

**May 17, 2016**  
**Comp Plan Update**  
**Citizen Advisory Committee**  
**At Places Packet**

1. Comment Letters
  - Community Services Element
  - May 16, 2016 City Council Hearing on 5<sup>th</sup> Scenario
  - Draft Land Use & Community Design Element Policies and Programs
2. CAC April 19, 2016 Draft Action Minutes

**From:** Annette Glanckopf  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 14, 2016 12:03 PM  
**To:** Lee, Elena  
**Subject:** my comments/questions on community services element

Although there are 2 maps that include neighborhoods, no mention in element.

There are 3 places that I would add...

- 1) introduction
- 2) Community Partnerships
- 3) In Goal C1 under partnerships policy c.1.7

GOAL C1 Program c1.1.1 - change word prioritize to "explore staffing a position to help ...."

I personally do not see this as a priority

Program c 1.3.3: Much too open ended. I have no idea what this implies. I suggest omitting this

Policy C1.9: What does this mean? should the words "for meeting space and events" be added.

I don't thin policy is necessary

Policy c 1.15 omit "senior services" it doesn't fit and I am not sure that PAUSD would consider this

Policy c 1.19 omit phrase "all public community facilities and parks" not needed. Actually I am not aware of any senior programs in parks.

GOAL C4

Policy c4.2 change "all neighborhoods" to all "residents"

Policy c4.8 What are we trying to get at? and why does this need to be a policy?. I would omit this policy

How does this differ from Policy c 1.9

Policy c5.2.1 OMIT

Annette

Don McDougall

The May 13, 2016 is very complete and represents the discussion of the CSF Subcommittee. Thank you and well done to staff for this draft. Alas I cannot help but make a few comments that I hope will help us have a better work product.

Page C-7 The edits to the table make it confusing to understand the final structure but I appreciate the subtotals for the various sections as they apply. I continue to object to the classification of Byxbee Park as a Nature Preserve. The idea of “Preserve” (I think the proper term is “Reserve” is to preserve the land as close to its original state as possible. This is hardly the case for a “Park” built on landfill. Just the name by the way should be a clue of the original intent - “Byxbee Park”. All the other “Open Spaces” are given the name “Preserve” (yes it is Foothills Open Space Preserve no Foothills Park in spite of some references on the Palo Alto web site).

Page C-9 The two paragraphs about the parks and facilities seem different from the rest of the introductory narrative. The rest of the narrative seems to be a statement of existing conditions. These two paragraphs seem to be statements of Policy that should be in the Policies and Programs section. And in fact maybe in the Land Use Policies and Programs.

Page C-12 The second paragraph references State Dept. Finance numbers. Which I believe are copied correctly below. They do show growth in the 65-85+ category from 12% of the population to 20% of the population. I agree “significant”, And the growth of all retirees (who retires at 64 any more?) is double from 199K to 432K.

I strongly urge that these numbers be provided in a table such as that below so future planners can check the validity of these assumptions. Presented this way they are meaningful to everyone rather than just the statement “grow significantly”.

	County	Total (All ages)	Preschool Age (0-4 years)	School Age (5-17 years)	College Age (18-24 years)	Working Age (25-64 years)	Young Retirees (65-74 years)	Mature Retirees (75-84 years)	Seniors (85 or more years)
<b>2010</b>	Santa Clara	1,785,089	124,025	305,511	157,802	998,949	107,494	63,269	28,039
	% of total		7%	17%	9%	56%	6%	4%	2%
<b>2030</b>	Santa Clara	2,151,165	121,878	308,902	180,794	1,107,748	238,616	141,455	51,772
	increase	366,076	-2,147	3,391	22,992	108,799	131,122	78,186	23,733
	%	21%	-2%	1%	15%	11%	122%	124%	85%
	% of total		6%	14%	8%	51%	11%	7%	2%
<b>2060</b>	Santa Clara	2,585,318	140,890	363,992	202,179	1,249,834	257,759	226,184	144,480
	increase	800,229	16,865	58,481	44,377	250,885	150,265	162,915	116,441
	%	45%	14%	19%	28%	25%	140%	257%	415%
	% of total		5%	14%	8%	48%	10%	9%	6%

Page C-13 I don't know where the statement "projected ... to have a higher percentage of over 60s" but I think the source should be referenced.

Page C-14 In the last paragraph "InnVision" is now "LifeMoves" if it is going to be referenced by name.

Page C-19 I suggest that Policy C-1.3 should be positioned as C-1.1. It is the simple statement of policy about participation. Policy C1.1 should be edited to simple start with "promote" and Program C1.1.2 maybe should say explore a City "solution" (why say online or person?). Don't we want just the best solution? And what was Policy C-1.3, is the edit finished there?

Page C-20 Policy -1.4 Would this policy be more clear if it just simply said "Encourage" rather than "Explore ways". Probably still sufficiently flexible.

Page C-21 Policy C-1.6 Although I felt before that the Library didn't need to be mentioned in various Policies or have a Policy of its own I now believe that it is such an important platform for the "community" activities we're promoting here it should be called out. For example the library just hosted lessons on using public transportation for new arrivals. I suggest a Policy that promotes continues support for the library as a facility for good services.

