

PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting

MARCH 6, 2023

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Kopf-Sill called the Planning Commission special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Planning & Building Director Russell called the roll.

Present: Planning Commissioners: Brothers, Krashinsky, and Targ; Vice Chair Goulden; Chair Kopf-Sill
Absent: None
Town Staff: Laura Russell, Planning & Building Director; Adrienne Smith, Senior Planner; Cara Silver, Town Attorney

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Time:00:01:39

Chair Kopf-Sill invited members of the public to share their comments on topics not on the agenda.

Caroline Vertongen urged the Commission not to recommend the adoption of the Housing Element to the Town Council. The document used outdated data, data from other cities, and failed to address the constraints of Portola Valley's landscape. Those constraints were identified on the Moritz Map, the existing Geological Map, and other documents that were not considered by the Housing Element. She referenced former California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Director Lynn Jacobs words and noted that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers were just a projection. The 5th Cycle RHNA was reduced because the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) considered and understood the unique landscape of Portola Valley. The building department refused to share that information with the Commission and the public. She asked how much the Town pays HCD and why was the Town not inviting a staff member from HCD to speak to the residents. She emphasized that the resident of Portola Valley were in desperate need of updated infrastructure, reliable energy, and a cut in taxes. The programs found in the Housing Element would be paid by the tax-paying residents. The residents did not qualify for many of the programs and would receive no benefit from them. She hoped that the Town Council and the Planning Commission understood the real needs of Portola Valley and that now was the time to accommodate the residents.

Rita Comes Whitney mentioned the agenda read that folks could access Rungie.com to see who was attending the meeting but that was untested software. She questioned where that data was being stored and was concerned that it may be sharing personal information about residents. She remarked that the residents had spent 100s of hours researching data and information on the Housing Element and the draft before the Commission did not reflect many of the key points raised by the residents. For example, Dorothy Ford Park was still being called Dorothy Ford Field and those types of mistakes had been called out many times.

Kristi Corley was disappointed that residents received short notice that the meeting was happening on Monday instead of the Planning Commission's regular day. Also, the notice that was sent out on Thursday contained the wrong date which caused more confusion about when the meeting was going to be held. The live link on the agenda required a passcode and ID. She requested that the Town allow folks to double-click and enter instead of residents giving out information to the software they knew nothing about. She inquired about what environmental impacts would be reviewed for the larger sites in the Housing Element and urged the Town to allow public comment for each of the larger sites. She said the proposed 5-foot setback for the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch was inadequate for the stream and all seasonal stream setbacks should be protected as stated in Section 18.59.01 through

DRAFT MINUTES

18.59.080. She commented that the Town should deed restrict for 99 years or in perpetuity and she agreed with the previous speaker that Dorothy Ford Park was misnamed throughout the document.

Karen Askey remarked she was part of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ambassador Team and the focus of the team was to find ways to streamline the process for folks interested in building an ADU. She reached out to folk who expressed interest in building an ADU and she shared a summary of those conversations. One person indicated they wanted an ADU and inquired if the Town would consider an ADU in high-fire-risk areas if it did not change the footprint of the structure and the parking was sufficient on the site. Another resident encouraged the Town to review the adjusted maximum floor area (AMFA) rules and treat ADU basements similarly to single-family homes rules. For properties under 1 acre, another person commented that the Town should revisit the 85/15 AMFA calculation as it currently precluded ADU and Junior ADU (JADU) development on smaller properties. The last was a homeowner who was not allowed to build an ADU because they lived on a corner property, on a street that was narrower than 18-feet.

PUBLIC HEARING

Time:00:16:14

(1) Adoption of a Resolution Providing a Recommendation that the Town Council Adopt the proposed Portola Valley Housing Element and Conforming General Plan Amendments

Planning & Building Director Russell summarized the meeting purpose, meeting format, and staff's recommendation, as outlined in the staff report. She reminded the Commission and the public that staff had a living table published on the City's Housing Element website that linked all the Housing Element documents in one place for folks to find easily.

On February 15, 2023, the Planning Commission recommended that the Town Council adopted the Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and added two additional actions to the Resolution. The first was that the Town Council adopt the project design features listed in the Targ/Brothers Colleague Memo, excluding the financial terms. The second was that Town Council further consider adopting the key approaches for Fire Safety that were presented by Fire Marshal Bullard in his presentation on February 15, 2023.

Planning & Building Director Russell gave a summary of the significant changes that were made to the draft Housing Element per the discussion held with the Commission and the public, as outlined in the staff report. The most significant changes included the updates to 4370 and 4394 Alpine Road inventory sites, the additional development standards for Ladera Church and Glen Oak site, and clarification and additional detail to the Housing Element Opt-in Program and other programs. The temporary standards proposed for Ladera Church was a density of 3 to 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), the setbacks would be 20-feet for the front with 10-foot setbacks for the rear and side, and the allowable height was proposed to be 28 to 34-feet. For Glen Oaks, the temporary standard was a density of 2 to 4 du/ac, the setback would be 75-feet for the front with 30-foot setbacks for the rear and side, and the height range proposed was 28-feet to 34-feet. With respect to other programs, staff increased specificity and added more timelines to several programs; re-worded Programs 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4; added Programs 8-9 and 8-10 which were in response to HCD's comments to meet State Laws; and added Program 9-1 in response to HCD's comments and discussion with the owner of 4394 Alpine Road.

Planning & Building Director Russell highlighted the changes that staff proposed for the General Plan and the upcoming meeting schedule, as outlined in the staff report. She invited the Commissioners and members of the public to share any typos and clerical errors with staff via email.

Chair Kopf-Sill invited Commissioners to ask clarifying questions of staff.

Time:00:44:52

DRAFT MINUTES

Vice Chair Goulden referenced Page 56 of the constraint section and asked for additional details on how a household is defined. Planning & Building Director Russell answered over time there had been different ways that household was defined. The focus now was that anyone living in the household should be counted and treated the same in the zoning language.

Vice Chair Goulden referenced Page 101, adequate sites, and asked if it was deliberate to stop at May 2022 for ADU production figures. Planning & Building Director Russell explained the information on Page 101 was presented to the HCD supervisor and staff felt the data should remain as is until staff could sort out the remainder of 2022 ADU production figures.

Vice Chair Goulden moved to the Opt-in Program and asked how the selection process would be performed. Planning & Building Director Russell predicting accepting the sites into the program would be a Planning Commission action.

Vice Chair Goulden recalled when the 4394 Alpine Road site was discussed, the focus was not to remove any existing elements the owner currently had but rather add onto them. Planning & Building Director Russell explained that because the site was mixed-use, the owner would retain their rights, with the proposed change.

