

Meeting recording:

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/bVaON2xOVjNcmAduhID_G8jd3XJxKr7SZoHN0hws0XIbPySdq7F6DD97KaFogM0N.Fj_nSuGcCLLtZyRx

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:24sec)

Chairman McArthur 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, Vice-Chair Sill, Targ, Turcott, Ward, Wernikoff, Wolter

Absent: None

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 McARTHUR:

44 community participants. Chair McArthur will be stepping away from the meeting early and Vice-Chair Sill will resume control of the meeting at that point.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (2min:44sec)

Oral communication received from:

- Rita Comes: Expressing concern that the meeting is occurring on Juneteenth.
- Wolter: Notes that state is open today.
- Bruce Roberts: Several residents have brought forth legal action against the town for any electronic communications distributed during meetings.
- Karen Askey: Concerned that meeting is taking place on Juneteenth. Additionally, how do we ensure all townspeople have received the information brought forth in the housing element meetings.
- David Cardinal: Notes that today was “business as usual” at Stanford University.
- Kristi Corley: Does not feel Juneteenth should be marginalized, and a meeting should not be held on this holiday.

- Chair McArthur: 61 attendees now in the meeting. Also, thanks everyone who took the time to write thoughtful, courteous, and helpful communications. Reminds all attendees to keep discussion orderly and encourages everyone to share their input.
- Wernikoff: Shares URL which attendees can view all in attendance.

PRESENTATION (11min:02sec)

1. **Review Public Draft Housing Element** – Building & Planning Director Laura Russell presenting. The meeting format and meeting purpose are reviewed. Chair Russell also gives updates from the May 24th meeting, and an updated housing sites summary is provided. Planning commission feedback is discussed, and several opt-in rezoning program examples are provided. Additional topics discussed are an SB9 reminder, further opt-in restriction possibilities, and upcoming meetings. Town Attorney Silver provides further detailed information on Ford Field and increasing the ADU allocation.

Committee Comments/Questions:

- Pierce: Questions how likely is it that HCD would approve any more ADU's than are already being put in the plan. Also, would like to know if Sunrise idea can be used as part of the buffer. Director Russell answers.
- Targ: Discusses possibilities of Sunrise opportunities, and questions regarding Ford Field in terms of the general plan and scenic corridor. Director Russell and Town Attorney Silver provide information.
- Kopf-Sill: Comments and questions on SB9 and the slide in the presentation, and opt-in rezoning which gives the property owner more benefits and the town a bigger setback. Question regarding the donations that were given to Ford Field – what will be done with that money now? Town Attorney Silver provides information.
- Aalfs: ADU enhances incentives and the Sunrise program. What does automatic mean? What does that look like? If we are not meeting numbers, would that make Ford Field or Nathorst automatic? Director Russell answers.
- Dorahy: Is there a way we can boost the number of 6 in terms of SB9? Director Russell answers.
- Vice-Chair Sill: SB9 is not very different from the opt-in program proposed. There has been interest in the opt-in program.
- Wolter: Questions on SB9 vs. opt-in. Would like clarity between them. What constraints and limitations do we have for SB9 that other towns do not? What are the ADU incentives? Director Russell answers.
- Wernikoff: Questions on 30-30-30-10 and how it impacts the number of ADU's. What was the safe harbor and other allocation option? Would all ADU's have a 4-foot setback? What happens when we get the fire code from Woodside Fire? Regarding Sunrise, we need to know exactly what those triggers are. Director Russell provides information and answers.

- Planning Partner Violet: Discusses allocations.
- Wolter: Notes that she is speaking for herself, not on behalf of her employer.
- Turcott: Notes differences between ADU's and junior ADU's. Can we break them out and treat them separately? Can we develop the soccer field close to town center? Has that been considered to preserve the number of fields? Director Russell and Town Attorney Silver provide information and answers.
- Aalfs: Confirming that our ADU is broader than the very high fire severity zone.
- Doyle: Are we doing a study of the ADU's that we currently have in the city? Director Russell answers.

