

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

Attachment B

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
1			Bob Wenzlau	Sustainability Lexicon. The drafting should consider coordinating the various terms of art that encompass sustainability. These include resilience, "green house gas reduction", "climate impact" and the "environment". While I don't propose the various terms be eliminated, I would ultimately strive toward a common well defined term like sustainability/sustainable knowing that the other terms are assimilated.	General/Sustainability	To be addressed in Land Use Element
2	L-1		Bob Wenzlau	Goal L-1. This is an area where "Resilient" might be replaced with "Sustainable"	Compact City/Sustainability	
3	L-2		Bob Wenzlau	Goal L-2. The "Adapt to Changing Climate" should be "adapt toward Sustainability"	Sense of Community/Sustainability	
4	L-1	L-8	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-8. I would opt to eliminate numeric goals and instead have the policy be aspirational to allow Council more discretion.	Compact City	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
5	L-1		Bob Wenzlau	Land Use Definitions. This should be removed from the narrative as there are many other places where these terms can be found.	Land Use Definitions	
6	L-4	L-26	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-26. Stanford shopping center policy should incorporate sustainability into their planning. Now the shopping center is seemingly entirely focused on auto access, and bike access for example is very complex	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Sustainability	
7	L-4	L-26	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-26. Please develop the housing potential into the Stanford Shopping Center above the retail.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Housing Opportunity Sites	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
8	L-4	L-32	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-32. Town & Country is a shopping center that serves Palo Alto High, Stanford and neighborhoods, but the shopping center is overly auto oriented. How land use and transportation relate is complex, but the policy should invite use of land to provide for safer bike and pedestrian access and parking.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted
9	L-4	L-33	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-33. The owner of T&C apparently has not long term interest in housing, so how does the comp plan engage with a single owner's aspiration that might differ?	Need Staff Clarification	
10	L-9	L-71	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-71. The concept of a community "gateway" should not be framed around automobile arrival, but rather multi-modal arrival.	Public Spaces	
11	L-9	L-77	Bob Wenzlau	Policy L-77. Insert use of permeable parking surfaces. A revised land use plan should be contemplated as land use for parking diminishes. The use of green parking design should be incorporated.	Public Spaces	This topic is addressed in Transportation Element Council directed staff and the CAC to go forward with Goal T-8: Maintain a local airport with minimal environmental off-site impacts. Existing Policy T-57 of the current, adopted Comp Plan, which limits Palo Alto Airport to a single runway and two fixed base operators, will be retained.
12			Bob Wenzlau	The following did not appear to have policy components attached to them: Net Zero Calculations. Use of calculations of sustainability impact for new development. This would be part of the growth management and invited a net-zero or less approach to impact. A program should be inserted that invites development calculations for targeting of net zero.	Indicators/Sustainability	Council directed staff and the CAC to go forward with Goal T-8: Maintain a local airport with minimal environmental off-site impacts.
13			Bob Wenzlau	The following did not appear to have policy components attached to them: Municipal Service Center. This land should be evaluated for return to natural habitat. The carve out of the baylands seems inappropriate, and perhaps a restoration could be contemplated. I did not notice discussion of this in the Land Use Element, but it may be there.	Natural Environment/Baylands	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
14			Bob Wenzlau	Resiliency to sea-level rise should be incorporated into the Land Use Element. This would be an "adaptive" component that would become more acute as the time approaches 2030. Is there a strategy for our baylands, as sea level rise will decimate them. Are their programs that should be added for monitoring and managing short-term impacts say for example the first 12 inches?	Need Staff Clarification/Sustainability	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
15			Bob Wenzlau	Land Use Buffering at 101 and other transit corridors. Highway 101 is an eyesore, and impacts the view from the baylands. Can land use be targeted to install a urban forest buffer between 101 and both the residential and baylands? Can the same be considered for rail/Alma?	Sense of Community/Sustainability	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
16			Bob Wenzlau	The Foothills and Fire. Does our land use plan need to anticipate the benefit, management and impact of forest fire that would occur in the foothills? Please consider policy in the land use section addressing this.	Hazards	
17			Bob Wenzlau	Stanford Industrial Park. Please consider additional housing for use in the Stanford Industrial park.	Housing Opportunity Sites	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
18	L-1		Bonnie Packer	Goal L-1 Substitute "Adaptable" for "Resilient" Goal L-1. "Resilient" is often used in the context of mental health – it seems odd here.	Compact City	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element
19	L-1		Bonnie Packer	Suggested edits to PROGRAM L-2B "City Staff will review development proposals within the Airport Influence Area to ensure consistency with the guidelines of the Palo Alto Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and when appropriate, will refer development proposals to the Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission for review and comment." [L5]	Compact City	
20			Bonnie Packer	Where there are already zoning regulations in place, change language from "Review and change..." to "Continue to implement..." This is from PTC edit of Program L-4. This applies to many programs in this draft.	General	
21	L-1	L-5	Bonnie Packer	What is meant by "performance measures in New Policy (Former PROGRAM L-5)? PROGRAM L-5: NEW POLICY: Establish new Ensure the use of performance measures and architectural standards to that minimize negative impacts where land use transitions occur. [former PROGRAM L-5] [L12] Shouldn't this new policy be combined with Program L-4?	Need Staff Clarification	
22	L-1	L-7	Bonnie Packer	From PTC: Add to Policy L-7 new Program or new Policy: "Participate in regional strategies to address the interaction of jobs, housing balance and transportation issues."	Compact City	
23	L-1	L-8	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-8 (and Program L-8) on non-residential caps: I strongly suggest that we draft a policy without specific numbers – as this is a 15-20 year plan and if the city is to be "resilient" or "adaptable" we should include a resilient and adaptable policy as follows: Policy L-8: Periodically review caps on the amount of square feet for new non-residential development in appropriate areas of the city, based on various data sources such as Congestion Management Plan (or a similar plan) and the economic situation at the time.	Compact City/Sustainability	
24	L-1	L-7	Bonnie Packer	Program L-7: Is there a more current study other than the 1989 study mentioned here?	Need Staff Clarification	
25	L-1		Bonnie Packer	Delete the following: New Policy: Limit approvals of new office and research and development uses Downtown, in the California Avenue area, and along the El Camino Real corridor, to a combined maximum of 50,000 square feet per fiscal year. [The City Council will consider this policy based on their experience with the interim office/R&D annual limit that is currently in effect.] [L19] This is not a Policy for a forward looking comp plan – it is current reaction to a current situation and if kept in the Plan it could seriously impact economic and business vitality.	Compact City	
26	L-1	L-10	Bonnie Packer	Program L-10. Don't limit mixed use to one- three stories. This will conflict with Policies/Programs that may allow 50 foot or more height limits in PTOD areas.	Compact City	Comment noted.