Page C-21 Policy C-1.7 I'm not sure what the "shared use" is of?

Page C-22 Policy C-1.9 In order for privately owned spaces to be used they need to be facilitated and Promoted. I also think that "Public Benefit Space" that are included in land use deals need to be included here. Benefit Spaces have simply become part of the private space.

Page C-22 Policy C-1.13 As we have done elsewhere I suggest that it should be "optimize" the use not maximize.

Page C-23 Program C1.13 would seem to be better placed under Policy C-1.14.

Page C-25 Policy C-1.18 might be better placed before Policy C-1.17. Policy C-1.17 says survey to determine the need to "increase" programs. This seems pessimistic and maybe it should be survey to "determine the requirements"? Program C1.17.2 should be two Programs. One should deal with inclusiveness etc. and the other to deal with vocations.

Page C-27 Program C1.19.1 seems a duplicate of C1.2-.1. Likewise for C1.19.2 and .3. A review of the editing even of the relevant Policies might improve the statements?

Page C-28 Policy C-1.22 The wording needs editing?

Page C-32 Program C3.3.3 should be discussed by the Sustainability subcommittee. Seems like a stronger position than "evaluate the costs" is warranted.

Page C-32 Policy-3.6 To be repetitious This Policy and Program make no sense when you're talking about Byxbee Park and note that Byxbee is not included in the list referenced in the Program.

Page C-33 Policy C-4.3 If we use the population and demographic data to suggest we care for the growing population of Seniors than maybe there isn't such a "growing need" for Parks etc. At least we should recognize that the working age population will grow 10% in the time the senior population grows 100% and make sure we prioritize the right things. Policy C4.2 could probably be worded better to express the intent of the Policy.

Page C-35 Policy 4.9 Since the terms "Neighborhood" and "District" parks are used explicitly here shouldn't the tables on page C-5 to 7 maintain the same terminology and subtotals?

Page C-36 Policy C5.2 Isn't the Policy about "access to"? Policy C5.4 The development Assets are about Teens but the Policy doesn't seem to talk like that. Maybe it should be made explicit? And since the Healthy Cities Resolution is included maybe the Development Assets list should be included. I believe they were "adopted" in the same way as Healthy Cities.

Page C-37 Policy C5-8 Does this belong in the Land Use Element?

In the Appendix of Policies and Programs to be shifted I think we are referring to Policy C-1.10.1 and Program C1.15.1?

**From:** Bob Wenzlau  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2016 9:07 AM  
**To:** Lee, Elena  
**Subject:** Distribution in CAC packet for May 17

CAC members for May 17 packet,

I generated two notes to City Council for their May 16 meeting on the EIR.

The first promotes that the EIR process is poorly integrated into our CAC deliberations, and would best be delayed.

The second responded to Council's aspiration for more housing, and even the call for a moon shot on housing. While incremental adjustment to zoning allowing ADU or height limits may bring some, there is no better place for a housing moonshot than our airport land. In the 110 acres I suggested that 5,000 housing units could be evaluated in a controlled development to offer housing to our workers.

Bob

### **Comp Plan 5th Scenario for EIR**

Council Members,

This is a short note regarding my views toward the EIR and the development of a 5th scenario. I ask that Scenario 5 be put on hold.

As context, I am a member of the CAC and worked diligently to form a sustainability subcommittee that would strive to integrate the SCAP into the comprehensive plan. My comments are as an individual and not as part of the CAC.

The relevance of the EIR, and its use, have been underdeveloped in the CAC and are ambiguous in their application. All the discourse on policy and program occurs without any consideration of the EIR.

My view is that Council is debating a view of our comprehensive plan within the EIR that would be better framed by giving constraints and direction to the CAC. If the Council would aspire to a Palo Alto that is consistent with Scenario 5, then offer that constraint to the CAC and we would necessarily apply that direction.

My recommendation would be to hold on implementing a new Scenario 5 until the CAC returns at the end of our service with a comprehensive plan shaped by CAC and the Council. If more attention were placed by Council on how to apply the CAC and to clarify a CAC deliberative process, then a better outcome from the CAC could be generated for use by the Council. With a better outcome generated on the Comp Plan, then a Scenario 5 could be prepared that is consistent with the policies and programs of the Comp Plan.

In essence the EIR continues to be the "cart before the horse" ... and we need the Council to lead more and allow the EIR to be formed around an comp plan is built by the Council. Instead, we may end up with a Scenario 5 that has ambiguous value, and would be a waste of nearly \$400,000. This is a staggering amount of money to spend for ambiguous value.

In summary, my view is the development of Scenario 5 should be put on hold. The Council should slow down, if at all possible, the EIR process so that the EIR does not precede the development of a comprehensive plan document. Staff should also spend more time with the CAC explaining how to apply the EIR to the Comp Plan process.

Good luck in your deliberations.

## **Palo Alto Airport and the Land for Housing**

Council Members,

While I am on the CAC, I am writing this as a citizen. I offer this based on comments heard between Council this evening.

