is duplex? Wants small cottages around that area to not decimate the trees.
- Opt in upzoning is concerning to some that these areas will pop up all over the place
- Don't agree with Upzoning at all or volunteer Upzoning which is spot zoning which can hurt the neighbors
- Not wanting Upzoning-- The buffer can go down to 15% yet we are bringing it to 20%, wants 15%
- **Affordable Housing**
 - Creating opportunities for affordable housing
 - Supportive of affordable housing in town
 - General Plan says affordable housing is meant for seniors and workers within town, not others from outside community...
 - When partnering with an affordable housing developer—are there assurances of amenities/services in what's being developed? For example, afterschool activities, additional facilities. Is there a way to make sure these developments with amenities can be developed close other affordable housing so there's a concentration of services and facilities people can take advantage of? Wants to make sure housing committee is thinking of this.
- **ADUs**
 - Need to pursue more ADUs
 - Are JADUs on our radar? Need to clarify methodology for the number of ADUs we are counting.
 - Prefer approach to ADU / SB9 units (used Woodside/ Atherton - example)
- **Town-Owned Properties**
 - Discussion of using the community center (public lands) as an option for housing
 - More Town-owned properties are needed
- **Nathhorst**
 - The Nathhorst Triangle is too concentrated and those sites are too far into Town for evacuation.
 - Several speakers concerned about the Nathhorst site and Bear Gulch sites due to congestion in the area
- **Glen Oaks**
 - Intrigued by Glen Oaks

- Glenoaks would not be able to serve the teachers or firemen or police, would only be the staff of Stanford. Wants the goal to be for workforce
- **Ford Field**
 - Several people cited concerns about evacuations if the Ford Field site were to be developed
 - Ford Field is problematic if a fire comes from Ladera or 280. References Zeke's [wildfire consultant] presentation
 - Ford Field seems like a good site. Hopes the Town will do less than 50 and keep one the oak trees. Maybe doable if they combine with the Ladera church property.
 - Some things like the oak trees and the green corridor are very important to the towns history and we shouldn't shove aside, hope we can do both building housing including at Ford Field and keep the heritage trees
 - Could we move the baseball field somewhere else so we can develop more housing there?
 - Constraints were identified before determining 50 units can be built there. However, constraints are self-imposed. Town has control and can eliminate them or reduce such as the scenic corridor setback. Ford Field itself is deed restricted but Town can go to state arguing the housing affordability crisis as reason to make it developable if additional land is needed.
 - Need to preserve the oak trees on Ford Field
- **Parking/Traffic**
 - Several people noted Portola Valley already has more traffic than it used to, and in certain sections of town it can be hard for families during school pick-up and drop-off times
 - Concerns about traffic associated with higher density
 - One person was concerned that the Stanford Wedge site would be developed without sufficient parking, and that residents/users would park in the Ford Field development (the implication being there wouldn't be enough parking for both sites)
 - Concerned about the amount of density and not for the parking along the scenic corridor, put the parking in the back perhaps
 - Not happy about parking spaces intruding into scenic corridor and wildlife
- **Safety**
 - Main priorities should be wildfire and soils
 - School safety a key
 - Fire is a concern either way. We don't want to create a bigger problem. Not convinced it is safe to add people.
 - Committee is working with hands tied behind its back. Safety Element is incomplete

- Concerns about safety especially as the fire map is old, and we don't yet have the evacuation study available & we need to ensure everyone can get out in a state of emergency
- Concerns regarding safety criteria, awaiting fire maps, concerns regarding informed site choice property
- General concerns about fire risk and evacuation routes
- How do we know safety criteria will be safe enough?
- **Density**
 - One person hoped the committee would think holistically about the rezoning process and consider the entirety of the impact to the town
 - 3.2-acre property in Westridge should be considered. A group needs to go in depth about density bonus. Letter from Don Bullard about density - increased density could lead to loss of life.
 - Concerned about high density. Number of units seem drastically larger. Own remodel process was painstaking and there were various fire safety concerns. hypocritical for town to have these discussions right now.
- **Other**
 - Only need 253 units. 304 units have been identified without touching the Nathhorst triangle.
 - Want to preserve Parkside Grille
 - Wants the maps to be better with roads on them and with the sites next to the A, B, Cs
 - Fan of economic diversity in town
 - Structures need to have sprinkler systems installed. Committee is doing a commendable job.

