

Public Comments

Submitted After 12 pm on February 20th, 2025

<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Time and Date Received</u>	<u>Item (Description)</u>	<u>Page</u>
Carter Warr	4:26 pm, 2/20/2025	4.b. Comments to be included in the AHSEC Report to Town Council. See pages 29-30 of the 2-20-25 AHSEC Agenda Packet.	2

From: [Carter Warr](#)
To: [Emily Lane](#)
Cc: [Terrence Grindall](#)
Subject: Fw: AHSEC Comments
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:26:36 PM

Here is a copy for you two.

Carter J. Warr, AIA, CSI, NCARB
CJW Architecture
(650) 851-9335
www.cjwarchitecture.com

From: Carter Warr
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:25 PM
To: Karen Askey [REDACTED]
Cc: ronnykrash [REDACTED]
Subject: AHSEC Comments

Karen and Ronny,
Here are my comments.

AHSEC
Comments – Carter Warr

- My highest rated votes are intended to represent the right answers to housing - The Portola Valley Way.
- Sites suitable for 50 or more units are well represented in the Village Square and the Hawthorns “racetrack” sites. While there are other lands that could make sense from a long-term planning strategy, the process has been hampered by not having a forward-thinking general plan and zoning ordinance.
- A more sustainable approach would be to reduce the minimum parcel size for multifamily housing. This would avail single family properties on the fringes to carve off portions of their land as development opportunities. This would allow current owners positive financial incentives without having to give up on their Portola Valley dreams. This would also reduce the stigma with collecting multifamily housing on to larger properties. This would reduce the impression of density by providing a more organic approach. It will also improve the likely design solutions approach since the developments would be on the current owners’ land or at least could be controlled by deed restrictions to the

subdividers' benefit. If a property a quarter acre parcel could be created without penalizing the existing owners' single-family opportunity, the development at 20 units/ acre with appropriate density bonuses would likely improve the Towns' potential of producing housing. The result for a 1/4-acre site would be at least 6 regular units and one low-income unit OR 7 regular units and one very low-income unit. If 100% of the units were moderate/low/very low-income units, the ¼ acre parcel could support 9 units.

- I have been and continue to support affiliated housing as the most sustainable approach. It would improve development opportunities on the affiliated sites to create quantifiable economic and processing incentives to leverage the Town's authority. It would also make sense to broaden the definition of affiliated to include all commercial, office, agricultural, and open space lands.
- While I support the Fogarty's Skyline Boulevard site for housing, I find it hard to see that as an integrated strategy when there is no public vehicular connection to skyline boulevard within Portola Valley.
- It is frustrating That the process of finding housing sites without thinking about and planning for a more complete and sustainable Town Plan. The Town has suffered by being too close to larger communities that with no effort can support our recurring needs... you just need tot drive a ways to and from to get there.
- To secure more potential sites, the Town must explain the opportunities to property owners. Simply asking an owner if they are interested is like asking if they want to have their toenails pulled. Owners are going to be reticent to publicly consent to interest without fully understanding positive benefit to themselves and their families.
- The final threshold to successfully planning for housing is a distributed way is to improve the Town with a Town wide sanitary sewer system. While the majority of the Town does not have access to a public sewer system all those properties are effectively off limits to any substantial increases in density.

Carter J. Warr, AIA, CSI, NCARB
CJW Architecture
(650) 851-9335
www.cjwarchitecture.com