27	L-1	L-10	Bonnie Packer	What is the desired result of changing the FAR in the following New Program? If it is for more housing, the Program should say so. New Program: Re-evaluate development standards in the Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, Service Commercial, and Downtown Commercial Districts (CN, CC, CS, and CD) to consider substituting residential FAR for non-retail commercial FAR. [L22]	Compact City	To be addressed in Natural Environment Element
28	L-1		Bonnie Packer	Add PTC Policy L1.7 regarding infill development: "Manage redevelopment of vacant and underused properties to promote infill development."	Compact City	
29	L-1		Bonnie Packer	Add PTC Program L1.7.1: "Create a list of vacant and underused properties and identify potential barrier to infill development on those sites and work with property owners to overcome such barriers."	Compact City	To be addressed in Safety and Noise Element

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
30	L-2		Bonnie Packer	Goal L-2 In the first New Policy delete the last phrase: New Policy: As a key component of a diverse, inclusive community, allow and encourage a mix of housing types, sizes, and affordability, in order to ensure that those workers whose jobs play a key role in our quality of life – such as teaching, childcare, nursing, and public safety – can choose to live here. [L25] This New Policy is admirable, but do not limit housing to certain kinds of workers. This may be illegal. So delete the last phrase.	Sense of Community	To be addressed in Natural Environment Element
31	L-2		Bonnie Packer	New Program about sea level rise is far too detailed and not appropriate for Palo Alto's comp plan. For example, what is meant by shoreline development?	Need Staff Clarification	
32	L-2		Bonnie Packer	Palo Alto does not have a shoreline. We have the Baylands Master Plan. This item lifted from the draft EIR does not reflect the reality in Palo Alto and should not be included. Sea level rise issues are important and should be addressed in the Natural Environment Element and written in a way that correctly applies to our City's geography. Instead use PTC policies L5.17 and L5.18.	Sense of Community	
33	L-3		Bonnie Packer	Goal L-3 New Program: Develop a new conservation district tool to regulate design and compatibility within established single-family residential neighborhoods and ensure that appropriate home improvements and remodels are allowed while preserving existing neighborhood character. [L30] Delete this New Program. What do we need it for? What is a conservation district tool? This is clearly incompatible with the long standing belief in this City that DESIGN WILL NOT BE REGULATED. This was clearly established in the development of the Single Family Individual review process. (See Zoning Code Section 18.12.110) I believe Policy L-12 adequately addresses the issue of compatibility.	Residential Neighborhoods/Need Staff Clarification	CAC members have said that Policy L-12 is not sufficient to protect historic homes and that a new tool is needed. The full CAC should discuss compatibility of this tool with Zoning Code Section 18.12.110 .
34	L-3	L-13	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-13 and Program L-14. Define terms. What is meant by a micro-unit or a studio?	Need Staff Clarification	This will be done in the narrative section
35			Bonnie Packer	Note to CAC box: The Housing Element has policies to encourage all types of housing, not just for seniors.	Housing	
36			Bonnie Packer	Policy L-14 Design and arrange new multifamily buildings, including entries and outdoor spaces, so that each unit has a clear relationship to a public street. [L35] This is poorly drafted. The City does not design buildings. The City establishes design guidelines and development standards for buildings. Requiring each unit to have a clear relationship to a public street is in conflict with development standards for other multi-family residential zones such as Village Residential, which would allow small units around a central courtyard.	Residential Neighborhoods	
37	L-3	L-14	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-16 Consider siting small neighborhood-serving retail facilities in existing or new residential areas. [L37] Add "Mixed Use" to this concept.	Residential Neighborhoods	
38			Bonnie Packer	Suggested edits: New Program: Develop an ordinance Consider allowing the Zoning Ordinance to address permit emerging short-term accommodation cooperative residential sharing arrangements or co-housing in a way that balances private property rights with impacts to neighborhoods and preserves the local housing supply. [L39]	Residential Neighborhoods	This topic needs to be a program, as it addresses AirBNB not co-housing; we shouldn't prejudice the outcome.
39	L-3		Bonnie Packer	Not sure what is intended by this proposed new program – AirB&B? or is it trying to address co-housing which is what my suggested edits would do.	Residential Neighborhoods/Need Staff Clarification	Terminal This topic needs to be a program, as it addresses AirBNB not co-housing; we shouldn't prejudice the outcome.
40	L-3		Bonnie Packer	Goal L-4. What are "formula retail limits" referred to in New Program: Evaluate the effectiveness of formula retail limits adopted for California Avenue and consider whether these limits should be applied in other Centers. Develop incentives for local small businesses where warranted.[L42]	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	master plan FAA
41	L-4		Bonnie Packer	Coordinated Area Plans – add San Antonio Road. There will be major changes in this area due to Mountain View's North Bayshore Precise Plan and it is very possible more residential-serving services would come to this area, especially if we plan for mixed use with residential for San Antonio east of Middlefield. Right now Council is considering moving Housing Element sites from San Antonio and that would be short-sighted without further study.	Coordinated Area Plans	safety
42			Bonnie Packer	Policy L-23. Because Cal Ave is becoming a more vital business district, change the wording that describes University Ave/Downtown as the central business district to "a major business district."	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
43	L-4	L-23	Bonnie Packer	Delete this "New Program: Evaluate to what extent the City can and should specify the types and scale of commercial operations, development, manufacturing, etc., are appropriate for Downtown or California Avenue. [L55]" as unnecessary. The Zoning Code defines the scale and type of commercial activities for these areas.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	landscape
44	L-4		Bonnie Packer	Add housing to PROGRAM L-23: Identify strategies to reuse surface parking lots, add housing, and improve pedestrian and transit connections at Stanford Shopping Center. [L62]	Pedestrian Scale Centers	native grass
45	L-4	L-24	Bonnie Packer	Is the following cap still relevant?: PROGRAM L-24: Maintain a Stanford Shopping Center development cap of 80,000 square feet of additional development beyond that existing on June 14, 1996.[L63]	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	leases
46	L-4	L-31	Bonnie Packer	Cal Ave is a Transit Oriented area and should not be limited to two or three story buildings. There may be opportunities to have taller buildings here. So modify POLICY L-31 as follows: Develop the Cal-Ventura California Avenue area as a well-designed mixed use district with diverse land uses, two to three-story buildings , and a network of pedestrian oriented streets providing links to California Avenue. [L73]	Pedestrian Scale Centers	noise
47	L-4	L-31	Bonnie Packer	Under Program L-31, delete reference to Hewlett-Packard.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	leaded fuel
48	L-4	L-32;L-33	Bonnie Packer	Policies L-32 and 33 re Town and Country Village. These policies need to be updated to reflect current conditions.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
49	L-4	L-35	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-35 re South El Camino Real. Do not limit development to one-, two and three-story buildings. There may be opportunities for taller buildings if the site and transitions to adjacent sites allow it.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
50	L-4		Bonnie Packer	Add a policy to prepare a coordinated area plan for San Antonio Road similar to the statements describing the CAP for South El Camino Real.	Coordinated Area Plans	
51	L-4	L-36	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-36 regarding South ECR: add mixed use and residential uses on these shallow parcels.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
52	L-4	L-40	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-40 ; Change "Revitalize" to "Maintain the vitality of..." This policy was drafted when Midtown was in a slump. That has changed.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
53	L-4	L-39	Bonnie Packer	Program L-39: Midtown: is this still relevant? Use, instead, PTC Program L3.16.1. Prepare an area plan for the Midtown Neighborhood Center....."	Pedestrian Scale Centers	The 2008 Baylands Master Plan (page 179) contains six policies preclude expansion, establish landscaping requirements, and call for relocation of the terminal.
54	L-4	L-40	Bonnie Packer	Program L-40. Improvements to Middlefield Rd in Midtown have been made. Perhaps the improvements are not enough. Consider redrafting this program to reflect current and possible future conditions.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
55	L-4	L-41	Bonnie Packer	Program L-41. Does the Parks Master Plan address restoring the creek in Hoover Park? If not, this should be deleted	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Natural Environment	
56	L-5	L-42	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-42: Employment districts – should this be in the Transportation Element and shouldn't Traffic Demand Management programs be added?	Employment Districts/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
57	L-5	L-44	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-44. Needs rewording. The City does not develop Stanford Research Park. Stanford does that. Anyway, the idea having the park served by transit modes belongs in the Transportation Element. Could be worded as follows: "Ensure that various transit modes serve all Employment Districts, including Stanford Research Park."	Employment Districts	Comment noted
58	L-5	L-45	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-45: Needs deletion and/or rewording. The City does not develop the Stanford Medical Center. Stanford does that. Isn't this obsolete as the Medical Center redevelopment is approved?	Employment Districts/Need Staff Clarification	
59	L-5	L-46	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-46. Parts of San Antonio Road now include housing and the Housing Element includes housing sites on San Antonio Road. So this policy needs to be reworded.	Employment Districts	
60	L-6	L-49	Bonnie Packer	Policy L-49: Add public health and well being.	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment noted
61	L-6	L-50	Bonnie Packer	Add "energy efficient" to Policy L-50 about signage. (From PTC)	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment Noted
62	L-6		Bonnie Packer	Add PTC Policy L2.9 and the Programs under that policy to address infrastructure improvements, and new technology.	Well-Designed Buildings	
63	L-7		Bonnie Packer	Goal L-7 The following new policy is over-reaching and over burdensome. It would require a historic evaluation –the criteria are not even defined here - to any building that may be demolished whether historical or not. It must be deleted. New Policy: If a proposed development would affect a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the City's Historic Resources Inventory, require an evaluation prior to the issuance of a demolition or alterations permit. [Comp Plan Draft EIR Mitigation Measure CULT-1b] [L122]	Historic Resources	
64	L-7	L-60	Bonnie Packer	All new policies under L-60: Archaeological resources seem unnecessary, as these are routine requirements for any new development.	Historic Resources	Comment noted
65			Bonnie Packer	[I don't understand why we have put all these EIR mitigations in the comp plan when they will be in the final EIR anyway.]	General/Need Staff Clarification	Mitigation measures provide clarity on how a potential impact is being mitigated; also, including them as policy ensures the regulation remains in place for the duration of the comp plan.
