

Meeting recording: <https://youtu.be/14r9IMLUIGo>

For each agenda item, there is a time stamp that corresponds to the time in the meeting video.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (0min:23sec)

Chairman Swisher called teleconference meeting to order. Planning & Building Director Russell called the roll.

Present: Committee Members: Chair McArthur, Aalfs, Armsby, Dorahy, Doyle, Kelly, Kopf-Sill, , Pierce, Sill, Turcott, Ward, Wernikoff, Wolter

Absent: Targ

Town Staff: Laura Russell, Planning & Building Director; Cara Silver, Town Attorney; Jeremy Dennis, Town Manager; Urban Planning Consultant Carla Violet; Dylan Parker, Assistant Planner

NOTE FROM CHAIR SWISHER:

50 community participants.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (2min:44sec)

Oral communication received from:

- Walter Evans: Wants to understand the motivations for going above the state requirement for units set forth by the state and wants to make sure the council is taking the town plan into consideration.
- Caroline Vertongen: Asking for confirmation that her concerns that were submitted in April were distributed and reviewed by the committee. Does not feel that the housing element reflects the town's values and goals and does not feel that safety considerations have been properly implemented. Also does not feel that new sites are mindful of the town's rural character.
- Rebecca Lynn: Agrees with previous comments. Does not see how current recommendations reflect town values and goals. Disappointed that list of houses that voluntarily up zoned was removed from the website. Why is the committee not in person at this time? Feels it is disingenuous to still be having virtual meetings.
- Karen Askey: Neighboring communities have come out with draft plans. Feels it's very important that committee is talking with those communities and having conversations with them.
- David Cardinal: Asking for clarification on the reasons that more sites than are required are being considered.
- Rita Comes: Comments on the aging infrastructure of the town and how it will affect the current residents of the town. Expresses concern that an infrastructure plan has not been set forth.

- Bob Adams: Would like to make sure that the town center is included on the list as a potential site. Possibility for eight low-income units.

PRESENTATION (13min:25sec)

1. **Ad Hoc Committee of Town Committees** – Committee Chair Judith Murphy summarizes the meeting held May 16, 2022. There were seven town committees in attendance and 23 members of the public. Housing elements progress was presented at this meeting, followed by questions and comments by committee members and members of the public. The agenda and minutes can be viewed at <https://www.portolavalley.net/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/30771/52?toggle=allpast>.

Committee Comments/Questions:

- Turcott: Asks Murphy for clarification on the term “pocket neighborhoods”. Murphy provides information to answer.
- Wernikoff: Would like to know from Murphy if there were actionable items to consider of the new ideas that were suggested at the AHCTC meeting. Murphy provides insight.
- Dorahy: Notes that fourplexes can be built to be like the large homes that already exist.

Public Questions/Comments:

- Rita Comes: Thanks to Murphy for presentation. Feels that the voice of the town was deeply represented and hopes that the town reads and fully considers the report, especially in regard to the safety element.
- Caroline Vertongen: Thanks to Murphy and hopes others follow her example.
- Loni: Has not been able to find agenda, but thanks Murphy for the summary. Echoes the sentiment to start slowly and begin with lower-impact projects first.
- Karen Askey: Thank you to Murphy for the tremendous summary. Concerned about over-development.

PRESENTATION (39min:01sec)

1. **Review Partial Draft Housing Element Update**– Building & Planning Director Laura Russell presenting. Key topics included a review of recent meetings, sites inventory updates, partial draft housing element, sites inventory table, policies and programs, and next steps.

Committee Comments/Questions:

- Kopf-Sill: Asking for clarification on zoning type for Ladera and why it would be considered affiliated housing and up zoning, and why one-acre was chosen for the opt-in. Kopf-Sill also expresses concern about the review by the planning commission; is there a possibility of discourse over each property that will be proposed? Who will be drafting and reviewing the objective standards for further input? Director Russell provides information and clarification.