Public Questions/Comments:

- George Savage: Comments on up-zoning and SB9. Opt-in zoning does not repeal SB9 but feels like a gift to developers who want to purchase the land and rezone. Will there be a large shift from homeowners to renters being the standard?
- Neil Weintraut: Comments on Ford Field, but feels council provided feels more of an attack, and the basic ordinance of the community is being ignored. Feels prior agreements are being ignored.
- Susan Dorsey: Plea to honor the donor intent of the \$10,000 to open space (Ford Field).
- Raayan Mohtashemi: Hillsboro Housing Element Committee Member. Encourages giving more consideration to communities affirmatively furthering fair housing concerns. Do a survey into how ADU's are being used and support the opt-in option.
- Debbie Fisher: Shares concern and advocates to not close the equestrian center.
- Gary Morgenthaler: We should compare ourselves with comparable communities in the area and, specifically, we should prepare ourselves with the ones most like us. Woodside says ADU's should consist of 49.6% of their return requirements, whereas our current proposal is 30.6%.
- Danna: Asks for clarification on next planning commission meeting.
- Andrea Young: Advocating for the equestrian facilities. Would like the stables taken out of the plan.
- Maria: Notes that Ford Field is not used often enough to be taken out of the plan, along with maintenance costs which are very high. Feels more people would be interested in the very low income, in terms of junior ADU's.
- Mada Jones: Concerned about fire risk. Surprised to head HCD is challenging our guidelines. When are the new WFD maps scheduled to be available? Will HCD consider those maps? How make units are currently being planned for Alpine Road?

- William Russell: Questions on rezoning and up-zoning legislation. Comments on impact of adding so many living quarters to Nathorst Triangle. It should be enough that the State sees we are extremely serious about actually meeting the RHNA numbers
- Karen Askey: Notes strong consensus among residents that they want new development to be dispersed throughout town and to keep community low density staying true to our general plan.
- Peter Lipman: Asks that committee begins to use proper name of Dorothy Ford Park vs. Ford Field. Can we count the buffer as developable land? Has consideration been given to using inclusionary housing to acquire a suitable space for development?
- Mary Hufty: Thanking Susan Ford for coming forth and speaking on behalf of the donors and citizens. Agrees that taking that very limited amount of open space that is Ford Field is not the right place for this development. Encourages revisiting Roberts parking lot.
- David Cardinal: Feels the discussion mostly has been around how to avoid providing any affordable housing that's realistic. Advocating for those who work in town but live hours away. ADU's are not the answer.
- Judith Murphy: Loves the Sunrise idea. How can we simplify the ADU and junior ADU process to not need to develop on Ford Field? Are the incentives all to Sunrise? Why would I build an ADU now? We need to incentivize now.
- Kristi Corley: Feels speakers should have 3 minutes. In favor of reducing the buffer. Comments on Christ Church and scenic corridor setbacks.
- Jonathan Bunemann: Expressing favor for opt-in housing and multi-family housing.
- Trish Heald: Speaking in favor of increasing ADU's and junior ADU's.
- Rita Comes: Concerned that there is no fire evacuation plan. We do not have the infrastructure to support this new housing. We do not have basic infrastructure to support the current population.
- Karen: Unfortunate that we have only just heard about money donated to Ford Field. People would definitely be willing to live in smaller quarters, let's not ignore junior ADU's.
- R. Denega: Works at Isola. Advocating for affordable housing. But why should we give up equestrian center for Stanford's higher income housing? Many jobs would be lost if equestrian center is closed.
- Jordan Grimes: Lead Member with Housing Advocacy Group Peninsula for Everyone. On ADU's and junior ADU's, they are great, but will not work for all. Low-income families deserve more housing options. Err on the side of caution and go with the larger buffer. Commit to more rather than less.
- Stephanie Knott: Would like clarification on comments that we either must have the Ford property and or a Nathorst equivalent dedicated to very low-income housing.
- Jerrie Welch: Comments on changes in setbacks. How will that affect the scenic corridor? Also concerned to lose any equestrian centers.

- Lee Middleman: Comments on traffic and congestion. New housing should be put on main roads, away from the sub-roads.
- Leah Solivan: Advocating for Glen Oaks and Isola. They are part of the economy and draw to this town.
- Leslie Kriese: Calling in support of Isola.
- Paul Heald: Concerned that at the end of the year three positions are up for election, and if the negative sentiment isn't addressed in some way those positions could be removed and all the hard work could end up being removed and change dramatically.
- Jay Hartman: Feels opt-in zoning will create tension and divisiveness among neighbors and friends. Feels requirements can be satisfied with other options.
- Holly Hartman: ADU's and junior ADU's should be considered separately.
- Director Russell provides answers to questions from the public.

