



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT PLACES MEMO
Tuesday, August 16, 2016**

Please find attached comments received from CAC members and the general public.
Comments were received from the following:

CAC members

Annette Glanckopf
Bonnie Packer
Jennifer Hetterly
Shani Kleinhaus
Elaine Uang
Steve Levy
Hamilton Hitchings
Whitney McNair
Arthur Keller

General Public

Ken Joye
Betty Jo Chang

Annette Glanckopf
2747 Bryant St
Palo Alto, Ca 94306

LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT
Comments to The CAC (Comprehensive Plan – Citizen’s Advisory Committee)
Aug 16, 2016

Vote to include child care centers in Neighborhood Commercial: I am against child care as a permitted use in the 3 Neighbor Commercial areas – Edgewood, Midtown and Charleston thus do not want it mentioned in comp plan. I am not against this use in other zones, and there are numerous child care centers scattered throughout the city in neighborhoods. There are 2 additional major reasons.

- 1) Child care needs to be in a safe location. Not one where children could dart into traffic. There also needs to be a safe space for them to play. This seems**
 - 2) Retail from these centers is vanishing quickly.**
 - Midtown with approximately 15 owners is becoming a haven for national chains and is losing retail due to rising rents. Currently there are multiple opportunities for kids at the centre –MyGym, School of Rock, Untied School of Defense, Kumon studies, Young Builder. Midtown needs more retail, not child care.**
 - Edgewood is already built out (except for grocery)**
 - Charleston has a single owner and tightly controls what business comes in**
-

Other comments

- The overview is too long, much too much fluff and some text is redundant to other sections of the element.**
- Pictures do not add anything if there isn’t any annotation as to the relevance/**
- Page L9: Not sure where you got 35 neighborhoods. The PAN site lists 33 and that includes HOAs.**
- Page L18: What parking lot has public art? What makes a parking lot well designed. The Midtown centre has lots of trees (not taken care of) with horrid circulation. I guess you can consider public art due to the art on the buildings.**
- Page L29: There are 3 defined neighborhood commercial areas.- why include locations along El Camino and Alma?**
- Child care: Why can’t we just remove this from the permitted uses ?**
- Page L33: I am not in favor of Program L1.4.1 “Work with property owners” this sounds like they will write zoning code. Suggestions needs to come from staff, PTC, council...not developers**
- Page L33: Policy L.1.5 then Program L1.1.5.1 Add consider expanding the flood zone to consider area that will be affected by sea level rise.**

- Page L42 under Community Performance Measures. – Housing Cost Burden : How would staff measure the % of homeowners paying more than 50% of household income for housing. This seems very invasive of privacy. OMIT
- Page L43: Program L2.2.1: Omit (retail in neighborhoods) Although this sounds like a worthwhile goal, I cannot support this due to issues of crime, noise, potential issues with maintenance of property – attractiveness, cleanliness
- Page L43: Policy L.2.4: How would we accomplish reuse of existing buildings? Incentives? Need more specificity
- Page L44 Program L3.2.1 specifically mention Airbnb
- Page L 45 Need program under Policy L 3.7 (multi-family buildings have clear relationship to street)
- Policy L 46: Program L3.8.1 consider zoning revisions “as greater setbacks” add this wording
- Page L 47 text is redundant
- Page L 50: Program L 4.2.3 Mention parks in the Fry’s master plan wording
- Page L 52: Program L 4. 5. 4: add traffic lights to text
- Page L 53: Omit Program L 4. 9.1 to reuse parking lots at Stanford. There is not enough parking now. I do not see this change in foreseeable future...actually I see the need for more parking.
- Page L 60: Policy L 6.12 add create special regulations/standards for Eichler neighborhoods
- Page L 61: Policy L 6.14 and 15 are the same
- Page L 67: Policy L 8.2: OMIT. Fluff
- Page L 68: Policy L 9.1 Add “careful use of signage” or words to that effect
- Page L 69: Policy L 9.7: “ensure that each residential neighborhood has such spaces” REWORD. Some neighborhoods are very small and are all housing (Triple EI, GreenAcres I and II) Some are huge like Midtown. I would remove this sentence.
- Page L 69: Policy L 9.8: I would like to see a program created to dedicate benches (and other amenities) in honor of someone who has died.
- Page L 70: Program L 9.9.1 “Enhance Public gateways” add Matadero Creek
- Page L 71: Program L 9.10.2: Add use water from dewatering sites
- Page L 74: Program L.10.2.4: Add “Work with SkyPosse and other organizations”

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Staff Report:

Child care. Keep child care as an acceptable use in neighborhood commercial centers.

