

Housing Element

Introduction

- 2400 The housing element sets forth the goals and policies of the town with regard to housing and responds to the requirements of Government Code Section 65583. It is an update and revision of the housing element adopted by the Town of Portola Valley on March 27, 1985. This element addresses Portola Valley's share of regional housing need as estimated by the Association of Bay Area Governments in Housing Needs Determinations, January 1989. Data describing population, housing and household characteristics are from the 1980 U.S. Census and the California Department of Finance, supplemented and updated wherever possible with available local information.

Public Participation

- 2401 In September 1989, the town council appointed a housing advisory committee to work with the town council, planning commission and town planner in preparing a new housing element. The committee consisted of six members of the public representing different geographic areas and economic segments of the town. Homeowners, renters and institutions were represented. One council member and one planning commissioner participated as ex officio members. The housing advisory committee met as a committee six times starting in November 1989. It then participated in three joint study sessions with the town council and planning commission in March 1990. Public hearings on the draft element were held before both the planning commission and town council prior to submittal to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review.
- 2402 After submitting the draft housing element to HCD for review, the town sent letters to every residence on May 9, 1990 and August 9, 1990

explaining the main provisions in the housing element and inviting participation in a long series of public meetings scheduled to discuss the issues prior to adoption. From May to October 1990, the planning commission held one and the town council held 12 meetings devoted all or in part to the housing element. Hundreds of people attended meetings and participated in the discussions through this time. Residents also joined in a field trip organized by the town council to see affordable housing projects in nearby Palo Alto. The housing element was revised in response to concerns raised during this extensive public debate and in response to the comments from HCD. Then starting in November 1990, the formal public hearings prior to adoption on December 19, 1990 were held before the planning commission and town council.

Consistency with Other General Plan Elements

- 2403 At adoption of this element, sections 2105 and 2146 of the land use element of the general plan will be revised for consistency with the housing element.

Evaluation of 1985 Element

Government Code Section 65588 (a): Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate the following: (1) the appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal, (2) the effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community's housing goals and objectives, (3) the progress of the [town] in implementation of the housing element.

- 2404 The goals, objectives and policies of the 1985 element were appropriate to conditions in the town but inadequate to contribute substantially to meeting the state housing goal.
- 2405 The element did not provide for the construction of affordable housing except through approval and construction of second units on lots of 2 acres or larger. This deficiency is corrected in the current element. The 1985 housing element has not been effective in attaining all the community's housing goals and objectives, not because the element is inadequate or poorly expresses the town's goals and objectives, but because explosive increases in the cost of housing during the 1980s put achievement of the goals beyond reach. Since January 1, 1980, 195 new housing units have been built in Portola Valley; more than the objective which was 156. According to ABAG projections, total housing production within the subregion including Portola Valley's spheres of influence has been almost exactly on target, with Portola Valley providing for a significant share of the need allocated to the unincorporated areas. The

considered affordable to these households are two guest houses and one mobile home.

- 2406 Town policies posed no significant constraints to meeting the total housing production goal. Ample residential land was zoned appropriately to meet the overall production goal. However, town policies regarding residential densities and strict conditions for constructing second units may have contributed to the shortfall in affordable housing construction. This updated element addresses these issues.

Housing Needs

Government Code 65583: The housing element shall contain all of the following: (a) An assessment of housing needs . . . The assessment . . . shall include the following: (1) Analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels. These existing and projected needs shall include the locality's share of the regional housing need in accordance with Section 65584. (2) Analysis and documentation of household characteristics, including level of payment compared to ability to pay, housing characteristics, including overcrowding, and housing stock condition. . . (6) Analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the handicapped, elderly, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter.

Population Trends

- 2407 According to the California Department of Finance, 4,526 people lived in Portola Valley on January 1, 1989. During 1989, building permits for eight houses were issued in the town. Assuming that these houses have been built and are occupied at the 1989 estimated occupancy rate, the January 1, 1990 population is 4,549. Table 1 shows the growth in population since 1980. During the eleven years, the town's population increased by 610 people or a little over 15 percent.
- 2408 The estimated group quarters population is based on the 1980 Census count adjusted annually using data on the population at The Sequoias, a retirement community, reported by the town. The number includes some residents at the Woodside Priory, a Catholic boy's school. The decade saw steady, moderate population growth with no major shift in the proportion of population in group quarters or in the number of persons per household. Household size stayed small during the decade. Most of the population increase can be attributed to the construction and occupancy of new houses.

Most of the population increase can be attributed to the construction and occupancy of new houses.

Table 1. Population Growth, April 1, 1980 to January 1, 1990

Year	Total Population	% Increase Population	Population in Group Quarters	Population in Households	Persons per Household
1980	3,939		326	3,613	2.916
1981	3,988	1.24	331	3,657	2.909
1982	4,059	1.78	331	3,728	2.897
1983	4,079	0.49	336	3,743	2.908
1984	4,145	1.62	324	3,821	2.919
1985	4,185	0.97	301	3,884	2.931
1986	4,269	2.01	301	3,968	2.931
1987	4,379	2.58	338	4,041	2.922
1988	4,439	1.37	338	4,101	2.904
1989	4,526	1.96	333	4,193	2.904
1990	(4,549)	(0.51)	(333)	(4,216)	(2.904)

Source: California Department of Finance, Report E-5, "San Mateo County Population and Housing Estimates", January 1 of each year. 1990 figures estimated by William Spangle and Associates, Inc. based on building permits issued during 1989.

2409

Table 2 compares changes in the age distribution from 1960 to 1990. The 1990 percentages are estimates from ABAG's projection for San Mateo County adjusted for Portola Valley by assuming that Portola Valley's changes in age distribution during the 1980s were proportional to the county's. Under this assumption, the percentage in all the major age groups increased slightly except for children and teenagers between the ages of 5 and 19. The slight increase in the percentage of children under five is a reversal of a strong trend since 1960. The percentage of people over 65 continues to grow, but at a slower rate than in the 1960s and 1970s.

Table 2. Percentage Distribution by Age Group 1960, 1969, 1980, 1990

Age Group	1960	1969(a)	1980	1990(b)
Under 5	11.3	4.9	3.5	3.8
5-19	29.2	32	22.4	19.0
20-44	35.4	27.6	30.5	31.2
45-64	17.4	23.5	29.2	30.0
65+	6.7	11.9	14.4	16.0
Totals	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0

(a) 1969 State Department of Finance Special Census for San Mateo County.

(b) Estimated assuming changes in age distribution from 1980 to 1990 in Portola Valley have been proportional to the distribution for San Mateo County projected by ABAG in "Projections 1990", December 1989.

Employment Trends

- 2410 The best source of current employment information is ABAG's Projections 90 which reports data for a "subregion" comprised of two 1980 census tracts which include Portola Valley and its two spheres of influence. According to the 1980 Census, this subregion had 3,144 residents over fifteen years old who were employed in 1980. Of these, 1,921 (61.1 percent) lived within the town. ABAG's Projections 90 estimates that this subregion now has 3,700 employed residents. Assuming the town's share of employed residents is the same as in 1980 and that ABAG's projections are accurate, Portola Valley currently has 2,261 employed residents over the age of fifteen—about half of the estimated 1990 population.
- 2411 In 1980, 1,801 employed residents reported place of employment. Almost 50 percent worked in the town or some other place in San Mateo County. Most of the rest worked outside of the San Francisco SMSA, probably in northern Santa Clara County. Table 3 lists place of employment of all employed residents in 1980, extrapolated to 1990 by assuming the percent distribution in 1990 is the same as in 1980. According to this method, 400 Portola Valley residents work in the town.

Table 3. Place of Employment, 1980 and 1990

<i>Location</i>	<i>1980</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>1990</i>
Portola Valley	319	17.7	400
Rest of San Mateo County	566	31.4	710
Rest of San Francisco SMSA	184	10.2	231
Outside of SMSA	732	40.7	920
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,801</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>2,261</i>

Source: 1980 U.S. Census; William Spangle and Associates, Inc. for 1990 estimate.

- 2412 ABAG's Projections 90 indicates that the subregion had 1,074 jobs in 1980. In 1981, the town surveyed 60 employers in town and found a total of 470 full-time jobs. The survey covered all public and private enterprises in the town except for four very small businesses. The town, thus had a little under 45 percent of the jobs in the subregion. This makes sense considering that the major employment center is in Ladera, outside the town limits.
- 2413 ABAG projects that the subregion has 1,150 jobs in 1990. Assuming that 45 percent of these jobs are in the town and that ABAG's projections are accurate, the town now has 518 full-time jobs. Employment growth in the town has been slow and, under current plans will continue to be slow. Only 18 acres of land are planned and zoned for commercial and office

uses, and most of that land is developed. The town continues to provide housing for people who work elsewhere, helping to relieve the jobs/housing imbalance in other Peninsula cities which have more jobs than employed residents.