Question 2: The Committee supports voluntary upzoning of single-family properties for up to 6 dwelling units/acre. What design features do you think would make a development compatible with the surrounding area?

- **Comments on Opt-In Approach to Upzoning**
 - There was an off-topic conversation about why the committee was pursuing an opt-in approach to upzoning. Council member Jocelyn explained that the approach came out of feedback received from residents that they didn't like the idea of parcels being upzoned without the consent of landowners. A participant asked if the committee has considered any downsides to an opt-in approach. The council member didn't know of any downsides.
 - Opposed to the spot zoning, don't want next door neighbor to spot zone and ignore what we want. Could bring down values of neighbor's homes. Trees can't cover that.
 - Need guardrails for upzoning. Is it for a certain size? Is every SF lot eligible? Which properties? Support if only certain properties/parcels.

- Does this voluntary upzoning include mixed use? How do you deal with mixed use (for example in Nathhorst Triangle)? Would anyone want a saloon or Alpine in their backyard? Probably not. Don't want SF being upzoned to mixed use. What control would town retain to peace of homes is preserved.
- We're not against housing in town, we're against voluntary upzoning, "rips apart community" "race to the bottom"
- Correction on chart: it is 4370 Alpine not Nathhorst
- Support for selected parcels. As long as it doesn't violate safety. No problem with amount of sq footage allowed, basic safety protected. Community will be enriched.
- Up zoning - "terrible thing"
- Voluntary up zoning needs to be removed
- If it can't be removed, there needs to be a more thoughtful process for what sites gets to opt into this.
- First people to up zone make profit. Rest of the neighbors have to deal with the construction and sense of neighborhood. This will pit neighbor against neighbor
- At this point it seems better to scrap it then rush it
- **Comments on Proposed Density**
 - If upzoning to SF to 6 units per acre is allowed- what control do town/neighbors/planning commission retain in terms of size, location, height, fire safety? Hard to answer this question in abstract without knowing the constraints. Do not want 6 DUs/acre as law without town having ability to control any variables that make the community nice.
 - Wanted to know how many square feet new homes would be allowed to construct
 - 90 Bear Gulch should only have one additional home
 - People that are coming to service the properties, more people coming into town with more dense housing
 - Dense housing isn't as peaceful
 - Doesn't think it matters if it's 4 or 6.
 - 4 or 6 questions is relatively mute
 - 6 dwellings on one acre are too many
 - 6 units per acre too many for privacy and other reasons
 - Concern over 6 units/acre, consider 4
 - Maybe there's only 2 buildings on the acre, triplex,
 - Would people be more accepting of this if it's six?
- **Parking/Traffic**
 - Sites include parking
 - Parking is an important thing to consider for these prospective developments.
 - Cars are important to consider when development

- Adding 250 homes to the town will at least 500 more cars
- Concern about parking and traffic
- Concerned about the number of cars. Shawnee pass is a narrow road. Concerned about egress... both parking and travel. Concerned about people being able to get out. Took 20 minutes to get to her driveway. Can we add roads for egress? Are there options for additional lanes?
- Design feature suggestions: limiting number of driveways accessing road they're coming off. Is it possible to design for 1 or two driveway entrances so all the homes come through this/these 1-2 driveways?
- Town is doing an evacuation traffic study.
- **Community Character**
 - Openness
 - will seem unnatural to have density next to other properties
 - Unobtrusive to the neighbors
 - People choose Portola valley because of the privacy/peace
 - Need to preserve the scenic corridor.
 - Appropriate landscaping to soften or hide the existing buildings – would help with the rural aspect and feeling of the community. Add trees, plants, etc to shield the view from the neighbors and public would make the building features less important
 - new units look nice and fit in to the landscape.
 - Keep a rural community feel
- **Typology**
 - potentially townhouses
 - Cottage/townhome style architectural preferred
- **Height**
 - Single story
 - Height should be kept to 2 stories
 - Encourage 1-2 stories (especially If we are providing the RHNA buffer)
 - Keep heights low profile, consider flat roofs
 - Two story limits
- **Setbacks**
 - Strong setbacks from adjacent properties
 - Keep buildings away from neighboring properties
 - Is setback
- **Building Material**
 - Need to be tasteful with color schemes and materials of future development