Draft Element:

Goal L1

Program L1.4.1[L5]. Poorly written : replace the words “and actions that attempt” with “and to work”

Policy L-1.9[L13] This policy favors hotels in transit areas and is in direct conflict with the Housing Element which encourages housing along these areas. Housing near commercial areas, which include downtown and Cal Ave, makes much more sense than hotels. **Delete this policy.**

Growth Management Policy Options

Please note that the existing comp plan does not use the word “cap” The current term is “limit.”

Why I oppose caps or limits on non-residential growth. An arbitrary limit or cap on non-residential growth is a non-analytical political sledgehammer. We can do better than that. To achieve the two-pronged goal sought by limiting development of office/R&D space -- to reduce commute traffic and to address the jobs/housing imbalance -- changes should be made in the zoning code to de-incentivize office development and to incentivize multi-family development. This can be done with changes to the zoning code, such as reducing FAR allowed for office/R&D and increasing FAR for residential uses. There is a start here in Program L1.17.5 [L31]. I suggest putting more teeth in that program.

Any cap or limit or trigger should address only net new square footage – it should not include conversions from one non-residential use to another. Again, this is another non-analytical political sledgehammer – staff has not defined what converted uses the cap would apply to. CAC has not agreed to include conversions, yet the staff report assumes this is the case. IT IS NOT.

It is absurd to ask CAC to come up with numbers for any kind of limit or cap without CAC having data on the history of development and data on what new square footage is possible based on current zoning in the various areas under consideration and what would be possible if the current zoning were changed as I suggest above. Without more information, any number CAC comes up with would clearly be a non-analytical sledgehammer based on no data and no analysis.

If a cap is adopted, however, it should include hotel uses, but not include conversions unless the conversion is from residential to office. The cap should apply only to net new square feet.

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

I choose no annual limit. Instead the comp plan should have a program to explore the adoption of zoning changes to encourage residential development. If an annual limit is adopted, exempt Stanford Research Park.

I choose no downtown cap. But if a downtown cap is adopted, do not try to exempt small offices – there is potential for abuse. Also, if it is adopted, apply the limit to hotels too.

What is the point of the Community Performance Measures? What will the City do with the information from the monitoring of community measures? Will a particular action be triggered if, for example, VMT is not reduced by 5% per year?

Remove the PAUSD items from the Community Performance Issues. Class size and spending per student are affected by many factors outside the control of the City, in particular, state funding, state requirements and revenue from real property taxes. These items are not directly affected by the amount of development in the City.

More on growth management:

Following is the memo I sent in July and asked that it be shared with CAC. I do not think that has happened.

To: Elena Lee and Elaine Costello
From: Bonnie Packer
Date: July 25, 2016

Re: Growth Management of non-residential development as discussed by CAC on July 19.

Existing Policy L-8 states that the limit for new non-residential development was established in response to transportation issues outlined in that 1989 Land Use and Transportation Study. **Since the original growth limit was related to traffic issues, any non-residential growth management policies in the updated Land Use Element should be related to and connected with traffic reduction measures proposed in the updated Transportation Element.**

In the draft updated Transportation Element, there are many policies and programs, which if implemented, would have the effect of reducing traffic and traffic congestion. Have there been studies to determine whether or not there is a meaningful correlation between the amount of traffic and the amount of new non-residential growth over the years – given that the growth limit was created to address traffic issues?

The trigger (or limit) in this updated Land Use Element should be tied to a traffic indicator of some sort. Would it be possible to develop a ratio of non-residential growth to traffic which, when this ratio becomes out of balance, it would trigger an effort to re-evaluate both transportation policies and development policies?

Below are some additional questions that I hope will be answered by the staff before the next CAC Land Use meeting:

How does the current annual limit work? Has it been operating as a moratorium on development? When in a developer's application process does it apply? Isn't the limit an incentive for a developer to simply wait until the following year with his/her application?

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Has there been a study to show the potential for growth in areas zoned for office and hotel? That is, given the existing zoning requirements which place limits on height, FAR, setbacks, etc., how much actual growth potential, measured in square feet, is there in these areas? Would a proposed cap/limit/trigger be based on this information? If not what would it be based upon?

If the word "cap" or "limit" is replaced with a word such as "trigger" what would occur if the trigger was reached? The existing comp plan says that the City will re-evaluate development policies and regulations when the limit might be reached. So, in reality, the limit was always intended to operate as a trigger to re-evaluate. [BTW: The existing comp plan does not call this a "cap" - it is called a limit.]