Vice Chair Goulden referenced Page 116, the setbacks between the two sites, and asked if the right to have a zero setback carried forward if the property were sold to a new party. Town Attorney Silver responded it would only apply to the supportive housing overlay and concurred that the language must be changed to reflect that.

Vice Chair Goulden understood that the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch had pipes on both sides of the property and Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct. He inquired if the site could propose a project if the project included the installation of a drainage pipe. Planning & Building Director Russell answered no, that was not the practice of the Town and the project would be recommended for denial. Vice Chair Goulden summarized there could be pipes on both sides but not in the middle.

Vice Chair Goulden referenced Page 128, Program 5-1, and asked what the definition of co-housing was. Planning & Building Director Russell explained it was a corporative arrangement and the concept was identified by the Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee.

Vice Chair Goulden remarked he had a detailed list of typos, clerical errors, and date corrections that he would send to staff. He moved to the last page, Table 7-2, and asked what the table was trying to display. Planning & Building Director Russell answered the table was a requirement of HCD.

Commissioner Targ mentioned there was a program around planning for disabilities and implementing measures to avoid constraints for disabled persons. He asked about the practicality of that program and how that would be applied to single-family residential projects. Planning & Building Director Russell predicted it would be present in universal design which was a housing design that could accommodate a range of people. Those universal designs were used more broadly in larger projects, but the proposed language was drafted in a way that could fit the typical projects that the Town saw. The Town was relying on the owner or nonprofits to determine how those universal designs could be incorporated.

Commissioner Targ referenced Program 8-9 and asked if the purpose of the program was to remove obstacles within the Town's Code that prohibited the creation of accommodations, or was it that new projects must include or consider accommodations beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Planning & Building Director Russell explained HCD recommended the Town consider

DRAFT MINUTES

its Municipal Code and revise its reasonable accommodation section to ensure there are no unreasonable obstacles for ADA compliance to be accomplished. The Town would also work with nonprofits to help update the Municipal Code where feasible.

Commissioner Targ was supportive of removing constraints but did not support enforcing additional requirements that increased costs. He referenced Page 59 and noticed there were proposed changes to the Green Building Code. He said there was a tradeoff and he wanted the Housing Element to be clear that Program 8-9 was removing constraints. Not requiring mandatory additional accessibility elements. Planning & Building Director Russell concurred that the objective was to remove constraints and the other place where the universal design would be considered was at the Ford Field Open Space. She emphasized that there was no requirement for private housing owners to implement the program.

Commissioner Targ wanted to see language that said “that the program did not include an affirmative requirement to” homeowners. Planning & Building Director Russell suggested that the Commission discuss the language during the discussion portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Targ referenced Page 61 where it said there was a by-right for properties that had 20 percent or greater affordability. Planning & Building Director Russell informed the by-right provision came from State Law and was not a discretionary decision of the Towns. The provision applied to projects that had 20 percent or more of its units designated for low or very-low-income persons only if the site was on the housing inventory and was designated for those income levels.

Commissioner Targ recommended that Ford Field and Open Space be referred to as Ford Park throughout the document. He asked if there was a reason why Ford Park was being referred to as Ford Field and Open Space. Planning & Building Director Russell believed the descriptive language for Ford Field and Open Space was superior and it recognized that it was open space. She said that transforming open space into housing was an important policy question and staff made that distinction on purpose to provide clarity.

Commissioner Targ understood that future development at Ford Field and Open Space would be subject to a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) between the developer and a third-party affordable provider. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Targ inquired how the DDA would work with the by-right process and Planning & Building Director Russell answered that the by-right provision would not apply in that scenario.

Commissioner Targ referenced Page 100 and stated he noticed that the Stanford Wedge project no longer included low-income requirements. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that the provision was not struck but rather the language was reworded per HCD’s recommendation.

Commissioner Targ referenced Page 108, the Opt-in Program, and remarked it was unclear what discretion remained under the program. Planning & Building Director Russell responded that the discretion would be with the Planning Commission and the Commission would ensure that the site met the safety criteria. Also, the Commission would select the sites, those sites would then be subject to Objective Standards, and the Architectural & Site Control Commission’s (ASCC) review would be based on those standards.

Commissioner Targ understood the Planning Commission would evaluate the sites themselves rather than the aspect of the project. Planning & Building Director Russell explained the Planning Commission would have the authority in setting the standards and then the Planning Commission would review the conceptual plans.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Targ understood the Commission would have discretion in the same way the Commission had discretion in the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process. Planning & Building Director Russell answered it would be similar but the criteria was specific to the Housing Element program and should not be conflated with the CUP process for commercial uses. Any project proposed under the program would have to meet the safety criteria as well as neighborhood compatibility and benefit to the community criteria.

Commissioner Targ understood once the project was allowed into the Opt-in Program, it move to the ASCC for ministerial review for consistency with the ACSS Objective Standards and Planning & Building Director Russell responded yes.

Commissioner Targ mentioned the Commission was very interested in a sunrise provision for Ford Park and asked how that was being addressed in the proposed Housing Element. Planning & Building Director Russell specified the sunrise provision came from a Colleagues Memo from Commissioner Targ and current Council Member Craig Taylor. The Planning Commission considered it in much detail but the Ad Hoc Housing Element Committee did not. Both discussions were presented to the Town Council and the Town Council supported the concept. They recommended including the site in the inventory but have the timeline not at the very beginning of the Housing Element cycle. Program 3-1 proposed to begin a site planning process in early 2024 and issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to affordable housing developers in the fall of 2024. She explained that affordable housing development projects take a long time due to financing and recommended staff check with contacts in the affordable housing field before moving the sunrise provision out later in the cycle. Staff did support moving the provision out a year.

Commissioner Targ stated that the Town now had commitments to construct several units at Ford Park but could determine that development was not needed if an alternative site was found. He inquired if the Town would still be in compliance with the Housing Element if it found such a site. Planning & Building Director Russell indicated that if the Town identified another site and development occurred. That would be supported and the Town would still be in compliance with the Housing Element.

Commissioner Targ asked if that should be made into an express provision. Planning & Building Director Russell emphasized that HCD wanted to see real feasible housing sites in the inventory and if they did not see that then they would ask for stronger commitments from the Town.

Commissioner Targ referenced Page 141, the Program Implementation Matrix Goal 1-1 A, and asked if establishing a Form-Based Code and by-right approvals for the new zoning district was leftover language. Planning & Building Director Russell agreed that some of the language was not up to date and that was a clerical error. She said the intention was to assign the Gateway Land Use Classification to Ford Park and that was to be a specific process developed by the Town with no Form-Based Code or by-right approval.