66	L-8	L-61	Bonnie Packer	Goal L-8 Policy L-61 repeats much of what is in the Community Services and Facilities Element. In any event add the word "City-owned" before "community" and add other types of facilities, such as theaters, art galleries, art studios, to the list. In fact much of what is in Goal L-8 could be deleted as it is covered in the Community Services and Facilities Element.	Cultural Facilities	Comment noted
67	L-8	L-68	Bonnie Packer	Program L-68 about cooperating with PAUSD is covered in the Community Services and Facilities Element so delete it here.	Cultural Facilities	Comment noted
68	L-9	L-77	Bonnie Packer	Goal L-9 Policy L-77 regarding reuse of surface parking lots: Use PTC Policy L2.5.	Public Spaces	Comment noted
69	L-9		Bonnie Packer	Somewhere here or in the Safety Element, we need to add a Policy that ensures that shrubbery and trees do not obscure Stop signs and other traffic warnings.	Public Spaces	Comment noted
70	L-9		Bonnie Packer	Why is Public Art in the goal that addresses public ways? Policies L-72 and 73 about public art and cultural facilities seem redundant as this is covered elsewhere. Could be deleted.	Public Spaces/Need Staff Clarification	This topic will be covered in the Transportation Element Comment noted
71	L-9		Bonnie Packer	New Policy on the Airport – This is already addressed in Program L-2B.	Public Spaces/Airport	
72			Bonnie Packer	General Comment: There are many good sustainability ideas in the PTC draft. I am hoping the Sustainability Committee will address that.	General/Sustainability	Comment noted
73	L-1		Don McDougall	Goal 1 - WELL-DESIGNED, COMPACT, RESILIENT ATTRACTIVE SPACES – what does resilient mean and is it covered in any of the Policies?	Compact City/Need Staff Clarification	
74	L-1	L-2	Don McDougall	L-2 Why add transportation? That's discussed elsewhere and dilutes the land use issue by being here.	Compact City/Need Staff Clarification	
75	L-1	L-3	Don McDougall	L-3 "Respect views of foothills is too much of a catch all. A 3D map could be built and used as a guideline for different areas of the city. Maybe parts of downtown should not be affected by this rule.	Compact City	
76	L-1		Don McDougall	L-6+ (new Policy) What performance measures and what architectural standards are being referred to? This Policy is not useful if the measures and standards are not defined.	Compact City/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
77	L-1	L-7	Don McDougall	L-7 Need to prioritize regional, city and surrounding neighborhoods. Palo Alto city goals should be first. Maybe we might "consider impact" on regional and surrounding neighborhood needs?	Compact City	Comment noted
78	L-1		Don McDougall	PL-7 System to monitor and report regularly and define what it means for the rate of growth to reach maximum within months, years?	Compact City/Indicators	Comment noted
79	L-1		Don McDougall	PL-8 Program L-8 should be a policy or Policy L-8 should be a program. They're the same level of detail but for different items. should be programs.	Compact City	
80	L-1	L-9	Don McDougall	L-9 What are desirable characteristics – does this even make sense as a Policy? The planning and zoning process be a separate program?	Compact City/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
81	L-1		Don McDougall	PL-10 Why are buildings from one to three stories called out in this program?	Need Staff Clarification	
82			Don McDougall	Definitions - All the definitions should be under review.	Land Use Definitions	Comment noted
83			Don McDougall	Open Space – what does compatible mean? Compatible with preservation and enhancement? Then say it.	Land Use Definitions	
84			Don McDougall	Public Parks –need further definition to include types of parks?	Land Use Definitions	
85			Don McDougall	Transit-oriented Residential. Should the 2000 foot walkable definition be increased to at least 3,000 feet?	Land Use Definitions	
86	L-2		Don McDougall	Why shouldn't the city do things city that resist climate change and when necessary adapt? Adapting to climate change rather than doing things to resist it seems inconsistent with everything Palo Alto is about.	Sense of Community/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
87	L-2		Don McDougall	CAC should suggest that council review this Goal.	Sense of Community	
88	L-2		Don McDougall	New policy – Should Diversity be included only as a Policy or should diversity be elevated into the GOAL? This is an important statement to make for the community and seems buried under a "Sense of Community" goal	Sense of Community/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
89	L-2		Don McDougall	New Program – Suggests new development requirements for Shoreline - what shoreline development? Should there be any planned Shoreline Development? Is shoreline defined as a Center or District?	Sense of Community/Need Staff Clarification	
90	L-2	L-10	Don McDougall	L-10 To maintain a structure of Hoods, Centers and Districts is laudable, especially with the intent to integrate those areas into the city and regions street and transit plans, not to mention the importance of a properly defined structure to things like the Shuttle program.	Sense of Community	
91	L-2	L-11	Don McDougall	L-11 Could be a Program under L-10. It's about connecting "communities" not building a sense of Community.	Sense of Community	In order for this to be a program, we would need to provide a specific mechanism for achieving it. As written it is an ongoing policy commitment.
92	L-3	L-12	Don McDougall	L-12 Preserve Character - Doesn't the city act stronger than "encouraging" (Eichler homes) today? Should this be stronger?	Residential Neighborhoods/Need Staff Clarification	
93	L-3	L-15	Don McDougall	L-15 Gathering Spaces – "Gathering Spaces" should be defined in the definition section.	Residential Neighborhoods/Land Use Definitions	

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
94	L-3		Don McDougall	New Program - BnB - This should be written as Policy [L39]	Residential Neighborhoods	This topic needs to be a program, as it addresses AirBNB not co-housing; we shouldn't prejudge the outcome.