- 2414 A problem arises, however, because many of the jobs provided in the town are filled by non-residents, in part because the employees cannot afford to live in town. A phone survey conducted in February 1990 of town government, the school district and two institutional employers in town revealed that most of their employees do not earn enough to afford market-rate housing in San Mateo County, let alone in the town. As summarized in Table 4, the four institutions employed 179 full-time and 80 part-time people of which 37 lived in town. Only five of the employees receive incomes classified as "above moderate" by the state for a family of three in San Mateo County. Most of the full-time employees received incomes in the "moderate" or "low" income category. Most of the employees receiving "very low" incomes are working part-time. Information from the survey is summarized below:

Table 4. *Employees and Incomes (a)*

	Employees			Live in town	Very Low <\$22,250	Low <\$30,600	Moderate <\$47,500	Above Moderate
	Full	Part	Total					
Town	7	3	10	1	3	5	2	0
School District	40	11	51	10	0	12	16	3
Sequoias(b)	102	58	160	14	81	12	7	0
Priory	30	8	38	12	21	7	8	2
Totals	179	80	259	37	105	36	33	5

(a) Income limits are for a family of 3 in San Mateo County, as defined by California Department of Housing and Community Development, February 1989. Income data were not reported for all employees.

(b) Income data is reported for 100 full-time employees.

Source: Telephone Survey, February 1990.

1. The Town of Portola Valley employs seven people full-time, three part-time and two on an occasional basis. Occasional employees are not included in Table 4. Salaries for the full-time people range from to \$27,696 to \$42,528 with only two people earning more than \$30,000 per year. None of the full-time staff live in town; one part-time employee rents in town. Part-timers receive about \$10 per hour; occasional employees about \$5.

2. The Portola Valley School District employs 51 people – 40 full-time and 11 part-time. These include 26 full-time and 10 part-time teachers with an average full-time salary of \$42,800; 11 full-time and 1 part-time classified employees with an average full-time salary of \$25,300; and 3 administrators, all with salaries over \$48,000. Ten of the teachers and classified employees live in the town. Table 4 categorizes the incomes of the employees by average salaries, although most individuals have incomes above or below the averages. In addition to the employees shown in Table 4, the district employs many classroom aides for 8 hours per week at \$7 per hour. Most of the aides are parents and reside in the town.
3. The Sequoias, a retirement community, with 323 residents, has a total of 160 employees; 102 are full-time, 10 are part-time with benefits, and 48 are considered casual, including teenagers from town who work in the dining hall. Salaries for nurses, health care professionals, administrators and other full-time employees are comparable to those in similar facilities. However, all are below the limits for market housing in San Mateo County, and only 7 full-time employees live in town.
4. Woodside Priory, a Catholic boy's school with 110 students (48 boarding), employs 30 full-time and 8 part-time people. Two have above moderate incomes; the rest have moderate, low or very low incomes. The school provides housing at affordable rents for eight of the employees to live on campus. The rest live outside of Portola Valley.

2415 There are other employers in town, and given the estimate that 400 Portola Valley residents work in town, many must have employees who live in town. Also, some residents are self-employed and work at home. The limited survey reveals, however, that those who administer the town's affairs, teach its children and care for its elderly, by and large, cannot afford to live in the town. Over 200 people working in town cannot afford to live here. This is a significant area of housing need which is addressed in the housing policies and program.

Housing Characteristics

2416 Portola Valley is a community of detached single-family houses on parcels ranging in size from 15,000 square feet to 2 1/2 acres or larger. Under conditions specified in the general plan and land use regulations, the town permits cluster development, guest houses on single-family parcels, second units within single-family houses, shared living arrangements and manufactured (mobile) homes. The location and density of housing development is controlled primarily by natural

conditions, particularly the San Andreas fault, which crosses through the town, and steep and potentially unstable slopes.

2417 From 1960 to 1980, the town's housing supply doubled while its population grew by 82 percent. During this time, average household size dropped from 3.66 to 2.92; however, during the 1980s, the Department of Finance shows little change in the average household size. The number of housing units increased by 195 from 1284 in 1980 to 1479 in 1989, an average of 19.5 units per year. The number of both people and housing units increased by about 15 percent during the decade.

2418 Table 5 summarizes Portola Valley's housing supply during the 1980s as estimated by the Department of Finance. The 1980 U.S. Census showed that Portola Valley had 71 multifamily units, 63 of them in complexes with 5 or more units. This is an error which has been continued by the Department of Finance in its annual housing unit count. One mobile home was added during the 1980s along with 194 single-family houses; 25 of the houses were guest houses with kitchens added as second units under terms of conditional use permits on parcels with existing single-family houses. In 1980, 1,142 (92 percent) of the occupied housing units were occupied by owners and 97 (8 percent) by renters. There is no information to indicate that the ratio of owners to renters has significantly changed during the decade. Therefore, in 1989 approximately 1328 housing units were probably occupied by owners and 116 by renters. Many of the renter-occupied units were probably guest houses.

Table 5. Housing Units, 1980 to 1990

	<i>Total Units</i>	<i>Added Units</i>	<i>Single Family</i>	<i>Multifamily</i>		<i>Mobile Homes</i>	<i>Vacant Units</i>	<i>House holds</i>	<i>Pop/ HH</i>
				2-4	5+				
1980	1,284		1,213	8	63	0	45	1,239	2.92
1981	1,295	11	1,224	8	63	0	38	1,257	2.91
1982	1,334	39	1,263	8	63	0	47	1,287	2.90
1983	1,341	7	1,269	8	63	1	54	1,287	2.91
1984	1,345	4	1,273	8	63	1	36	1,309	2.92
1985	1,375	30	1,303	8	63	1	50	1,325	2.93
1986	1,410	35	1,338	8	63	1	56	1,354	2.93
1987	1,430	20	1,358	8	63	1	47	1,383	2.92
1988	1,461	31	1,389	8	63	1	49	1,412	2.90
1989	1,479	18	1,407	8	63	1	35	1,444	2.90

Source: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, Report E-5, San Mateo County Population and Housing Estimates, April 1 1980, January 1, 1984-89.

- 2419 In 1984, ABAG estimated that the Portola Valley "subregion" needed to provide 259 housing units between 1980 and 1990, of which 156 would be within the town limits. The 195 units added to the town since 1980 more than meet the town's need. ABAG's Projections 90 indicate that the subregion had 2054 households in 1980 and a projected 2270 households in 1990 for an increase of 216. The 216 households combined with 43 vacant units (Portola Valley's average was 46 during the 1980's) gives a total of 259 units. It appears that housing production in the subregion has been adequate to meet the projected need.
- 2420 **Overcrowded Households.** The U.S. Census defines "overcrowding" as 1.01 or more persons per room occupying a housing unit. Under this definition, Portola Valley had 10 overcrowded housing units in 1980 occupied by 55 people. Seventeen of the people were in two overcrowded rental units; the rest were in owner-occupied housing.
- 2421 Most houses in Portola Valley are large. The 1980 Census reports that 80 percent of the housing units had six or more rooms ("rooms" do not include bathrooms, storage areas, or areas separated by less than a floor to ceiling partition). New units constructed between 1985 and 1990 have averaged about 5,000 square feet. The trend before 1980 toward smaller household size seems to have stabilized at about 2.9 persons per household. Yet, with the increasing size of new houses and the large number of housing additions during the 1980's, those 2.9 person households are occupying more and more space.
- 2422 **Housing Condition.** Most housing in Portola Valley is in good condition. The 1980 Census shows 4 units lacking complete plumbing facilities. Only two were occupied; both by owners. The 1980 U.S. Census lists 105 housing units built before 1940. Thirty-five of these were occupied by renters. Older houses appear to be a significant source of rental housing in town. Some of these may be converted accessory structures on single-family parcels.
- 2423 Many houses in town are not visible from public roads making "windshield" surveys of housing condition difficult and partial. However, building permit records indicate a consistently high volume of remodeling and additions. The high value of properties in the town leads to a high level of maintenance, and over any significant period of time, the private market eliminates substandard conditions. None of the information available to the town indicates a significant problem with housing condition.

Housing Affordability

2424 In the 1980 U.S. Census, "affordable housing" is defined as housing that costs 25 percent or less of a household's monthly income. Households with above moderate income have numerous housing choices and may choose to pay more than 25 percent of their income for housing. The primary concern is for households with moderate, low and very low incomes that have few choices in the housing market.

2425 In 1980, the regional median household income was \$20,607. Low income households are defined as those with incomes at 80 percent or less of the regional median, in this case \$16,486 or less. According to this definition, Portola Valley had 115 low income households in 1980, including 69 homeowners and 46 renters. As shown in Table 6, the 1980 U.S. Census indicates that 59 of the low income households in Portola Valley were paying more than 25 percent of their income for housing.

Table 6. Low Income Households Overpaying for Housing - 1980

	<i>Total</i> <i>Households</i>	<i>Low income</i> <i>Households</i>	<i>Low income</i> <i>HH's</i> <i>Overpaying</i>	<i>Proportion Low</i> <i>income</i> <i>HH's Overpaying</i>
Owner	1,239	69	42	0.61
Rental	97	46	17	0.37
Totals	1,336	115	59	0.51

Source: U.S. Census, 1980 as presented in ABAG, *Housing Needs Determinations*, 1989, p. 81.

2426 In most cities and counties the proportion of low income renters overpaying is significantly higher than the proportion of low income owners. In Portola Valley the reverse is true. There are not many rental households and, although half of them are low income households, only a small proportion of the low income households are overpaying. Many rental units in the town are guest houses or some type of second unit. In 1980, 10 were offered for "no cash rent", presumably to persons employed by the property owner. It is harder to explain overpayment by low income homeowners. Many are probably retired residents or divorced single parents facing reduced incomes.