Commissioner Brothers inquired if the Town was required to make the General Plan changes in the same timeframe as the Housing Element Update. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that the Town was required to do that and the Elements in the General Plan must be consistent with each other.

Commissioner Brothers asked what environmental review was expected for each project and would some of the projects qualify for Categorical Exemptions under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Planning & Building Director Russell stated the 4394 Alpine Road site was likely to have a supportive housing project which under State Law was Exempted from CEQA and a by-right approval. Any other type of project would follow its own environmental process. With respect to Ford Park, any project would have its own environmental review, such as an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). With

DRAFT MINUTES

respect to the Glen Oaks housing site, she was not sure what type of environmental review that site would endure.

Commissioner Brothers asked if there would be public notice for the Glen Oaks housing site and Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed the site would go through a discretionary process.

Planning & Building Director Russell moved to 4370 Alpine Road and predicted that the environmental review would depend on what the scope was for what was being proposed. For the remaining sites, she could not speculate on what environmental review there would be until a project was proposed.

Commissioner Targ asked if Glen Oaks would have a significant environmental review due to its size, or would it fall under affordable housing. Planning & Building Director Russell remarked that the property was owned by Stanford University and she imagined they would propose a project similar to the Stanford Wedge.

Commissioner Brothers recalled there being a 5-foot setback for the stream and understood the designer for the Glen Oaks project also used the 5-foot setback. Planning & Building Director Russell clarified it was a 50-foot setback because it is a named creek and they have a larger setback.

Commissioner Brothers asked to what extent did the Housing Element establish an environmental standard. She commented that she did not want to preclude meaningful environmental provisions that were included in the Housing Element for a different purpose. Planning & Building Director Russell referenced the Glen Oaks housing site and said the map included a large setback around the creek. In the Municipal Code, there was language that creeks must have a buffer and that was an important standard from a CEQA point of view. She expressed that the map was a feasibility analysis to demonstrate that the site was developable. With respect to the 5-foot setback, the 5-foot was the bare minimum but any additional footage would require a CEQA analysis.

Commissioner Brothers indicated she would be more comfortable if more specific environmental figures included a description as to why they were included. That would eliminate confusion and, in the future, they would not be used as a standard.

Commissioner Krashinsky referenced the matrix on Page 29 and the item about community opposition to affordable housing. He articulated he did not see any reason for that to be placed in the document and was unsure if that was accurate. Also, the language was not tied to any specific programs. He asked why that language was added and if it were removed, would there be any negative impacts? Planning & Building Director Russell said that the language was added in response to the comments received about fair housing. Under the Fair Housing Law, HCD wanted sites that had never had multi-family zoning to recognize and understand that there have been exclusionary zoning practices. She shared it was added to the Housing Element because there had been a historical practice of the Town of not allowing multi-family in affordable housing developments. If the Planning Commission agreed, the language could be removed. With respect to the programs, the Housing Element was establishing multi-family zoning for the first time and identified locations for affordable housing. Those were the programs to move the community past its historical opposition to affordable housing.

Commissioner Krashinsky mentioned that first-time readers may not understand what the Opt-in Program is. He asked if the program could be renamed to Opt-in Housing Diversification Program or a different name to provide clarity. Planning & Building Director Russell remarked the name was kept because the community had been discussing it for a long time and staff was not trying to confuse folks. She supported changing the name as long as the words "opt-in" remained in the title.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Krashinsky understood the selection process under the Opt-in Program was a subjective process but that was not made clear in the document. Planning & Building Director Russell explained after reviewing the discussions over the many Planning Commission meetings, staff understood that there was a desire to not have a lengthy process, and there was a concern that HCD would not support the program because of its many obstacles. The proposed language was trying to have a subjective review based on criteria but the criteria was published in a way that there would be minimally discretionary. Also, the criteria would be listed in the Call to Projects instead of in the Housing Element itself.

Commissioner Krashinsky inquired if applications came in for less than the 12 unit minimum, could the Commission still use subjective criteria to say that a project was not accepted? Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes.

Commissioner Targ asked if it would be a subjective decision or a decision made based on stated rules that the Planning Commission would apply an amount of judgment to. Town Attorney Silver mentioned that HCD had never heard of an Opt-in Program and so it came with a legislative decision as well as a quasi-judicial decision.

Commissioner Targ inquired if it were a CUP, would the CUP be adjudicative on a decision and Town Attorney answered yes.

Commissioner Targ stated the Opt-in Program was narrower than a CUP so it was an adjudicative process. Town Attorney Silver confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chair Goulden assumed that the criteria would be a list and the Planning Commission would be judging projects based on the amount of variety they proposed. Town Attorney Silver informed that staff had not drafted all the details yet for the program, but she envisioned it would be similar to RFP criteria.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked for the Glen Oaks site, would it be possible to keep the equestrian use and cluster the 16 units on a smaller portion of the site? Planning & Building Director Russell understood the community and Town Council intended to preserve the equestrian use if possible and not write regulations that would preclude retention of the equestrian use. She stated the units could be clustered together.

Commissioner Krashinsky referenced Table 6-6 on Page 111 and asked why under the proposed rezoning column for Dorothy Ford Field and Open Space the word Gateway was not included with the General Plan Amendment. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed staff could add the word Gateway in the column.

Commissioner Krashinsky understood that Ladera Church was part of the Gateway classification as well as being rezoned to multi-family. He asked if both designations should be included in Table 6-6 and where both designations being considered for the site. Planning & Building Director Russell reported that the church had been interested in an affordable housing project for several years and per the Town's recommendation had waited for the Housing Element Update to move that intention forward. The church was included in the Gateway to provide the option to have an affordable housing developer develop both sites. The multi-family zoning allowed them to pursue an independent project with the Town's zoning requirements. Also, the church was a part of the Affiliated Housing Program which allowed the church to engage in a discussion with the Planning Commission if they wanted additional flexibility. She agreed in the rezoning category it should list that Ladera Church was part of the General Plan Amendment for the Gateway classification and that it was multi-family zoning. Staff would align the General Plan classification densification with multi-family densification.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Krashinsky asked for multi-family zoning if 3 to 20 du/ac was correct, because it varied throughout the document, and how was that range chosen. Planning & Building Director Russell remarked that the correct number was 3 to 20 du/ac. Through discussions with the owner of 4394 Alpine Road, the owner had shared they may wish to build a supportive housing project that had a shared kitchen in the units and a lower number du/ac allowed the owner to pursue that type of housing product.