95	L-4		Don McDougall	PEDESTRIAN SCALE MIXED USE FOCAL POINTS - (why focal points rather than "gathering Places" defined as providing focal points?)	Need Staff Clarification	
96	L-4		Don McDougall	Background – Definitions need to be reviewed. For example Cal Ave, T&C and S El Camino both aspire to and create the traffic challenges of being very regional and are not particularly neighborhood sensitive.	Land Use Definitions	
97	L-4		Don McDougall	New Program [L42] – Coordinated Area Plans – This should be written as and elevated to the level of Policy! Maybe all Centers or ED's should have Coordinated Area Plans eventually.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Coordinated Area Plans	
98	L-4	L-23	Don McDougall	L-23 University Ave – Why not just refer to the Downtown Coordinated are plan?	Need Staff Clarification	
99	L-4		Don McDougall	New Program [L55] – Isn't this just the coordinated plan?	Need Staff Clarification	
100	L-4	L-24	Don McDougall	L-24 University Ave pedestrian – Add bike parking for bicyclers in the policy.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
101	L-4	L-21	Don McDougall	Program L-21 – U Ave – incorporate this program into the Policy L-24	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
102	L-4		Don McDougall	Programs L-25 and 26 – Why aren't these written to be one program?	Need Staff Clarification	
103	L-4	L-28	Don McDougall	L-28 What does it mean to keep Cal Ave as intermediate character?	Need Staff Clarification	
104	L-4		Don McDougall	Program L-27 Should be a Cal Ave Coord Plan per suggestion	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
105	L-4	L-29	Don McDougall	L-29 Cal Ave mixed use – Under L-28 as coordinated Plan incl Program L-29	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
106	L-4	L-31	Don McDougall	L-31 Cal Ave mixed use – Incorporate into L-28 in Coordinated Plan or as Program	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
107			Don McDougall	Program L-31 Cal-Ventura – These are very prescriptive statements that might not belong in a Comp Plan?	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Coordinated Area Plans	
108	L-4	L-32	Don McDougall	L-32 Town & Country as community serving – T&C is well beyond Community serving at this point and I doubt retailers would want you to think of them as community only. At least PA serving if not regional.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	PRIORITIZE B& P PLAN \$
109			Don McDougall	L-39 Hood Centers as pedestrian – Is this "pedestrian friendly" within the Center or to and from the Center?	Need Staff Clarification	update 5 years
110	L-4	L-39	Don McDougall	Program L-38 Zoning – Medium density or high density housing near Neighborhood Centers should be high priority. Also public transportation for Neighborhood Centers should be a policy.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Pedestrian friendly is defined as within neighborhood centers mobility and safety study
111	L-4		Don McDougall	Program L-48 Zoning – This might be better positioned as a Policy rather than a program?	Well-Designed Buildings	This topic will be covered in the Transportation Element
112	L-6		Don McDougall	Program L-53 Awards – This program would fit better under Policy L-50 or 49?	Well-Designed Buildings	Sunday streets program
113	L-7		Don McDougall	[L122] new after L-51– Historic potential – This is dangerous and could cause new evaluations to create economic hardship and delay or end otherwise valuable development.	Well-Designed Buildings	Policy L-48 does this
114	L-7	L-52	Don McDougall	L-52 City Historic – This policy seems to allow the city more leeway on altering facilities than offered to public	Well-Designed Buildings	
115	L-7	L-56	Don McDougall	L-56 U Ave historic preservation – If the Policy is to reinforce U Ave should there be some sort of U Ave specific registry or other device to single identify and promote U Ave?	Need Staff Clarification	The existing Historic Inventory identifies these sites
116	L-7	L-57	Don McDougall	L-57 Historic incentives – Are all these programs for real?	Need Staff Clarification	
117	L-8	L-61	Don McDougall	L-61 Gathering places – Should be defined like other Centers and Mapped etc.	Cultural Facilities	
118	L-9	L-81	Don McDougall	L-81 Utility Elements – Policy should include maintenance or should be a program for maintenance.	Public Spaces	
119	L-9		Don McDougall	L- Don – There should be a policy about attractive and MAINTAINED public gathering spaces	Public Spaces	Pavement mgmt. for bikes
120			Shani Kleinhaus	General format comment: Please use page numbers in our package?	Process	businesses
121	L-6		Shani Kleinhaus	1. Add a policy and program for Bird Friendly Building Design under GOAL L-6. • NEW POLICY - Buildings and other structures will minimize hazards to birds and the potential for bird collision	Well-Designed Buildings	
122	L-6		Shani Kleinhaus	1. Add a policy and program for Bird Friendly Building Design under GOAL L-6. • NEW PROGRAM – develop an ordinance for Bird Friendly Architecture	Well-Designed Buildings	
123			Shani Kleinhaus	2. Consolidate all the policies and programs related to the airport under the Landuse Element, and bring back to discussion by the CAC	Public Spaces/Airport	
124			Shani Kleinhaus	3. Integrate the Urban Forest Master Plan (UFMP) into all the Policies and Programs that direct streetscape and other land-use aspects. Incorporate UFMP goals of not losing canopy cover in the city as a whole, and of expanding canopy in South Palo Alto. Add implementation of the Urban Forest Master Plan and adding trees (especially native oaks) as a public benefit. Consider incentives for including trees in new developments.	Natural Environment/UFMP	This topic to be addressed in the NE Element
125	L-3		Shani Kleinhaus	4. Palo Alto should develop a Policy and programs that retain landscaping in private yards and setbacks.	Residential Neighborhoods	This may not be compatible with LID and sustainability principles.
126			Shani Kleinhaus	Recommend including basements in FAR calculation.	Residential Neighborhoods/Indicators	Zoning code defines ""Floor area ratio" as the maximum ratio of gross floor area on a site to the total site area."
127			Shani Kleinhaus	6. To protect and enhance riparian corridors: • NEW POLICY – Protect creeks and riparian corridors.	Natural Environment	This topic will be covered in the NE Element
128			Shani Kleinhaus	6. To protect and enhance riparian corridors: • NEW PROGRAM – Develop a Creek Corridor guidelines that provides minimum rather than maximum setbacks and creates "creekside overlay zones" to minimize lighting and other urban-related disturbances in creek corridors.	Natural Environment	This topic will be covered in the NE Element
129			Shani Kleinhaus	7. Replace "street trees" with "trees" throughout the plan. Change "Urban Forest Management Plan" to "Urban Forest Master Plan".	Natural Environment/UFMP	

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
130			Shani Kleinhaus	8. Add a policy to evaluate the City's Sustainability and Climate Action Protection Plan to ensure consistency with the Urban Forest Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.	Sustainability/UFMP	Comment noted
131			Shani Kleinhaus	9. Re-evaluate the East Meadow Circle Concept Plan to consider residential use.	Coordinated Area Plans	Comment noted
132	L-8		Shani Kleinhaus	Create a policy and programs to explore acquisitions of land for parks under GOAL L-8	Cultural Facilities	Comment noted
133			Shani Kleinhaus	11. New Policy: Collaborate with regional efforts to adapt to Sea level Rise Add program: Study potential impacts and externalities of development in areas vulnerable to storm related flooding and/or sea level rise.	Sustainability	Comment noted
134	L-1	L-2	Shani Kleinhaus	Goal L-1 Policy L-2 PROGRAM L-2B Is this program obsolete? If not, then move to a new Airport Section in the Landuse Element. (move all airport-related policies and programs from transportation to landuse element)	Need Staff Clarification/Airport	Comment noted
135	L-1	L-10	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-10 – Please retain the existing policy. I strongly disagree with zero setbacks. Also, parking does not always have to be at the rear. Alma Plaza is the ultimate example of how disastrous the combination of zero setbacks and parking in the rear has been. Front gardens should be encouraged and setbacks should be wide enough to allow wide-canopy trees (as opposed to palms) to line the streets and pedestrian movement.	Compact City	
136			Shani Kleinhaus	Land Use Definitions as they correspond to the categories on the Land Use and Circulation Map : Publicly Owned Conservation Land: Open lands whose primary purpose is the preservation and enhancement of the natural state of the land and its plants and animals. Only compatible resource management, (add: compatible) recreation, and educational activities are allowed.	Land Use Definitions	
137			Shani Kleinhaus	Public Park: Open lands whose primary purpose is active recreation and whose character is essentially urban. These areas (remove: have been planted with non-indigenous landscaping and) require a concerted effort to maintain recreational facilities and landscaping. (we hope that over time landscaping should orient to more California native plants)	Land Use Definitions	Comment noted
138			Shani Kleinhaus	Streamside Open Space: This definition is not enough to protect streams, riparian ecosystems and water quality. A Riparian Corridor policy is needed. Setbacks should be a set at a minimum, not a maximum.	Land Use Definitions	Follow up with CSD is required
139			Shani Kleinhaus	Open Space/Controlled Development Is this meant for private property? New Policy and program is needed to limit the size of mansions.	Land Use Definitions/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted This topic is not applicable to private land
140	L-2		Shani Kleinhaus	In the proposed new program (see below) Define Shoreline Development? Is there a map associated with Shoreline Development? New Program: Develop new development requirements for shoreline development to ensure that new development is designed and located to provide protection from potential impacts of flooding resulting from sea level rise and significant flood events. Requirements may include: new setbacks to ensure structures are set back far enough inland that they will not be endangered by erosion; limits on subdivisions and lot line adjustments in areas vulnerable to sea level rise to avoid the creation of new shoreline lots; incentive or transfer of development rights (TDR) programs to relocate existing development away from high risk areas; and/or triggers for relocation or removal of existing structures based on changing site conditions and other factors. [EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-3. Note that additional mitigation measures to address sea level rise and climate change adaptation will be added to the revised Safety Element.][L26]	Land Use Definitions/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
141	L-4	L-19	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-19: I am not supportive of adding housing to ALL neighborhood centers (Alma Plaza is an example of how unfortunate outcomes can result from such policy).	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Housing Opportunity Sites	Comment noted
142	L-4		Shani Kleinhaus	The proposed New Program [L44] " Update the use definitions for the Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, Service Commercial, and Downtown Commercial District" should be revised as part of the CAC role in the Comprehensive plan update.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted
143	L-4	L-19	Shani Kleinhaus	I would remove Policy L-19 and move the New program [L51] "Identify and prioritize the Centers and/or Employment Districts that would benefit from a Coordinated Area Plan..." to Policy L-18	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted.
