

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Coordinated Area Plans	Whether we use coordinate plans or not is secondary to what is our goal for each area. The Comp plan update group should focus on clearly articulating the vision for each area of the city. Then we can decide how to achieve it. Using "Coordinate area plans" as code for an unstated, denser future is not appropriate.
Coordinated Area Plans	California Avenue area. They need more housing and vibrancy to support the struggling retail over there. Really surface parking lots???? In this day and age???? With this real estate climate and housing shortage????
Coordinated Area Plans	Around Page Mill between El Camino and Junipero Serra
El Camino Real	El Camino would have largely residential areas (as it does now) with some shopping / business at Cal Ave, Embarcadero, and University. Paly / college terrace, Barron park would be mostly residential with larger setbacks maintained. Automated cars will glide smoothly along the street. Hopefully technology standards will be developed to prevent Waze / Google from routing traffic onto local streets. Bikes will use parallel streets and remain off of El Camino.
El Camino Real	<p>I saw an actual working solution in, of all places, Tahiti. Apparently "paradise" has developed serious commute traffic. In order to keep the flow moving, they have disallowed left turns by constructing a barrier down the center of the road and eliminated most stop lights. Every 1/2 to 3/4 miles there is a multi-lane traffic circle where vehicles can reverse direction and make a RIGHT turn where desired. (Note that well-designed traffic circles are common in Europe, and significantly reduce traffic back-ups). Drivers entering the road can only make a right turn; they go to a circle if they want to go the other direction. It's like a mini-freeway. Just eliminating left turns speeds traffic up, regaining the 20-30 seconds for the left turn arrow and another several minutes for cross traffic and pedestrians, and keeping the traffic going, not stop-wait for cross traffic and left turns-and-going. With 3 lanes, ECR could have dedicated 2 lane through traffic, 1 lane bus and right turn. I posit that the speed up would be greater than the flawed plan proposed by the VTA to modify ECR. I'd like to see computer simulations of both proposals under expected future traffic, and the effect on parallel routes (Alma, Middlefield, Foothill Expy). Bike routes should be developed on parallel side streets. There are several logical locations for circles: Stanford Shopping center, Embarcadero, Oregon/Page Mill, Charleston, San Antonio. The extra gas to go the extra distance to make a left turn would be more than compensated by being able to drive non-stop. There should be numerous pedestrian and bike crossings ELEVATED above ECR like the crossings over Woodside (near Middlefield), or 101 (near Oregon Expy), or the 4-way style seen in Las Vegas.</p> <p>I also expect a fleet of non-polluting autonomous vehicles (instead of buses) that transport people from portal to portal anywhere in the Bay Area (instead of station/bus stop to station/bus stop), eliminating the "first and last mile" issue.</p>
El Camino Real	Some form of frequent electric streetcar or bus service. Safe bike lanes. Additional vegetation. Room for street-side kiosks and/or food trucks to attract foot traffic.
El Camino Real	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More services so residents do not need to drive. For example no grocery store in segment of Palo Alto near Baron Park. 2. Automated tram running down center and eliminate buses. 3. Buffered with hard curb safe lane for bicycles on el camino.
El Camino Real	All through vehicular traffic in a tunnel under ground . Connect to surface at El Camino, University, and San Antonio

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Employment Districts	Comp plan should maintain and clarify that Downtown Palo Alto is NOT an employment district, but it should have locally serving businesses for residents. Employment districts - research park, bayshore, etc should have more food options and childcare so that commuters do not need to drive during the day as much.
Employment Districts	Employment districts should add apartment and condo housing targeted to young singles, young childless married, and senior "empty nesters". When I was unmarried, and when married before we had children, I did not want a single-family dwelling with yard. I wanted a small apartment with easy access to gym, pool, game room, and social opportunities - PREFERABLY very close to work so I would not need a car. If employment districts, such as Stanford Industrial park and other concentrations of larger companies, could provide on-site housing, it would benefit the companies and the employees. Now that I'm an empty-nester, I would consider moving into a condo because I can't take care of the yard and household repairs. Were I a widower, I would like something like retirement housing that provides shuttles to nearby retail areas and entertainment venues, meals and planned social activities. I would like to get rid of the car, if only I did not need it.
Employment Districts	These questions are obviously related. If we have employment areas without anything else nearby, then no, walkability is not important, because no one will have reason to walk there. If developers are interested in adding retail or other uses to employment districts, I say let them.
Employment Districts	Housing (with parking!) near employment makes sense. Walkability is important; it is magical thinking to expect most workers to arrive on transit or bike. This isn't NYC with a great subway/bus system!