Commissioner Krashinsky noticed that the deadline for Program 1-5, co-housing, was June 2023 and the Town was making a commitment for 2 to 3 years. He asked if that was a realistic deadline and could the Town meet that commitment. Planning & Building Director Russell suggested the deadline be moved to the year 2026 and the goal was to meet twice during the planning cycle.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if Program 3-1, RFP for the Gateway zone, should include Town Council along with the Planning Department as the responsible agency. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct and made a note to add Town Council to the program.

Commissioner Krashinsky shared he presented his typos and clarifications to staff offline.

Chair Kopf-Sill referenced the 5-foot setback for the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch and asked how that setback would be enforced. Planning & Building Director Russell mentioned there was complicated water math that the Engineering Department did to determine if the structure was 5-feet or more from the ditch.

Chair Kopf-Sill wanted to make sure that the new home was built safely while enforcing that the home did not dump trash into the creek. Planning & Building Director Russell explained that a structure closer to the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch would require more stabilization and that must be maintained for safety purposes. So, often the interest of the Town, the neighbors, and the applicant were in alignment on that aspect.

Chair Kopf-Sill commented that several Commissioners were set on maintaining the 75-foot setback for scenic corridor. She understood from staff's presentation that there may be scenarios on the Ladera Church site that the 75-foot setback would be reduced to 20-feet. Planning & Building Director Russell concurred that the Ladera Church site was the only site being considered in the Housing Element to reduce the setback.

Chair Kopf-Sill understood that the owners of 4394 Alpine Road would be allowed to move soil that was moved by previous owners. Planning & Building Director Russell said the previous owners did unpermitted soil movement and the current owners wanted to move the soil back to its original location.

Chair Kopf-Sill recalled in the Opt-in Program there was language about subdivision land restrictions and she asked what that meant. Planning & Building Director Russell articulated that the language acknowledged that there may be different legal arrangements and those would be considered in the Call for Projects process. Chair Kopf-Sill suggested that the language be revised to provide clarity.

[The Commission took a short break]

Chair Kopf-Sill opened public comment.

Time:02:06:58

Planning & Building Director Russell asked how the Commission would like to handle questions that come from the public. Chair Kopf-Sill suggested the public ask their questions and then Commissioners would ask Staff the question after public comment if it would help for them with their decision.

DRAFT MINUTES

Karen Askey mentioned that the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch had a bridge that crossed it behind the offices and she had concerns about the 5-foot setback. A neighboring city had a 35-foot setback for intermediate streams and another had a 35-foot setback. With that said, she recommended that the setback be extended to 10-feet from the ephemeral creek/drainage. Also, HCD allowed for pipeline projects to be included in the inventory but there was no mention in the Housing Element of the ADUs that were in the pipeline nor the Woodside Priory's proposed housing. With respect to 4370 Alpine Road, the maximum height was proposed to be 35-feet and she asked if that height would result in a three-story structure. With respect to Ladera Church, she expressed concern about the 75-foot setback on Alpine Road. The reduction would impact the scenic corridor and Alpine Road is one of the major evacuation routes. Also, the 10-foot setback on the side would impinge on the adjacent neighbor. With respect to the soil movement at 4393 Alpine Road, she asked where that soil was moved from and was there any relation to the creek. In the Town's Open Space section, the park was called Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space and she requested it be called that to have consistency. She questioned if the Town had done a site analysis of Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space because the 2.54 acres did not appear to be big enough for development. She said she supported the sunrise provision and moving them out. Also, she reminded that the Glen Oaks equestrian use was also a small business and any residential development would displace folks working at the equestrian facility.

Bob Adams, a resident of the Nathhorst neighborhood, concurred that he and several others had been working with the neighborhood, the owner of the Alpine Road site, and the staff to reach a consensus on a project that would work for the entire community. The original idea was to have the site be part of the Opt-in Program but the owner did not support that because it was too limiting. One of Mr. Adam's main concerns for the parcel was the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch. The creek, at the footbridge, was 5-feet below grade, and 15-feet away it was 8-feet below grade. With that said, the proposed 5-foot setback was not workable when there would be a 60 percent slope and he understood that any project would have to go through the CEQA process. He shared his appreciation to the Commission and the staff for their hard work.

Rita Comes Whitney indicated that the Stanford Wedge was included in the Housing Element but the project was severely delayed. The Glen Oaks site was also owned by Stanford University and she stated the horse facility was used by folks living all over the Bay Area. It would be disappointing if that use was not retained. Information about fire hazards in Portola Valley was incorrect and this was acknowledged by the Town Manager and the previous Mayor. That information was still sent to the State and she predicted that information was what was being used by HCD. Many of the feasible, buildable sites carried real safety concerns and any new resident should not be subject to a structure collapse because of the Town's negligence. She asked when will the residents be able to review any documents concerning the hazards in the town before they are sent to the State.

Bill Russell, a resident of the Nathhorst neighborhood, complimented the folks who worked on a compromise between the owner of the Alpine Site and the neighborhood. With respect to 4370 Alpine Road, five units were proposed to be constructed in the rear and four in the front. How will that arrangement affect CEQA requirements? Was it clear that the homes along Nathhorst will face Nathhorst? With respect to 4394 Alpine Road, he asked what the maximum for market-rate units that could be constructed on the property.

Ron Eastman stated he supported the sunrise provision that was originally proposed by Commissioner Targ and former Commissioner Taylor. He remarked the solution proposed in the Housing Element was less than optimal. If any Commissioner believed that any of the proposals would diminish the environmental review, resident's quality of life, and so forth. Then the Town should allow more time for further analysis. He supported using the Town's Affordable Housing fund to buy vacant land in the town's center because the area anticipated mixed-commercial and residential. The current version of the General Plan did not support mixed-commercial and residential along Alpine Road and the scenic

DRAFT MINUTES

corridor. He found the Housing Element to be a substantial violation of the General Plan. One idea was to create a loan program to encourage ADU production and another option was to allow basements for ADUs. He shared that his neighbors were also in favor of the original sunrise provision. He echoed the question as to why the Priory's project was not included in the Housing Element and why the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch was being called a drainage ditch.

Richard Thesing, the owner of 4370 Alpine Road, recalled that the Ad Hoc Housing Committee had supported the construction of nine units on the rear portion of the parcel. That was approved by the Planning Commission, the Town Council, and was submitted to the State. Now it was changed to have five units in the back and four in the front. He stated those front units would never be built due to a lack of space. There was no intention of tearing down the existing office building. With the change in the setbacks, the five units in the rear would have to be reduced to three units. He supported having three R-1 lots at the rear of the property with no units in the front.

