

**From:** [Patrick Shannon](#)  
**To:** [Lisa Natusch](#); [General Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Larry May](#); [Al Royse](#); [Sophie Cole](#); [Christine Krolik](#)  
**Subject:** Comments to affordable housing plan  
**Date:** Monday, August 8, 2022 2:59:40 PM

---

Council members:

Please enter my comments below into the record for tonight's meeting Re Agenda number 9.

Hillsborough is an entirely residential community. That is Hillsborough's hallmark. We have all paid a premium on our homes for that aesthetic environment. The Town must exhaust every possible option to preserve that environment and avoid "re-zoning" any residential area.

The astronomically high new housing allocation to Hillsborough is a problem of the Town's own making and the burden is on the Town to fix it without undermining the character of the Town or impairing our property values. The Town should have negotiated with surrounding areas to adjust the allocation to commercial areas in other jurisdictions or it should have been contested as it is 6-fold the prior allocation to Hillsborough over the last allocation cycle, notwithstanding the fact that the population is decreasing in California. Other similar communities have half the allocation of Hillsborough or even lower, such as Atherton and Belvedere.

The Town must solve this problem by exhausting every option to create housing on Town-owned property first, including Town Hall, the district office, the building and planning office, the construction yards, etc. Then on any non-residential property such as Nueva and Crystal schools, the Hillsborough Racket Club, etc. Then on any open space where a portion could be utilized or segregated subject to negotiation and even purchase.

ADUs and SB 9/10 units should be prioritized to increase housing but with legally enforceable restrictions to preserve Hillsborough's character to the maximum extent feasible.

Re-zoning residential areas should be off the table, certainly until the Town has met its extremely high burden to demonstrate that all other options have been entirely exhausted.

If the state Housing and Community Development agency rejects Hillsborough's plan, then Hillsborough should contest that and only resort to the last ditch option of re-zoning residential areas if legally required to do so and only on an egalitarian basis where the burden is distributed equally across all areas in Town, subject to safety exclusions such as fire and evacuation risks and infrastructure constraints.

The proposed RD1 Re-zoning is grossly inefficient. It would supposedly create 232 new opportunities but only generate 15 units. Why rezone 99% of the homeowners' properties for 7% yield? Why Re-zone 99% of the Town when it would only contribute 2% of the overall solution? It makes no sense.

The RD1 re-zoning could be eliminated if Hillsborough set a buffer of 18%. The HCD did not "strongly recommend" a buffer of 20%, rather they dropped a "helpful hint" for jurisdictions to consider a buffer with a low range of 15%.

If Hillsborough imposed a buffer of 17% or 94 units then the plan would generate 648 units which is 17 units off 20% (665) and would more than eradicate the need for any re-zoning for parcels 10 acres or less - which affects 99% of the residents.

Los Altos Hills set a buffer of 15%. Hillsborough should similarly set a maximum buffer of 15%.

Regards,

Patrick Shannon  