2427 What has happened to affordability since the 1980 U.S. Census? Every indication is that the situation is worse today. Income data is very difficult to get. The California Department of Housing and Community Development estimates that average household income statewide increased 77 percent from 1980 to 1989. According to ABAG's Projections 90 the average household income (in constant 1988 dollars) in Portola Valley increased from \$93,038 in 1980 to \$97,800 in 1990, an increase of

only 5.1 percent. In the San Mateo County, the projected increase is from \$45,209 to \$51,700, or 14.4 percent.

- 2428 The July 14, 1982 *Country Almanac* listed 11 homes for sale in Portola Valley with asking prices between \$239,000 and \$750,000 and averaging \$511,000. The February 14, 1990 *Country Almanac* listed 12 homes for sale in Portola Valley with asking prices between \$429,500 for a two-bedroom, one-bath home and \$2,350,000 for a five-bedroom, seven-bath home. The average was \$1,310,600. Assuming, the relationship between asking and sales prices has remained constant, the average cost of a house in Portola Valley has more than doubled in the last 7 1/2 years. None of the housing for sale in February 1990 would be considered affordable by households with moderate or below incomes under typical financing terms. It appears that housing prices have been increasing at a faster rate than incomes; however, in the second half of 1990 prices have flattened and/or decreased and this trend is expected to continue in the near future.

ABAG Housing Needs Determination

- 2429 Every five years, ABAG is required by the state to determine how much housing, available to all income levels, is needed in the region and to allocate shares of the estimated need to the cities and counties in the region. ABAG allocates housing need to "subregions," which in Portola Valley's case was an allocation of 161, including the town and its spheres of influence – unincorporated Ladera and the Los Trancos Woods-Vista Verde area. The town council considered the housing needs numbers at its regular meeting on November 16, 1988. On February 6, 1989, the town sent a letter to ABAG agreeing to "make a 'sustained and serious' effort to meet the housing needs, particularly of persons employed within the town", but also requesting that the housing needs numbers be revised to exclude the need for the unincorporated area (see Appendix 8).
- 2430 The town was told by ABAG that a revision in the needs numbers was not required for such a purpose and that the proper way to handle the problem was to request a "technical split" when work on the housing element began. This was done and a letter from ABAG authorizing the split was sent on November 29, 1989 (see Appendix 8). Subsequently, staff at HCD asked to review the question, and, in a letter dated February 5, 1990, HCD disagreed with ABAG's decision (see Appendix 8).
- 2431 Then, the San Mateo County Planning Division completed its calculations of the county's housing need. ABAG allocates housing need to the county only for the rural areas which are not in an urban sphere of influence. The rest is allocated to the cities. However, San Mateo County recognizes its responsibility to plan for the unincorporated spheres of influence and accepts the housing need allocated to these areas. In June 1990, San Mateo County distributed a list specifying the share of each city's

housing need which would be assumed by the county. The list indicates the county's commitment to plan for 63 of the 161 housing units allocated by ABAG to the Portola Valley subregion (see Appendix 8).

- 2432 Table 7 shows the housing need, by income category, allocated to the subregion, the need assumed by San Mateo County, and the remaining need which pertains to the town. Portola Valley accepts ABAG's allocation of housing need to the subregion as a commitment to be met jointly by San Mateo County and the Town of Portola Valley. The town further accepts San Mateo County's calculation of the county's share of that need. In accepting these allocations, the town assumes responsibility for making suitable sites available, within the town limits, to meet the need pertaining to the incorporated town.

Table 7. Housing Needs in Portola Valley and the Subregion, 1988-1995

<i>Household Income</i>	<i>% Regional Median Income</i>	<i>% of Unit</i>	<i>Allocated to Subregion</i>	<i>Assumed by San Mateo Co</i>	<i>Portola Valley Need</i>
very low	under 51%	15%	24	9	15
low	51-80%	12%	19	7	12
moderate	81-120%	17%	27	11	16
above moderate	over 120%	56%	91	36	55
<i>Totals</i>		<i>100%</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>98</i>

Source: ABAG, *Housing Need Determinations*, January 1989; San Mateo County Planning Division, *Existing and Projected Housing Needs, 1988-1995*, San Mateo County and Cities, received July 18 1990.

- 2433 The housing needs numbers are for a seven-year period from 1988 to 1995; two years have already passed. In 1988 and 1989, 26 new houses were built in Portola Valley. That leaves 72 units to be provided from 1990 to 1995, about 15 per year. That rate of housing production is reasonable in terms of past rates in the town. The town assumes that 55 or more above moderate housing units will be provided without significant public intervention or changes in town policy. The challenge will be to provide sites for 43 units of housing affordable to moderate, low and very low income households.
- 2434 Table 8 shows current (February 1990) income limits used to qualify for assistance from federal and state housing programs. The income limits vary with household size. The table lists the limits for one-, two-, three-, and four-person households. The maximum income to qualify for housing assistance in San Mateo County ranges from \$38,300 for a person living alone to \$54,700 for a four-person household.

Table 8. *Income Limits (a) and Affordable Monthly Housing Costs (b)*

Number in Household	Maximum Income & Housing Cost	Income Categories		
		Very Low	Low	Moderate
1	Income Limit Housing Cost	\$18,100 \$452	\$25,000 \$625	\$38,300 \$957
2	Income Limit Housing Cost	\$20,700 \$517	\$28,550 \$714	\$43,800 \$1,095
3	Income Limit Housing Cost	\$23,250 \$581	\$32,150 \$804	\$49,250 \$1,231
4	Income Limit Housing Cost	\$25,850 \$646	\$35,700 \$893	\$54,700 \$1,367

(a) From California Department of Housing and Community Development, income limits for San Mateo County, February 1990.

(b) Assumes affordable housing costs no more 30 percent of monthly income.

- 2435 Federal housing programs consider housing affordable if total monthly housing costs (including taxes, insurance, utilities, an allowance for maintenance and repairs, etc.) do not exceed 30 percent of household income. Using this guideline, Table 8 also shows the maximum monthly payment a household in each income category can afford for housing. The range is from \$452 for a one-person, very low income household to \$1,367 for a four-person, moderate income household. The policies and programs in this element are designed to provide affordable housing within these income limits, which are updated annually by the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Special Housing Needs

- 2436 The housing needs numbers from ABAG address only overall housing need and affordability. However, suitable housing is more than affordable; it also must meet other needs of households. Some special housing needs are defined in the following sections.
- 2437 **Handicapped.** According the 1980 U.S. Census, 122 people living in Portola Valley suffered a "work disability". Of these, 54 were working and 38 were not, although 12 of the 38 could have worked. Also, 61 people had a "public transportation disability" including 49 people 65 years or older. The Center for Independent Living in Belmont provides services for disabled people in San Mateo County. According to its records, the center has no clients in Portola Valley. The town has no data to indicate that housing for handicapped persons is a significant unmet need in town.

- 2438 **Elderly.** Portola Valley's population continues to age. In 1980, 567 people, comprising 14.4 percent of the town's population, were 65 years or older. Based on ABAG's Projections 90, 728 or 16 percent of the 1990 population are 65 or older in 1990 (see Table 2). In 1990, 323 senior citizens lived at Sequoias; the rest (405 people) were living in single-family houses in the community. They probably constitute a majority of the lower income households in the town. Many are undoubtedly living in houses that are much bigger than they want or need. Long-term older residents often have paid-up mortgages or low mortgage payments and, under Proposition 13 provisions, low property taxes. Some literally cannot afford to move. Some residents with long ties to the community may be forced by a shortage of suitable senior housing in town, in any price range, to move out of the area as they get older.
- 2439 The Sequoias, a buy-in retirement community in town operated by the Presbyterian Church, was home to 323 senior citizens in January 1990. The minimum age to enter is 62, but most people are in their 70s when they enter. Current residents average 84 years old and can expect to remain at Sequoias an average of 15 years. The facility provides common dining and medical care geared to various levels of need. The cost to enter ranges from \$39,000 to \$200,000 for housing, three daily meals and medical care for life. In addition, monthly costs range from about \$900 for a studio to \$1400 for a two-bedroom unit. If a resident runs out of resources during his or her tenure, the church subsidizes costs for the rest of his or her life. Seven hundred people are on the waiting list for a place at the Sequoias. Sequoias sent a survey to its residents in January 1990 regarding their incomes. As of February 15, 62.5 percent had replied, indicating that 52, or over one-fourth, had low or very low incomes. Table 9 summarizes the survey results.
- 2440 The Sequoias is interested in increasing its ability to serve the needs of senior citizens, particularly lower income seniors, in Portola Valley through possible expansion at its current site or some other site in town, through provision of services to help older people stay in their homes as long as they wish, and through support for possible shared housing or congregate care arrangements in town. Town officials have discussed and will continue to discuss these and other issues with the Sequoia staff and other county organizations that provide services to the elderly as part of their commitment to help meet the housing needs of the community's older residents. The long waiting list at the Sequoias is a strong indication of the need for additional housing options for the town's older residents. Housing programs in this element to expand housing choices for elderly people in the town include liberalizing second unit regulations, supporting options for shared living and congregate care, and opening the door to possible expansion of the Sequoias.

