

Submitter DB ID 7187
IP Address [REDACTED]
Submission Recorded On 03/12/2024 1:36 AM
Time to Take the Survey 0 minutes, 56 secs.

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Karen Askey

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Not answered

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

PORTOLA VALLEY

6. State

CA

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

03/13/2024

9. Agenda Item number or name

2. Oral Communications

10. Comment

See uploaded Letter

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

[Opt-in Letter to TC 3_13 Meeting - Google Docs.pdf](#)

Dear Town Council -

I am unable to attend the 3/13/24 meeting, but feel it important to share my thoughts.

I am disappointed with the hurried decision at your 1/24/24 meeting to offer the Opt-in Program without the appropriate amount of research and analysis to better understand the ramifications of such a decision. To believe that adopting this revised opt-in program is not a material change, when hundreds of homes could now be built (vs a cap of 12), is ludicrous. I strongly believe that this is a significant change which requires Planning Commission and resident input.

If you recall, the Opt-In program, even as a pilot, was HIGHLY controversial with residents and members of the Planning Commission. I recall Mayor Wernikoff and Councilman Taylor (along with Hasko) being against this type of program. Yet here we are with even more destructive potential.

But, what's done is now done, and we need to figure out quickly how to "stop the bleeding" before Portola Valley becomes urbanized, lacking the appropriate infrastructure and conflicting with both our Town ethos and General Plan.

These are my initial thoughts as we move forward, but I'm sure more will be added to the list...

- Numerous study sessions need to be held with residents, the Planning Commission and the ASCC. We need residents who live in and understand the culture and nuances of Portola Valley to help solve this conundrum. Residents know every street and its particulars, not consultants looking at a map...
- Speaking of maps...the Town Council should have reviewed and thoroughly analyzed the parcel map prior to making its decision. But hindsight is 20/20, so NOW is the time to do a thorough site analysis and revise the map.
 - Lots highly unlikely to be developed, such as Corte Madera School, Ormondale, Alpine Hills, Ford Field, etc., need to be flagged.
 - The white-coded lots, which may be unencumbered and qualify for Opt-In, need to be assessed and revised accordingly.
 - ALL lots on roads with locked emergency gates should be removed from qualification, as there is no guarantee the gate could be unlocked depending on the type of emergency. This includes Nathorst, Georgie Lane, Grove Drive, and Iroquois, but there might be more. Safety first!
- A thorough review of "what-if" scenarios need to be addressed. A couple of examples, but there will be more:
 - If an owner builds under the opt-in program, how would we then be able to preclude him from state-mandated SB-9 or ADU rights?
 - Are we rezoning lots? If so, would that trigger bonus density, and how many more units could be built on a parcel?
- In order for Portola Valley to strictly control the design of the units built in the opt-in program, the Town should develop designs and building/lot drawings that MUST be used

by the lot developer. These designs would fit into the aesthetics and culture of our town. Visualize a 6-unit building like the recently-built Priory residence, placed far from lot lines. Or a cluster of 6 cottages with a common courtyard and parking...

In closing, please take advantage of resident knowledge and expertise to help get us to a better place. And we need to begin this process immediately to create the most successful outcome.

Thank you,
Karen Askey

Submitter DB ID 7186
IP Address [REDACTED]
Submission Recorded On 03/11/2024 2:42 PM
Time to Take the Survey 2 minutes, 31 secs.

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Karen Vahtra

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Not answered

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

Portola Valley

6. State

CA

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

03/13/2024

9. Agenda Item number or name

9.a.

10. Comment

Dear Town Council,

I would like to address the council on the topic of the Sheriff's contract (Agenda Item 9.a) with three minor items, and also request meeting transcripts.

Alarm Permit and Response Fees

Section 1.2.1 States "Town shall remain responsible for the actual billing and collection of Alarms Permit and Response revenue. Administrative staff will maintain and forward the necessary information to Town's Finance Department for the billing and collection of said revenue upon request of Town."

This section appears to be a boiler plate from other areas in San Mateo County. I do not believe that we charge for either the installation of an alarm or the response to an alarm (whether a real situation or a false alarm) nor our residents required to register their alarms. Back in 2016 after a robbery in town, residents were notified to have our alarm companies call the Sheriff first before calling anyone else. As far as I understand the number of false alarms in town is not impacting our emergency response.

If the number of false alarms does in fact impact our contract, I would like the town to consider billing the residents directly. In San Francisco, the procedure is as follows:

"Every alarm site (residential and business) in San Francisco is required to have an alarm license. San Francisco Police Emergency Alarm Ordinance defines a false alarm as an alarm dispatch request to a law enforcement agency, when the responding law enforcement officer finds no evidence of a criminal offense or attempted criminal offense after having completed a timely investigation of the alarm site. If your alarm location is registered, there is no penalty for the first false alarm within the calendar year. The second false alarm penalty is \$100, the third is \$150, the fourth is \$200, and five or more is \$250 per instance. If your alarm location is unregistered, you are charged a \$100 Non-licensed Alarm penalty and the \$250 Non-licensed Alarm – False Alarm fee per false alarm instance."

Alarms are occasionally unnecessarily triggered. In Portola Valley when an officer does respond to a false alarm, no subsequent notification is given to the resident. A follow up phone call, text, or even a standard note somehow delivered to the address would be reassuring for the resident who is likely away from home and may be a bit nervous.

I would like to see Section 1.2.1 removed or restated to reflect the current state where we have no alarms permit and response revenue.

Crime Rate Statistics

In recent years, the communication to residents about burglaries and crime statistics has been inconsistent and sporadic.