Kristi Corley thanked the Commission and staff for their work. With respect to the Opt-in Program, she asked how will the public participate in the selection of projects and the planning for new neighborhoods. Also, she asked what mechanisms did the Town have to prevent whole streets from being bought by one developer? She echoed the comment that the ephemeral creek is not a ditch. The new maximum height proposals could be doubled if the project qualified for the State Density Bonus Law. She supported retaining the 75-foot setback along Alpine Road and was surprised the Town was considering reducing it to 20-feet. She concurred that the Town should focus on buying vacant lots with the Affordable Housing Fund and having a loan program for ADUs. Lastly, she wanted to understand how public comment will be built into the process and what the notification process would be for residents near the proposed developments.

Alyson Wood Illich greatly appreciated Planning & Building Director Russell being clear, patient, and professional throughout the whole process. After watching and listening to all of the discussions, she recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council submit the Housing Element to the State.

Time:02:32:42

Chair Kopf-Sill closed public comment and asked if any Commissioners had questions related to the Sequoia project. If so, Commissioner Krashinsky must recuse himself for he had a conflict. Also, if there was to be any discussion about the sites along Alpine Road, Commissioner Targ would recuse himself for he also had a conflict. She noted that Commissioner Krashinsky and Commissioner Targ would be participating in the discussion about the Housing Element in general. She invited Commissioners to ask questions to Staff that were raised by the public.

Vice Chair Goulden asked if any ADUs in the pipeline were counted in the Housing Element.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the Woodside Priory housing was included, would each project go through a CEQA review process, the unit arrangement for 4370 Alpine Road and how that affected CEQA, would the homes face Nathhorst, what was the maximum number for market-rate developments for 4394 Alpine Road, and how will public comment be included for site selection for the Opt-in Program?

Commissioner Brothers asked what the radius was for notification.

Commissioner Targ requested further detail on the definition of a creek versus a drainage ditch.

Chair Kopf-Sill requested clarification on ADUs and basements.

DRAFT MINUTES

Planning & Building Director Russell referenced to ADUs in the pipeline and explained the Town does an ADU projection that was based on past ADU production. If the ADUs were included in the pipeline project, that would be double counting them. Woodside Priory had repeatedly stated they would not be building additional housing in the next 8-years. ADU are allowed to have a basement but the basement counted towards floor area. With respect to 4370 Alpine Road, she could not predict what the CEQA analysis would be for an arrangement of five units in the back and four in the front.

Commissioner Brother noted that the creek on the site was a major element.

Planning & Building Director Russell agreed but restated that she could not predict what type of analysis would be warranted. She noted any development in the creek bed or water would require a permit from other State agencies. She did not support prescribing that the homes along Nathhorst face Nathhorst for site planning purposes. With respect to the maximum number of market-rate units at 4393 Alpine Road, she answered 21. With respect to public comment, she shared that single-family home projects required a 300-foot notification but if the project included a CUP then the notice radius was 1,000-feet. The noticing radius for the Opt-in Program would be set for the Call for Projects but she imagined the notification would be within a 1,000-foot radius. She added that the public would be allowed to come to the meeting and share their comments with the Commission orally for any project. The public would be able to submit written comments as well.

Commissioner Brothers mentioned that she could not find in the ADU projections how much the amnesty program would add. Planning & Building Director Russell answered that was not included and staff did not add any additional units from that program. Though the amnesty survey was beneficial to the Town, she predicted it was not enough evidence for HCD to support an increase in ADU production.

Commissioner Targ remarked that a creek was defined in the Portola Valley Municipal Code. Planning & Building Director Russell shared she talked to the Public Works Director and the Town identified it as a ephemeral creek/drainage ditch. The creek was identified on the Town's local Drainage Map as drainage and it was not on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map as a designated local creek or waterway.

Commissioner Targ asked if it was drainage in the same way that it was part of the stormwater drainage for the Town or County's drainage system. Planning & Building Director Russell informed that she understood the question but was unclear why it mattered for the purpose of the Housing Element. The majority of drainage in the town was overland drainage and the town did not have an underground stormwater system.

Commissioner Targ clarified there are designated creeks in the Town's Municipal Code that were treated differently than stormwater drainage. Planning & Building Director Russell restated that the Public Works Director had explored that and the creek was not designated as such a creek on any of the Town's approved maps. Town Attorney Silver concurred that in the Town's records, the creek was identified as a drainage facility.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if any Commissioner had specific comments about the Sequoia project; seeing none she asked about the two Alpine Road sites. Town Attorney Silver clarified that Commissioner Targ had a conflict with 4394 and 4388 Alpine Road.

Time:02:50:23

Town Attorney Silver requested that Commissioner Targ leave the meeting until further notice.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Targ asked if he would be able to participate in the vote on the Resolution. Town Attorney Silver confirmed that was correct.

Time:02:50:36

Commissioner Targ left the meeting.

Chair Kopf-Sill invited comments on 4394 and 4388 Alpine Road. She summarized the proposal was to have zoning that allowed market rate units with a density of 3 to 20 du/ac. Also, there was a Supportive Housing Overlay which had its own rules and regulations if the owner decided to pursue that route. She said she appreciated that the Town and the owner came up with a solution that was supported by everyone involved.

Commissioner Brothers supported the proposal.

Commissioner Krashinsky echoed Chair Kopf-Sill's comment.

Vice Chair Goulden wanted to see the Town retain the owner's current rights and add to them when feasible and he expressed excitement about the Supportive Housing program.

Commissioner Krashinsky recalled the Chair was concerned about the soil movement. Chair Kopf-Sill commented that the site appeared to be level and that her concern about the soil was resolved. Planning & Building Director Russell said it was a concern because of the way the Town's Site Development Permit language was drafted and that was why it was included in the Housing Element.

Planning & Building Director Russell informed that staff added additional details to the 4388 Alpine Road description in the Housing Element both as a pipeline project and to provide context to the 4394 Alpine Road site. The other change was in Program 9-1, which allowed the owner to keep their vested rights if the property were rezoned.

Time:02:56:20

Chair Kopf-Sill invited Commissioner Targ back to the meeting.

Commissioner Targ suggested that the Commission discuss the Housing Element by topic.

Time:02:59:50

Chair Kopf-Sill invited a discussion on Ford Park and the Gateway Designation.