Table 9. Incomes of Sequoia Residents by Type of Unit

<i>Single People Type of Unit</i>	<i>Very Low* <\$17,350</i>	<i>Low* <\$23,800</i>	<i>Above Low* \$23,800+</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Studio	16	12	22	50
1 Bedroom	2	10	35	47
2 Bedroom			7	7
<i>Couples (number of people listed) Type of Unit</i>	<i><\$19,800</i>	<i><\$27,200</i>	<i>\$27,200+</i>	
Studio	4		2	6
1 Bedroom	2	4	30	36
2 Bedroom		2	54	56
Total Residents	24	28	150	202

* The survey and classification of Sequoias' residents was done before the February 1990 income limits were released by HCD. These are the February 1989 income limits for one- and two-person households in San Mateo County.

- 2441 **Large Households.** Most of the housing in town is well-suited to large families. In 1980, about 80 percent of the housing units had 6 or more rooms. During the 1980s, new construction added larger houses to the town. In the early part of the decade, new houses ranged in size from 2,500 to 4,000 square feet with an average about 3,500 square feet. This was the time when most of the houses at Portola Valley Ranch were built. In the late 1980s, most applications were for houses between 4,500 and 6,000 square feet, with an average over 5,000 square feet. Increasingly, the town is facing proposals to tear down existing houses to construct very large new ones. The town has enough houses for large households and there is no information to indicate a significant unmet need.
- 2442 **Farmworkers.** The 1980 U.S. Census shows 37 Portola Valley residents working in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and mining. Twenty-three list their occupation as farming, forestry and fishing. ABAG's Projections 90 estimates the subregion had 205 jobs in agriculture and mining in 1980, which will decrease to 190 in 1990. Webb Ranch, on unincorporated land owned by Stanford University, is the major employer of farmworkers in the subregion. Farmworker housing is provided on the ranch. No significant need for farmworker housing has been identified within Portola Valley.
- 2443 **Female-headed Households.** The 1980 U.S. Census shows that 137 households or 11.1 percent of all households in Portola Valley were headed by women. Of these, 61 were one-person households, 59 family households and 17 non-family households. The census also shows that 13 families in Portola Valley had incomes below the poverty line in 1980, and that 7 of these were headed by women. Households headed by

women typically have less income than households headed by men. In Portola Valley, most are probably composed of widows and divorced women, often with dependent children. Thirty-eight of the family households headed by women in 1980 had children under 18. A local realtor estimates that most of the rooms rented in town are in houses owned by single women, often recently divorced and maintaining a home on a reduced income. In this way, they are providing shelter at much more affordable rates than typical in town, while at the same time meeting their own housing needs. The housing stock is suitable and housing is available in town for households headed by women. There is no information available to indicate a significant unmet need.

- 2444 **Homeless.** A survey of the three local churches was conducted in summer 1989 to identify the homeless. The results are:

Our Lady of the Wayside identified one homeless person living in the town and noted that, in a typical six month period, six to eight transients come to the door and are assisted.

Portola Valley Presbyterian identified one homeless person who lives in a chicken coop and works for various people in town. Once in a while, homeless people pass through the town and ask the church for handouts which the church provides.

Christ Church was unaware of any homeless people in town. A few transients pass through and ask for handouts. The church has a small budget to help the homeless and provides food and lodging for a night. Churches in Portola Valley offer limited assistance. They are not directly facing a large need and are able to address the need as it arises. No town policies or regulations constrain their assistance to the homeless.

- 2445 **Rehabilitation.** The needs analysis identifies very little need for rehabilitation or of existing housing units. However, the program to legalize existing second units is an effort to conserve that important part of both the rental and affordable housing stock. Up to 56 to 85 units could be legalized; 42 to 64 of them affordable. The amnesty period will be between 1990 and 1995.

- 2446 **Affordability for Subsidized Units.** The town currently has no housing units subsidized with public funds, and therefore no need to protect the affordability of subsidized units.

Sites Suitable for Housing

Government Code Section 65583: "The element shall contain all of the following: . . . (3) An inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for

redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites."

- 2447 Under the current general plan, Portola Valley has land available for about 300 additional housing units. At a development rate of 15 units per year, this is enough land for the next 20 years. Table 10 summarizes the town's capacity to accommodate additional housing on vacant land in each of the nine residential areas within the town limits. The capacities are based on the general plan, zoning ordinance and land use regulations. The town's regulations adjust permitted density according to slope and hillside stability characteristics. Geologic investigations undertaken prior to development may indicate that more or fewer units can be built on a site. These regulations play an increasingly important role in determining the town's development potential as most of the flat and stable land has already been developed. Also, the town requires setbacks from the San Andreas fault consistent with the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act. Much of the potential in the R-1 areas is on scattered single lots dispersed throughout the older developed part of town. Most of the vacant lots in Woodside Highlands cannot be developed now because they are inadequate for on-site septic systems and the area is not served by sewers. Planning is underway to bring sewers to this part of town, but construction is unlikely to be completed by 1995. The potential in the Upper Western Hills is seriously constrained by slope and unstable hillsides and in the Lower Western Hills by unstable slopes and the San Andreas fault.

Table 10. Housing Capacity by Residential Area, May 1990

<i>Residential Area</i>	<i>Zoning and Minimum Lot Size</i>	<i>Total Capacity</i>	<i>Existing Units</i>	<i>Remaining Units</i>
1 Brookside	R-1 (15,000 s.f.)	185	181	4
2 Woodside Highlands	R-1 (20,000 s.f. to 1 ac.)	99	90	9
3 Portola Redwoods	R-1 (20,000 s.f.)	33	30	3
6 Willowbrook	R-E (1 acre)	55	54	1
7 Arrowhead/Alpine etc.	R-E (1 acre)	620	547	73
8 Westridge	R-E (2 to 2.5 ac.)	317	267	50
9 Portola Valley Ranch	PC (2 acres)	242 (205 PVR)	196	46
11 Lower Western Hills	R-E (2 acres)	124	54	70
12 Upper Western Hills	M-R (3 acres)	57	10	47
<i>Housing Units</i>		1,732	1,429	303

Source: William Spangle and Associates, Inc., Memorandum re holding capacity revisions, June 14, 1990, reclassified by planning area, August 1990.

- 2448 There is little potential for redevelopment in the town. The town has two small commercial areas, but most of the land is developed or

approved for development for commercial uses. Some owners are removing older single family homes and replacing them with larger and more lavish homes. This trend decreases, rather than increases, affordability. The town does not have any surplus public lands. The school site and Town Center are fully utilized.

- 2449 Under market conditions, one would expect 75 to 100 of these potential housing units to be built in the five years from 1990 to 1995 – none of them affordable to moderate, low or very low income households. Increasing density alone will not lead to affordable housing units. Because of the desirability of Portola Valley as a place to live, units at any density would be priced beyond the affordable range. This element sets forth three programs to overcome this very strong market condition and make sites available for affordable housing. The programs, described in detail in the section, "Housing Programs and Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995", are: (1) adoption of inclusionary lot requirements, (2) provision for multifamily affordable housing, and (3) adoption of new second unit regulations. Sites made available for affordable housing under each of these programs are described in the following sections.

Inclusionary Lots

- 2450 The town will require that 15 percent of the lots in all new subdivisions of seven lots or more be provided at no cost to the town for affordable housing. In subdivisions of fewer than seven lots, the subdivider may chose to provide either one lot or an in lieu payment of 15 percent of the value of the improved lots. A density bonus of 10 percent would be granted to subdividers required to provide the inclusionary lots. Up to four attached or detached housing units would be permitted on each inclusionary lot. The lots would be transferred by the town to a non-profit housing corporation for development of the units. Deed restrictions to keep the units affordable will be placed on the sale of the units. As shown in Table 11 and on the map in Appendix 8, eight properties in town have the potential for subdivisions of seven or more lots. With the inclusionary requirement, these eight properties provide a maximum of 26 lots for development of 104 affordable housing units.

Table 11. Potential Subdivisions with 7 or More Lots

Properties	Acres	Lots Permitted	15% Inclusionary		10% Bonus Lots*	Total Lots	Probable Timing
			Lots*	Units			
Melchor	228	28	4	16	2	30	after 1995
Morshead	356	24	3	12	2	26	after 1995
Corte Madera	209	22	3	12	2	24	after 1995
Fogarty	215	18	2	8	1	19	after 1995
P.V. Estates	264	27	4	16	2	29	1990-95
Stanford	89	27	4	16	2	29	1990-95
Woods	78	23	3	12	2	25	after 1995
Priory	26	23	3	12	2	25	after 1995
	1,465	192	26	104	15	207	

* Fractions of lots are disregarded. The program provides for an in lieu payment for fractional inclusionary lots. Fractional bonus lots may be used to partly offset in lieu payments.

2451 The capacity of the eight properties under current zoning and regulations is 192 units. The number of building sites is low relative to the acreage because most of the land is very difficult to develop. These sites have geologic problems, difficult access, lack of sewers, steep slopes, or other constraints that make reasonably safe development difficult and expensive. However, all the properties have areas within them which are safe for development. With careful subdivision design and clustering of units, the bonus lots, plus fully improved sites for inclusionary housing can be provided on these properties. Development of these parcels could occur anytime, but only one, Portola Valley Estates, is considered highly likely to be developed within the time frame of this element (1990-95). A second, the Stanford Wedge, is also considered by the town as a possibility in the 1990-95 period. These two properties could result in the creation of 58 lots, an annual average of 11.6 lots. This rate of subdivision is supported by the fact that from 1975 to 1990 an average of 20 lots were created per year.

