



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Ad Hoc Site Evaluation
Committee Meeting
Thursday, February 20, 2025
6:00 PM

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

HYBRID MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES

HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE – 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA

Present: Askey, Chiariello, Gray, Hufty, Krashinsky (attending via Zoom), Warr

Absent: Vahtra **Secretary:** Dewes

PV Interim Planning and Building Director: Grindall

1. CALL TO ORDER at 6:04 p.m.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **February 3, 2025:** After corrections/edits, minutes were approved unanimously.

4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

a. Site Updates:

- **Portola/Alpine Corners:** (Gray, Hufty, Warr):
 - No update
- **Alpine/Los Trancos/Skyline** (Chiariello, Hufty, Krashinsky):
 - Nona/Mary/Ronny met with the GM/COO of Alpine Hills Tennis Club. He indicated an interest and willingness to work with the Town on potential options to supply affordable housing. He indicated that the project should benefit both Alpine and the Town and that the Club could not sustain any net loss of recreational facilities. The Club does not want to manage or be involved in the construction.
 - Several available parcels were reviewed that are behind the Club where access would most likely be from Los Trancos Road.
 - It's likely a parking structure will be needed. It's also possible that tennis courts could be built on the roof of the parking structure.
 - The Club is also concerned about the impact on close residents, particularly regarding noise.
 - The project would likely require another party for the development.
 - The project does not necessarily mean they would sell a portion of the property.
 - They do not have a sense of the # of units yet, but probably more like 10-20. They are not necessarily solving for housing for their workers but are not opposed to it. They just haven't thought it through to that level.
 - The project would obviously need Alpine Board approval and possibly a vote from the membership.
 - The conversation was very general but indicated an overall positive direction and support.
- **Committee Questions:**

- What is the Benefit to AH? Primarily financial gain, not worker housing,
- Carter recused himself from the discussion as he has a client that owns adjoining property. It was clarified that Committee AH members do not need to recuse themselves unless they have financial/familial ties.
- **Public Comments:**
 - Dave C: former Board president of AH. Members have indicated a need for more recreational facilities so using available land for housing would probably not be supported. There's also not a lot of space behind the Club due to creek setback.
 - Carolyn V.: employees are part of a family with multiple incomes. They live elsewhere because that's where they can afford to live.
- **Committee Discussion:**
 - Karen A: Believes that there is a real opportunity for AH worker housing. Many of the Club's 80 employees commute from long distances and median income levels would fit into an affordable housing model.
 - Karen A: Also believes that the Town would benefit by getting more data about worker commutes, income levels, etc to ascertain the overall opportunity and perhaps show local businesses the opportunity and value of local affordable housing.
 - Ronny: It's relatively easy to add affiliate housing but we need a partner. Neither AH nor Fogarty want to manage the project.
 - Carter: (comments are general in nature and not specific to the AH project). In order for affiliate and/or affordable housing to succeed, the Town needs to help business/property owners understand the benefit and value that they will see by participating. Show them the incentives so they understand why it's such a good deal. The Town has not done a good job of this.
 - Carter: The HCD mandates are abominable. The zoning required for minimum density is going to kill the opportunity for housing.
 - Nona – Agrees with Carter with respect to telling owners about the benefits, conversations have been difficult as she does now know what to tell people what the benefits are. . .
 - Carter: The principal goal in providing affiliate housing has been to be able to solicit and retain better talent than they would normally be able to secure. It's a stepping stone. . . i.e. for the Priory, it enabled them to get better people that would not have had the opportunity to come to work in the Bay Area, either financially or geographically.
 - Grindall: Can do an RFP without owning the property. Obviously we would want to work in partnership with the owner.
 - Karen A.: Could there be central and shared affiliated housing for multiple businesses? Grindall: yes, but it has not been easy to find space. However, it would probably not satisfy the HCD requirements of replacing DFPOS/50 units.
 - Grindall: Provided some clarification. Our requirements under the HCD plan are to ID and zone for a 50-unit property such as DFPOS. The expectation from the State is that this density would result in a certain ratio of VLI units. The Town is not required to make those units affordable or meet the ratio outlined in the HE; we are only required to meet the density (no net loss). However, if the number of affordable units required in our RHNA numbers are not built, those units would most likely be added to the next cycle. And in order to substitute for deed restricted units, the property has to be zoned for minimum density. This is

likely the inhibitor (that Carter alluded to) for property owners to build affordable units.

- **Portola Corridor/Town Center** (Askey, Hufty, Vahtra)

- Karen A.: Christ Church (CC) is working on an outline of their plan and hopes to have more clarity by end of March. It was asked whether CC and Village Square should be talking to one another about their plans. We felt it's probably too early in the process and there's not enough data to have a discussion.

- Mary A.: Has another appt w Habitat for Humanity for general information gathering

- **Committee Questions/Comments:**

- Carter: We should be looking for land outside of PV and annex it.

- Ronny: Is it becoming more difficult to find affordable housing developers?

- Grindall: It's hard to say. To make it financially feasible, a developer usually is looking at a project with 40-50 units. They may be interested in a project with fewer units, but it will likely cost more.

- **Public Comments:**

- None.

- **Committee Discussion:**

- **Joslyn:** Asked why Hawthorns cannot be zoned to replace DFPOS. Grindall: For a property to be rezoned to replace DFPOS, it needs to be "feasible." i.e. available and appropriate for residential development Hawthorns is not "available" because the conservation easement does not allow for development. Midpeen, as the owner of the property, cannot be forced to change the conservation easement.

- **Master List:** Mary and Karen V. reviewed all sites that have been discussed and evaluated. Certain information has been redacted that needs to be protected and kept private.

- **Public Comments:**

- None

b. Review & Approve AHSEC Report to Town Council:

- The Committee reviewed the report and made suggestions, modifications, etc. The Committee also discussed how to organize the report so that the recommended sites are highlighted first and others are perhaps put into an appendix.

- **Public comment:**

- None.

c. Review, Discussion & Approve Main Message Points for 3/12/25 Town Council Meeting Memo/Presentation

- **Committee Discussion:** Motion was made and seconded to form a sub-committee consisting of Karen A., Ronny, and Nona to finalize the memo/presentation. Motion passed.

- **Public Comment:**

- Judith Hasko: Counseled that the purpose of the presentation to the Town Council is not to rehash the work of the Committee. It is to summarize the work. The substance should be a high level framework to set the stage for the work done and the recommendation.

d. Formation of Sub-Committee, if necessary:

- The Sub-Committee was formed in c.

- **Public Comment:**

- None.

e. Next Steps:

- Sub Committee to finalize memo/presentation to Town Council.
- **Public Comment:**
 - None

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Committee Reports** – None.
- **Staff Reports** –
 - Grindall: The Town has prepared a response regarding the rezoning of DFPOS to the HE to address its latest letter. The response will be reviewed by the Planning commission on March 19 and by the Town Council on April 9. It's important to remember that the zoning being recommended for DFPOS removes a step to move forward for the certification of our HE but does not dictate any further action on that property.
- **Public Comments**
 - None

6. ADJOURNMENT at 8:35 p.m.

- *The next regular Ad Hoc Site Evaluation Meeting scheduled for 3/3/25 is cancelled, but we will leave future meetings on the calendar should the Town Council request something further from us in the 3/12 meeting.*

Submitted by Patty Dewes