144	L-4	L-20	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-20: Remove? It is not clear what this does. If there is space – plant trees for small pocket parks.	Need Staff Clarification	Topic will be addressed in Community Services and Facilities Element The intention of Policy L-20 is to foster a walkable environment that increases foot traffic and boosts retail sales. Removing it would reinforce driving habits and would be counter to the goal of reduced automobile use.
145	L-4	L-22	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-22: Remove? Not clear why maintenance is a policy...	Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted.
146	L-4	L-24	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-24: Add trees and reference to the Urban Forest Master Plan.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/UFMP	Comment noted. The UFMP will be cited in the margin
147	L-4		Shani Kleinhaus	Program L-21: Add trees and reference to the Urban Forest Master Plan.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/UFMP	Comment noted.
148	L-4	L-33	Shani Kleinhaus	Policy L-33: Add consistency with the Urban Forest Master Plan.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/UFMP	Comment noted.
149	L-5	L-43	Shani Kleinhaus	Policy L-43: Add consistency with the Urban Forest Master Plan.	Employment Districts/UFMP	Comment noted
150	L-5	L-43	Shani Kleinhaus	New Program under Policy L-43: integrate UFMP into this program.	Employment Districts	Comment noted
151	L-5	L-46	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-46: The policy states: "Maintain the East Bayshore and San Antonio Road/Bayshore Corridor areas as diverse business and light industrial districts, consistent with the approved East Meadow Circle Concept Plan (Appendix Y of this Comprehensive Plan). [L106]" The City should start looking at retreat as adaptation to Sea Level Rise. The City should stop encouraging new development there, and start considering retreat as sea level rises.	Employment Districts	Comment noted
152	L-6		Shani Kleinhaus	GOAL L-6: Well-Designed Buildings That Create Coherent Development Patterns And Enhance City Streets and Public Spaces (add: ecology and public health)	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment noted
153	L-6		Shani Kleinhaus	Add Bird Friendly Building Design	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment noted
154	L-6	L-48	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-48: remove the word "creative"	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment noted
155	L-8		Shani Kleinhaus	GOAL L-8 Add a policy and program to: Acquire more parks Implement the Park, Recreation and Natural Open Space Master Plan.	Cultural Facilities	Comment Noted
156	L-8		Shani Kleinhaus	Remove PROGRAM L-70 It is included in the Parks Master Plan.	Cultural Facilities	Comment noted.

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
157	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	GOAL L-9: New Program [L167]– Shade: This new program should be modified to prohibit shading of creeks and public open space. Here is an alternative: New Program: Develop an ordinance that will require development projects of a certain size or location to <u>avoid</u> potential shade/shadow impacts to creeks and public open spaces (other than public streets and adjacent sidewalks) between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. from September 21 to March 21.	Public Spaces	Comment noted.
158	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-71: Remove? Prominent Gateways should be avoided near creeks and open space. Let nature speak for itself. Gateways should not create hazards to birds.	Public Spaces	Comment noted. This topic is covered in the NE Element
159	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	Program L-72: Remove? Prominent Gateways should be avoided near creeks and open space. Let nature speak for itself. Gateways should not create hazards to birds.	Public Spaces	Comment noted
160	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	New Program [L167] regarding setbacks: add the Urban Forest Master Plan. Remove “innovative new designs.” Or specify that new designs should not create hazards to birds.	Public Spaces/UFMP	This topic is covered with new program for bird friendly design guidelines
161	L-9	L-73	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-73: To this or as a separate policy, add implementation of the Urban Forest Master Plan and adding trees as a public benefit. Consider incentives for including trees in new developments.	Public Spaces/UFMP	
162	L-9	L-74	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-74: Remove? It happens with no need for special policy?	Need Staff Clarification	
163	L-9	L-75	Shani Kleinhaus	POLICY L-75: Remove? Alma Plaza shows that this policy should not be applied uniformly.	Need Staff Clarification	
164	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	New policies (under PROGRAM L-81:?) regarding the airport: New Policy: Regulate land uses in the Airport Influence Area to ensure consistency with the Palo Alto Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. [L185]	Public Spaces/Airport	
165	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	New policies (under PROGRAM L-81:?) regarding the airport: Add consistency with the Baylands Master Plan	Public Spaces/Airport	
166	L-9		Shani Kleinhaus	New Policy: “Palo Alto is committed to preservation of the Baylands as called for in the Baylands Master Plan, which is incorporated here by reference. [L186].” This does not strong enough to protect the Bayland ecosystem. Need specific language on hierarchy of decision-making regarding landuse and activities at the airport.	Public Spaces/Airport	Baylands conservation will be addressed in NEE
167			Jennifer Hetterly	I very much appreciate the redlined version in the packet, showing additions and deletions while retaining the program and policy numbers as presented in the existing comp plan; it made for a much more efficient and effective review.	Process	
168			Jennifer Hetterly	Not surprisingly, housing is dominating discussion around this element. The current draft seems vaguely designed to support the goal of “more”. As we’ve learned from the experience of promoting/facilitating “more” commercial development, if you don’t carefully define what you want, you get what you get. It would be a folly to embrace a land use element that merely resulted in more luxury housing that was equally unattainable. Furthermore, as long as we continue adding office space, the demand for “more” housing will only grow.	Housing Opportunity Sites	
169			Jennifer Hetterly	And just like commercial growth was to parking, residential growth has disproportionate impacts on parks, recreation, and community services infrastructure, not to mention schools. We have a lot of park and open space acreage, but even now, only 4% of it is in our neighborhoods, readily accessible to most residents without a car. Significant new residential growth will require additional neighborhood parks, community services and schools to support that increased resident population. Those all require real estate. An open-ended “more” strategy is unmanageable and unsustainable.	Housing Opportunity Sites	
170			Jennifer Hetterly	I agree that there is consensus around “promoting a mix of housing options and types as a key to a diverse community.” However, I do NOT think there is consensus around what that mix should look like (see Affordability, below).	Housing Opportunity Sites	
171			Jennifer Hetterly	I do not think there is consensus around blanket support for “regional collaboration on big issues like housing.” There is strong opposition within the community to ABAG’s RHNA allocations, in particular counting the housing needs for the entire sphere of influence (SIO) in Palo Alto’s allocation (as opposed to the County). Similarly, accommodating housing for all the new jobs proposed for Mountain View’s North Bayshore development in addition to our own is a very tall order. It may be fair to say that there is consensus around investigating opportunities to collaborate regionally, but an unqualified commitment to regional collaboration doesn’t pass muster.	Housing Opportunity Sites/Regional Collaboration	Comment noted
172			Jennifer Hetterly	Housing Affordability It is overly simplistic to expect that if we just build enough housing, it’ll be affordable to all (or most, or even many). The comp plan should provide clear policy guidance about what types of housing we want to prioritize (as opposed to an inclusive, open ended range of types) based on commonly understood affordability goals. It also should address how much we want (not infinite) and how best to mitigate the population impacts.	Housing Affordability	Comment noted
173			Jennifer Hetterly	We need clear and consistent language when we talk about “affordable” housing. In the current public discourse, sometimes people mean FMV housing that is naturally more affordable, due to size or character (though still well above the regional average), sometimes they mean BMR housing for, alternately, very low income, low income or moderate income, perhaps even moderate to high income.	Housing Affordability	Comment noted
174			Jennifer Hetterly	It would be helpful to relate affordability to percent of median income ranges and connect the dots, at least generally, between our cohorts of commuting workers (e.g., tech engineers, teachers, service workers) and the levels of affordability and size of housing that they need.	Housing Affordability	Comment noted