Sites for Multifamily Affordable Housing

2452 With adoption of this element, the town creates a designation allowing multifamily affordable housing as an option on three sites: The Sequoias, Woodside Priory, and Stanford Wedge (see map in Appendix 8). The option can be exercised only for the purpose of providing affordable housing. Multifamily affordable development can occur on Woodside Priory or Stanford Wedge through the PUD process and at The Sequoias through amendment of the existing conditional use permit which controls development on the site. The total floor area of multifamily

development on each site would under no circumstances exceed that permitted for single homes, and should probably be less. The overall size, density, design and siting of any proposed multifamily project shall be carefully evaluated prior to approval to ensure that environmental impacts are within acceptable levels. All the potential sites have suitable infrastructure (road capacity, sewers, water, etc.) to accommodate multifamily development within the limits set forth below:

- 2453 **The Sequoias.** The Sequoias Retirement Community, built before the town was incorporated, contains a multifamily development of 226 independent living units for senior citizens. Northern California Presbyterian Homes, Inc., which owns and operates the Sequoias, wishes to expand, but the San Andreas Fault and landslide deposits severely limit expansion possibilities. There are, however, approximately 2.5 acres of vacant land which can be considered for expansion. The maximum density permitted would be 20 units per acre. Assuming geologic studies show that all 2.5 acres can be developed, the site could accommodate up to 50 new units.
- 2454 **The Woodside Priory.** The Woodside Priory, a Catholic boys boarding school, has received lands adjacent to its original holdings in town which are not dedicated solely for educational purposes. The Priory has expressed interest in selling and/or developing some or all of these lands. The school and town are specifically interested in affordable housing. As noted in Table 11, however, the site could alternatively be developed for single family housing. The available lands total 26.3 acres which are zoned R-E 1 with a minimum lot size of 1 acre. Applying slope-density regulations yields a total capacity of 23 lots with a total maximum permitted floor area of 105,202 square feet. Other site factors or the application of other town regulations may indicate development at less than the theoretical maximum based on floor area alone.
- 2455 The town intends that multifamily development on Priory lands be located close to and with access from Portola Road. A significant open space buffer would need to be maintained between any multifamily development on Priory lands and adjacent residential lots. Development of the property should be located, designed, and landscaped to preserve the scenic quality of the site, particularly as viewed from Portola Road.
- 2456 **Stanford Wedge.** This 89-acre site, owned by Stanford University, is located on Alpine Road between Westridge Drive and Golden Oaks. Although much of the parcel is very steep, a portion located near Alpine Road appears suitable for multifamily development. The parcel is zoned R-E with a 3.5 acre minimum lot size and can accommodate up to a maximum of 27 single family homes with a maximum floor area of 186,759 square feet under current town regulations. Under the

multifamily affordable housing option, multifamily development could not exceed this floor area. A reasonable number of units for the property might be significantly less when all site factors, neighboring land uses and traffic, are taken into consideration.

- 2457 The 89-acre Stanford Wedge is also listed on Table 11 as a potential subdivision. If Stanford decides to have the property developed, it has the option of a single family residential subdivision or a multifamily affordable housing project. Since this decision is largely up to Stanford, the housing element recognizes both options. Town policy, however, is to encourage the multifamily affordable housing alternative. The town favors a cluster development for this site with housing units concentrated on about five acres near, but well screened from, Alpine Road and the remainder of the site maintained as common open space. No access to the site would be permitted from other than Alpine Road.

Sites for Second Units

- 2458 Second housing units, either attached to the main residence or in a separate structure, provide much-needed rental housing that is often within the reach of moderate, low and, sometimes, very low income households. Under current town regulations, guest houses (second units) without kitchens are permitted only on parcels with one or more acres and guest houses with kitchens are permitted on parcels with two or more acres. No guest houses are permitted on lots with less than one acre. Guest houses with kitchens are permitted on the 535 lots in zoning districts requiring two or more acres per housing unit (see Table 10). The town has issued permits for 25 such units since the ordinance permitting them was adopted in 1979. Town regulations will be changed to permit, with a conditional use permit, second units with kitchens on all parcels of one acre or more (see map in Appendix 8). This will allow second units on another 675 lots with one to two acres, more than doubling the number of lots available for second units. An amnesty program to legalize existing second units will also be put into effect as described in Program 4.

Constraints on Housing

Government Code, Section 65583: (4) Analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures. (5) Analysis of potential and actual non-governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or

development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction.

Government Constraints

- 2459 The town's ability to provide adequate sites for affordable housing is constrained by its policies and regulations based on environmental factors, slope and geologic hazards, lack of infrastructure and ability to provide public services, and, to some extent, by county and regional planning policies. These primary constraints are discussed below, along with less important constraints related to processing of development applications, fees and exactions.
- 2460 **Policies and Regulations.** The town's development policies have evolved over the years in direct response to the town's beautiful and varied natural environment. A major goal of all planning in the town is to permit development in a way that preserves the natural environment, protects natural drainage and maintains the rural character of the town. The resulting policies and regulations, which preclude multifamily residential projects, constrain the ability to provide affordable housing in town.
- 2461 The town's geologic setting is a major determinant of its policies. Starting in 1965, the town has evolved an innovative and systematic approach to regulating development of lands crossed by the San Andreas fault and dotted with steep and unstable slopes. The regulations, which have become models for ordinances adopted by other jurisdictions in California and in other states, control the uses of land and the intensity of development according to slope and geologic characteristics. The basic regulations include a slope-density system, setbacks from the San Andreas fault and land use limitations based on landslide hazards. The town has detailed slope, fault and landslide potential maps to support the regulations. The maps can be changed based on more accurate and detailed information from site investigations.
- 2462 As the town reaches buildout, the development potential is increasingly affected by the geologic regulations. Most of the remaining vacant land is in steep and often hazardous terrain. The Upper and Lower Western Hillsides, which contain most of the undeveloped land in the town, are very steep; approximately 70 percent of the land has slopes greater than 30 percent and 25 percent has slopes greater than 50 percent. Slope density provisions encourage concentration of development on the flatter portions of the large holdings in these areas. The provisions lead to safer, more easily accessible and more efficiently served development than might occur otherwise.

- 2463 To mitigate constraints deriving from plans and regulations, the town is making major changes in policy: 1) requiring subdividers to provide 15 percent of their lots for affordable housing, 2) adopting a multifamily affordable zoning option as part of its Planned Unit Development regulations and 3) liberalizing second unit regulations (see "Sites Suitable for Housing" and "Housing Programs and Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995").
- 2464 **Public Service Constraints.** The level of public services provided by the town is geared to a small dispersed population. Many of the roads are narrow and winding with restricted capacity. Limited bus service is provided by Samtrans along Portola and Alpine roads and in the Westridge area. Only a portion of the town is served by sanitary sewers. On-site disposal systems are used in much of the town and, in many areas, successful disposal requires large sites because of adverse soils and drainage conditions. Most local public services are provided by special districts or San Mateo County under contract. Woodside Fire Protection District provides fire protection services. Police services are provided by the Woodside Patrol and County Sheriff. Building inspection is provided by the County. The town has limited control over the quality or quantity of these services.
- 2465 The town government operates on a minimal budget with no city manager and a staff of only seven full-time people. It relies heavily on volunteer efforts for many public functions. The town's ability to undertake major programs to provide housing is severely constrained by fiscal realities. These constraints affect the timing of development and the ability of the town to take on housing programs with high administrative costs.
- 2466 To mitigate the constraints pertaining to public services, this element provides for affordable housing on sites already provided with services or in new subdivisions in which infrastructure will be provided as part of the development. The town will look to nonprofit housing organizations, such as the Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, and San Mateo County to help administer housing programs. In lieu fees collected as part of the inclusionary lot program might be used to help cover costs of administering housing programs.
- 2467 **Regional Role and County Planning Policies.** The town's low-density development is consistent with policies of the Association of Bay Area Governments fostering a "city-centered" pattern of urban development with emphasis on in-filling. ABAG's Regional Plan 1980 contains this statement relevant to the Portola Valley area:

Throughout this planning area there are relatively limited opportunities to support added population growth. Most vacant

residential land is located in hillside areas which lack urban services and where environmental conditions may preclude all but very low density and high cost units. (p. Sub-area 1-2)

In fact, the town also has an important, and growing, role in providing open space for the region. The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District now owns over 1100 acres of public open space with the town limits. The district lands are available for hiking and other low-intensity open space uses and attract people from all over the region. The low density housing pattern and the clustering of development in the town serves to protect this important regional resource. Portola Valley's low-density character is also consistent with the San Mateo County Master Plan. This plan contains the following principles for residential communities:

- a) The highest population densities should occur in relatively level areas close to major centers of commerce and industry where coordinated development is possible and where transportation and other necessary public facilities can readily be provided.
- b) Population density should decrease as the distance from district centers, industrial areas, and employment centers increases.
- c) Population density should decrease as distance from local service facilities increases.
- d) Population density should decrease as steepness of terrain increases.
- e) The lowest densities and largest lots should occur on steep hillsides or in mountainous areas where it is necessary to limit storm runoff, prevent erosion, preserve existing vegetation, protect watersheds, and maintain the scenic quality of the terrain.

2468 To mitigate constraints pertaining to regional and county planning, the town has chosen programs to make sites available for affordable housing which when developed will be largely consistent with the rural and open space character of the town. The proposed programs permit little increase in floor area permitted in the town, except for the possible 15 bonus lots under the inclusionary lot program. More and smaller units will be permitted within the currently allowed floor area.