- Natural, Building material usage
- **Lighting**
 - Lighting. No street lights.
 - Night sky ordinance
 - No common/lighting
 - Lighting should not impact neighbors
- **Other Suggested Standards**
 - There's only 1 front door on each door
 - Separation of structures and sprinklers are necessary
 - Intact single unit?
 - Signage
 - Septic (up-zoning options), water
 - Noise ordinance (how do these interplay)
 - Non-shared
 - lots of pervious surfaces
- **Precedents**
 - Woodside priori project is good example
 - Woodland commons (on alpine road)
- **Unrelated Comments**
 - More control in the General Plan. We need to follow the General Plan and be strict with its implementation.
 - Maybe considering Public Lands?
 - We'll be sharing these breakout notes with the committee.
 - Consolidating housing: why do we need 2 baseball fields? What if we just consolidate 2 fields into 1?
 - For Nathorst, the 20 du/ac is inappropriate
 - For Affordable Housing, Ford Field should take care of what is needed but Density Bonus could add more units on other sites!
 - Ford Field, 2 cars per unit

Question 3: For new multi-family development along Alpine Road in the scenic corridor, new zoning standards will be established. What specific things should be considered as they're developed?

- **Comments on Site Selection**
 - Convos between town and property owners are private- doesn't give neighbors opportunity to comment
 - Cannot destroy value of lifetime of savings by people who've lived in town for only a few years

- Use town-owned land that is not immediately adjacent to SF
- Ad-hoc Committee member or Councilor said it's best to save Nealy property for next housing element round. Odd. Why? A lot of squeezing making people in room nervous. Spring down farm
- Prioritize old established planning
- General plan prohibits multi-family development along alpine road
- Ford field site is open space (per advice); concern regarding it as open space
- Concerned regarding general plan
- **Scenic Corridor**
 - Are not happy with the decision to put more density in the corridor. Can't hide huge buildings with trees they'll be too small
 - Setbacks from alpine road
 - Scenic corridor and mf are contradictory
 - Might have to be in scenic corridor because it's most accessible place to build multi-family housing
 - Need to protect scenic corridor- Jon will offer lot to town
 - Scenic corridor
 - How do we design and plan to make scenic corridor stay as lovely as possible?
 - Maintain the scenic corridor setbacks and use landscaping to hide some of the new development
 - Buildings should be setback from the street and maintain scenic corridor requirements
 - Want view protections and better understand what people will see
- **Traffic/Parking**
 - Parking (located front/back/tuck under?)
 - Cars are not attractive to see
 - If you can develop up to 36 units- where will cars go?
 - No parking in the scenic corridor. Put parking underneath or behind development
 - Resident expressed that they don't want to be looking at a parking lot from their home
 - Concern about traffic, ford field, major entry and exit. Will create a bottleneck.
- **Creek**
 - Setbacks from riparian corridor
 - Urban water ways
 - Development is next to a stream. It's really important not to pollute the stream. Landscaping shouldn't pollute streams

- **Setbacks**
 - Consider setbacks, how to make entrance into PV as attractive as possible
 - Setbacks
 - At Ford Field one participant suggested the buildings be move forward toward Alpine Rd with parking in the back
- **Lighting**
 - People were interested in continuing to enforce the dark skies ordinance that limits nighttime light pollution
 - Lighting
 - Lighting
 - Parking lot won't have lighting. Liability to have unlit parking lot.
 - Reminder that only dim light is needed for safety
 - Consider lighting
- **Trees**
 - Need landscaping
 - More trees.
 - Adding trees to buffer won't be enough because it will take a long time for them to grow
 - Also maintain the heritage trees and the feeling of the community to maintain the rural atmosphere
- **Screening**
 - Screening, particularly natural screening, is important
 - Trash and utilities should be screened or enclosed so as not to be visible from the street
- **Other Suggested Standards**
 - Open space/landscaping/trails
 - Materials
 - Articulation
 - Height
 - Sit quietly in the landscape. Doesn't like 3 story buildings. Height or heft shouldn't be taller than existing buildings. Have architectural guidelines.
- **Safety**
 - Evacuation route
 - Need to understand geologic issues with building on orchard land
 - Fire department is not equipped to extinguish a fire in multifamily housing.

