



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Ad Hoc Site Evaluation
Committee Meeting
Monday, February 3, 2025
5:30 PM

Karen Askey, Chair
Mary Hufty, Vice Chair
Ronny Krashinsky, Committee Member
Carter Warr, Committee Member
Nona Chiariello, Committee Member
Joslyn Gray, Committee Member
Karen Vahtra, Committee Member

HYBRID MEETING

MINUTES

HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE – 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA

Present: Askey, Chiariello, Gray, Hufty, Krashinsky, Warr, Vahtra **Secretary:** Dewes
PV Interim Planning and Building Director: Grindall

1. CALL TO ORDER at 5:31 p.m.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: Karen A. welcomed Mark Linder, interim PV Town Manager who was attending via Zoom. He commented that he was here to here to listen to the good work that the committee was doing, thanked the members and stated that he was very supportive of the project.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **January 21, 2025:** After corrections/edits, minutes were approved unanimously.

4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

a. Site Updates:

- **Portola/Alpine Corners:** (Gray, Hufty, Warr):
 - Carter - Roberts Market indicated no interest in developing their parking lot.
- **Alpine/Los Trancos/Skyline** (Chiariello, Hufty, Krashinsky):
 - Nona, Ronny & Mary met Pat Fogarty on Jan 23 at the parcel. Photos were shared. Observations: Level enough to accommodate housing, passes other HE filters. This area has a dirt road loop from one fairly level area down a small slope to another level area. Avg. slope of 12% or 7 degrees. Beautiful area with wonderful views. Appears to fit the criteria for high-density, temporary quarters potentially to house fire-safety workers, migrant farmers, and other local area workers.
 - Mary – beautiful habitat, relatively unique. High potential for mixed use.
 - Karen V. also offered some observations. The overall area was quite flat and appropriate, but drop-offs were pretty steep along the ridge. The area is categorized as the highest possible hazard category on Flamemapper. Possible sight line issues for left and right turns exiting/entering the area and Skyline speed limits are posted as 50 mph but often exceeded. Also shared non-transit location-based criteria showing that distances to some desired services exceed California tax credit guidelines for financing (important to developers). Will workers who work in HMB/Pescadero, want to drop off kids in Portola Valley and then go to work? Questioned whether worker housing demand would support a 50-unit site? Could we potentially work with w/ Mid-Pen, San Mateo County to build affiliated housing to support their workers? But these workers would not likely be VLI.

- Karen V. - Hawthorns: Conservation easement is very strict, does not allow for construction of any new buildings. The only option would be to remodel the main house, which would only be a few units, there is also no budget to do this. Sightlines for entrance/exit off Los Trancos are not safe and have been strongly rejected by Mid-Pen when considering a new parking lot.
- **Portola Corridor/Town Center** (Askey, Hufty, Vahtra)
 - Karen A. – Christ Church – Hoping to get conceptual ideas by the end of Feb.
 - Karen A - Our Lady of the Wayside - spoke to the Pastoral Council member. Does not envision significant expansion, 2 units today, a few more units in back where there is a small parking lot and redwood trees.
 - Mary – Springdown - Met w/ Carol, reviewed property, no possible opportunity within the next 10 years with regard to affordable housing.
 - Karen A. – New Opportunity: the sub-committee had a very productive meeting with Stanley Lo, a Bay Area Developer and owner of the Village Square.
 - **Village Square (VS):** large flat 2+acre lot, built in the 50's, single-story commercial site. Brought up in the last cycle but not pursued.
 - Karen V. provided an overview of the existing layout of the property as well as a “back of the napkin” initial proposal for construction of a multi-level residential building (possible 3 stories) and layered/shared parking garage.
 - Mr. Lo envisions 75 residential units’ total; 50 VLI and 25 AMI. The latter units are needed to ensure profitability. The commercial strip on the left side would remain.
 - Mr. Lo is very amenable to helping us achieve our goals. He is open to further development of the property but without disturbing the current tenants.
 - There is a current sewer pump station, while it’s advantageous that sewer is available, its location may be problematic for the proposed buildings. Possibly it could be undergrounded.
 - There are some heritage redwood trees that would need to be removed.
 - Will require re-zoning for mixed use but there is also an option for lot-split zoning; one parcel commercial, one parcel residential.
 - There are very few residential neighbors.
 - Mary: commended Karen A. for her persistence in pursuing Mr. Lo, this is truly a wonderful opportunity for the town.
 - Karen A. - Mr. Lo is open to options, this is just one idea. Lots of work still has to do with the Planning Commission, etc. How to make it “PV.” Could perhaps be lower density than presented if other areas are developed.
- **Committee Questions:**
 - Joslyn – What would be the timing on VS? Grindall: The RFP process needs to be started by Jan 2026. Mr. Lo is open to that timing
 - Grindall - Re-zoning would begin once the Town Council indicates that they are willing to consider the plan, and it would take about 6 months.
 - Nona - 75 units is potentially a lot for that area. The sub-committee indicated that Mr. Lo needs something to subsidize the VLI, if scaled back VLI, then could scale back AMI.
 - Ronny – the ratio of AMI/VLI is surprising, is this typical? Grindall – it really varies based upon how the developer can subsidize the VLI. Some developers rely more on grants, etc. This may not be the case in this instance.