2469 **Building Code.** The town adopted the 1988 Uniform Building Code in March 1990. No unusual building regulations have been adopted. Enforcement is handled by San Mateo County inspectors under contract with the town.

- 2470 **Site Improvements.** The site improvement requirements in the town are appropriate for low-density, rural residential development with an emphasis on preservation of natural features and limiting excessive paving. For example, usually street lights and concrete curbs, gutters and sidewalks are not required. These requirements will apply to affordable housing constructed under any of the housing programs, but are not expected to be a constraint. The amount of building coverage will not be significantly greater than already permitted.
- 2471 **Fees and Exactions.** The town sets fees to cover the actual costs of processing development applications. Planning, engineering and geologic review are provided by consultants who charge the town for services. These costs, which can be substantial for complicated projects, are passed on to applicants. For the typical house being built in Portola Valley, the fees are a minor part of the applicant's costs and an insignificant percent of the value created by approvals. Selected fees and deposits for services required to evaluate applications are listed in Table 12. They are comparable to fees charged in other nearby communities. Fees are retained by the town. Deposits are used to the extent necessary to cover services of consultants including the town engineer, town geologist and town planner. Exactions required by the town are drainage fees, easements or in lieu fees for parks and open space, and off-site improvements made necessary by the development. Amounts depend on the specifics of each project.
- 2472 It will be difficult for the town to waive fees and deposits entirely for affordable housing projects because of the routine use of outside consultants and reliance on the fees to cover the cost of the services provided. To mitigate constraints pertaining to fees and exactions, the town is prepared to set aside in lieu fees collected from the inclusionary lot program to help reduce fees and/or exactions for nonprofit housing developers of multifamily affordable projects on the three possible sites.
- 2473 **Processing and Permit Procedures.** The town's processing and permit procedures effectively protect the community interest while permitting safe and responsible construction, additions and remodeling on private property. A key aspect is the requirement for geologic investigations to ensure safe development in areas of the town mapped as potentially hazardous. If geologic or seismic hazards are found, this can add significantly to the time required for processing an application. A typical subdivision application, without an EIR, is normally processed in 3 to 6 months. If an EIR is required, processing will more likely take 6 to 12 months. A building permit application for a new house or major addition is typically processed in 4 to 6 weeks. The town's processing and permit procedures do not constitute a significant constraint to the provision of affordable housing.

Table 12. Selected Housing Development Fees in Portola Valley

	Filing Fees	Deposit for Services
Zoning Permits		
Conditional Use Permit – standard	\$ 1,050	\$ 2,000
Conditional Use Permit – guest house	400	2,000
Variances	650	750
Planned Unit Development	2,000	2,000
Site Development Permits		
Grading 50-100 cu.yds.	\$ 275	\$ 500
100-500 cu.yds.	550	1,000
500 + cu.yds.	1,050	1,500
Geology Review	50	1,000
Building Permits		
ASCC Review – new residence	\$ 50	\$ 500
modifications/additions	50	500
Plan Review	65	0
Geology	50	1,000
Building Permit Fee	based on valuation per 1976 UBC	
Plan Check	75% of Building Permit Fee	
Subdivisions (total for preliminary, tentative and final maps)		
1 - 4 lots	\$ 1,950	\$ 3,500
5 - 14 lots	2,350	4,200
15 - 24 lots	2,600	4,900
25 - 40 lots	3,150	6,200
over 40 lots	3,600+	6,950

Source: Town of Portola Valley, "Building and Other Fees", "Zoning and Site Development Fees" and "Subdivision Fees", July 31, 1989.

Nongovernmental Constraints

2474

Nongovernmental constraints that can affect a community's ability to provide suitable sites for affordable housing include the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction. In Portola Valley, the availability of financing for purchase, rehabilitation or repair of housing is not a constraint. No information exists to suggest that any financial institution places restrictions on loans secured by Portola Valley property. The price of land and costs of construction in Portola Valley are not significantly higher than in other areas of the Peninsula. However, the desirability of Portola Valley as a place to live has led to exceptionally high housing prices which are high regardless of the underlying costs for land and construction. This is the single most important constraint, governmental or nongovernmental, to the provision of affordable housing in town.

- 2475 Opportunities for rural-style living close to jobs and urban amenities are few, and growing fewer, in the Bay Area. The result is that housing in the town commands high, and rapidly increasing, prices. In 1986, the average price of a house sold in Portola Valley was \$511,957; by 1989, the average price was \$860,948 (Cornish and Carey, February 1990). This is an increase of 68 percent in three years. Undeveloped land in Portola Valley currently sells for between \$600,000 to \$700,000 per acre. Although this seems very high, it is comparable to the cost of land in the more urbanized flatlands of the Peninsula.
- 2476 The challenge from the town's perspective is to provide affordable housing opportunities in face of extreme market pressure, while at the same time preserving the characteristics that make Portola Valley a desirable place to live. The town's housing programs attempt to mitigate the effects of these market conditions. The inclusionary lot program is designed to make land available for affordable housing at no cost to nonprofit housing developers. The multifamily affordable housing option allows increased density, reducing costs per unit so that specific institutional land owners can provide affordable housing. And the liberalization of the second unit program increases the number of homeowners who can construct a second unit with essentially no land cost. Further, the town will ensure permanent control of resale prices or rents of affordable units built on inclusionary lots and all multifamily affordable units. It does not intend to control rents on second units, but by limiting unit sizes, it hopes to keep most rents within the affordable range.

Goals and Policies

Government Code, Section 65583: The element shall contain all of the following: . . . (b) "A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

- 2477 Goals
1. To maintain and enhance the character and quality of Portola Valley's residential neighborhoods and the condition of its housing.
 2. To accommodate new residential development in a manner compatible with the rural character of existing residential development.
 3. To control the location, design and density of new residential development consistent with preserving regional open spaces,

avoiding areas of seismic and geologic hazards, and ensuring the adequate provision of safe access and public services.

4. To provide opportunities for people of all income levels and with special housing needs, particularly elderly residents and those employed in Portola Valley, to live in the town.
5. To accept and fulfill responsibility for a reasonable share of the regional need for affordable housing.

2478

Policies*

1. All housing units in the town shall conform to the principles and standards set forth in the general plan and town regulations.
2. The town will continue to participate in regional and county efforts to increase the availability of affordable housing in the region and county.
3. The town will adopt an inclusionary lot program requiring that at least 15 percent of all lots in subdivisions be deeded to the town for affordable housing. The program will grant the subdivider a density bonus of 10 percent and establish a system of in lieu fees for fractional lots and subdivisions of fewer than 7 lots. Floor area constructed on any inclusionary lot shall not exceed the floor area permitted for a single family home on the lot, but could include up to four attached or detached affordable housing units. Deed restrictions to keep these units affordable will be placed on the units.
4. The town will establish a special affordable housing fund to reserve in lieu fees, collected pursuant to Policy 3. Moneys in the fund may be used to help write down the costs of land or construction for affordable housing projects, reduce or waive fees and deposits for nonprofit housing developers, cover the cost of administering housing programs or pay for other programs determined by the town council to increase housing opportunities in town for very low, low and moderate income households.
5. The town will amend the planned unit development regulations to permit multifamily affordable housing projects on sites identified in the general plan for that purpose. Such projects must be accessed from Alpine or Portola roads, served by sewers, located and constructed to avert geologic and seismic hazards, and designed to

* This section corresponds to the "principles" sections in other elements of the general plan..

be fully compatible with surrounding development and the rural character of the town.

6. The town will cooperate with housing developers interested in constructing affordable housing on the identified sites in town. The town will waive fees and deposits for review of affordable housing projects to the extent possible given the small town budget and reliance on fees to pay for essential services.
7. The town will encourage construction of housing which provides housing opportunities for low and moderate income families, particularly elderly residents and people employed in the town.
8. The town will amend its regulations governing second units to permit second units with kitchens on residential parcels of one acre or more and allow second units to be rented.
9. The town will adopt an amnesty program allowing the legalization of existing nonconforming second units in order to conserve this important part of the existing affordable housing supply. The program will establish standards for units to be legalized which are more liberal than the standards in the new second unit regulations. The opportunity for owners to legalize second units will run for about a year, after which all second units permitted in town must conform to town standards.
10. The town will continue to permit manufactured housing and mobile homes in all residential districts subject to the same design and siting conditions that pertain to other single family houses in the zoning district.
11. The town will adopt procedures for granting density bonuses pursuant to Government Code Section 65915.
12. The town will coordinate with San Mateo County and nonprofit organizations serving the county in addressing the housing problems of special populations, such as the homeless and disabled. The town will participate in the Human Investment Project shared living program.
13. The town will refer families to the three churches as they continue to provide emergency food and shelter.
14. The town will comply with all federal and state laws protecting equal housing opportunity for all people and coordinate with MCFH in handling complaints.

15. The town will continue to contract with San Mateo County and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to participate in the Community Development Block Grant Program, thereby increasing the county's share of block grant funds to be used to aid low and moderate income persons.
16. The town will administer these policies to encourage achieving up to the housing needs numbers for very low, low and moderate income categories contained in Table 7. If the town meets its housing needs numbers before 1995, it will review the housing element and amend policies and/or programs as appropriate. In 1995, the town will consider new needs numbers and reevaluate its housing element.

Housing Programs and Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995

Government Code, Section 65583: "The element shall contain all of the following: . . . (c) A program which sets forth a five-year schedule of actions the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element through administration of land use and development controls, provision of regulatory concessions and incentives, and the utilization of appropriate federal and state financing and subsidy programs when available."