Vice Chair Goulden was concerned about pushing out the sunrise provision because of how long it takes for projects to go through the process. He recommended that the timeline remain as proposed rather than later in the 8-year cycle.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the project had to be completed within the 8-year cycle if it was identified in the Housing Element. Planning & Building Director Russell answered the Building Permits have to be granted for the project to count toward the 8 years.

Vice Chair Goulden noted that the State would be monitoring the Town's progress annually and if the Town's production did not match the Town's projections. Then modifications and mitigations may be required. Planning & Building Director Russell concurred HCD will be requiring annual reports and new housing laws will be coming into effect in the future. With respect to identifying new sites during the

DRAFT MINUTES

Housing Element period, the No Net Loss Rule required the Town to identify more sites if a project did not meet the threshold of units identified in the Housing Element.

Chair Kopf-Sill understood that the Town could not issue all its Building Permits in the last year of the cycle. Planning & Building Director Russell explained there are progress targets within the 8-year cycle and if the Town was not meeting those targets. HCD would implement a more streamlined review process.

Vice Chair Goulden restated that he supported staff's recommendation as proposed.

Commissioner Targ recommended a minimum of 2 years from the adoption of the Housing Element. At that time, the Town would begin the process unless it identified an alternative site for the projected dwelling units.

Commissioner Krashinsky summarized the current proposal was the site planning would be done in January 2024 and the RFP in September 2024. Also, that staff was comfortable moving those timeframes out a year if the Commission agreed.

Commissioner Targ restated his suggestion was to start site planning in January of 2025 and the RFP in September of 2025. He believed the Town needed a couple of years before issuing an RFPs.

Commissioner Krashinsky supported moving the timeline out to the year 2025.

Commissioner Targ indicated that the name should be changed to Ford Park instead of Ford Field and Open Space.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked Commissioner Targ to restate what language should be included in the Housing Element.

Commissioner Targ proposed the language read unless the Town identifies an alternative feasible means of replacing the dwelling units at the Ford Park location.

Chair Kopf-Sill clarified what the area should be called.

Commissioner Krashinsky recalled staff had said it was called Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space throughout the Municipal Code.

Vice Chair Goulden said though he preferred to leave the dates as presented, he could support moving them out a year. He asked Commissioner Targ where his proposed language would go in the document. Commissioner Targ explained the language was to make the issuance of the RFP conditional based on if the Town was meeting its targets. He emphasized it should be made clear that there would be no development of Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space if targets were being met.

Chair Kopf-Sill did not support the language because it made it sound like the other sites would magically produce the units. She understood that an advisory group would explore other potential sites and if such a site were discovered then that site would replace Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space.

Commissioner Targ agreed but believed that there were a variety of ways to reach the targets without finding an alternative parcel to develop.

Chair Kopf-Sill did not believe that the Town had to make that distinction because it gave the impression that the Town was not serious about developing housing.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Targ remarked the language indicated that if the Town was not on track then a date certain was set as to when the Town would pursue other options and it set a predicate for action.

Commissioner Brothers commented that what Commissioner Targ was proposing was a good idea and acknowledged that it was a lawyerly suggestion. She supported moving it out to 2025 because there was a lot of upfront work when implementing programs.

Commissioner Krashinsky understood Commissioner Targ was explaining the original sunrise proposal and that the Town Council had advised staff not to include that language in the Housing Element. He asked what the reasoning was to take the language out and how did staff think HCD would interpret it. Planning & Building Director Russell explained the intention was to demonstrate that the Town had the whole package in that the Town had evaluated the constraints, that the sites are developable, and that the Housing Element had programs to support the development. She predicted the implementation language would have to be strengthened and detailed if the sunrise language was added back in. If the implementation language was strengthened then she believed HCD would support it.

Commissioner Targ supported Planning & Building Director Russell's recommendation to strengthen the implementation language.

Planning & Building Director Russell said it was a reasonable argument for the Town to make to push out the timeline by 2 years as long as the language was concrete and specific.

Vice Chair Goulden believed the Commission was having a political discussion and the Town had the flexibility to control the timing, the site, and the ability to modify the document with or without the language.

Commissioner Targ articulated that the sunrise provision was important to him and did not view it as a political argument. He asked where in the document did it say "unless another great site becomes available".

Commissioner Brothers opined that it was not unreasonable to think that something may come forward in the future. She supported the language as stated by Commissioner Targ.

Chair Kopf-Sill commented that she supported substituting sites but believed it did not need to be stated in the document.

Planning & Building Director Russell appreciated the comments about private real estate dynamics and that it made sense to talk about the turnover of parcels. She shared that the Housing Element Committee discussed in detail what made a site feasible. It was not about finding a site but finding a site where financing could be obtained. She restated that if the Commission agreed to add the sunrise language back in then the why should be clearly explained.

Town Attorney Silver remarked either direction would work.

Commissioner Brothers disclosed that a vast number of projects were located along Alpine Road and that raised many concerns about traffic and evacuation. If another site were made available in a different location then she said it would be nice to use that site instead of the sites along Alpine Road. If that were included in the document then that would send a clear signal to the residents, the Town, and HCD.

DRAFT MINUTES

Planning & Building Director Russell asked if the Commission wanted to incorporate Commissioner Targ's language or to allow staff to craft the language based on the conversation and take that language to the Town Council.

Chair Kopf-Sill supported staff drafting the language.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the draft language could be vetted by the Commission. Planning & Building Director Russell agreed the language could be reviewed by two Commissioners. She announced that the name of Ford Park would be renamed to Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space and the Commission agreed.

Commissioner Krashinsky wanted to see the Gateway classification added to Table 6-6.

Commissioner Brothers announced she was very concerned about the reduction to the 75-foot setback at the Ladera Church site. She did not want the Commission to be the first Commission to set a precedent and break the 75-foot setback requirement. Planning & Building Director Russell informed that the site was not developable if the 75-foot setback was retained.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the setback could be increased beyond the proposed 20-feet. Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes but noted the church would most likely request a Density Bonus waiver to reduce the setback to 20-feet.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked Staff to explain the current conditions at the Ladera Church site. Planning & Building Director Russell said the site currently did not have any structures on it except for the overflow of their playground area. The church site itself had an old accessory building that was close to the street and that structure was roughly 20-feet set back from the road.

Commissioner Brothers inquired how much of the new structure would encroach into the setback. Planning & Building Director Russell answered a significant portion of the structure as well as parking. In order to make a project on the site that did not reach substantial heights, the building would be expanded outward and parts of it would encroach into the 20-foot setback. She noted that there was no proposal or design as of yet.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the height proposed was Ladera Church's recommendation or the Town's. Planning & Building Director Russell proclaimed the Town would be imposing the height requirement.

