



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Ad Hoc Site Evaluation
Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 7, 2025
5:00 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

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 attended via Zoom.

1. CALL TO ORDER at 5:07 p.m.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **November 19, 2024:** November 19, 2024: After corrections/edits, minutes were approved unanimously.
- **December 17, 2024:** Under 3350 Alpine, amendments were proposed to change wording regarding AB721 and to clarify that it is Christ Church that hopes to build more affordable units. It was noted that the official name is Dorothy Ford Park and Open Space (DFPOS). The committee acknowledged this but felt that the 12/17 minutes should reflect DFP as it was discussed in the meeting. Minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

- a. Site Updates:** Karen A. recognized Karen V. as being the single point of contact for updating and maintaining the AHSEC Master Site list.
 - **Nathhorst Triangle & Vicinity** (Gray, Hufty, Warr):
 - Sequoias – Joslyn contacted the CEO and President of the Sequoias; at this time, they are not considering adding more units but would be open to having a discussion in future rounds.
 - Jelich family – Mary had a productive discussion with them, but their interest is purely commercial.
 - 130 and 150 Portola road - no interest in further development
 - Parking lot behind Roberts - the subcommittee will reach out to the new owner.
 - The area between the Jelich property and the corner - mainly the Priory and the rest are single family homes. Have we had a conversation w/ the Priory about other types of housing? Mary has been in contact with the headmaster and is willing to bring this up.
 - 555 Portola Road - no update but will follow-up.
 - 4370 Alpine – Property is in front of the Planning Commission to be subdivided and single-family housing will be built on the site of the tennis courts. The site is already included in the HE for 9 AMI units.

- **Alpine Corridor/Los Trancos/Skyline** (Chiariello, Hufty, Krashinsky):
 - Fogarty – Mary and Nona had a very successful meeting. Fogarty is very supportive of what the Town is trying to do. At this time, they do not need housing for their workers but are supportive of providing housing for other area farm workers. NW parcel along Skyline about 15 acres appears to be the most attractive. They do not want to oversee the construction or manage the property.
 - Grindall – Our building code allows farm worker housing in the Fogarty area. Relatively straightforward process to make it happen, don't need to go through a zoning change process. We would likely use an RFP process to get a better idea of the opportunity. The timeline would be very quick – could start working as soon as TC says this is a direction they want to go in.
 - It is unclear if the Williamson Act allows for farm worker housing, Fogarty is looking for the original purchase contract which would specify. Williamson Act stays w/ the land, not the owner. But would the Act allow housing to be built for farm workers who are NOT Fogarty employees?
 - Concerns were expressed if there is enough VLI housing demand in this area; remote with no access to support infrastructure (transit, grocery store, etc.).
 - 3350 Alpine: Mary is participating in discussions but is recusing herself from decisions as she is a resident of Westridge. Mary and Nona met with the owner. There is a willingness to put all 50 units on the site.
 - Nona reviewed a presentation that compares the pluses and minuses of 3350 vs. DFPOS. Key takeaways:
 - 2.9-acre property is larger than DFPOS.
 - The owner would like to stay on the property for ~ 5 years.
 - Longer frontage along Alpine Road simplifies access and parking
 - Possible neighborhood opposition but uphill residents see DFPOS more
 - 3350 is not subject to the 55' creek setback. DFPOS is very vulnerable to Los Trancos Creek bank erosion and shifts in the creek direction.
 - It appears from Nona's quick analysis that 3 structures and a parking area would impede creek setbacks.
 - Grindall – When asked about Town-owned vs. private property, the State would expect us to move faster on Town owned property, privately owned property would move at the speed dictated by the homeowner. Because DFPOS is already in the HE, it's "likely" (i.e. we cannot predict what HCD will do) we are going to be pressured to find an alternative solution that is on a similar timeframe. There could be penalties if this is not the case.
 - Grindall – In properties that are already in the HE, there would likely be no penalties from HCD if the timeline was not adhered to AS LONG AS the Town did nothing to impede the progress.
 - Dr. Miller: Main concern is that ANY project to build 50 units for multifamily housing is not consistent w/ the character of PV. But 3350 is a better alternative than DFPOS. He would prefer to see less density if possible.
 - Hawthorns – Subcommittee would like to see more housing proposed here. But Karen A. cautioned that, based upon the work of an ad hoc committee that looked at the overall site, this was probably not reasonable to assume and, even if it did happen, the timing is beyond the current HE cycle.
 - Midpeninsula Open Space – there are other areas to talk to them about.