- Sill: Expresses concern about zoning to 20 units per acre and overall density impact. Can a discussion be had with owner at 4394 Alpine to up zone? Director Russell provides updates.
- Armsby: How was Glen Oaks allocated, what was the process? Director Russell answers.
- Wolter: Kudos to the staff. Questions why not allow ADU's to come in with more flexibility? Director Russell answers.
- Wernikoff: Requests clarification on the buffers. Would like committee to focus on the collective density. If there is the ability to increase ADU's, would there be the option to decrease Glen Oaks? Director Russell answers.
- Chair McArthur: How many units can be removed so that it looks like a smaller density project? Director Russell answers.
- Turcott: Is the sites inventory different from the table in the agenda packet, specifically in terms of Ladera Church. Asks for clarification on other properties that have been dropped from the list. Expresses surprise that increasing ADU production and Junior ADU production and using the Affordable Housing Fund was not part of today's meeting materials. Further expresses concern about the evacuation plan. Questions regarding approach to opt in up zoning. Director Russell provides answers and information.
- Dorahy: Will HCD look favorably upon the good faith effort that is being put forth? If so, can be bump up the ADU buffer? Director Russell answers.
- Wernikoff: Has there been any indication from HCD that the projection would be higher? Director Russell answers.
- Armsby: Have any other communities statewide similar to Portola Valley had their housing plans approved? Director Russell answers.
- Chair McArthur: Asks for clarification on how density bonus works. Director Russell answers.

Public Questions/Comments:

- Ellen Vernazza: Concerned to see the possibility of 20 units per acre so near other high-density housing. Feels most of the town was against rezoning Nathorst as high-density housing. What happened to spreading it across town?
- Rita Comes: Asks if there a quorum when so few people are showing up on camera at these meetings. Would like to have a public meeting before the 30-day time period is up to make comments.
- Jon Silver: Strongly supports summary provided by Judith Murphy. Concerned about Ford Field open space, but he is not sure there is a better alternative. Provides thoughts and information on the 20% buffer requirement.
- Mary Hufty: Concerns about the opt-in; feels it will pit neighbor against neighbor and feels it should be avoided. Also feels the one acre limit is very arbitrary.

- David Cardinal: Wants the record to show that we do have an evacuation plan, which was created by Woodside Fire.
- Tim Clark: With Ladera Community Church. Confirming Director Russell's earlier comments as to why they were removed from the list.
- Rebecca Lynn: Feels the equestrian community is not being considered. Also feels up zoning will pit neighbor against neighbor, and that 20 acres per unit seems like a very bad idea.
- Karen Askey: Concerned about over development and bonus-density. We need to increase the number of ADU's.
- Bill Russell: Reminder that the plan being presented to the state is the first draft. Our first submission should not be our final offer.
- Bob Adams: Why the town center land is not a part of the conversation. Dropping that land is not productive.
- Ron Eastman: Agrees with Bob Adams and does not understand why town center land is not being included. Expresses concern regarding homeowner equity.
- Robin M.: Wants to take more risk in the negotiation. Expresses concern about up zoning.
- Gene Chaput: Has anyone at the town council contacted CALE?
- Cornelia T.: Worried about the opt-in, sounds like it will get out of control. If it has to be included, it should not be below one acre. Wants to add more ADU's and would like information on the ADU's that aren't currently permitted. Can we provide incentives for people to legalize them? What happens with property taxes? Feels buffer numbers should not be included.
- Laura Davidson: Would like to discuss safe commutes, especially in terms of the children going to and from school.
- Danna: Thanks to Judith Murphy. Most concerned about the general plan. Would be interested in helping locate those who would be willing to create ADU's and junior ADU's.
- Caroline Vertongen: Why is HCD not a part of these meetings? Would like to hear the rationale for the increased numbers.
- Leslie Kriese: Would like town to be more aggressive in negotiations. Does not want to offer the buffer up front. Would like CALE conversation to be public. What are the conversations being had with other towns going through this process?
- Mighty Jones: Should not lead with our best offer or try to get "brownie points" with HCD. Feels someone experienced in negotiations should be handling that portion.
- Loni: Feels people are repeating items because they are not being heard.
- Peter Drager: Feels that the minority opinion is driving the draft. Do we support 6-units per acre at Nathorst?