As you contemplate the housing questions in Palo Alto in the EIR, one always hears how there is no more land. Council member Kniss announced this conundrum. However, the Palo Alto Airport offers at least 110 acres that could be evaluated as a source for at least 5,000 residential housing units.

Sadly our City holds this local airport as a sacred cow. Your CAC has been urging that the airport be moved from the Transportation Element to the Land Use Element. Why? Because the airport contributes nothing to the city's transportation needs.

Those that hold the airport as a the sacred cows will scream. A sacred cow moos: The airport is essential for emergency response after an earthquake. Really? Seems like there are plenty of nearby airports. Moo: The housing would infringe on the sensitive habitat. Really? Housing could be integrated to envelope the habitat. The impact would surely be less that low flying aircraft. Moo: The development would be built on land that would subside in an earthquake. Really? The engineering could easily address subsidence and sea level rise. Moo: We are in a long-term contract. Really? In the time frame of our comprehensive plan we leave that contract and begin the conversion.

As we embark on the SCAP there is not doubt that the airport is about as unsustainable a land use as there is in town. Why can't we at least entertain the question of use of the airport as an option in our essential search for new housing.

Can the Council explore a housing and a school site housing scenario as a "north of Bayshore" housing concept similar to that in Mountain View? Some sacred cows must be challenged in order to create more affordable housing units. That the City owns the land allows for a planned community that might allow preserving price points that would support our workers.

Good luck.

--

Bob Wenzlau  
[bob@wenzlau.net](mailto:bob@wenzlau.net)  
650-248-4467

**From:** Hamilton Hitchings  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 15, 2016 8:52 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Cc:** Gitelman, Hillary; Lee, Elena; Friend, Gil; Keene, James  
**Subject:** 5th EIR Scenario - Improving Quality of Life

Dear City Council and Senior Staff,

I'm excited you are looking at a 5th scenario with the goal of making Palo Alto better in 2030 with a higher quality of life vs. the current 4 scenarios which do not improve traffic, parking and the jobs to housing ratio.

Many residents including myself would like to see the specific outcomes achieved with the 5th scenario:

- ENVIRONMENT: Put us on track towards our goal of achieving 80-30 and environmental leadership
- PARKING: Significantly reduce the number of working commuters parking in residential neighborhoods
- PARKING: Fix parking so when if you go to Downtown or Cal Ave for lunch, shopping or meetings you can easily find a parking spot
- TRAFFIC: Reduce daily single vehicle occupancy trips
- TRAFFIC: Reduce significant traffic delays during rush hour, especially along major roads
- TRAFFIC/HOUSING: Noticeably lower the jobs to housing ratio
- TRAFFIC/HOUSING: Increase the percentage of Palo Altans who live & work in Palo Alto
- HOUSING: Increase affordable housing, below market housing, denser apartments in downtown/cal ave, housing for seniors and housing for young workers.
- QUALITY OF BUILDINGS: Improve human scale and appearance of new buildings and redevelopments so they maintain the current height limit, are smooth transitions, compatible architecture (e.g. not glass & steel) with the surroundings and enhance their local neighborhood and not detract from it.

To improve the jobs to housing ratio we need to continue and office cap for all of Palo Alto except Stanford Research Park and the Stanford University Medical Center. I am concerned about displacement of small local offices, such as the proposed project for 550 Hamilton. I am also concerned about the displacement of startups by highly successful larger companies such as Palantir although I do not have a good proposed solution.

However, I do not think that limiting employment densities is not the solution, rather we should limit the number of commuter cars & parking permits granted into downtown. I also think it's very important not to allow new projects to add to public parking demand and in fact ask them to help improve it when possible.

I believe the steps above will help put us on a course towards a better Palo Alto in 2030 and request your leadership in making them happen.

Hamilton Hitchings



Don McDougall

## **Introduction**

The Staff narrative suggests comments focus on Goals L-1 to L-3 specifically in the context of subcommittee consensus on policies and programs that::

1. Containing development
2. Preserving and enhancing single family quality of life
3. Addressing housing affordability and diversity
4. Monitoring growth.

The Three Goals; **L-1** An attractive city, **L-2** A Sense of Community, **L-3** Attractive neighborhoods focus almost exclusively on policies and programs in categories 1, 2 and 4 above. A quick analysis suggests to me (my opinion) that of the 22 policies within these 3 goals 2/3 are to keep things as they are, and 1/3 are of the “enhance” variety. This may be exactly what is intended and if so, OK, but if not then a review of the policies under this light might yield a better result.

## **Definitions**

I appreciate the provision of Land Use Definitions especially for Open Space. It seems though that Open Space is being defined as any space that does not have a building on it. There are several issues:

- These are not the same definitions used in the Community Services Element and maybe they should be the same?
- Previously Open Space seemed to envelope the areas know as Preserves (a Preserve is where you protect animals so that with a license you can hunt them, a Reserve is a place where you maintain the land in its natural state but OK we can forget that). Public Parks are not in their natural state and are not intended to be.
- Foothills Park for example is referred to on the Palo Alto web site as a “Nature Preserve” as are several others.
  - <http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/csd/parks/preserves/default.asp>
- The “Centers” are better defined and the “multi-neighborhood” category is useful in the Policies.