Growth Management	We keep falling further and further behind when we add non-residential growth. It's time for Palo Alto to put a pause on additional office space and focus on revitalizing the downtown as a place that attracts residents and has useful local services. We should work with Stanford to concentrate any further commercial growth in the research park, but seek businesses that are less people dense - such as biotech
Growth Management	We live in times where human excesses have damaged the world perhaps beyond saving. Palo Alto faces these same excesses, with less global impact, but severe local consequences. If we wish to reach true sustainability, we need to say no to more growth and begin to try to make what is here already more sustainable and more pleasurable to live with. We haven't begun to offset the terrible traffic and increased pollution from the excesses of office space brought upon this city by previous city councils. Say NO to all growth and concentrate on improving and repairing what we have.
Growth Management	We need to build housing. There are no two ways about it. Without dense and varied housing near transit centers we will only be putting a band-aid on our problems.
Growth Management	The main impacts of non-residential growth that I expect to experience are more stores and restaurants and bars to choose from (since office workers will need places to eat and shop and such). There's no need to "deal with" that.

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Growth Management	<p>William F. Buckley said, "A conservative is someone who stands athwart history, yelling Stop". I am sympathetic to conservatism -- it is right to worry about change, but I think it's impossible to prevent it. Instead we need to think about how to adapt to it and deal with the impact.</p> <p>So, my answer to this question is: Deal with the impact. Don't limit but instead manage growth. If the problem is traffic and parking, encourage more office space along caltrain at university and cal ave (instead of fighting that office space there, which has been happening for the last year!). Require businesses to pay for transit passes for their workers. Perhaps monitor that the businesses are complying. Replace free parking with for-fee parking (especially for non-residents, residents can get a free pass). These things create the incentives for business to reduce their traffic impacts.</p>
Growth Management	<p>I'd love to see the see the city try to work with both large and growing companies to solve the two biggest issues for residents -- car traffic and car parking -- in innovative ways. I'd love to see the city work constructively with the many brilliant people at these companies, rather than vilifying them.</p> <p>A few specific policies that would help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - charge a lot more for parking; get rid of all free parking - encourage building without parking, in places with good transit options - give companies economic incentives to get employees to walk/bike/take public transit to work - work with companies on new transit options (e.g., shuttles from various places around the Bay Area)
Growth Management	Monitor the carbon footprint of non-residential growth and require offsetting.
Growth Management	please put a moratorium on further large office buildings downtown.
Growth Management	Focus on the problems (traffic, pollution, etc.) not the perceived symptoms like development. Greater density coupled with transportation innovations have merit
Growth Management	<p>I disagree completely. Palo Alto has historically been a vital place of dynamism and new businesses in the bay area and in the entire world.</p> <p>When you put a moratorium on building you drive businesses out of palo alto. Personally, this reduces my employment prospects and increases the chance I have to move or commute a long distance. In terms of our economy, it also makes it harder for new businesses to be successful in literally the place where the greatest engine of economic growth has been for the last 20 years. It hurts the entire world.</p>
Height Limits	No. Height limits should be lowered in other zones as our current zoning is leading to greater density than the major of residents want. Neighborhoods can be protected by making sure transition zones are all 35 feet. Please make sure Comp Plan maintains protection of our scenic views of the Foothills!
Height Limits	The height limit should be reduced so that only 2 story building can be built. 50 feet buildings are a blight on the city and create a dark, brooding and unfriendly environment.

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Height Limits	YES YES YES, create visual interest and add housing with higher heights. It can be done well - definitely!
Height Limits	Absolutely. Some of the higher-than-55-foot buildings in town already are eyesores primarily because they're isolated. More tall buildings near, say, 850 Webster would improve the appearance of the neighborhood.
Height Limits	Just eliminate the height limit except where it would cause a significant hazard or problem that cannot be resolved by better design and/or compromise.
Height Limits	Why is there a height limit? If no good reason, scrap it and allow more efficient use of land and utilities. A well designed arcology (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arcology) could house many families at lower cost and more efficient use of utilities, leaving much more room for parks, orchards, gardens and landscape (perhaps over underground parking). The main concern is seismic safety, but a 500 foot limit would surely not be a problem (the Tokyo Skytree is 2,080 ft. in a very earthquake-prone area). Imagine a 100'x50'x500' condo apartment complex, 33 or more floors of spacious apartments/condos housing upwards of 75 families. That's single-family homes population of more than 2 residential blocks, perhaps 10 acres, on a footprint the size of my single-family dwelling.