Back in 2016 after a home invasion, I and a few other residents formed an informal Crime Safety Committee. The BPTS committee interacts with the Sheriff around bicycle and traffic issues. We currently have no town committee or group with crime prevention in their purview, and the communication on crime has not been consistent in recent years.

During the Sheriff's Q&A, the crime rates in Portola Valley were reported over very short time frames of 3 and 5 years. I would like to see the same data reported in the future for 10 or 20 year time spans, since our crime rate is fortunately quite low. The statistics on the Town's web site mostly refer back to 2022. <https://www.portolavalley.net/departments/san-mateo-county-sheriff/portola-valley-crime-statistics>

I would like to see a regular (perhaps annual) exchange between the Sheriff and the Town providing an update with the town in a consistent format. I don't have a concrete suggestion here on how this should be implemented, but I think we would benefit from more regular consistent communication.

Sheriff Flyer's Consistent with Municipal Code

Another minor note is that I would like to see all the information provided by the Sheriff's office is in line with the Portola Valley municipal code. Because of our wish to be dark sky compliant, we do not allow floodlights in town. The Sheriff recently distributed the following information encouraging floodlights "Install motion-sensor activated outdoor floodlights. Ensure that every corner of your home has them installed. These lights are cost-effective, so the more you have, the better.." <https://www.portolavalley.net/home/showdocument?id=18158>

The Need for Transcripts

On a side note, I have had a few questions in the last few months about the contract as there had been some unclear information in a public meeting. Mayor Wernikoff told me about the Sheriff's Q&A in June that clarified two of these concerns: a full time person 24/7 in Portola Valley, and a separate car that serves Ladera and Los Trancos Woods. Unfortunately, the information is only available in video format with poor audio quality. I would like to see the town provide some level of transcripts from our videos. Even watching a video at twice the speed with closed captioning, finding the correct information is time consuming and challenging. At almost every meeting even with new microphones, a few people are difficult to hear.

Karen Vahtra

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

Submitter DB ID 7184
 IP Address [REDACTED]
 Submission Recorded On 03/11/2024 11:03 AM
 Time to Take the Survey 5 minutes, 23 secs.

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Kristi C

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Self

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

Portola valley

6. State

Ca

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

03/13/2024

9. Agenda Item number or name

#7

10. Comment

We hope the town council values resident and public comments. I'm requesting that "public comment for items not on agenda" remain at the beginning of the meeting #1 and not rearranged to #7 on the agenda. Please give residents this courtesy to be heard at the beginning of meeting.

This is a new rearrangement of the public comment section and is not ideal for the residents. Accommodating residents needs to remain a priority.

All the best,

Kristi

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

[Empty text area for optional comment upload]

Submitter DB ID 7185
IP Address [REDACTED]
Submission Recorded On 03/11/2024 1:29 PM
Time to Take the Survey 1 minutes, 43 secs.

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Loni Austin

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Not answered

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

Portola Valley

6. State

ca

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

03/11/2024

9. Agenda Item number or name

unsure

10. Comment

Please see attached. I don't know what meeting this is for so I chose today's date. I was told to submit this doc via this portal. It is a general comment on the opt-in housing plan.

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

[to town.pdf](#)

March 11, 2024

To Portola Valley Town Council Members,

I am writing to put on record my disappointment and strong opposition to your recent decision to make a major change to the PV Housing Element regarding the Opt-in program with no public or Planning Commission input. In addition, I want to emphasize that the PV Forum is not an official form of town communication and it's very disturbing that residents like me who are subscribed to the official town communications email did not receive a call out on this change and had to become aware of it via neighbors who are on the PV Forum. Not everyone is on the Forum, it is run by a member of the community who selectively allows posts and viewpoints and bans those who have strong opinions conflicting with her own.

I also want to remind you that Sarah Wernikoff and Craig Taylor were against opt-in early on in this process and the large majority of residents were completely against this idea from the onset. I thought it had been laid to rest and was taken off guard by the fact that this new decision was made in about 90 minutes and overrides the previous decision on upzoning which was a pilot program for 3 lots only with 4 units per acre. What was potentially 12 new high density housing units has become over 800 even higher density housing units. This is a major change and should require more study sessions and communication / consideration with residents, Planning Commission, ASCC working hand-in-hand as well as a thorough review of all the "what ifs." Why are we relying on consultants and staff who do not understand and appreciate the history and culture of Portola Valley?

I also don't understand why these upzoned lots are deep into town where in the state of an emergency such as fire or earthquake, a large percentage of residents, including two schools are blocked in. We do not have infrastructure in this rural town to support more building so deep into our rural town. What happened to the idea of using lots further up Alpine Rd. such as Ford Field and the Stanford Wedge to meet housing quotas? I live on Echo Ln. and can't get out onto Portola or Alpine Rd. during school pickup and drop off. Can you imagine if there is an emergency and cars are back to back lined up on these roads trying to evacuate? You are literally leaving residents with no exit if you add 130 parcels which could equate to 800 new housing units.

I strongly urge the Council to revisit this change to the PV Housing Element.

Sincerely,

Loni and Brent Austin



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submitter DB ID 7183
 IP Address [REDACTED]
 Submission Recorded On 03/08/2024 7:48 PM
 Time to Take the Survey 37 minutes, 30 secs.

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Lou Salerno

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Not answered

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

Portola Valley

6. State

CA

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

03/13/2024

9. Agenda Item number or name

9

10. Comment

I wanted to voice my support for the Town purchasing some FLOCK units. From what I've read and heard these units would be of great help in our quest for a safer Portola Valley and they have the advantage of currently being used in many neighboring communities as well as across California.

This implies that an integrated (and possibly seamless) network of vigilance could be created which would increase the effectiveness of the resources we have much more than just adding conventional surveillance cameras.

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

[Empty text area for optional comment upload]