Maybe it’s worth some effort into getting the definitions right and consistent throughout the Plan for future users of the Plan?

## **Housing**

Although the adopted Housing Element is included for reference (not just for senior housing as the note says?) recent council conversations and the lively discussion of the parameters for Scenario 5 of the EIR suggest that more conspicuously including these policies might be useful. It would either provide a reminder and reinforcement of important policies or cause discussion of ambiguity between the Housing Element and the current CAC Plan.

**Affordable housing needs to be addressed as a major land use issue.**

### **Parks, Playing Fields and Gathering Places**

I continue to believe that Palo Alto should develop its own policies and programs as to what kind and how many parks it needs. It can use whatever national standards it wants as guidelines but it should take a Palo Alto granularity approach to policies. Common belief (and data) is that the population is aging. A more granular framework for Palo Alto parks strategy might include policies that address:

- **Parks** to play in generally serve the 24% of our population that are “players” today and that population is going to 20% with virtually no growth in the total number. But the parks we have need to be **aggressively maintained and should have bathrooms.**
- **Playing fields** generally serve the over 50% of the population is in the “playing field” category. These fields can be within longer walk or bike riding distance (and have bathrooms).
- Community **Gathering Places** for the aging population that is going from 12% to 20% of the population could maybe be more deliberately considered and defined. Gathering Places need to be within walking distance, can be smaller, (and innovatively designed) and comfortable.

### **Walkability**

The Element should contain a Policy or Policies that explicitly address walkability. Although mentioned in several places I don’t think there is an explicitly statement that we want walkability in all neighborhoods and centers.

**From:** Hamilton Hitchings  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 15, 2016 8:43 PM  
**To:** Lee, Elena; Gitelman, Hillary  
**Cc:** Andrew Hill  
**Subject:** Land Use Draft Comment

Elena & Hillary,

This is the first time in the Land Use Subcommittee we've seen the changes we discussed, reflected in a draft of the Land Use Element. Overall, I'd say you've done a great job. I did have one area where I think the changes can be streamlined to make it easier for city council and that's on L-8 since I feel the options are repetitive and can be reduced without materially changing the choices. Here are my suggestions and please include this in the full CAC meeting in-place handouts:

Replace Options 2, 3A, 4A and 5A with:

**NEW PROGRAM:** monitor new residential and non-residential development to proactively address its adverse effects, including traffic, parking, air quality and noise. (I don't see how this would be considered controversial and I would assume almost everyone would support it)

**OPTION 1:** Maintain the 3,257,900 limit on non-residential development.

**OPTION 2:** Expand the 3,257,900 limit on non-residential development to city-wide.

Combine NetZero options 4B and 5B since they look identical

Thank you.

Hamilton Hitchings

**From:** Annette Glanckopf  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 14, 2016 12:27 PM  
**To:** Lee, Elena  
**Subject:** Land use

First fast read of document that was delivered Friday night

Options for height

Option 2...I thought we agreed to remove the text that starts with "to allow flexibility in floor to ceiling heights..."

Comments on Goals 4 onward

did these get changed with our comments?

GOAL 4 Why is Midtown such a focus and not other neighborhood centers?

Policy L71: what does this mean? reuse of buildings?

Policy I26: remove wording " to enhance access for ..."

it doesn't fit

Program L23: Break into 2 programs; second starting with "Improved pedestrian.."

re south El Camino Policy L81 - not consistent with L 160

Program L 36: remove the word multi, since this section talks about neighborhood centers

POLICY L88 OMIT

Program L 38 remove words "within or"

Program L 39 OMIT this is a left over from the old comp plan

PROGRAM L 41: OMIT. By the time the comp plan gets approved, the path will be decided

POLICY L 41 remove wording " encourage additional residential mixed use development"

NEW POLICY L 101: Remove word "some"

POLICY L 46: San Antonio has quite a bit of housing...so I am not sure I agree with this policy

GOAL 7

I think it is time to define a historic district and strictly monitor developments for architectural compatibility

so I suggest we craft new polices/programs

GOAL 8:

NEW PROGRAM L 145 omit wording " in single family neighborhoods..." make it more generic

POLICY L 74: confusing data driven design thinking  
why aren't these in numeric order?

Policy L 72: I recommend review of private art for artistic merit and compatibility

POLICY L 64: omit " encourage and support pedestrian..."

GOAL L 9

This is a great place to put a program that talks about a light hand with striping and signage in residential neighborhoods

I also would love to see some prohibition of those tacky signs that are signboards for commercial, esp neighborhood centers

Policy L78: Somewhere I'd like to add, new projects must be fully parked, with the exception of those for disabled

NEW Program L160: Consider whether sidewalks.....this is not wording for a program

URBAN Forest

needs wording for design of bird friendly buildings

need wording to make sure all this landscaping gets irrigated....with sprinklers etc

Review and reduce limitations on placement of street trees

Make installation of street trees mandatory

Program L 80: IS this current?

need a program to develop and implement secondary source of power

Policy L 175: Omit - why single this out

**Re: School Impacts and Local Land Use Authority (Attachment D)**

This document fails to address explicitly the question of whether the City may consider impacts to schools as part of legislative acts, such as revisions to the Comprehensive Plan. I understand the answer to be yes.