Height Limits	55-60 feet is nowhere near high enough. Palo Alto has some of the most expensive property costs in the world, because of artificial constraints on development. Let's allow buildings 2-3x the current limits across the city: 3-5 stories in existing residential neighborhoods, and 100+ feet downtown and along El Camino Real.
Height Limits	I think that creating a taller / more dense downtown area (Cal Ave, University Ave, Mid-town) could create livelier live/work/shop zones. Those buildings could be required to be carbon-neutral and have roof-top green spaces as part of their design.
Height Limits	Taller buildings should be away from the downtown or residential neighborhoods. I do not know if such areas exist!
Height Limits	Height limits are a draconian solution to an unspecified problem. If there are concerns about shadows or the "canyon effect" on wind speed, let's address that specifically. A limit on number of floors would make far more sense. El Camino is a good place to start.
Height Limits	<p>We already have tall buildings in palo alto. 101 alma is 141 feet. 525 university is 180 feet. There are 7 other buildings > 95 feet. Since most of these buildings were constructed we've added a height limit.</p> <p>The height of none of these buildings bother me because they are downtown and near transit, which is where we should want tall buildings. So yes, in general we should allow higher buildings near university ave and caltrain ave train stations. Since Palo Alto has a terrible housing crunch, I'd be in favor of addressing it through raising building height limits. (Actually, I'd get rid of them entirely.)</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Height Limits	<p>I disagree strongly. Downtown is highly attractive as a location for taller buildings. And while I agree we generally should avoid mixing neighborhoods of single-family housing and multi-unit development, the residential corridor along Alma Street is the ideal location for more intensive multi-unit residential development, including taller developments. Where virtually all of the Alma corridor is 1- and 2-story development, we should encourage easing the house pressure by encouraging development of 3-, 4- and even 5-story apartments and condominiums.</p> <p>The right approach could even allow Palo Alto to address (and help pay for) long-term solutions to some of our most persistent and intractable problems. The entire Alma corridor is a major issue that Palo Alto and Menlo Park created for themselves in the 1950s and '60s, by opting out of a regional approach toward the Central Expressway. We're now reaping the harvest with endless discussions about eminent domain, grade separation of rail and roads, infrastructure that can't handle the traffic and shortages of housing. Creating a special housing zone along Alma could open up new revenue sources for long-term solutions to many of these problems.</p>
Height Limits	<p>I disagree strongly. Downtown is highly attractive as a location for taller buildings. And while I agree we generally should avoid mixing neighborhoods of single-family housing and multi-unit development, the residential corridor along Alma Street is the ideal location for more intensive multi-unit residential development, including taller developments. Where virtually all of the Alma corridor is 1- and 2-story development, we should encourage easing the house pressure by encouraging development of 3-, 4- and even 5-story apartments and condominiums.</p> <p>The right approach could even allow Palo Alto to address (and help pay for) long-term solutions to some of our most persistent and intractable problems. The entire Alma corridor is a major issue that Palo Alto and Menlo Park created for themselves in the 1950s and '60s, by opting out of a regional approach toward the Central Expressway. We're now reaping the harvest with endless discussions about eminent domain, grade separation of rail and roads, infrastructure that can't handle the traffic and shortages of housing. Creating a special housing zone along Alma could open up new revenue sources for long-term solutions to many of these problems.</p>
High Quality Design	<p>As a built-out city we should insist on Quality - quality materials, interesting design (not cookie cutter), good setbacks and respect for context - new buildings should fit in and add to the existing area, not assault it. Focus should be more on quality, less on legislating "design" as long as it works in context</p>
High Quality Design	<p>High quality is characterized by livability and affordability. Look to the "green" designs being developed by engineering and architectural students: self-sufficient, able to dramatically reduce carbon footprint, economical, minimize waste with newer technologies to reclaim, reuse and recycle water and minimize solid (including body) waste disposal. Use furnishings that can be put out of the way when not needed to give more usable space (e.g. Murphy beds, built-ins that can be pulled out or down or up to use and then put out of the way when finished, etc. Rising utility costs should be the driver for developing and using technology to reduce reliance on and use of municipal gas, electricity, water, waste disposal. Ability to live comfortably "off the grid" should be the goal.</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