- David Cardinal: Wants to remind town that the staff has professional negotiating skills. The public cannot back seat drive.
- Tammy Cole: Concerned about increasing units to 20 units per acre.
- Rebecca Lynn: A note that part of the charm is being able to have children walk to school. Wants to make sure safe routes to school are being included.
- Bob Schultz: Concerned about traffic, infrastructure, and safety of the neighborhoods.
- Gary Morgenthaler: Feels that a voluntary decentralized solution based on ADU's and junior ADU's is the optimal approach for meeting requirements. Committee needs to think outside the box.
- Rob Jack: Opt-in voluntary up zoning will be problematic for the town. There should be a third-party review of the suitability of any property. Is there a limit for voluntary up zoning?
- Director Russel and Town Attorney Silver address comments and answer questions presented by the public.

Committee Discussion:

- Wolter: Feels we should discuss flexibility with ADU's.
- Kelly: Feels the draft is a great starting point. We should expect HCD should be inflexible and unreasonable. Feels we are not making an aggressive offer, but a mildly aggressive, reasonable offer. Has reservations about the opt in program, feels it will lead to more difficulty over time.
- Kopf-Sill: These negotiations are different than dealing with a company. This is public, there is no such thing as a low offer.
- Armsby: Suggesting that discretionary questions that are on the margins won't make a dent, but can we be below the buffer if it works out? Was not suggesting the removal of a buffer. Cautiously in favor of an opt-in that would be very regulated.
- Pierce: Why are the 20-acre options all up against Ladera? In favor of having one in the vicinity of Alpine and Portola. We should only use the opt-in if we have to.
- Wolter: Was recently verbally attacked for supporting the opt-in program. Reminder of what considered "low-income", which is now family of four making \$160,000. In favor of the opt-in program only if it is well-regulated. Wants more ADU flexibility and supports as much zoning flexibility as possible.
- Turcott: Feels the draft is missing out on the unique features of the town. Draft does not address laws and policies and feels these should be addressed moving forward. Would like language to include best practices.
- Aalfs: Reminder that the opt in is voluntary. Trying to spread housing and density out as best to compromise for all.

- Sill: Would like someone on the planning staff become an ADU advocate. Feels the opt in approach is still reasonable. Concerned we are going towards too much density at Nathorst Triangle.
- Wernikoff: Does not want to go over 20%. Would rather round down vs. up. In favor of pushing ADU number up to improve deficits. Uncomfortable with opt in.
- Kelly: Can we claim a small number of SB9's? Director Russell provides information.
- Wernikoff: Would the current numbers in the proposal be kept or will these change as more calculations are done?
- Planning Consultant Violet: At the vacant lot, if you do 20 per acre, you can get up to 23 units. Total units are currently at 315.
- Director Russell: For most people, the opt in is at the bottom. We will only use that if we need it and we will design it to limit it more so that it's just a step beyond SB9.
- Wolter: Would prefer town money goes into very low-income housing.
- Ward: Likes the suggestions regarding the opt in program. Would like a community development organization.
- Dorahy: Let's put in a few more ADU's, expand that number. Make the most of our objective standards.
- Director Russell: Summary of new ideas for draft.
- Kelly: We do not have any protections based around the ownership of horses. Most of the old barns are now ADU's.
- Sill: This is going to be a trade-off of proposals: density at Nathorst, density at Glen Oaks, or the opt in.
- Ward: Did Glen Oaks create plans to build affiliate housing? Would there still be a way to maintain modified, smaller horse facilities to keep the horse operation intact?
- Director Russell: Would like all to note that some of the items that are being taken off the list may need to return once HCD has reviewed the plan.
- Turcott: Would like to be aggressive about ADU's.
- Chair McArthur: Can we do a survey around ADU's?
- Kelly: A survey may not be helpful in any way.
- Turcott: A prepaid application should be considered.
- Kopf-Sill: Not everyone will actually use their ADU's.

- Director Russell: Still feels we are split on increasing the number of ADU's on the draft.
- Chair McArthur: Does not hear strong support. 4 in favor on increasing ADU number.
- Director Russell: We will not increase the ADU's based on that quick vote. The next step at this point is a full draft that will be reviewed at the next meeting.
- Chair McArthur: The public review of the draft will take place June 7th.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (4hr:51min)

1. **Ad Hoc Committee of Housing Element** – May 2nd, 2022 meeting. Motion to approve minutes carried by Bill Kelly and seconded by Andrew Pierce. All voted in favor of adopting the minutes.

Public Comments on the Minutes:

- None

Final Remarks

- None

ADJOURNMENT (4hr:52min)

Chair Swisher adjourned meeting.