**Height Limit Options**

1. The 50-foot height limit is an overall cap for new construction in most areas of the City. In most parts of the City, a lower limit applies. For example, with a few exceptions in general the limit is 25 feet in CN, and also within 40 feet of a residential zone in ROLM, ROLM(E) (near Embarcadero), RP and RP(5) (in hilly areas); 30 feet in R-1, RE R-2 and RM-15; 35 feet in RMD and RM-30; 35 feet in CC, CC(2) or CS within 150 feet of a residential district (other than RM-40 or PC zone) abutting or located within 50 feet); 35 feet in MOR, ROLM, ROLM(E), RP, RP(5), and GM within 150 feet of a residential zone (including RM-40 or PC zone); 40 feet in RM-40; 37 feet in CC(2) other than near residential district; **50 feet in CC, CS, CD-C, CD-S, CD-N, MOR, and GM other than near residential district, and in PTOD for higher-density residential development.** Within 150 feet of any abutting residential zone district, the maximum height of CD-C, CD-S, and CD-N shall not exceed the height limit of that abutting residential district. **So each of the options for an increase in height limit should recognize that they only apply when the current 50 foot high limit applies.**
2. Note that current Housing Element Program H2.1.1 already states, “To allow for higher density residential development, consider amending the Zoning Code to permit high-density residential in mixed use or single use projects in commercial areas within one-half a mile of fixed rail stations and to allow limited exceptions to the 50-foot height limit for Housing Element Sites within one-quarter mile of fixed rail stations.” So Options 3 and 4 are unnecessary as it is already in the Housing Element.
3. **I prefer Option 1.** Currently, 50-foot height buildings downtown (*e.g.*, 432 University Avenue) are *four* stories tall. I think we do not want this change to allow an increase to five stories over and above the changes considered in Housing Element Program H2.1.1. Changing to 55-foot heights would mean *lower* retail ceiling heights on the ground floor to fit in *five* stories, one additional story than now.

**Non-Residential Growth Management**

1. I prefer a reworded Option 3. “Establish a citywide limit of 3,257,900 square feet of new non-residential development since the 1989 Citywide Land Use and Transportation Study, actively address traffic congestion and parking shortages, and establish lower annual limits for non-residential growth until existing that depend on the level of traffic congestion, and spillover neighborhood parking, and other adverse issues are addressed impacts.” Also reword the new program: “Establish goals for

declining traffic congestion, spillover neighborhood parking, and other adverse impacts strategies to achieve them and methods for monitoring.”

2. For Options 2, 3, and 4, there is a need to reference the 1989 Citywide Land Use and Transportation Study, as I have done above. Otherwise, the 3.25 million square foot cap does not have a reference starting point.
3. Regarding exceptions to the cap for retail development, where in Palo Alto has retail square footage increased? Has it ever been held up by the growth cap?

### **Detailed Comments**

Single Family Residential (page 1) I disagree with an increase in density in single family areas to 14 units per acre in order to support second units. If every lot has a second unit, the character of the neighborhood would change. Otherwise, I support these edits.

Restore the second sentence of [L3] if not the first.

[L6] Review development standards applicable in areas susceptible to flooding from sea level rise, including east of US 101, West Bayshore and East Meadow Circle, and the area east of San Antonio Road and north of East Charleston, ...

[L21] Create opportunities for new mixed use development ~~that includes~~ consisting of housing and retail.

[L24] ~~Re-evaluate~~ Consider revising development standards in the Community Commercial, Service Commercial, and Downtown Commercial Districts (CC, CS, and CD) and the Neighborhood Commercial District along El Camino Real and Alma Street to ~~consider incentivizing~~ incentivize the conversion of non-retail commercial FAR to residential use.

[L46] ~~Consider~~ Evaluate and enact strategies to prevent illegal conversion of residential and neighborhood-serving retail space to retail office or short-term vacation rentals.

New Program after [L47]. Based on nexus studies, charge additional housing impact fees when redevelopment results in the loss of housing units or the replacement of rental housing units to ownership housing units.

New Program after [L49]. When undergrounding fixed rail in Palo Alto, consider workforce housing as a use above it.

[L51] In appropriate locations, encourage a mix of housing types, ~~including~~ such as micro-units, studios, co-housing, clustered housing and secondary dwelling units, to provide a more diverse range of housing opportunities.

[L54] Analyze existing neighborhoods and determine where publicly accessible shared, outdoor gathering spaces are ~~lacking~~ below the Citywide average. Create new public spaces, including public squares, parks and informal gathering spaces in these neighborhoods.

Under Goal L-4. Is Alma Plaza (or Alma Village) still a neighborhood center?

[L62] Encourage broad community involvement in the planning process for proposed development, including the participation of homeowners associations, particularly for developments proposed in the South El Camino Real corridor and the Fry's site and surrounding area, as an integral part of the preparation prior to completion of coordinated area plans.

[L63] **NO BUILD-TO LINES.** Instead consider prohibiting parking in front of new retail buildings.