175			Jennifer Hetterly	The CAC should also be working from a common understanding of how BMR housing works. Does the City have any tools to regulate around BMR housing for incomes at 100% of median income, 150%?	Housing Affordability/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
176			Jennifer Hetterly	Neighborhood Centers This is an area targeted in the draft for vague, new housing opportunities, despite considerable negative impacts that seem inconsistent with other policies designed to protect neighborhood character and sustainability goals. The mere fact of more units should not, alone, justify the impacts.	Housing Opportunity Sites	Comment noted
177	L-4	L-19	Jennifer Hetterly	New Program under Policy L-19 to “Update the use definitions for Neighborhood Commercial, CC, CS and CD”: What is the nature and purpose of the “Updates”?	Land Use Definitions/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted
178	L-4	L-19	Jennifer Hetterly	As for CN, by definition as “neighborhood center” it already includes housing and a mix of small scale local businesses. Changing the definition to encourage denser housing development in neighborhood centers will adversely affect their scale and character as well as safety, congestion and SOV commutes.	Pedstrian Scale Centers/Land Use Definitions	Comment noted

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
179	L-4	L-41	Jennifer Hetterly	Policy L-41: I do not support "encouraging" additional residential development in the Midtown area, particularly when combined with Policy L-40 designed to slow traffic. Midtown is not an employment center nor a transit hub and the retail is highly used by children, youth and teens. Safeway and the pharmacies create an established, high inflow of vehicle trips into the area. The Shuttle does not connect to Cal Ave train depot and even if going to University depot, the Shuttle schedule does not accommodate commute times. Increasing housing density will increase congestion, worsen safe access on bike or foot and change the character and scale of the neighborhood significantly, while not reducing SOV commutes.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Housing Opportunity Sites	Comment noted
180	L-4		Jennifer Hetterly	I would like to see something in the comp plan that enables mini-neighborhood centers in underserved areas of the city with neighborhood serving retail, like a small corner/general store (not a grocery) where you can pick up milk, or printer paper or a flashlight without driving all the way across town.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted This goal could be achieved by applying new mixed use designation in those areas
181			Jennifer Hetterly	These two policy areas go hand in hand in my view. More office space = more jobs = greater housing demands. Mixed use designations are a good tool to co-locate compatible uses, but they should not be used to sidestep efforts to control commercial growth. We should scrutinize consistency of policy incentives.	Mixed Use Designations/Commercial Growth Limits	Comment noted
182			Jennifer Hetterly	Did not find Staff edits reflecting a way to resolve the conflict over retail/housing vs retail/housing/office or vague "mixed use with limited office". Definition of mixed use category retains Live/Work and Residential/Office (aren't those the same?) as well as Retail/Office and Residential/Retail.	Mixed Use Designations/Need Staff Clarification	
183	L-1		Jennifer Hetterly	Revised Program L-10 provides some design guidelines, but doesn't address the desired "Mix." Furthermore, L-10 calls for zero setbacks along the street, a design element not likely to get consensus on this panel, particularly in light of Council's recent efforts to increase setbacks along El Camino Real.	Compact City	
184	L-1	L-8	Jennifer Hetterly	Understanding that Council wants to take the lead on L-8, I don't think that should preclude the CAC from sharing its thoughts on commercial growth. Indeed, I think they want to hear our insights about community preferences/priorities/concerns in this area.	Commercial Growth Limits/Compact City	Comment noted.
185			Jennifer Hetterly	I think that commercial growth should be controlled throughout the city, not just the nine planning areas. I do NOT think that a tie to Congestion Management Plan data is an adequate or appropriate substitute. Growth impacts extend far beyond traffic and the hard decisions about how much growth to accommodate should reflect consideration of all of them. The same is true for residential growth.	Commercial Growth Limits	Comment noted.
186			Jennifer Hetterly	Height Limits Meaningful discussion of height limits should consider how much, at what price point and how fast we want to accommodate housing growth. While there is strong opposition to raising height limits, some might be won over if a case were made that the only way to get x number of new units at y price point is by adding a story or two for certain residential developments. If it is demonstrated that in order to get that x units at y price, we'd have to go up to eight or ten stories, the converts may go the other direction.	Height Limits	
187			Jennifer Hetterly	Council direction asks us to "evaluate policies and programs that control the occupant density of existing commercial uses." Beyond the limited data from the business registry cited in the packet, I think it's fair to assume we don't know much about this area. Are there any other data sources that can put the registry numbers in context? Does the registry data offer any insight into subcategories of office use that vary significantly in occupant density? Do nearby cities have any data about changes over time? Examples of policies and programs to control commercial occupant density? Surely Palo Alto isn't the only city concerned about this?	Commercial Growth Limits/Need Staff Clarification	Comment noted.
188			Jennifer Hetterly	2. Regarding "comparative impacts of restaurants versus other retail on trip generation and parking," can we expect information beyond the registry, such as trips and parking due to customer flow as opposed to employees?	Mixed Use Designations/Need Staff Clarification	
189			Jennifer Hetterly	3. More frequent use of Coordinated Area Plans. Code chapter 19.10 seems to have already established a procedure to initiate CAPs, yet Council is asking for "language to [make CAPs] a more frequently used planning tool." What have been deterrents to more frequent use? Are they related to the requirements in Ch.19.10? Workload? Insufficient emphasis in the Comp Plan? Staff guidance about why they have not been more frequently used would be helpful here.	Coordinated Area Plans/Need Staff Clarification	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
190			Jennifer Hetterly	4. Any lessons learned from the Cal Ave/Frys or East Meadow Circle Area Plans that should inform comp plan revisions?	Coordinated Area Plans/Need Staff Clarification	
191			Jennifer Hetterly	Not sure what "look at mechanisms for office, medical office, and R/D development and its impact on the jobs housing balance" means. Mechanisms to measure impacts of those functions (or each of them) on jobs/housing balance? Reduce such impacts? Mitigate them?	Commercial Growth Limits/Need Staff Clarification	
192			Hamilton Hichtings	The City Council directed staff to come up with a fifth DEIR scenario that would actually meaningfully reduce the impacts of growth including both traffic and parking and improve the quality of life.	General	
193			Hamilton Hichtings	The council asked to evaluate regulating employment densities to help mitigate the impacts of growth. I propose that we instead target reducing day commuter car trips via managing car parking availability, cost and public transportation alternatives.	Commercial Growth Limits	Comment noted
194			Hamilton Hichtings	In-terms of office growth, every square foot of office space we build is one less square foot of housing. It's pretty simple, office space is the most profitable, followed by luxury housing. Redwood City is adding 2,200 apartments and so far they are all luxury units. If we want more affordable housing then there must be regulation. There are currently apartments available for rent in Palo Alto, it's just that they are expensive.	Commercial Growth Limits/Housing Affordability	
195	L-1		Hamilton Hichtings	The City Council asked to further evaluate regulating office and R&D growth beyond scenario 2. Thus, the current language below Program L-9 in the proposed draft of the Land Use Element limits growth to 50,000 square feet for Downtown, Cal Ave and the El Camino Corridor falls short, and it should be reduced further and expanded to all of Palo Alto except Stanford Research Park. I feel a simpler mechanism would be simply to limit new additional office space for all of Palo Alto to 5,000 square feet per development until such time as the jobs to housing ratio drops significantly, say to 2.0.	Commercial Growth Limits	
196			Hamilton Hichtings	In terms of items that the CAC reached consensus on, "Regional collaboration on big issues like housing" was not one and myself and other Palo Altans are not supportive of, and in particular ABAG regulations and feel our housing discussion to focus on residents who want to remain or who already work in Palo Alto.	Housing/Regional Collaboration	PTC Program T5.2.3 addresses this topic.
