



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Ad Hoc Site Evaluation
Committee Meeting
Tuesday, December 17, 2024
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

MINUTES

HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE – 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA

Present: Askey, Chiariello, Gray, Hufty, Krashinsky, Warr, Vahtra **Secretary:** Dewes

1. CALL TO ORDER at 5:01

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES from December 3, 2024: Changes/edits proposed:

- In Intro - change Also Present, to Also Present in Schoolhouse
- Under 4biii, add that Miller indicated his interest in offering his property at 3350 Alpine Road (discussed later in meeting).
- Under 4eiii - add that Vahtra reviewed Town Soccer Field alternative
- Remove chart (Sites being considered by subcommittee) at back as it is also included in Alpine/Los Trancos/Skyline Subcommittee Report
- Corrected typos
- After changes/edits, the minutes were approved unanimously

4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

a. Announcement Committee Member Change: Welcome to Carter Warr who joins the Committee representing the ASCC, he is replacing Danna Breen.

b. Site Updates:

- **Nathhorst Triangle & Vicinity** (Grey, Hufty, Warr):
 - Subcommittee proposing Site Name Change to Alpine/Portola Corner.
 - Outreach. Discussion with Bud Jelich. He is committed to keeping his Nathhorst properties as a commercial center to serve the Town.
 - Outreach to other multiple owners in the area has so far yielded no opportunities but there are other parcels and potential candidates still to be looked at.
 - The committee asked about the likelihood of parcels becoming available soon. Mary said they still need to have several conversations.
 - The sub-committee will also look further into Nyland flats.
- **Alpine Corridor/Los Trancos/Skyline** (Chiariello, Hufty, Krashinsky):
 - Have not yet been able to meet w/ Fogarty stakeholders.
 - Hawthorns: outreach, supportive but not encouraging. Need housing for rangers and maintenance workers but the logical place for it would be the Historic Complex. But development of that site is on a slower timeline/process.
 - Added a few more sites

- 3350 Alpine across from Dorothy Ford Park Open Space (DFPOS): Seeing real possibility of moving units from DFPOS but would likely create WASC/neighborhood issues. Could reduce density on DFPOS to potentially save the oak trees. The homeowner did not support high density but thinks lower density might be a possibility. Any development would require a vote from WASC homeowners to modify CC&R's, however, AB721 which allows affordable housing development even if there are CC&R restrictions. Potential options include putting all 50 units on that site, or a combination of units between DFPOS and 3350 for the Gateway concept. If Christ Church builds more affordable units, could 3350 be for the 6 AMI no-net loss?
- Town Center/Portola Road Area (Askey, Hufty, Vahtra)
 - Soccer field: The Committee has reviewed all league schedules to determine possible impact
 - Substation: Clarified that easement is for ingress/egress into neighboring properties. Carter commented that the first ad hoc housing committee had looked at adding 2nd floor, and/or adding an additional unit at the other end of the parking lot. Issue/concerns will revolve around displaced parking, noise from soccer field, etc. From a building, planning standpoint, it is a viable site. The Town owns the property and there is sewer, water access from Portola Road. There are currently no plans to move the Sheriff room or the restrooms as they are being used. It could be difficult to parcel off. Town acting as a landlord is worth further review.
 - Carter – There's no perfect answer that solves all the problems all at once. We should break down a map of the Town and mark out all the sites. We may be able to spread efforts vs one site
 - **Public Comments:**
 - Why would the Town want to buy property for Fogarty to have subsidized housing?
 - More housing on Skyline would add to fire safety/evacuation issues.
 - WASC needs to show proof they support affordable housing in Portola Valley
 - Substation is an opportunity, encouraged by Carters' drawings.
 - Parking issues on substation access road need to be addressed.
 - Creative soccer game scheduling might alleviate parking issues.
 - Protect our recreational fields. Adults/children need physical activity to combat diabetes, mental health, etc.
- **Committee Discussion:**
 - Just a reminder that Krashinsky needs to be recused from any Sequoias decision making, OK for discussion
 - Sequoias could be an opportunity for a combination of housing options. Demand for senior housing is growing. MR units could be an option for functional senior living options. And housing is needed for their workforce.
 - Reminder that planning for housing at the Sequoias is already in our HE: 23 units - 18 Above Moderate (for seniors) and 5 Moderate (for workforce), but it is not clear where on the property they would be built, and we need to follow up. Karen A asked Emily if she could ask Adrienne Smith if she had Sequoias contact info from HE work.

- c. **Proposal for Reporting to Town Council (Krashinsky):** Ronnie/Karen V. reviewed a DRAFT of a proposal for the voting criteria for the additional sites that are under consideration together with potential questions that we may want to get input from the Town Council before we take any next steps on each of these possible sites.
 - Should we consider applying for grants to perform any necessary work? Problem – need staff time to apply for grants.
 - Don't feel ready to ask TC any of these questions, feels like more work and outreach is needed.
 - Is our goal to task the TC for clarification? Or present a proposal? And when is the right timing?
 - Need clarity on the building space at Dorothy Ford Park Open Space? Is it really the size represented in the HE and can it support the # of units we committed?
 - Should we use the same criteria that HCD uses to evaluate LI units to show the feasibility of the site? Several are: 1) owner interest, 2) 20-23 development units (d/u) per acre, 3) ratio of building to land.
 - **Public Comments:**
 - Commendations on the process. . . #1 or #2, hardest to answer. . . it is SO dependent on which one site vs. 5 sites. Recommend clarification on that question before we take it to the TC and/or evaluate.
 - **Committee Discussion:**
 - If we can find a site that accommodates 50 units, then it is much more feasible. Can we answer that question first?
 - Focus on 1-2 sites, better chance of success.
 - But the original objective/directive was to disperse housing. Wouldn't it be prudent to get TC clarification on which priority is more important?
 - IF we are going to do VLI, then it's better to have density
 - Doors are still opening/closing, isn't it too early to approach the TC?
 - Shouldn't we first answer what size lot and how many properties before diving into individual sites?
 - Workforce housing may not generate traffic/evacuation issues
 - **Summary:** All agreed we need more time to review this process and the next steps. All members should come to the next meeting prepared to discuss.
- d. **Site Evaluation Criteria (Vahtra):** combined into c above.
- e. **San Mateo County Income Limits (Askey):** Sharing for public transparency and information.
- f. **Nex Steps:**
 - Come back w/ thoughts/recommendations on Site Evaluation Criteria and Next Steps for reporting to Town Council
 - Vahtra has offered to consolidate master list of 3 sub-committee templates.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

6. ADJOURNMENT approximately 7:20 p.m.

- a. *The next regular Ad Hoc Site Evaluation Meeting will be Tuesday January 7, at 5:00pm*

Submitted by Patty Dewes