- Carter - What about the density bonus? Grindall – we would have to look at that. Carter also indicated that the biggest challenge might be the height, not the density.
- Mary – What needs to be done to satisfy the sunrise provision of the HE? Grindall – the zoning would need to be completed. HCD wants to see the alternate sites zoned for the appropriate use. Also, the environmental work adds time, changes in zoning can require a CEQA analysis.
- Karen A. – Would CEQA review require an updated traffic analysis? Grindall – Possible, but not necessarily, CEQA evaluates vehicle miles traveled, not traffic
- Nona – Would Mr. Lo be open to putting housing above the commercial buildings? Grindall – Mr. Lo does not want to interfere with the existing buildings or tenants. Current commercial buildings would need to be demolished and rebuilt to accommodate housing.
- Joslyn – question regarding rezoning in general. Grindall – Any alternate site we choose would need to be rezoned.
- **Public Comments:**
 - Rebecca Flynn – VS parcel, certain portion of land would be required for commercial element, is that the case? MU rezoning would be new to Portola Valley. Has Mr. Lo given any indication about the size of units? Footprint/size of the garage? Hawthorns, why not put in a new driveway onto a straighter stretch of Los Trancos?
 - Betsy M. - congratulations, very exciting meeting. Every property is going to have advantages and drawbacks. VS – SE side, what is the bite out of the property line? Is there a 50' creek setback constraint?
 - Carter - Flood plain line on the map may pre-date creek setback ordinance.
 - Caroline V. submitted a letter attached as public comments asking the committee to please preserve recreational land.
- **Committee Discussion:**
 - Mary - Fogarty; still believes that this development would help build a strong sense of community along Skyline; this area has been underserved by PV. It also offers access to trails and improvement of wildlife corridors. Acknowledges that more work needs to be done but much of that discussion is outside the scope of this committee.
 - Ronny - Feels like committees' work is nearing completion. We're arrived at 2 viable sites. Supportive of Fogarty and VS is exciting. We should recommend both and potentially use units at Christ Church to reduce density.
 - Carter - agrees with Ronny
 - Karen V. - No on Hawthorns and Fogarty, yes on VS
 - Joslyn – We shouldn't limit ourselves to solving just this cycle, we should look at all these sites to develop responsible affordable housing which is desperately needed.
 - Karen A. – VS is a great opportunity. Fogarty, there are people who want and choose to live there, it seems far away to us, but it's closer for many local workers who commute from much further away. Hawthorns. could be an opportunity for the future. Supports the opportunity at Christ Church.
 - Mary – The local churches are planning a future date to talk about affordable housing but their plans may not be in our timeline.
 - Grindall reminded us that this committee is not choosing the site, we are only making a recommendation. We should propose sites that we believe are

viable. Questions about acquisition, CEQA, zoning, etc. will be up to the Town Council.

- Nona - excited about VS, it's a great opportunity. Also supports Fogarty, there may not be room for 50 units, but a smaller development would be viable. Hawthorns is probably down the road.

b. Review, Discussion & Second Vote to Proposal for Reporting to Town Council

Feb 26: Committee asked if it was possible to do it sooner if we are ready to make a recommendation? Grindall indicated that we should submit our recommendation, and the interim Town Manager, Mayor and Vice-Mayor decide on the Council agenda and timing.

- **Committee questions:**

- Karen V – Worried that we are all ranking on different criteria?
- Karen A. - We should rank based upon what you believe is the right solution to what we are solving for – an alternative to DFPOS. Additionally, we should all provide our commentary about why/how we are ranking so that the Town Council sees the full picture.
- The committee added and revised some of the recommendations based upon the evening's discussion.