197			Hamilton Hichtings	It should be very clear the City Council and majority of Palo Altans do not support raising the 50' height limit in order to accommodate more office development nor for mixed use buildings with office space in them. The housing element can meet its target without raising the 50 foot height limit and many Palo Altans including myself do not support raising it.	Height Limits	Comment noted

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
198			Hamilton Hichtings	However, some would like to see an additional story allowed for high density housing near CalTrain stops. Housing element H2.1.1 proposes evaluating this. If this was to be pursued, that additional story should be used exclusively for low income and affordable housing beyond what is already required for that building.	Height Limits/Housing Affordability	
199	L-4		Hamilton Hichtings	We need a zoning designation for retail plus housing and should opportunistically convert some zoning to it.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Mixed Use Designations	
200	L-3		Hamilton Hichtings	Low density residential neighborhoods are not zoned as hotels or boarding houses and renting to occupants for less than one month should not be permitted. New Program [L39]	Residential Neighborhoods	Comment noted This topic needs to be a program, as it addresses AirBNB not co-housing; we shouldn't prejudge the outcome.
201	L-3	L-13	Hamilton Hichtings	We need to protect low density residential neighborhoods and not upzone them with the exception of modest loosening of ADUs as long as FAR requirements are not expanded for them.	Residential Neighborhoods	Comment noted
202			Hamilton Hichtings	In general, TDR's have contributed significantly of the City's growth problems so are counter productive to limiting growth and should be reduced or eliminated.	TDR	Comment noted
203	L-8		Hamilton Hichtings	I believe the City Council wanted to hear our thoughts on L-8 so I'd like the CAC to discuss that as well.	General	Comment noted.
204	L-1		Hamilton Hichtings	Zero setbacks are a bad idea and were hurt Alma Plaza and Alma near downtown.	Compact City	
205	L-4		Hamilton Hichtings	New Policy [L52] Deferring to the Rail Corridor Study, which reaches all the way across El Camino into Barron Park and College Terrace is not a good idea since it does not take a holistic approach.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
206			Hamilton Hichtings	There should be no additional new development in the Baylands for environmental, global sea rise, winter storm tidal flooding and seismic liquefaction safety reasons.	Sustainability	Comment Noted
207			Hamilton Hichtings	We should limit use of coordinated area plans and they should be required to conform to the comprehensive plan and city ordinances.	Coordinated Area Plans	Comment noted
208			Hamilton Hichtings	We should not move items to other elements such as retail mix, basements and airport, although moving the transportation policies is fine.	General	Comment noted
209			Hamilton Hichtings	Basements should count towards FAR.	Residential Neighborhoods/Indicators	
210	L-6		Hamilton Hichtings	Buildings should be bird-safe.	Well-Designed Buildings/Natural Environment	Comment noted
211			Hamilton Hichtings	In general, I find the current draft changes of the Land Use Element vague, deferring far too much to future studies and not fully reflecting the direction of the City Council and feedback from the CAC so there is more work to do.	General	Retain existing Program T-4 under Goal T-1(Sustainable Transportation) and Program T-54 under Goal T-7 (Regional Collaboration)
212			Hamilton Hichtings	What is the current total square footage added downtown since 1986?	Need Staff Clarification	
213			Ellen Uhrbrock	Add – Small commercial ground floor offices and shops (see small business definition above)	Mixed Use Designations	To be addressed in Land Use Element
214			Ellen Uhrbrock	Add 2nd and 3rd floor residential units above ground floor commercial businesses.	Height Limits	Comment noted
215			Ellen Uhrbrock	Approve and add high-rise residential condo/apartment buildings and retirement homes suitable for mixed use of income, age, and occupation including home offices.	Height Limits	To be addressed in Land Use Element
216			Ellen Uhrbrock	All units equipped with Wi-Fi – subsidized if necessary. Residential units suitable for mixed income residents, employees and owners of small businesses, young professionals, students and seniors.	Height Limits	To be addressed in Land Use Element
217	L-5		Ellen Uhrbrock	Define small business and include it throughout the element. Suggested definition – “commercial business with 25 employees or less on site in Palo Alto and dependent on customers to walk in to shop or for service.”	Employment Centers/Need Staff Clarification	
218			Ellen Uhrbrock	Define regional collaboration and include it throughout the element. Suggested definition – “include Santa Clara and San Mateo counties and Stanford”	Regional Collaboration/Need Staff Clarification	To be addressed in Natural Environment Element
219	L-1		Ellen Uhrbrock	Define “resilient” (Goal 1)	Compact City/Need Staff Clarification	To be addressed in Land Use Element
220			Annette Glanckopf	1) Retain 50 foot height limit.	Height Limits	To be addressed in Land Use Element
221	L-3		Annette Glanckopf	2) Preserve R1 (Residential Neighborhoods).	Residential Neighborhoods	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
222	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	3) Preservation of neighborhood centers.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
223	L-5		Annette Glanckopf	Controlled Commercial development.	Commercial Growth Limits	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
224			Annette Glanckopf	5) Consider elimination of TDRs.	TDR	Topic will be addressed in Natural Resources and Environment Element.
225	L-6		Annette Glanckopf	Code enforcement with serious penalties	Well-Designed Buildings	Comment noted Municipal Code section 16.24.020 establishes height limits for fences - not more than 4 ft high generally
226			Annette Glanckopf	• Many of the items are stale and need to be removed.	General	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
227	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Alma Plaza is no longer a neighborhood center and should be removed from the comp plan as a CN district, since it no longer fits the definition Neighborhood Commercial [CN] It is primarily residential and has minimal retail.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Topic to be addressed in Land Use Element
228	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	• Residential in CN districts. This is a slippery slope. Putting housing in CN is in conflict with retail. For mixed use new development, housing should only exist on second floor. Taking Midtown as an example, any housing would have to be second floor, due to the GF retail overlay. This would require major remodeling, displacing any current GF retail <during construction>. Most/many of the existing retailers would never be able to come back due to increased rental spaces. Parking is also an issue. Housing parking should not force away potential shoppers. Any housing in CN should be fully parked, preferably underground. For Midtown, this center is already under parked.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Topic to be addressed in Land Use Element
229	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	• I have concerns with future modifications to uses in CN. For example, medical offices should be retained as conditional use, with rigid examination of application.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	PTC Policy T1.3 and T1.4 address this topic.