Chair Kopf-Sill supported having a taller structure if it would retain setback requirements. Planning & Building Director Russell said the site was small, only half an acre, and that size was hard to develop in a rural setting.

Vice Chair Goulden stated that Ladera Church was planning a structure that was only for low-income households. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was their intent but that was not confirmed.

Vice Chair Goulden understood if they only had 20 percent of low-income they would receive multiple exemptions. Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes and they would also receive waivers. She noted that the church could ask for a waiver for anything that precluded them from developing the site.

Commissioner Brothers asked if approved, how could the Town ensure that other setbacks are protected and that the Commission was not setting a precedent. She shared that she moved to Portola

DRAFT MINUTES

Valley from San Mateo and many churches had applied for a Variance which were approved. That set a precedent and now many structures were non-compliant.

Vice Chair Goulden asked if the language could be left out of the document which would require the church to pursue waivers. Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes and then the church would be forced to apply for the State Density Bonus.

Commissioner Brothers supported leaving out the provision.

Planning & Building Director Russell said the Commission would have to change the Temporary Development Standards to normal Development Standards and then the church would have to apply for the State Density Bonus .

Chair Kopf-Sill acknowledged that many folks in town were worried about how the State Density Bonus would be applied and used. She said on the one hand she liked being upfront, transparent, and having discussions about the tradeoffs between taller structures and setbacks.

Commissioner Krashinsky commented that the State Density Bonus required projects to be affordable housing developments. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct and the proposed draft language suggested that Ladera Church could have the 20-foot setback even if the project was not affordable.

Chair Kopf-Sill announced her support to remove the language from the draft Housing Element.

Planning & Building Director Russell inquired if a sentence should be added that the Town understood that the State Density Bonus may be applied to the site in the future. Vice Chair Goulden agreed. Chair Kopf-Sill supported that and suggested that it also says that the State Density Bonus will likely affect the 75-foot setback.

Planning & Building Director Russell shared that the Commission previously discussed the front setbacks to be 75-feet, the interior side setback be 15-feet, and the rear setback be 30-feet.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if those setbacks applied to only Ladera Church or all multi-family. Planning & Building Director Russell specified it applied to multi-family 20 du/ac district.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if those setbacks would apply to the multi-family zones located at 4370 and 4394 Alpine Road. Planning & Building Director Russell responded that the rear setback for 4394 Alpine Road was 20-feet and the side setbacks were 20-feet. She explained that the 15-foot and 30-foot setback would work best for Ladera Church because the size of the parcel was small.

Commissioner Krashinsky inquired what if Ladera Church built a multi-unit structure. Planning & Building Director Russell predicted the parking would encroach into the setbacks due to financial constraints. She noted there may be concerns raised by HCD if they saw that the smaller Ladera Church site had setbacks of 20-feet and a front setback of 75-feet.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if there needed to be a setback near the church itself and Planning & Building Director Russell answered no. She suggested the side and rear setback be 15-feet, then retain the 75-foot setback for the front, and have a zero-foot setback near the church.

Commissioner Brothers and Vice-Chair Goulden supported Planning & Building Director Russell's suggested setback.

DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Kopf-Sill invited Commissioners to share their comments about Glen Oaks and announced she supported staff's proposal for Glen Oaks.

Vice Chair Goulden could not recall the Commission discussing any items that needed to change for Glen Oaks.

Commissioner Targ agreed with what was being proposed.

Commissioner Brothers loved the idea of mixing the equestrian use with housing.

Chair Kopf-Sill invited comments on 4370 Alpine Road. She noted it was the parcel with the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch and the proposal was to have five units in the rear and four in the front.

Commissioner Krashinsky inquired if staff had any reaction to the owner's comments from public comment. Planning & Building Director Russell said having three R-1 lots in the rear was a zoning issue and if the zoning was written in a way to allow that type of development. Then the owner would be able to construct three R-1 residences under the Housing Element. She mentioned the Town did not have zoning that accommodated small lot single-family and the proposal would be small lot single-family.

Planning & Building Director Russell stated on Page 120 under additional requirements it noted that the Town was anticipating that a Homeowner Association (HOA) would be formed. If the proposal was for three single-family homes, there would most likely not be an HOA.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the zoning change would have to be made now or later when the rest of the zoning was changed.

Vice Chair Goulden was concerned about reducing the number of units further when there had been discussion of having nine with the understanding that only five units would be built.

Chair Kopf-Sill agreed and felt that with the nine units it was going to be a different type of housing product whereas having three single-family homes was standard.

Commissioner Krashinsky reported that the density range was 3 to 30 du/ac and so three units was allowed under the zoning density.

Vice Chair Goulden recalled the Commission was supportive of having five units in the back and four in the front.

Commissioner Brothers asked what would the Town do if the units were not built.

Vice Chair Goulden reported then the Town would have to use one of the buffer sites to reach its RHNA target.

Planning & Building Director Russell said the density minimum for 4370 Alpine Road was 4 du/ac. The property would have to meet the minimum density for any project it proposed.

Chair Kopf-Sill announced she was in favor of keeping the zoning as it was being presented. Planning & Building Director Russell informed per the proposed language if the owner built to the minimum density the homes on the Nathorst side would have to be one story. She commented the proposed language was fine as is but the Commission would have to consider the implications during the Zoning Code Amendment discussion.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the parking would be on the interior portion of the lot. Planning & Building Director Russell said yes but to the extent feasible. The other aspect was the five guest parking spaces which was related to having five units. If there are only three units, then those units would be subject to the guest parking regulations for single-family in the Municipal Code.

Chair Kopf-Sill understood the Commission was recommending leaving the language as presented. She asked about the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch and the 5-foot setback. Planning & Building Director Russell said she could add clarifying language that the applicant's engineer would conduct an analysis, to be reviewed by the Town's engineer, and in no case could the setback be less than 5-feet.

Commissioner Krashinsky questioned if the 5-foot setback strengthened the bank or weakened it. Town Attorney Silver could not recall where the 5-foot setback came from but believed language that read "in no case should the setback be less than 5-feet" would be sufficient.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if that specificity was needed. Chair Kopf-Sill supported the setback because it discouraged folks from building over the creek. Planning & Building Director Russell said small architectural features could encroach into the 5-feet and that would cause a problem.

Commissioner Brothers understood that no development or development elements would be within the 5-foot setback. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct. Commissioner Brothers found that minimum to be too low but supported having a minimum.

Commissioner Krashinsky agreed it was a low minimum and suggested 10-feet.

Planning & Building Director Russell said she could not imagine a scenario where a structure would come within 10-feet of the creek.