High Quality Design	<p>I hinted at this kind of design in my post above about new housing types. One example is best embodied in the phrase "gracious, high-end, multi-unit homes." Older longtime Palo Alto residents, many of them "house rich," look forward to a comfortable, luxurious life in retirement. They also look forward to decades in an active, highly social community filled with friends and in-home entertaining without the hassle of upkeep, maintenance and repairs demanded by a single-family home. But the available options for condos and apartments in Palo Alto are almost entirely student-style or young-professional housing -- cheaply built apartments, both high-rise and low-rise, at best glossed over with a few grand in high-end appliances, fixtures and finishes with postage-stamp bedrooms, paper-thin walls, 100-s.f. kitchenettes and no cross-ventilation, views or access to the outdoors. All for \$2 million.</p> <p>Surely, Palo Alto can come up with design guidelines and policies to ensure that at least some new multi-family development is of a quality that isn't purely superficial add-ons like chrome-plated fixtures and Subzero refrigerators, but also includes spacious floor plans, balconies, world-class sound-proofing, cross-ventilation, elevators and room for entertaining without cramming it all into 800 s.f.</p> <p>With land prices driving the costs, the obvious approach is to think intelligently about offering opportunities to build up as well as out. Building height limitations have been one of Palo Alto's many political "third rails" over the past 40 years, ever since the disastrous mistakes that resulted in the scattered high-rises that mostly populate the downtown area. But allowances for building 4- and even 5-story buildings could encourage the quality many of us desire without destroying Palo Alto's ongoing appreciation for beauty and enduring value in our built environment.</p> <p>Like it or not, Palo Alto is a blend of urban and suburban environment. Indeed, that very blend is the "secret sauce" of our enormous appeal as a place to live. Rather than ongoing skirmishes between "residentialist" homeowners, short-sighted "downtown business interests" and greedy "developers," we should perfect how we balance those legitimate and necessary components of this diverse community.</p>
Historic Character	<p>We need huge improvements in our historical protections. Palo Alto is the birth place of silicon valley and many of the important buildings from the 1950s that are being lost. We need to update our historic register to include key events and places from the beginning of the transistor and make sure we preserve it.</p> <p>We also need residential preservation districts to allow second stories while preserving the design standards of our intact neighborhoods - this would be a BIG benefit to the community and should be a focus.</p>
Neighborhood Character	<p>City should protect its residential neighborhoods - need to make sure that R1, R2 etc is respected and enforced - city should make sure that the number of people in these buildings is reasonable for the neighborhood and take steps to ensure we are not cramming too many people in.</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Neighborhood Character	<p>The major issue Palo Alto faces is the cost of housing: it increases stress, decreases quality of life, and means that our neighborhoods become places that only the super wealthy can afford (key stat: Palo Alto was 2.5x average US housing prices in 1980 and is 10x today).</p> <p>To deal with housing costs, we need to get rid of the insanely restrictive zoning laws that have made it virtually impossible to build housing over the past 40 years. Done right, we'd change the laws in ways that encouraged the construction of tens of thousands of new units, which would push housing prices down and allow Palo Alto to return to its roots as an innovative city that is constantly reinventing itself.</p>
Neighborhood Character	<p>Apps like Google maps and Waze are increasingly routing traffic through our neighborhoods, and that will only get worse the longer we keep sticking our heads in the sand and refuse to invest in adequate infrastructure to handle the increased traffic or in much better mass transit options to take cars off the road.</p> <p>The focus should be on upgrading infrastructure and mass transit options. Simultaneously, we should be optimizing the traffic network so as to make the existing high-traffic corridors exponentially more efficient with "smarter" signals and traffic control devices that don't bog down traffic unnecessarily on existing major arterials like Oregon expressway, Embarcadero Road, El Camino Real, Charleston and Arastradero Road.</p>
Neighborhood Character	<p>Check out Lilypad.com for some ideas about carving out low income housing from a typical Palo Alto house. By making it easy for a homeowner to carve out a rental unit from current bedrooms, senior citizens could stay in their homes instead of selling and moving to a senior residence, perhaps with a live in caretaker, if needed, or by generating needed income the senior requires. These carved out units do not change the visible character of the neighborhood and may enhance the quality of life for the homeowner. They may also allow workers to live in Palo Alto rather than commuting long distances.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>The comp plan should re-emphasize protections for residential neighborhoods! This is critical. Any "new" housing should come from commercial zones. I'd like to see emphasis on making sure our existing housing is being used as housing, not as illegal businesses.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>Adding more housing makes the city denser, worsens traffic, overcrowds schools and city services, uses more water and energy and adds to the local pollution level and expulsion of CO2. We do not have to feel responsible for housing everyone who wants to live here. It is OK to say we have reached our limit and no more growth is possible. The Bay area has already exceeded the capacity for people, as has the state. We should set an example by saying no to growth and request that the state also manage the resources that it has with the 50 million people who are already here. Population stability and perhaps decrease is the only way to truly achieve a sustainable life style. Let us be the first to try to reach that goal.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>Absolutely agree! This is the wave of the future. Smaller, greener, spaces. Density should go near transit centers - Cal Ave and University Ave.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>Yes, obviously SFHs aren't going to keep working. We have such a housing shortage that we should make as many options available as possible.</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