230	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	There should be some way to limit the number of similar uses in a center – dry cleaners, nail salons, educational uses, exercise etc.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
231	L-2		Annette Glanckopf	• Although I appreciate the concept of including sustainability and healthy communities in every element of the comp plan, in this section they seem to be artificially stuck on (Goal L2)	Sustainability	To be addressed in Land Use Element
232	L-3	L-15	Annette Glanckopf	Although I appreciate the concept of including sustainability and healthy communities in every element of the comp plan, in this section they seem to be artificially stuck on Goal L3 Policy L15	Sustainability	
233	L-3	L-17	Annette Glanckopf	Although I appreciate the concept of including sustainability and healthy communities in every element of the comp plan, in this section they seem to be artificially stuck on Policy L17	Sustainability	
234	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	I also have a concern with the misuse of "neighborhood serving offices." We want to encourage retail and not replace potential locations with office.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Topic will be addressed in Land Use Element
235			Annette Glanckopf	There are quite a few coordinated area plans mentioned. Perhaps there should be prioritization?	Coordinated Area Plans	To be addressed in Natural Environment Element
236	L-1	L-2	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L-2: Include San Mateo County	Compact City	Comment noted
237	L-1		Annette Glanckopf	• Program L 2b: There should be no development in the Baylands. Add Baylands Master Plan.	Compact City	Topic to be addressed in Land Use Element
238	L-9		Annette Glanckopf	• Since Palo Alto owns the airport, not sure that land uses have to be approved by County. I prefer the more overarching new Policy L185.	Public Spaces/Airport	To be addressed in Land Use Element
239	L-1	L-6	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L-6: There needs to be new (strong) guidelines for development of commercial next to residential. Not sure what is meant by performance measurements? Mandatory guidelines and new zoning need to be created to avoid such issues as happened recently – a three story glass office next to a single story bungalow.	Compact City	This is done in zoning code already
240			Annette Glanckopf	Policy L-12: There needs to be new (strong) guidelines for development of commercial next to residential. Not sure what is meant by performance measurements? Mandatory guidelines and new zoning need to be created to avoid such issues as happened recently – a three story glass office next to a single story bungalow.	Sense of Community	This is done in zoning code already
241	L-4	L-25	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L25: I am opposed to listing types of professions with exclusion of others.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
242	L-4	L-26	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L26: I have a major concern with this bullet. There should be NO NEW development in the Baylands with the exception of levees or berms. This concept should be in the Safety element instead of here.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
243	L-2	L-12	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L12: IR needs to add a new component on review of Eichlers, SSO, housing in flood zone	Sense of Community/Hazards	maintain LOS and other
244	L-2	L-13	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L13: While some modest second units are desirable, it is important to have them adhere to current zoning lot size for development, FAR, set-backs. I agree to comments made by Arthur Keller in writing on second units.	Sense of Community	monitor 20
245	L-2	L-13	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L13: Add "encourage".	Sense of Community	strategic plan w classes
246	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	• Program L34: remove CN from this list. Again, in a mixed use (housing and retail) zone, housing should be second story only.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
247	L-2	L-14	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L14: Combine with L13.	Sense of Community	
248	L-2	L-15	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L15: OMIT.	Sense of Community	truck routes
249	L-3		Annette Glanckopf	Some neighborhoods are very small and have no space for any public area, nor are they close to any parks. Some neighborhoods are huge and have parks, but still not close to every neighbor within the neighborhood. It is fine to have a policy to create more open space, but this wording using neighborhoods doesn't work for me.	Residential Neighborhoods	truck routes
250	L-3	L-16	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 16: Remove "existing." I would not support putting retail into current neighborhoods. Not appropriate for CN.	Residential Neighborhoods	Comment noted
251	L-4	L-19	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L19: Add "second floor" to housing. CN are not appropriate for housing.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
252	L-5		Annette Glanckopf	Program L44 [L100]: Sounds like an action item. The devil is in details. For CN districts see comments in opening general remarks above.	Employment Districts	To be addressed in Municipal Code
253	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 20: Not appropriate for CN	Pedestrian Scale Centers	Comment noted
254	L-4	L-21	Annette Glanckopf	POLICY L21: Use "encourage" not "provide". Taking Midtown as an example, I would not like to remove any retail space. Plus who is going to pay for this? The merchants are barely surviving. Will the city pay for improvements in a private center? See next comment re rest rooms. I support public art and street trees.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
255	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L17: Same comment as above. Who would pay for this? This program should be omitted, since all centers CURRENTLY have public bathrooms available during business hours – drug stores, grocery stores, food facilities.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
256	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L22: Same comments as L21. Who would pay for this? Use "encourage merchants to enhance." Also omit "variety of paving materials."	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
257	L-7	L-52	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 52: Mixed use center "South Palo Alto." As there is no such designation, more specificity is need? Are we talking about the East Meadow area, where Google has purchased property?	Historic Resources	
258	L-7		Annette Glanckopf	Program L55: Will the City of Palo Alto Economic Development start to assist businesses to (re)locate in the city?	Historic Resources/Need Staff Clarification	
259	L-4	L-25	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L25: How does one enhance the character of SOFA as a mixed use area? Are there guidelines? Mandatory items? Task forces? I would omit policy.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	This topic is addressed in PTC Policy T1.17
260	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 29: What comparable area is referred to? Downtown is over-developed and should not be used as a guideline or standard. I do not think we have a model area in our city for comparison.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	
261	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	General point: I suggest that any Cal Ave development be done in conjunction with the Evergreen neighborhood and that should be added to the Comp Plan.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
262	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L31: North of Sheridan....omit, since that is where the new Public Safety building will be built	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
263	L-4	L-33	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L33: add "second floor" to housing. Any new housing should be fully parked...preferably underground. Is this Policy needed? T&C has just been renovated.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
264	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	• Program L 36: Same comments as before in zoning. There are too many similar uses in CN. Too many dry cleaners, hair salons, exercise facilities and not enough places to buy goods...bakeries, shoes, etc. Medical offices and most neighborhood serving offices are not desired. What is purpose of program?	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	

CAC Comments on the Land Use Element

Source: Comment Letters

Date: March 15, 2016

No.	Existing Comp Plan Goal	Existing Policy/Program	Commenter	Public Comment	Comment Topic	Staff Comment
265	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 38: I do not support ANY changes to R1 near CN zones.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
266	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 39: Been there done that	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
267	L-4	L-40	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 40 is stale. Planning has occurred and it is very difficult to get the 15 owners to collaborate. The center is currently under parked: the only way to get more parking would be to construct a garage. Agree that signage is definitely needed, but who would pay for it? We have broached this with merchants in past and no one was willing to pay. Street furniture not high priority.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	
268	L-4	L-41	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 41 is stale. Planning has occurred and it is very difficult to get the 15 owners to collaborate. The center is currently under parked: the only way to get more parking would be to construct a garage. Agree that signage is definitely needed, but who would pay for it? We have broached this with merchants in past and no one was willing to pay. Street furniture not high priority.	Pedestrian Scale Centers/Need Staff Clarification	
269	L-4		Annette Glanckopf	• Program L 41: This wording is stale. Since the project is already in a committee and conclusions will be decided before the end of the comp plan revision, this should be removed.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
270	L-4	L-41	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 41: Remove as redundant to the many other references to mixed use housing.	Pedestrian Scale Centers	
271	L-5	L-45	Annette Glanckopf	• Policy L-45: Stale. Remove	Employment Centers	
272	L-6		Annette Glanckopf	New guidelines/zoning are needed for Eichler development, SSOs, new housing in flood plain.	Well-Designed Buildings	
273	L-6		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 52: Inappropriately high fencing is the most abused and ignored of zoning regulations.	Well-Designed Buildings	
274	L-7		Annette Glanckopf	Historic – should Eichlers be defined as historic?	Historic Resources	This topic is covered in program L-54
275	L-7		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 57: I would add "create incentives to."	Historic Resources	
276	L-7		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 60: I do not support TDRs.	Historic Resources/TDR	
277	L-8		Annette Glanckopf	Program L 68: Stale. Needs updating especially in light of the Cubberley contract. Perhaps it should say something about developing a specific redevelopment plan in conjunction with PAUSD.	Cultural Facilities	
278	L-9	L-73	Annette Glanckopf	Policy L73: There needs to be a review of "public art" in private developments. Several of the newer projects have art that doesn't relate to neighborhood in terms of streetscape and massing.	Public Spaces	
279	L-9		Annette Glanckopf	Program L80: I would like to see more undergrounding. It has been effectively halted due to lack of funding. This needs to continue	Public Spaces	
280	L-9		Annette Glanckopf	Policy L 185: Add "and the Baylands Master Plan"	Public Spaces/Baylands	