[L68] Identify priority street improvements that could make a substantial contribution to the character of Centers, including such as widening sidewalks, narrowing travel lanes, creating medians, restriping to allow diagonal parking, and planting trees.

Is [L85] specific to Town and Country Village? If so, it should say so within.

[L87] Review and update the zoning code as needed to ensure it supports the types of uses and scale of buildings considered appropriate in ~~Multi-Neighborhood Centers~~. (This is in the Neighborhood Center section, not the Multi-Neighborhood Center section.)

[L91]. Revise land use and zoning designations as needed to encourage medium-density housing (20 to 25 units per acre) in existing family residential areas ~~within or near~~ Neighborhood Centers served by public transportation to support a more vital mix of commercial activities. (Addition of housing failed for Alma Plaza, and doesn't seem to work for Edgewood Plaza. We shouldn't have a program calling for conversion of R-1 to medium density housing. And we know how VTA plans to cut the 88 and (maybe) 35 bus routes.)

Drop [L95]. ~~Maintain existing residential uses within the Midtown area and encourage additional residential mixed use development.~~ (See comment for [L91].)

[L97] Provide landscaping, trees, sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and connections to the citywide bikeway system within Employment Districts. Pursue opportunities to ~~incorporate~~ include sidewalks, paths, low water use landscaping, and trees in renovation and expansion projects.

[L100] Create ~~and apply~~ zoning standards and design guidelines for commercial hotels, conference centers, and possible residential or mixed-use projects ~~along the El Camino Real edge of~~ in the Stanford Research Park. (Note that the reference to El Camino Real is crossed out in the "marked up" version, but appears in the "clean" version.)

[L102] Evaluate the optimum number of future hotel rooms for Palo Alto and consider reductions in the allowable floor area ratio ~~if~~ as necessary.

[L104] Implement the 2012 East Meadow Circle Concept Plan (Appendix Y of this Comprehensive Plan) ~~in~~ when approving new development or other improvements within the Plan area.

[L147] Explore ways to dedicate a ~~proportion~~ of in-lieu fees towards acquisition of parkland, not just improvements.



[L166] Establish incentives to encourage trees, low water use plantings, and "green infrastructure" in new development throughout the city.

[L167] Update the municipal code to require trees and other landscaping within surface parking lots, which can serve to capture and filter stormwater.

[L175] ~~Encourage~~ Facilitate public participation in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) planning process to obtain public input on the City's infrastructure priorities, including early in the annual cycle.

Also: Require CUP for *all* private schools *everywhere*, including trade schools, so their transportation and other impacts can be addressed.

### **The Community Services and Facilities Element.**

Next time, please also provide a clean copy of the proposed element. Otherwise, it can be hard to see what the intent is for the revised version.

The policies and programs moved to the Land Use Element do not yet appear there, including "Require an assessment of school impacts prior to the approval of development projects that require legislative acts, including general plan amendments and zoning changes."

Page C-2 states, "The Land Use and Community Design Element identifies the locations of park, open space, and other public land, and *also establishes policies for payment of impact fees that are an important source of funding for the services addressed in this Element.*" (emphasis added) I didn't see the reference to impact fees within the Land Use Element. Why should impact fees associated with the CSF Element be in the Land Use Element? See, *e.g.*, Program C3.3.4 on Page C-32.

Page C-2. theatres->theaters. Use the American spelling, not the British one.

Map C-1. Byxbee Park is mislabeled. It points to the Golf Course. The airport area shouldn't be marked as Park/Open Space. Emily Renzel Marsh should be labeled.

Table C-1. I disagree with combining the various parks. We should separate mini-parks from neighborhood parks from district parks. In any event, the edit to Hoover Park is incorrect. The subtotals are useful in each subgroup.

Page C-9. Reinstate this paragraph. "In addition, the City is committed to providing new facilities in areas that are underserved, and in areas where change is expected in the future. The principle of equal access and inclusivity for all members of the Palo Alto community is an integral part of this commitment. Equal access is based on the location of facilities, their design, and the availability of transportation to reach them."

Page C-9. Add mention of the need for additional parkland to support increased housing density.

Page C-10. Avoid use of “it” when rewording will do better. “Major renovations on the Main Library were also completed in 2014, and the branch re-opened with a new name— Rinconada Library. ~~It now houses a~~ as well as new program and group study rooms.”

Page C-11. Delete reference to the \$76 million general obligation bond *unless* you are referring to paying for the renovations. I would reword as follows. “The City Library receives funding from the general fund and fees, supplemented through the fund-raising activities of Friend of the Palo Alto Library (FOPAL), a member-supported non-profit organization, primarily through book sales. The renovations of the City Libraries were funded from a \$76 million general obligation bond, as well as the Palo Alto Library Foundation, which ceased operations on June 30, 2015.”

Page C-12. “Additionally, the City’s Human Relations Commission (HRC) acts on behalf of any person or group that does not benefit fully from a public or private resource in the community.”

Page C-13. Be consistent on whether or not you use the serial comma (also known as the Oxford comma). You’ve deleted them in Youth and Teen Services, but not elsewhere. Where you deleted the comma near the top of Page C-14, it reduces readability.