- **Other comments**

- Ownership options (would like this for affordable solutions)
- Resident expressed that they'd love to see more young families moving to Portola Valley

Question 4: For ADUs/JADUs, what other improvements would you suggest? What other assistance would help you through the process?

- **Amnesty Program**

- All (suggestions) good. We should be strongly encouraging them. Particularly amnesty program
- Make use of ADUs/JADUs as much as possible. Amnesty program is important. Can't rely on ADUs alone.
- Need more clarity with Amnesty Program. What are the requirements and what can we include in the RHNA?
- Amnesty program important
- Amnesty program
- Support for the amnesty program
- Amnesty program is important. Her home had problems with water flow when new housing was created. Why not legalize existing units. Town needs to help resolve these issues. Town General Plan needs to be followed.
- There was some conversation about amnesty programs. People had questions about whether the amnesty program could be used to legalize units that could count towards the town's RHNA. There were questions about how residents could find out whether an existing JADU/ADU was legal and known about by the town.

- **Informational Resources**

- Have a designated person residents interested in ADU's can speak with
- Office hours won't be enough
- Junior ADUs are great, need a marketing program for JADUs
- A tool to help homeowners visualize what an ADU would look like on their property
- Town revise handouts and create office hours

- **Permitting Process**

- Establish easy process for JADUs
- Process needs to be streamlined; it took two years to get an ADU approved
- Need to support homeowners get through the process
- More clarity for the process
- Flexibility in permitting
- Look back at comments from past ADU permits that held permit up (most seen city comments)

- Contract planners reviewing ADUs need to be designated (need uniformity in review)
- Streamlined process
- Process is a huge barrier
- Residents expressed concerns the process of getting an ADU approved is long and expensive
- **Support for Pre-Approved Plans**
 - A lot of support for pre-approved ADUs
 - Pre-fab options would be good too
 - Pre-approved plans
 - Would like preapproved plans and pre-fab options
- **Cost**
 - Need to think about whether or not to require sprinklers as that adds a lot of cost
 - Need help determining how much taxes will go up
 - Incentives for homeowners – many people are house rich but cash poor
 - Programs that would reduce costs – one person pointed out that building an ADU in the town is expensive. Several people expressed interest in programs that would reduce costs.
- **Utilities**
 - How can residents get information on sewer and septic tank hook ups? Can be cost prohibitive. Can town offer financial assistance?
 - Facilitate to obtain the necessary info and pre-requirements for sewer hook-up and septic tanks.
 - Consider ways to streamline horizontal utilities/infrastructure
 - Electrical panel upgrades
 - Sewage/septic connections
 - Septic approval process (with Westbay) makes the ADU build process painful
- **General Comments on Housing Element**
 - Pointed out that he believes you can do a time limited deed restriction to have something count in the RHNA allocation.
 - Deed restrictions can be time limited.
 - Need a way of measuring how many ADUs we have already.
 - Need to disperse more housing through more ADUs/JADUs
 - Encourage merging adjoining lots and then upzone (i.e., merge two one-acre lots, then build 10-15 units of senior or low-income housing).
 - Wants a process that does not pit neighbor against neighbor (referring to housing in general not just ADU's)

- We want more young families in our community
- Lots of houses are empty. Wants to see numbers of what's been built, what is occupied. Etc.
- **Other Ideas**
 - Look at Oakland for examples
 - Match low-income renters with owners

Additional Comments

- Embarcadero findings, may not be 3.5m units needed for the state after all, might be less
- Thought only 63 attended the April 19th meeting, not 90
- Need more in person meetings – felt more outreach necessary