Thanks for considering these issues. Please share this memo with the Land Use Element sub-committee and the rest of CAC.

Comments on Other Goals:

Goal L2

Cross ref to Transportation Element

Goal L3

Policy L3.2 [L44] Preserve residential uses from conversion to office or short term vacation rentals. [NEW POLICY] [L44] This is stated in a very broad and confusing way and should not include the air B&B issue. I suggest: "Consider changes to the zoning code to de-incentivize the conversion of residential uses to office uses in commercial zones. "

The issue of short term vacation rentals is much stickier and should probably not be included in the comp plan. This is a current issue that the City Council could consider addressing after checking with the City Attorneys on how to do this.

Program L3.2.1 [L45] address a different issue than the one stated in Policy L3.2 as it addresses retail being converted, as well as residential. I have the same concerns as stated above.

Program L3.3.1 [L47] In R1 and R2 neighborhoods the city cannot legally control whether a property owner wishes to rent or not rent the property. Please check with City Attorney before putting these draconian ideas in the comp plan.

Goal L4

Program L4.1.1 [L56] please define formula retail or put more info about these limits on Cal Ave in a side box.

Program L4.2.1 [58] The CAP for South El Camino includes the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park – yet nothing is said in the program about affordable housing. Please add language that the plan should consider housing for very low, low and moderate incomes.

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

L4.2.3 [L60] The CAP for Fry's should relate somehow to the CAP for South El Camino – as they are so close to one another.

Policy L4.3[L61] It is unnecessary to spell out that broad community involvement should be encouraged in planning for coordinated area plans. This policy should be eliminated or as an alternative simply add the words “with broad community involvement” in Policy L4.2 [L57]

Policy L4.19 [L85] The parking and circulation in Midtown needs work. This should be addressed somewhere.

Goal L6

Building Heights: I favor option 4. Policy L6.10 [L107]

Policy L6.14[L117] and L6.15 [L118] say the same thing. Don't we already have an ordinance limiting the height of fences? Why do we need this? In any event, the concern is with obscuring the view of the **front** of houses – on corner lots, homeowners should be able to have fences to obscure the sides of their houses.

Delete this as being too vague and unenforceable:

If a proposed development would affect a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the City's Historic Resources Inventory, consider whether it is eligible for inclusion in the City's Inventory prior to the issuance of a demolition or alterations permit. (NEW POLICY) (Comp Plan Draft EIR Mitigation Measure CULT-1b) [L123]

Goal 7

Policy L7.16[L143] It is absurd to include in the comp plan a statement that all new development must meet state codes. That is a given. Maybe it could be reworded so that it says “Ensure that developers understand their obligation to meet state codes.....”

Goal L8

Cross ref to Community Services Element

Policy L8.4 [L151] Expand this Policy to specify the Civic Centers: Mitchell Park, Ricnonda Library, Art Center, Cubberley.

Policy L8-5 [L152] Expand the breadth of this policy by adding the words “cultural, musical and artistic” “better urban spaces for civic, musical, cultural, and artistic programs, events and exhibitions.”

Goal L9

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Cross ref to Community Services and Transportation elements. Cross check to see where there may be overlaps.

Program L9.2.1 [L158] As stated, this program is a bit overreaching and may be unnecessary. Much of this is already addressed in the zoning code. Please check the code to see if this is really necessary. For example, there are a lot of homes along Embarcadero with typical R-1 setbacks. Page Mill Road in the Open Space district has a huge setback requirement. Soften language to say "Evaluate existing zoning code setbacks to ensure that setback requirements along these routes are appropriate for non R-1 scenic areas.

Goal L10

Program L10.21[L187] Two separate ideas here landscaping and bike path. Make it two programs.

Overall Growth Management Policy Options

Please clarify that although 2015 may be used as the baseline for a growth management/monitoring system based on square footage, (derived from 1989 land use study and current cap), that does not mean we're starting from a clean slate in terms of impacts. Community performance measures should reflect and address the cumulative impacts of both past and future growth.

Calling for caps to be re-evaluated "regularly" is pretty vague. Does that mean there will be re-evaluation in addition to the 67% marker? Or does "regularly" refer to the frequency of re-evaluation only where there is no numerical cap/limit? A timeframe for re-evaluation should be specified and guidance should be explicit: if performance measures are not achieving the desired management of impacts, caps will be imposed or existing caps adjusted down and performance metrics will be strengthened going forward.

TABLE 1

Desired Approach

Monitoring Development: "Monitor non-residential development and market rate housing."