- 2479 The town will pursue several programs to implement its goals and policies. The actions contained in this program will pave the way for construction of some affordable housing in the town. These actions set the stage for efforts to provide affordable housing continuing past 1995. The program calls for key ordinance changes in 1990 and 1991. Once the town has adopted these measures, the emphasis for the rest of the time period will be on handling projects as they come and monitoring the effects of the changes on production of affordable housing. The most important of these are the programs specifically designed to increase the availability of sites for affordable housing and to conserve the existing affordable housing stock, consisting almost entirely of second units. These and other programs are described below. Wherever relevant, quantified objectives are listed at the end of each program description.

Program 1. Inclusionary Lot Requirements

- 2480 In all new subdivisions of land, 15 percent of the lots created shall be provided to the town at no cost as sites for the construction of affordable housing. The lots shall be fully improved with infrastructure, ready for development and an integral part of the whole subdivision. The town

intends to provide the lots at no cost to a nonprofit housing corporation for the actual development and management of the sale and resale of affordable housing. At the time of transfer of an inclusionary lot from the town to a nonprofit corporation, the town shall, through the PUD process, describe terms and conditions that will pertain to the intensity, siting and design of the development; the process for obtaining development approval; and the town's position on the income levels of eligible purchasers, the control of resale prices and priorities for occupancy. Features of the program include:

1. **Floor Area Limitation.** Development on an inclusionary lot shall not exceed the floor area permitted on a lot for a single family house, but may consist of up to four attached or detached housing units.
2. **Development Conditions.** The affordable housing shall be integrated within the subdivision with design and architecture compatible with the market units. It is expected that requirements pertaining to construction of a single family house, such as setbacks, height limits, and impervious surface limitations will pertain to the inclusionary lots.
3. **Approval Process.** The design of all developments will be subject to PUD control and approval by bodies designated by the town council. Final approval of projects will rest with the town council.
4. **Sale and Resale of Units.** Units must be made available to households of low and moderate incomes. The town expects that most will be sold to first-time home buyers rather than rented. Resale prices should be controlled by deed restrictions so that the units continue to serve the same income category as turnovers occur. In general, the town favors giving priority for the affordable housing to people who live and work in the town.
5. **In Lieu Fee.** In subdivisions less than 7 lots and for fractional lot requirements in subdivisions of 7 or more lots, a subdivider may choose to provide either one lot or pay an in lieu fee for the fraction of a required inclusionary lot. The in lieu fee will be set based on the market value of a fully-improved lot. The town will place the in lieu fees in a special affordable housing fund which shall be used to reduce fees and deposits for a nonprofit housing developer, help write down the cost of land for a multifamily affordable housing project, cover costs to administer housing programs and pay for other programs designed to increase housing choices in the town.
6. **Density Bonus.** The town will grant a density bonus of 10 percent to subdividers required to provide at least one inclusionary lot. The

bonus would not apply to subdivisions of fewer than 7 lots. A system will be developed by which fractions of bonus lots can be used to partially offset required in lieu fees.

Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995

- 2481 As noted in Table 11, this program applies to eight undeveloped properties in town with a potential for 26 inclusionary lots and 104 affordable housing units. Between 1990 and 1995, one property is expected to be subdivided – PV Estates. A second property, the Stanford Wedge, is a potential candidate. A subdivision plan is currently being prepared for the PV Estates property with a potential for 27 lots. Four inclusionary lots with a capacity of 16 affordable units will be provided. The Stanford Wedge would also produce four inclusionary lots with a potential of 16 inclusionary units. The town would seek development of half of the units for moderate income households and half for low income households. Thus, the quantified objectives for 1990 to 1995, depending on whether one or two subdivisions take place, are:

Moderate income housing units	8 - 16
<u>Low income housing units</u>	<u>8 - 16</u>
Total affordable units	16 - 32

Program 2. Multifamily Affordable Housing

- 2482 Multifamily affordable housing projects will be permitted on the three sites described in this element – The Sequoias, Woodside Priory and the Stanford Wedge. It is expected that most such projects will be undertaken by a nonprofit housing developer also equipped to handle long-term management. This program has the following features:

1. **Planned Unit Developments.** The town will amend its planned unit development regulations to permit multifamily housing on the two designated sites according to the general guidelines contained in the site descriptions under "Sites for Affordable Housing". As mentioned previously, the third site, the Sequoias, is controlled by a conditional use permit. The PUD or CUP for a multifamily affordable housing project shall control the siting and design of projects, the mix of units by income category of eligible occupants, methods of controlling rents and/or resale prices, provisions for ongoing management of the project and other matters deemed appropriate by the town.
2. **Inclusion of Market Rate Units.** The purpose of this program is to provide affordable (below market rate) housing. The town may permit the inclusion of market rate units in a project, if it

determines they are necessary to make a project feasible. However, substantially over half the units in any multifamily project must be affordable to moderate, low and very low income households according to guidelines issued annually by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

3. **Floor Area.** The floor area in multifamily affordable housing projects shall not exceed that total floor area which would be permitted for the total number of single family houses which would be allowed on the property under existing zoning. The town expects that most projects will include considerably less floor area than this maximum.
4. **Development Conditions.** All multifamily affordable housing projects are expected to meet all the normal zoning, subdivision and site development requirements that pertain to all residential development in the town, including Resolution 500. Particular care is expected to ensure the compatibility of the projects with adjacent neighborhoods and the town's rural environment.
5. **Occupancy.** The town considers this program particularly suited to providing housing for senior citizens and rental housing for households with incomes in the very low to low categories. If units are provided for sale, resale controls to preserve affordability will be required.

Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995.

2483 The town expects that one of the three sites will be developed for multifamily affordable housing between 1990 and 1995. Northern California Presbyterian Homes, Inc., a nonprofit housing corporation of the Presbyterian Church which owns and operates The Sequoias, is now actively exploring options to expand its existing facilities. This expansion might take place at the existing site, or even possibly at the Woodside Priory. Between 1990-1995, it is reasonably likely that about 50 units will be added to the Sequoias, distributed by income category as follows:

Moderate income units	10
Low income units	20
<u>Very low income units</u>	<u>20</u>
Total affordable units	50

Program 3. Second Units

2484 Regulations governing the construction and occupancy of second units on single family lots will be liberalized to provide additional housing opportunities in town for very low, low and moderate income

households. The town's development pattern is well-suited to providing affordable housing through second units on developed single-family parcels either as separate structures or attached to the main house. Most lots in town are large enough to accommodate second units and associated parking without significant visual or environmental impact.

2485

Second units provide housing at a cost well below that of single-family houses; however, the rents do not always meet the HUD definitions of affordable. Average current market rents range from about \$750 to \$1500. As required by the town, most units are occupied by family members and household employees, often at reduced or no rent. It is reasonable to assume that at least 75 percent of the second units are affordable to moderate, low and very low income households with the numbers about evenly distributed among the income categories. In order to encourage the provision of affordable housing, the town's guest house regulations will be revised to permit guest houses with kitchens on one- to two-acre lots. In addition, the new regulations will have the following features:

1. **Type and size.** Under the new regulations, whether a second unit can be attached to or detached from the main residence depends on the lot size as follows:

Lot Size	Attached	Detached
1.0 to 2.0 acres	yes	maybe*
2.0 + acres	yes	yes

* If the result is a superior design which causes less adverse impact on neighboring properties than an attached unit would.

In adopting ordinance revisions, the town will consider allowing second units larger than 600 square feet but in no case larger than 750 square feet.

2. **Site Coverage.** The floor area of the second unit shall be counted as part of the floor area permitted for a single family residence on the lot.
3. **Occupancy.** Currently, town regulations require that guest houses be occupied by no more than two persons who have a relationship with the owner, such as a family member or someone providing a service. A new provision will require that the owner maintain residence in either the main residence or the second unit. Also, owners of second units will be required to report annually to the town about type of occupancy, and indicate any payment in-kind or monetarily in partial exchange for occupancy.
4. **Conditions for Approval.** As in the existing regulations, a conditional use permit will be required to construct a second unit.

In approving a new second unit, the following findings, in addition to the standard use permit findings, must be made:

- a. The second unit will not substantially block distant views enjoyed by neighboring properties.
- b. The second unit will not substantially negatively affect neighboring properties.
- c. The second unit will be in keeping with the character and quality of the neighborhood.

Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995.