Commissioner Brothers supported a 10-foot setback.

Commissioner Targ mentioned at 5-feet or 10-feet, encroachment into the setback would be for aesthetic purposes only.

Planning & Building Director Russell remarked she was comfortable with 10-feet.

Vice Chair Goulden and Chair Kopf-Sill supported changing it to 10-feet.

Commissioner Targ recommended that it be made clear why there was a 10-foot setback. That it was an aesthetic standard and that there would be engineering and environmental review.

Chair Kopf-Sill moved to Christ Church Affiliated Housing and invited comments. With no comments, she moved to ADUs. She mentioned that the ADU Committee was discussing creative ideas for ADUs.

Vice Chair Goulden recalled there being a discussion about increasing staff and holding discussions about ADUs. Planning & Building Director Russell predicted there would be office hours with technical staff to help local churches and institutions to develop housing as well as educate folks on ADUs. The ADU Ambassadors were considering future steps and possibly being used as the first step for folks who were seeking more information about ADUs. Also, the Town was working with 21 Elements to create a county-wide ADU center to provide more education about ADU and the development process.

Vice Chair Goulden predicted that work was not concrete enough to include in the Housing Element and Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct.

DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Kopf-Sill moved to the Opt-in Program and noted that the program presented before the Commission was staff's attempt at combining all of the comments from prior Commission meetings into a workable program.

Commissioner Krashinsky proposed to change the name to Opt-in Housing Diversification Program.

Vice Chair Goulden supported the name change and liked how it was being presented in the Housing Element itself.

Chair Kopf-Sill supported the general outline that was presented in the Housing Element.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if language should be added that specified that it is a subjective review. Planning & Building Director Russell said the Town could wait for HCD to provide their comments before adding specificity to the program.

Commissioner Targ liked the idea of having it be a subjective process and that the Planning Commission would be the body selecting the sites and projects.

Vice Chair Goulden asked Commissioner Targ if there should be changes in the Housing Element or was his comment more for the implementation of the program. Commissioner Targ answered that it should be included in the Housing Element.

Planning & Building Director Russell referenced the language on the bottom of Page 108 and top of Page 109 and asked if that language was sufficient. Commissioner Targ explained that a person could sue a city or town for failure to issue a CUP. He suggested using language that the projects must provide a benefit and be the more superior project.

Vice Chair Goulden referenced Page 109 and understood the program would develop criteria beyond the safety criteria. Planning & Building Director Russell agreed and suggested mimicking the language for Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects.

Commissioner Targ recommended the Housing Element state the program would mimic the PUD criteria in the form of superior design.

Planning & Building Director Russell summarized the program would be a discretionary review and that it was based on the safety criteria, superior design, and community benefits.

The Commission announced they supported that revision.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if any other topics needed to be discussed.

Commissioner Targ mentioned the entry sign should be changed to Welcome to Portola Valley and that should be under the program for signage. Planning & Building Director Russell remarked there were two signs. One sign could be under the Gateway program and asked under what program would the second sign fall under?

Commissioner Targ suggested that Planning & Building Director Russell place it in the Housing Element where she saw fit. Planning & Building Director Russell concurred she would propose a program but would indicate to the Town Council that there was no consensus among the Commission to change the sign.

Commissioner Krashinsky did not support placing it in the Housing Element.

DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Kopf-Sill invited comments on the revised Resolution.

Planning & Building Director Russell referenced the Gateway language and mentioned that staff would draft the language but asked if a Commissioner or two was going to review the language. Town Attorney Silver suggested that be included in the motion.

Commissioner Brothers volunteered to review the Gateway language.

Commissioner Targ referenced Number 7 of the Resolution and asked if that gave the Planning & Building Director Russell authority to make procedural changes or changes to the process. Town Attorney Silver explained that was a placeholder for the Resolution that the Town Council would consider and so that language could be struck from the Planning Commission's Resolution.

Commissioner Brothers agreed Number Seven should be removed from the Resolution.

Commissioner Brothers moved the adoption of the Resolution with the incorporation of the revisions as discussed and that staff draft language for the Gateway, as discussed, with Chair Kopf-Sill and Commissioner Brothers to review it, and that Number 7 of the Resolution be removed. Seconded by Vice-Chair Goulden, the motion carried 5-0.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(2) Commission Reports

Time:04:22:57

None

(3) Staff Reports

Time:04:23:06

Planning & Building Director Russell announced at the next meeting the Commission would be voting for a new Chair and Vice Chair.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(4) Planning Commission Meeting of February 15, 2023,

Time:04:23:39

Planning & Building Director Russell mentioned the motion language would be clarified to reflect the motion that was adopted. Also, there were small errors that needed to be cleaned up.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if any Commissioners had substantial changes that needed to be made.

Commissioner Krashinsky remarked that Fire Marshal Bullard's name was spelled wrong, on Red Page 116 he suggested adding language to Planning & Building Director Russell's remark saying "if they impact analysis and any of the impact categories", on Red Page 119 replace "order of magnitude" with "order of priorities" in Vice-Chair Goulden's comment, on Red Page 122 Bob's last name should be changed to "Turcott", on Red Page 123 the unknown female speaker was Mary Hufty, on the same page under Ms. Hufty's comments to change the word "fire district" to "Woodside" and replace "held at the Planning Commission level" to "between Woodside and the Fire District".

Time:04:28:27

Chair Kopf-Sill noted in the same paragraph the word "corporation" should be changed to "cooperation". She opened public comment on the minutes.

DRAFT MINUTES

Bob Adams asked if the Commission decided on a 5-foot or 10-foot setback for the ephemeral creek/drainage ditch and recommended that the title remain creek/drainage ditch. Planning & Building Director Russell said the Commission ruled on a 10-foot setback and the title would be ephemeral creek/drainage.

Caroline Vertongen appreciated the new Commissioners being very detailed with their questions. She stated it was unacceptable that members of the public raised their hand to speak but were not allowed to speak. She mentioned that the packet shared with the public was incomplete which made it impossible to follow the discussion.

Chair Kopf-Sill apologized and stated that she tried to call on Ms. Vertongen several times but there was a technology malfunction. Also, the Commission was referencing both the Packet and the draft Housing Element.

Rita Comes Whitney appreciated the Commissioner's comments about the minutes and recommended that the minutes be more thorough.

Commissioner Krashinsky moved to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2023, meeting, as amended. Seconded by Vice Chair Goulden, the motion carried 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT [11:36 p.m.]

Vice Chair Goulden moved to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Brothers, the motion carried 5-0.