Committee Discussion:

- Targ: Comments on opt-in program, and a further evaluation of what makes sense in year three. Feels we need to better understand and evaluate the buffer.
- Pierce: ADU's are not the way we want to go. The amount we are projecting is far higher than we have ever produced. The only way to avoid Ford Field is to build at Alpine and Portola.
- Wernikoff: Agrees with Pierce. Feels that although opt-in is a good idea, it would cause a lot of neighborhood angst and does not feel it is worth it. Supports examples provided by Director Russell, but not think opt in is needed. Sunrise is an interesting idea but would like to hear further details and backup plans. Feels that we could have more ADU's but does not feel it is realistic to replace the very low-income units. Wants to work on preserving equestrian centers. Would like to look at junior ADU's separately. Would like to keep Ford Field out of the plan if it can be done.
- Wolter: Does not feel SB9 iteration is feasible. Supports the opt-in, it helps keeps control local. Feels the buffer is in the right place. Does not want to trigger any vitriol, so concerned about a Sunrise plan. Discusses Ford Field and the oak trees. Further discusses road remnant. Put Nathorst back on the map. Feels that the pre-application for ADU's should be simplified.
- Aalfs: Cannot support items in which most of the constituents are opposed. Expresses concern about the Sunrise plan. Generally supports the opt-in and does not want to minimize the issue it may cause between neighbors, but neighbors object to ADU's also. Feels we are better served by the current buffer, keep the buffer at a place that is likely to get approved. Does not like the idea of going back on open space, but the circumstances have drastically changed. If we take Ford Field off the table, it means putting Nathorst back on.
- Ward: Finds the opt-in to be very valuable and makes more sense due to local control, if done properly by limiting design. We need a more balanced approach to include Nathorst and Roberts. ADU's and junior ADU's are great in theory but doesn't make economic sense to

spend \$1 million to build them and then rent them at low-cost housing rates. Advocating for Community Development Corporation. Change is going to happen, so let's try to do it together.

- Dorahy: Supported SB9 at the beginning of the night but feels opt-in may be the way to go as it keeps control to the local community. Feels the buffer can be reduced. The equestrian centers should not be affected, as this affects business and jobs. If we are rural community, we need to keep the horses and stables. ADU's and junior ADU's should be broken out and considered separately and can there be amnesties for these. We need to listen to the people. It will be very sad to lose Ford Field. Can we look more at the land being used for parking? Feels Sunrise will cause more contention. Very disappointed at the behavior of many of the townspeople towards the council, committee, and volunteers.
- Turcott: This is an incredibly complex process. Many thanks to Director Russell, staff, and the consultants. Outreach to community has been critical, and this has made the staff's job very difficult. Reminder that plan is a result of the work of the staff with input from committee and non-committee residents. Feels people may think the plan is a failure if it is accepted on the first pass. Asks Director Russell to push boundaries and push in the direction that minimizes the impact on the community. Feels that a rejection on the first pass would be a good thing. Sunrise incentives delay action. Feels the buffer should be lowered for the moderate and above moderate. In favor of avoiding Ford Field.
- Kopf-Sill: In favor of the opt-in. Would vote in the name of consensus but would like to keep it. Is happy with the proposed buffer. Worried that people may not be paying attention and will be upset later. In favor of keeping Ford Field in the plan. In favor of keeping the equestrian centers, supports raising money to move stables.
- Vice-Chair Sill: Support the opt-in. Supports the 20% buffer. Feels people are being unrealistic thinking that ADU's and junior ADU's are going to be the main source of our low-income housing. Feels Ford Field is the better option. Does not support Sunrise programs.
- Director Russell on behalf of Chair McArthur: Does not support Sunrise provisions. Would like to see a 19% buffer but would go lower and is comfortable with the 20% buffer currently in place. Supports the use of Ford Field. Supports the op-in. Would keep the ADU's as-is and would remove the SB9 option. Like the idea of using parking across from the community bridge.
- Director Russell would like a show of hands to vote on opt-in, using Ford Field as proposed, increasing ADU numbers, and potential analysis of Sunrise programs.
- Wernikoff: Can we clarify vote on ADU's? Provides clarity on each vote.
- Vote on keeping opt-in program: 7 in favor, 3 against
- Vote on use of Ford Field on the assumption that the trees will not be preserved: 6 in favor, 4 against
- Vote on greatly increasing ADU numbers: 0 in favor, 10 against
- Vote on minimally increasing ADU numbers: 5 in favor, 5 against
- Vote on moving ahead with analysis on potential Sunrise programs: 2 in favor, 8 against

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5hr:13min)

1. **Ad Hoc Committee of Housing Element** – May 24th, 2022 meeting. Motion to approve minutes carried by Jeff Aalfs and seconded by Sarah Wernikoff. All voted in favor of adopting the minutes.

Public Comments on the Minutes:

- Kristi Corley: Would like to see more complete minutes and the list of who attended to be exact.
- Rita Comes: Would like to see more thorough minutes and the names of who attended.

Final Remarks

- None

ADJOURNMENT (5hr:14min)

Vice-Chair Sill adjourned meeting.