New Housing Types	<p>I've traveled in Europe, Asia and South America. I've seen some good ideas and some terrible ones.</p> <p>Transportation hubs and industrial parks should investigate the arcology concept (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arcology) with limited, very expensive parking. It would be attractive to working people.</p> <p>Commercial streets, such as University Ave and N. California, should investigate multi-use buildings, with a business on the lower floors, parking underground, and living areas on the upper floors. A mix of condo designs could accommodate owners and/or employees. Some of the streets should be converted to pedestrian only, or commercial traffic only at night or early morning. This works well in many cities.</p> <p>Schools should investigate a high-rise apartment with condos and rental units solely for use by school employees, at subsidized rates. Perhaps also offered to police and fire personnel.</p> <p>Detached dwellings should allow somewhat greater structure footprint (e.g. 40-50% of lot) and no total square footage limitation (of course, property tax would be paid on total square footage, including basement). Off-street parking area for one vehicle per bedroom, plus one (for guests, contractors, etc.) should be required. Multi-generation housing should be encouraged by revising code.</p> <p>(I'd be glad to be hired as an adviser/consultant).</p>
New Housing Types	<p>Micro-units are currently not economically feasible because of maximum units/acreage zoning + parking requirements. We should absolutely relax that zoning to allow micro-units in transit-accessible areas. (The people who would live in a micro-unit are also likely to want a car-free transit-oriented lifestyle.)</p> <p>Elsewhere in town in SFH areas, we should absolutely allow "granny units". Half of the homes on my SFH street are occupied by elderly people living alone. Many people can not downsize because of the lack of options in palo alto. Because of prop 13, people don't want to realize a capital gain, pay taxes, and then have to pay huge property taxes on their new smaller unit (which would usually be worth well more than the assessed rate on their older and larger home). As was done experimentally in santa cruz, ADUs will allow people to age in place and also make substantial income on their (formerly main) residence, all without realizing a capital gain. It would also open up more SFH supply to growing families in Palo Alto. It seems like a win-win-win to me.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>I like the idea of making it very easy for homeowners to create granny units or Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADU). These will provide low income housing for renters without the city having to convert current areas zoned for business into low income housing. These dwellings are a win - win for Palo Alto. I think the city should do a survey to see how many homeowners and renters would like to see more of this type of housing.</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
New Housing Types	<p>One unacknowledged problem with Palo Alto housing is the near-total absence of gracious, higher-end, multi-unit homes. With the exception of a handful of beautiful old pre-war buildings in the downtown, Palo Alto's apartment stock is virtually all a legacy of the architectural blight of the '50s, '60s and '70s: scores of shoddily built apartments, both high-rise and low-rise, a residential wasteland that blights the downtown, the north side, Professorville, the Alma corridor, California Avenue and other parts of the city. Many upper-middle class, empty-nesters, now edging into their 60s and 70s and hoping to downsize, find themselves with a cruel choice: either move out of Palo Alto or condemn oneself to a retirement lifestyle in a cramped, shoddily built, \$2 million condo with postage-stamp-sized bedrooms, paper-thin walls, a 100-s.f. kitchenette and no cross-ventilation, views or access to the outdoors.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>I agree that new housing types need to be consider. What if Palo Alto committed to some early experimentation of new forms of housing so we could learn what works best for our city and what might be some of the unintended consequences of these new structures?</p>
New Housing Types	<p>I agree - the more different housing types, the better. Near transit is good, but it is limiting and we should open up as many locations as possible. Parking requirements should be reconsidered, rules for attached vs detached units should be reconsidered, sizes of lots for second units should be reconsidered.</p>