- **Town Center/Portola Road Area** (Askey, Hufty, Vahtra)
 - Christ Church – they are thinking of housing for Church employees. Why AMI not VLI? The Church did not understand that they could support VLI and corresponding income levels.
 - Looking at other properties. Will go back to Our Lady of Wayside. Spoke to Valley Presbyterian, very supportive but did not have anything to offer.
- **Public Comments:**
 - Our housing goals should be focused on PV workers/families, not random housing that is not relevant to PV. Build community here, not up there.
 - Many issues with adding housing on Skyline; Fire safety, evacuation, etc.
 - Developers are probably not interested in buying land for LI housing.
 - Should look at options of building lower density housing on DFPOS because of the creek, soil issues, etc.
 - At the next Open Space committee meeting, Betsy M. will encourage the committee to look at appropriate ways of using the Open Space funds.
- **Committee Discussion:**
 - Nona: Feeling the need for guidance from TC. Would privately owned be better/worse than Town owned property? Do we still know that higher density is more financially feasible?
 - Seems like we are down to a few opportunistic sites:
 - Ronny: Fogarty
 - Ronny: 3350 Alpine
 - Karen A: Christ Church is still promising. Having the property owner interested moves it to the top of the list but they need more time. Maybe increase the units from 6. It won't replace DFPOS but offsets some units at the LI level.
 - Karen A: Substation/soccer field is still an option. Wouldn't take it off the list.
 - Karen A: Remember - our charter is to come up with a list, NOT make the decision
 - Are there retailers that are interested in worker housing?
 - More doors are opening. Keep ears/eyes open.
 - Carter – We need to take a more enlightened approach. Instead of approaching property owners with the HCD needs, we should present them with the incentive for THEM, i.e. what housing could do for them and for PV in the long term. Should be framing it - what is the benefit to PV, its residents, our workers, our neighbors. Think about who we are serving, we can get to the HE classifications if we approach it differently.
 - Carter – Need a LT Master Plan/vision for the Town so we can show how it fits in. But how to pay for it, planning grants?
 - Carter: We are losing housing for seniors, workers, and our kids are moving out as they grow up and have families.
 - Karen V: Concern about Fogarty, Williamson contracts may be very difficult to manage. Infrastructure is not there to support a farm worker community.
 - 3350 is more suited to keeping the vistas open.
- b. **Proposal for Reporting to the Town Council (Krashinsky):** Made some updates to the questions based upon the discussion of last week's meeting.

- **Public Comments:**
 - Prefer to have the committee ask the questions of themselves. Come to a conclusion and then take that to the TC. Create your own point of view, otherwise it will be the TC's view not yours.
 - Super work by the committee
 - Consult a realtor to find out all properties for sale, be on top of it and reach out quickly.
 - Like looking at other HE's to get ideas. Look at a housing/hotel combination.
- **Committee Discussion:**
 - Will not be on the TC agenda until end of February. We have some time to develop and consider our approach.
 - The proposal is that everyone votes on recommendations.
 - Some members feel that they need more time before voting, think there are questions that the committee has for the TC that would help us move forward.
 - Others felt that it's not possible to get any good answers from TC until we provide more context.
 - How about getting guidance from TC sub-committee Mary/Judith?
 - Our charter is to develop a recommendation, so some members felt strongly that we should develop a POV.
 - Is there an opportunity to incentivize JADU's to offset 50 units? We have to convince HCD that it's doable. We would be subject to penalties if we tried to replace DFPOS with JADU's and we did not meet our commitment. HCD "believes" that high density is the way to solve for affordable housing.
 - It's "possible" that we could replace DFPOS w/ 2 or more sites but not sure that HCD would accept it.
 - Whatever we arrive at tonight, is just a first draft – the beginning of a discussion. This is NOT what we should send to the TC.
 - Other factors that we may need to consider as we are voting; Town owned land vs private, HCD considerations for viability of sites, preserving future options for the Town, community resource impact.
 - Some members submitted a vote, others deferred.
- **Formation of Sub-Committees, if necessary:** No action required.
- **Next Steps:**
 - Come back w/ thoughts/recommendations on Site Evaluation Criteria and Next Steps for reporting to Town Council
 - More Outreach

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

6. Public Information/Comments:

- Corrected San Mateo County Rental Limits – attached
- Email to Committee from Sarah Wernikoff – attached
- **Public Comment:**
 - It is important for the Committee to understand any new laws for 2025, especially bonus density laws

7, ADJOURNMENT at 8:40 p.m.

- a. *The next regular Ad Hoc Site Evaluation Meeting will be Tuesday January 21, at **5:30 pm** (note time change)*
- b. *It was proposed and agreed that we meet February 3 at 5:30 p.m.*

Submitted by Patty Dewes