2486 As described in the section, "Sites Suitable for Housing", it is anticipated that this program will about double the potential number of second units in town. Under the old regulations, an average of 2.5 second units per year was constructed between 1979 and 1989. However, that rate dropped off to slightly under 2 per year after 1984. With the changes in regulations, an average of 3 to 4 second units per year might be expected. At this rate, 15 to 20 second units would be added from 1990 to 1995. As noted above, about 25 percent would be expected in each income category. The quantified objectives by income category are:

Above moderate income units	3 - 5
Moderate income units	4 - 5
Low income units	4 - 5
<u>Very low income units</u>	<u>4 - 5</u>
Total units	15 - 20

Program 4. Amnesty for Illegal Second Units

2487 It is generally known that many second units have been built without permits and that kitchen facilities are illegally provided in some. Based on data from the Multiple Listing Service, 13.8 percent of the houses listed for sale in Portola Valley in 1988 and 1989 had second units (30 second units on 218 properties). At this rate, the town could have up to 167 units on the 1,210 lots of 1 acre or larger, excluding Portola Valley Ranch. Twenty-five of these are legal, leaving at least 142 illegal second units. In order to preserve this important part of the existing affordable housing stock in town while at the same time ensuring habitable conditions, the town will conduct an amnesty program to identify and place under permit existing illegal second units which meet certain minimum standards. The amnesty period will run for six months to one year and the program will have the following features:

1. **Eligibility by Size and Type.** The criteria to determine eligibility for amnesty based on second unit type and lot size are:

- a. Existing attached or detached second units with kitchens, regardless of the size of the lot, may be legalized as second units.
 - b. On lots of one acre or larger, kitchens may be added to existing attached and detached second units without kitchens and the second units may be legalized.
 - c. The size of the second unit shall not exceed by more than 50 percent the square footage permitted for a new second unit in the zoning district. A smaller maximum size may be imposed when the town council adopts the ordinance instituting the amnesty program.
2. **Standards.** The building inspector must find the second unit is safe and habitable according to standards used by San Mateo County for such purposes as approved by the town.
 3. **Approval Process.** An application for a permit for an existing second unit can be approved by town staff without a public hearing. No fees will be charged to process such applications.
 4. **Occupancy.** The property owner must be a permanent resident of either the main residence or the second unit proposed for legalization.
 5. **Additional Requirements.** The town will establish liberalized requirements regarding parking, setbacks and submittal of plot and building plans. In addition, the town will require annual reporting of rents.

Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995.

2488

If one-third to one-half of the potential 142 second units are legalized during the amnesty period, the program would create an additional 47 to 71 legal second units. The units which have not been counted by the U.S. Census or the California Department of Finance may also be considered as new units for purposes of meeting the town's share of regional housing need. Perhaps half of the units legalized will fall into this category. The expected distribution by income category is the same as for new second units. On these assumptions, the quantified objectives for 1990 to 1995 by income category are:

	Total Legalized	# Considered "New" Units
Above moderate income units	12 - 18	6 - 9
Moderate income units	12 - 18	6 - 9
Low income units	12 - 18	6 - 9
Very low income units	11 - 17	6 - 9
Total units	47 - 71	24 - 36

Optimism regarding success of an amnesty program is based in part on the recent experience of San Mateo County. For the county, approximately 80 percent of the second units which have been approved were approved as a part of the amnesty program.

Program 5. Shared Housing

2489 Low and very low income housing is provided in the town through various shared living arrangements or the renting of rooms in single-family homes, but at present the town has no system to document such units. A local realtor estimates that about 5 percent of the households in Portola Valley rent rooms and that most of them are headed by recently divorced women. This means that housing is being provided for about 75 people, probably at affordable rates. Although rented rooms do not usually meet the HCD definition of a housing unit, they do provide decent and safe living quarters.

2490 The town will support the Human Investment Project (HIP) in making arrangements for shared housing in Portola Valley. A nonprofit organization serving San Mateo County, HIP conducts a program supported by federal, state and city funds to match housing "providers" with housing "seekers." A person with housing space can contact the organization and be "matched" with a suitable person with a need for housing. Rents are established case by case and can sometimes be partly defrayed by services. HIP does have one or two clients in Portola Valley now. Portola Valley will join HIP and seek an agreement to place between two and three very low income or low income persons in houses in the town each year. By joining HIP, the town would help inform residents about this service and help meet the need for affordable housing.

Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995.

2491 At 2 to 3 placements per year, 10 to 15 people might be placed over the 5 year period. By agreement with HIP, all would be low or very low income persons.

Program 6. Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing

2492 Emergency shelter is currently being provided at the three churches in town as needed. These three sites continue to be available for this

purpose. Transitional housing is not provided in the town. No need within the town has been identified. Social services, such as job counseling, drug and alcohol treatment, legal aid, and so forth are not available in town, nor are public resources available to provide them at this time. The town will participate in countywide efforts to provide transitional housing and related services.

Program 7. State-Required Density Bonuses

- 2493 In accord with Government Code Section 65915 Portola Valley will adopt procedures to provide incentives to developers of affordable housing including a 25 percent density bonus and at least one other regulatory concession or incentive.

Program 8. Fair Housing

- 2494 Midpeninsula Citizens for Fair Housing handles complaints of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing and in the mediation of tenant/landlord disputes in Portola Valley under terms of the MCFH contract with San Mateo County. MCFH staff indicates very few complaints are received from the Portola Valley area (personal communication, October 30, 1990). A supply of brochures describing these services is available at Town Hall.

Program 9. Energy Conservation

- 2495 The town supports energy efficient design in all new construction and encourages subdivision design that protects solar access from all lots. Although the town does not require solar installations, its ordinances are permissive and pose no particular barriers. Most new residential development in the town is expected to occur in clusters in the lower portions of the Western Hills. Clustered development is far more energy efficient than large lot subdivisions, saving the energy costs of extending roads and utility service and the day to day costs of fuel for transportation. The town also requires landscaping in new residential developments to consist primarily of native vegetation. This greatly reduces water requirements for landscape maintenance, thereby reducing water and power consumption.

Program 10. Community Development Block Grant Funds

- 2496 The town is part of an "urban county" in San Mateo County which increases the amount the county receives from the Community Development Block Grant Program. The town does not submit applications for projects within the town, preferring to see the funds go to areas with greater needs targeted by the county. These funds support the following programs: Shared Housing, Home Modification Program to

Provide Handicapped Accessibility, Financing Program for the Creation of Second Units, Reverse Mortgage Program for Seniors and Fair Housing Program.

Summary of Five-Year Housing Program

2497 An outline of the five-year housing program is contained in Table 13. The program requirement from the Government Code is listed in the left-hand column; the actions the town will take to implement the housing element are in the middle column and the time frame is in the right-hand column. The table indicates where an item does not need action because it is not identified in the element as a problem or there is too little information to define the problem well enough for action. Some of these may well be action items in future revisions of the housing element. The Portola Valley Town Council, assisted by the planning commission, town committees and town staff, will be responsible for all of the actions cited in the table.

Table 13. Housing Program, 1990-1995

<i>Program Purpose</i>	<i>Program Action</i>	<i>Time Frame</i>
<i>Provide adequate sites (c 1).</i>		
a) Insure total dwelling capacity equal to new construction need.	o No action needed.	n/a
b) Provide sites suitable for a variety of types of housing for all income levels; rental and manufactured housing.	o Program 1 o Program 2 o Program 3	1990 1990-91 1990-91
c) Identify sites for emergency shelters and transitional housing.	o Program 6	1990-95
<i>Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of low and moderate income households (c 2).</i>		
a) Use appropriate federal and state financing and subsidies.	o Programs 1 & 2 o Programs 5 & 10	1991-92 1990-95
b) Provide regulatory concessions and incentives.	o Program 2, 3, & 7 o Program 4	1990-91 1991-92
<i>Address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints (c 3).</i>		
a) Land use controls	o Programs 1, 2, 3, 4	1990-91
b) Building codes	o No action needed.	n/a
c) Site improvements	o No action needed.	n/a
d) Fees and exactions	o Program 1 & 2 o Program 4	1990-95 1991-92
e) Processing and permit procedures	o No action needed.	n/a
<i>Conserve and improve the condition of the existing housing stock (c 4).</i>		
	o Program 4	1991-92
<i>Promote equal housing opportunity (c 5).</i>		
	o Program 8	1990-95

Summary of Quantified Objectives

2498

Table 14 summarizes the quantified objectives pertaining to affordable housing for Programs 1-4 and compares them with Portola Valley's regional share of housing need as analyzed in the section, "ABAG Housing Needs Determination". It is expected that new market-rate construction on available vacant residential land will meet the housing needs of above moderate income households.

Table 14. Quantified Objectives, 1990-1995

	Income Categories			Totals
	Moderate	Low	Very Low	
<i>Allocation to Subregion</i>	27	19	24	70
Assumed by San Mateo County	11	7	9	27
Provided for in Portola Valley	16	12	15	43
<i>Inclusionary Units</i>				
Portola Valley Estates	8	8	0	16
Stanford Wedge	0 - 8	0 - 8	0	0 - 16
<i>Multifamily Affordable Housing</i>				
Sequoias Expansion	0 - 10	0 - 20	0 - 20	0 - 50
New Second Units	4 - 5	4 - 5	4 - 5	12 - 15
Legalized Second Units 6.-9	6 - 9	6 - 9	6 - 9	18 - 27
Total Affordable Units	18 - 40	18 - 50	10 - 34	46 - 124

2499

These quantified objectives are shown as a range since their achievement is fundamentally dependent upon actions by entities other than Portola Valley. The town will, however, put in place programs which greatly encourage the attainment of the objectives. The town is most certain regarding the Portola Valley Estates subdivision and the second units, both new and legalized. The town believes there is a very high probability that the units related to these categories will be added to the affordable housing stock. Subdivision of the Stanford Wedge and expansion of the Sequoias, however, while likely, are less certain. The town knows The Sequoias wants to expand, the question is how this can be done. It is very likely that a solution will be found within the next five years. With respect to the Stanford Wedge, this is land that Stanford is free to sell whereas most of their land cannot be sold. Also, some discussions have been held with Stanford regarding possible development. It is within reason to anticipate development within the next five years. The town believes that its programs provide ample suitable sites with realistic chances of development for the accomplishment of these objectives.