- **Public comment:**

- Kristi C – Concerned that VS was being voted on, but the public has not been aware of it. Karen A reminded everyone that the committee is not voting on anything, only making a recommendation to the Town Council. Grindall confirmed that there would be plenty of opportunities for public input if the Town Council decides to move forward with VS in any way.

- **Committee Discussion**

- All committee members were polled and voted on each line item.
- Ronny will send out final votes (attached).
- A motion was made to submit the final package, including the votes, all supporting materials and individual committee member comments to the Town Council. Motion passed.

c. Formation of Sub-Committees, if necessary:

- **Committee Discussion:** Mary and Karen V. agreed to form a sub-committee to review the Master Site List to ensure it is complete. They were asked to capture as much institutional knowledge as possible for future cycles ensuring public transparency into our process. However, certain information should be redacted for privacy.

- **Public Comment:** None

d. Next Steps:

- Karen A. - Meet with the Town Council Sub-Committee (Mary Hufty and Judith Hasko) to determine the next steps with the Town Council.
- All - Provide Ronny with your comments. Be as robust as needed, more than one page is fine. It's important to share your thoughts/thinking. Diversity makes a good community.
- Sub-Committee to coordinate and complete final Site Master List.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. **Committee Reports** – None.
- b. **Staff Reports** –

- Grindall reported on our status with RHNA units. He reminded us that construction is not required but based upon the permits and information that he has, we are in line to meet our commitment.
- Grindall also commented that a streamlined amnesty program for existing ADU's is still being worked on. However, the existing process still allows for upgrading the units. The committee was reminded, however, that these upgraded units do not count towards our RHNA.
- Grindall also reported that the Planning Department is still working on rezoning DFPOS. The Town should be successful on our "argument" to move forward in March and re-submit the HE to the State for certification.
- **Public Comments - None**

7, ADJOURNMENT at 8:26 p.m.

- a. ***The next regular Ad Hoc Site Evaluation Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 18 at 5:30 p.m. However, Karen A. will inform the Committee if this meeting is required based upon her discussion w/ the Town Council Sub-Committee.***

Submitted by Patty Dewes

	Question	Carter	Joslyn	Karen A	Karen V	Mary	Nona	Ronny	Avg.	Var.	Summary (yes/no)
1	Recommend 1 site for ~50 units	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1.6	0.6	7 / 0
2	Recommend ~2-3 sites for ~50 units	2	5	1	5	3	2	2	2.9	2.5	5 / 2
3	Recommend ~5 sites for ~50 units	1	5	3	6	3	3	5	3.7	2.9	4 / 3
4	Recommend 3350 Alpine Rd. for ~50 units	5	5	3	5		3	4.5	4.3	1.0	2 / 4
5	Recommend 3350 Alpine Rd. for ~10-25 units, joint dev. with DFP	5	6	5	5		5	3	4.8	1.0	1 / 5
6	Recommend 3350 Alpine Rd. for ~10 units, independent of DFP	5	6	5	5		5	5	5.2	0.2	0 / 6
7	Recommend Fogarty parcel for ~50 units	3	3	1	5	1	1	2	2.3	2.2	6 / 1
8	Recommend Fogarty parcel for ~10-25 units	2	6	3	6	1	1	3	3.1	4.5	5 / 2
9	Recommend Fogarty parcel for Affiliated Housing	1	5	2	1	1	1	4.5	2.2	3.2	5 / 2
10	Recommend Blue Oaks strip east of Los Trancos Rd. for ~10 units	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5.1	0.1	0 / 7
11	Recommend Christ Church for ~10 VLI units (vs. current HE 6 AMI)	1	5	1	5	1	1	2	2.3	3.6	5 / 2
12	Recommend TC substation strip for ~10 units	3	5	3	6	5	5	5	4.6	1.3	2 / 5
13	Recommend TC soccer field + substation strip for ~50 units	5	2	5	3	5	5	6	4.4	2.0	2 / 5
14	Recommend Hawthorns Historic Complex for ~5 units	2	5	1	6	1	1	5	3.0	5.0	4 / 3
15	Recommend Hawthorns Historic Complex for ~50 units	1	5	5	6	5	5	6	4.7	2.9	1 / 6
16	Recommend Village Sq. for ~40-50 VLI + ~20-25 AMI units	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1.1	0.1	7 / 0
17	Recommend Dorothy Ford Park for ~50 units	5	2	5	2	6	6	3.5	4.2	3.0	3 / 4