New Housing Types	<p>Yes, I agree with whole heart. Close to transit friendly location should be fine. However, I found that the parking space requirement from the current code is the major barrier. We need to remove the parking requirement, since these residents are tend to us public transportations. Or, we need to be creative about the garage, such as under ground garage with mechanical shaft in the driveway without set backs is a new trend to consider. Where can we find space in downtown areas to build big garage for seniors or single professionals who lives in new housing types. Even if we find the space, who can afford it?</p> <p>Also, for some reason, I am marked as belong to " Outside Palo Alto". In fact, I am a resident of Evergreen Park Neighborhood.</p>
Goal L-1 General	<p>I live in a house which was remodeled to accommodate my three-generational family. But the PA zoning regulations are so punitive that we could not add enough space to make the house truly workable. So although it's OK, it's cramped for 5 people and closet space and storage is extremely limited. My suggestion is to allow multi-generational house remodels additional leeway. I also have to say that since we did our remodel in 2010, houses around us have been being remodeled/rebuilt which are considerably larger than ours. FRUSTRATING!</p>
Goal T3	<p>At the summit, the recurring idea that many groups could agree on was that there we should encourage higher density housing for areas near transit centers such as RM-15/30/45 zones around downtown Palo Alto and Cal Ave. Mixed use, different types and height limits should be carefully reconsidered, as these areas have the biggest potential of reducing per capita traffic while allowing more housing and housing affordability</p>
Policy L-13	<p>This is fine, but I don't think it should be an emphasis. I think the emphasis should be on building altogether new housing. The more that is on the market, the cheaper it'll be.</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Policy L-16	<p>Yes! I want a store in my neighborhood that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is welcoming and bright design, instead of a dull gas station 2) Sells healthy food and daily products (such as hygiene things) <p>This would be wonderful in Ventura!</p>
Policy L-23	<p>I love the emphasis on high-quality design, e.g. The Epiphany. The food options are diverse and very high-quality! University Ave feels very welcoming given its bright lighting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I don't like that it is not very dense. 2) I would love to see more and taller residential buildings. 3) I would like to see more support for the homeless population (not criminalizing homelessness!) 4) Finally, I'd like to see more late-night food/drink options beyond alcohol
Policy L-26	<p>At the comp plan summit, there are were many suggestions for mixed residential/commercial buildings for Stanford Shopping Area. Proximity to caltrain is another plus. Need to link Stanford Shopping Center to caltrain in a much more seamless, pedestrain friendly manner.</p>
Policy L-26	<p>I would like to see more shopping areas and increasing parking density (e.g. through larger/taller parking garages). The Stanford Shopping Center is beautiful and we should support its growth.</p>
Policy L-3	<p>How would the neighborhood be compensated when the building heights are raised.</p>
Policy L-3	<p>Yes! I would strongly support no height limit, to support the density that the population desires. Downtown is needlessly height-restricted.</p>
Policy L-35	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Maintain high quality of the road itself 2) Good for both pedestrian and car usage 3) Improve the design and quality of shops along El Camino. It currently looks pretty rundown south of Page Mill, and higher standards could go a long ways towards improving the feeling.
Policy L-6	<p>Extremely negative. Having lived in many large cities around the world, I moved to Palo Alto as an escape from the city to a calmer, quieter, and more natural living environment. I'd like so see Palo Alto retain its smaller scale and allow the dense cities - Oakland, San Jose, and San Francisco to remain the urban centers.</p>
Policy L-6	<p>Density is an immensely positive word to me. I envision a downtown that supports the many people that want to live there, and provides the services that those people want within walking distance.</p>
Policy L-8	<p>This limit is ridiculously high. There is no way Palo Alto can support development at that level. We need to stop developing until a thorough data-based analysis is done of the consequences of adding additional non-residential growth and consequent jobs. Palo Alto should have the statistical/analytical tools to do this and if they don't they should get them. It is magical thinking to want to add that much non-residential development without having a clear idea of what the consequences would be for traffic, parking, housing, schools, utilities, energy, waste management. YES - there should be a limit on new non-res development!</p>

Public Comments (Digital Commenter) - Land Use Community Design

Topic/Policy	Public Comments
Policy L-8	This limit is way to high and will not be hit for many years. There should be a hard limit - dealing with impacts is NOT enough, as the loss of forest, space, clean air, and quitness can never truly be "dealt" with.
Policy L-8	A limit to non-residential growth does not make sense to me. I would much prefer accommodating growth by supporting it with appropriate housing growth.
Policy L-9	Retro-fit/remodel the commercial buildings on University Ave, California Ave, Mid-town that are below the Palo Alto height limit with living space on the top floors. Not commercial or office but LIVING SPACE. Do not allow any commercial development or office development that does not include adequate parking and living space.
Program L-22	Around El Camino and Page Mill could use more planning. Right now it's a key part of the city that feels very neglected.