Pages C-16 to C-17. Please better identify what changed in the Health and Well-Being section.

Page C-19. There is still text at the bottom of the page for deleted Policy C-1.3.

Page C-20. The second deletion to Policy C-1.4 should be reinstated, because otherwise the policy does not scan properly. Also the serial comma improves readability here.

### **Notes on Census Bureau data (see next few pages)**

1. Over 60% of households (over 65% in rental housing) in Palo Alto are one or two persons.
2. Less than 4% of housing units are studios and about 17% are one bedroom.
3. Only about 6% of Palo Alto households do not have their own car. Over 58% have two or more cars.

**S2501: OCCUPANCY CHARACTERISTICS**  
**2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates**

Subject	Palo Alto city, California		
	Occupied housing units	Owner-occupied housing units	Renter-occupied housing units
	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
Occupied housing units	26,420	14,464	11,956
<b>HOUSEHOLD SIZE</b>			
1-person household	28.6%	20.1%	38.8%
2-person household	31.9%	35.8%	27.1%
3-person household	17.4%	17.7%	17.1%
4-or-more-person household	22.1%	26.4%	17.0%
<b>OCCUPANTS PER ROOM</b>			
1.00 or less occupants per room	97.1%	99.2%	94.6%
1.01 to 1.50 occupants per room	2.2%	0.6%	4.2%
1.51 or more occupants per room	0.6%	0.2%	1.2%
<b>HOUSEHOLD TYPE (INCLUDING LIVING ALONE) AND AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER</b>			
Family households	65.0%	76.6%	50.8%
Married-couple family	55.3%	68.0%	40.0%
Householder 15 to 34 years	6.5%	2.5%	11.3%
Householder 35 to 64 years	37.1%	48.1%	23.8%
Householder 65 years and over	11.7%	17.3%	4.9%
Other family	9.7%	8.7%	10.9%
Male householder, no wife present	2.4%	2.5%	2.2%
Householder 15 to 34 years	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%
Householder 35 to 64 years	1.8%	2.1%	1.5%
Householder 65 years and over	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Female householder, no husband present	7.3%	6.2%	8.7%
Householder 15 to 34 years	0.5%	0.1%	1.0%
Householder 35 to 64 years	5.2%	3.7%	7.1%
Householder 65 years and over	1.6%	2.4%	0.6%
Nonfamily households	35.0%	23.4%	49.2%
Householder living alone	28.6%	20.1%	38.8%
Householder 15 to 34 years	6.1%	1.9%	11.2%
Householder 35 to 64 years	9.5%	6.0%	13.8%
Householder 65 years and over	12.9%	12.3%	13.7%
Householder not living alone	6.5%	3.3%	10.4%
Householder 15 to 34 years	3.8%	0.6%	7.8%
Householder 35 to 64 years	1.8%	1.3%	2.4%
Householder 65 years and over	0.8%	1.4%	0.2%
<b>FAMILY TYPE AND PRESENCE OF OWN CHILDREN</b>			
With related children under 18 years	34.8%	36.0%	33.3%
With own children under 18 years	34.2%	35.3%	32.9%
Under 6 years only	6.8%	5.4%	8.5%
Under 6 years and 6 to 17 years	4.5%	4.1%	5.1%
6 to 17 years only	22.9%	25.9%	19.3%
No own children under 18 years	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%
No related children under 18 years	65.2%	64.0%	66.7%

**DP04: SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS**  
**2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates**

Subject	Palo Alto city, California	
	Estimate	Percent
<b>HOUSING OCCUPANCY</b>		
Total housing units	27,983	27,983
Occupied housing units	26,420	94.4%
Vacant housing units	1,563	5.6%
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.3	(X)
Rental vacancy rate	3.3	(X)
<b>UNITS IN STRUCTURE</b>		
Total housing units	27,983	27,983
1-unit, detached	15,635	55.9%
1-unit, attached	1,703	6.1%
2 units	290	1.0%
3 or 4 units	1,494	5.3%
5 to 9 units	1,757	6.3%
10 to 19 units	1,829	6.5%
20 or more units	5,132	18.3%
Mobile home	143	0.5%
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0.0%
<b>ROOMS</b>		
Total housing units	27,983	27,983
1 room	852	3.0%
2 rooms	1,691	6.0%
3 rooms	3,540	12.7%
4 rooms	4,891	17.5%
5 rooms	4,617	16.5%
6 rooms	3,969	14.2%
7 rooms	3,316	11.9%
8 rooms	2,426	8.7%
9 rooms or more	2,681	9.6%
Median rooms	5.2	(X)
<b>BEDROOMS</b>		
Total housing units	27,983	27,983
No bedroom	1,061	3.8%
1 bedroom	4,833	17.3%
2 bedrooms	6,753	24.1%
3 bedrooms	8,203	29.3%
4 bedrooms	5,178	18.5%
5 or more bedrooms	1,955	7.0%
<b>HOUSING TENURE</b>		
Occupied housing units	26,420	26,420
Owner-occupied	14,464	54.7%
Renter-occupied	11,956	45.3%

Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.66	(X)
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	2.25	(X)
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT		
Occupied housing units	26,420	26,420
Moved in 2010 or later	7,437	28.1%
Moved in 2000 to 2009	9,705	36.7%
Moved in 1990 to 1999	3,845	14.6%
Moved in 1980 to 1989	2,406	9.1%
Moved in 1970 to 1979	1,685	6.4%
Moved in 1969 or earlier	1,342	5.1%
VEHICLES AVAILABLE		
Occupied housing units	26,420	26,420
No vehicles available	1,624	6.1%
1 vehicle available	9,376	35.5%
2 vehicles available	10,782	40.8%
3 or more vehicles available	4,638	17.6%
OCCUPANTS PER ROOM		
Occupied housing units	26,420	26,420
1.00 or less	25,664	97.1%
1.01 to 1.50	585	2.2%
1.51 or more	171	0.6%
MORTGAGE STATUS		
Owner-occupied units	14,464	14,464
Housing units with a mortgage	9,500	65.7%
Housing units without a mortgage	4,964	34.3%

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**Citizens Advisory Committee**  
**DRAFT ACTION MINUTES AND MEETING SUMMARY**

The Citizens Advisory Committee met on April 19, 2016 in the Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room

**Present:** Filppu, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Kou, Levy, McDougall, McNair, Moran, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Uang, Uhrbrock, van Riesen, Wenzlau

**Absent:** Emberling, Fine, Garber and Nadim

**Staff Present:** Hillary Gitelman, Elena Lee, Robin Ellner, Elaine Costello, Gil Friend and Andrew Hill (consultant)

**Agenda Changes, Additions, and Deletions:** None

**Oral Communications:**

Rebecca Byrne – of Housing Choices Coalition stated that relaxing the height limit would help with providing more housing units.

William Macrae – supported relaxing the height limit.

Justine Burt – Family with son who moved to attend Palo Alto public school and cannot afford to buy. Urged CAC to consider zoning changes to allow more density within a mile of trans stations.

Neilson Buchanan – Height exceptions need to be considered carefully. Senior housing, especially congregant housing, have enormous potential and should be considered for higher density development.

Eileen Meyer – Tracks multi-family housing. The information can also be found at the following web link: <http://bit.ly/1JWU6bz>

Linnea Wickstrom - 45 year resident with a developmentally disabled son. High density, multi-story housing near transit is needed for developmentally disabled adults. Also in favor of additional dwelling units. People should be prioritized over parking.

John Kelly - Urged that the City be courageous and bold. The City should raise the height limit. He also stated that the City needs to embrace the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan. The S/CAP people should be invited to participate.

Brett Anderson – Concerned about climate change, quality of life and sustainability and stated that higher density is needed to address those concerns.

**Staff Comments**

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director thanked staff, the CAC housing delegation and the subcommittee members. She stated that staff would take a more active role at subcommittee meetings, adding more structure if needed to meetings. Director Gitelman introduced Elaine Costello, the new project manager for the Comp Plan Update. She then provided an update about the City Council meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> on housing issues and upcoming meetings including the May 16<sup>th</sup> Council meeting on the fifth scenario and June 6<sup>th</sup> Council meeting on the Draft EIR. She also invited Gil Friend to speak on the S/CAP and relationship with the Comp Plan. Staff anticipates a monthly meeting with the Sustainability Subcommittee. Director Gitelman then introduced the use of color cards to indicate support, opposition or that more consideration is needed for the evening's discussion.

Gil Friend, the Chief Sustainability Officer provided an update of the April 18<sup>th</sup> Council hearing on the S/CAP and introduced the S/CAP. He stated that the draft is available on the City's website. He also stated that staff has met and will continue to meet to discuss the integration of the S/CAP and the Comp Plan. Mr. Friend and Director Gitelman then responded to questions from the CAC.

**Report from the CAC housing delegation to the March 21<sup>st</sup> City Council Meeting**

CAC members Uang, Moran, Kou and Summa provided a summary of what was discussed at the Council meeting. Director Gitelman then expressed appreciation for the housing delegation's work within a short time frame. The delegation was able to convey to the Council the complexity and differences of opinions on the housing issue. This work helped to inform Council's direction to staff. Staff will continue to work with Council on this issue.

**Status Update from the Community Services and Facilities and Land Use and Community Design Subcommittees**

Community Services and Facilities Subcommittee members Packer and McDougall provided an update of the subcommittee's work on the revision of the element per Council direction. Following this discussion, the Land Use Subcommittee members Levy, van Riesen, Glanckopf, Filppu, Hitchings, Summa, Kleinhaus, Sung provided a summary of their April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting on that element.

**Discussion of Land Use & Community Design Element**

The CAC then discussed the Land Use and Community design element. The discussion focused on housing, mixed use, height limits, dynamic growth management tools, Coordinated Area Plans and park land.

**Feedback for Continuous Improvement**

CAC discussed the subcommittee process.

**Future Meetings**

- June 6, 2016, City Council hearing on Draft EIR
- June 21, 2016 CAC Meeting, Mitchell Park Community Center