This Comp Plan Update encourages housing development. Despite lots of language saying that what we really want is affordable and special needs housing, it should be well understood that unless the government builds it, the bulk of new housing will be market rate. Even if a big chunk is smaller, "more affordable" units, Palo Alto will remain unaffordable for most people. When we incentivized office growth in the last Comp Plan, we ended up with well more than we wanted or could manage. We cannot afford to go down that same road with market rate housing.

All new development diminishes already meager supply of buildable land. If what we really want is a more diverse and affordable community, we should closely monitor market rate residential development and build in triggers to constrain it in the future, in order both to manage impacts on community performance measures and to preserve space for what we really want.

New Performance Measures: Both types of Performance Measures should have a trigger for tighter requirements if the desired outcomes are not achieved.

Other

Enforcement: Add an enforcement element under Annual Limit and New Performance Measures. Compliance oversight and strict penalties should be specified for failure to comply with requirements for "self-mitigating projects" and other exempt uses as well as for failure to meet required performance standards.

Triggers vs. Caps

With or without caps, a decline in community performance measures (livability standards) should trigger new constraints on development.

TABLE 2

Development performance measures listed in the comp plan should include targets that go above and beyond existing development standards. Existing standards have proven inadequate to manage impacts. The point of testing performance measures is to identify and implement specific metrics that will effectively reduce impacts sufficiently to justify elimination of hard caps/height limits.

As such, key measures should correlate to the specific impacts we want to manage better. Development performance measures should track site specific impacts while community measures track cumulative impacts.

Development Performance Measures

a-1. Add VMT and LOS related to project with minimum requirement of no increase.

b. "Preserving Affordable Housing: no net loss of affordable dwelling units, displacement of existing BMR residents, or ~~and discouraging~~ loss of smaller homes such as cottages."

c. Delete "micro units." By their nature, micro units can fit into any mix of multi-family housing. They should not require special height exceptions. Furthermore, they will be market rate units, providing greater return on investment than "affordable" (if we mean BMR we should say so) units or those targeted to populations with special needs. Exceptions providing flexibility around height limits (or other requirements such as parking or FAR) should be limited to housing types that will go unbuilt absent special incentives or exceptions.

d. "Urban forest, open space, and habitat: ~~preserving or~~ increasing canopy cover or parkland or a percent native plantings conducive to habitat ~~vegetated/open space areas."~~

Developers have a self-interest in providing vegetated/open space areas (aka landscaping) on site. If performance measures are really intended as a tool to manage the impacts of growth, they should be targeted toward addressing community needs or challenges.

e. Add parking – no overflow to public streets.

f. Add noise, glare, shading, water impacts.

Community Performance Measures

2. LOS should be added to VMT. It is a direct measure of localized livability impacts.

4. Jobs/housing balance in and of itself is NOT a livability index. Achieving balance could more than double the resident population resulting in significant detriments to livability including housing construction up to four times the cumulative total built from 1970 to 2014 and the inevitable costs and strains of that population growth on services (schools, police & fire, community services, etc) and infrastructure (traffic, parking, water, etc).

While jobs/housing balance may be a goal worth striving for, the outcomes one seeks to achieve through that balance are better represented by the more targeted measures identified in the 8 other bullets.

10. Add Parking – reduction in overflow into neighborhoods and progress toward goal of 80% parked vehicle level.

11. Add percent increase in urban canopy.

School Impacts

Land Use Subcommittee Staff Report from 8/1/16 indicates that Policy C-1.14 “Make it a high priority to assist PAUSD in anticipating and addressing land development related school enrollment impacts” and Program C-1.14.1 “Provide regular status reports to PAUSD and to the public on potential and approved development projects” have been reinstated in the Schools section of the Community Facilities Element.

That policy and program are more directly related to the City’s Land Use and Community Design than to its Community Services and Facilities. Furthermore, Planning staff is better positioned than Community Services staff to provide the necessary reports and assistance to PAUSD regarding land development related impacts. The Policy and Program should be moved to the Land Use Element.

Policies and Programs

Program L1.13.1 [L19] should be moved to L1.12.1 as both deal with hotel cap.

Programs L1.17.2 [L28], L1.17.3 [L29] and L1.17.4 [L30]: Delete last sentence “Development in excess of the cap may be permitted during this re-evaluation process if the percentage of commute trips to/from Downtown by single occupant vehicle is less than __ percent.”

Policy L1.18 [L33]: Hold development to “highest standards” of what? Construction quality? Compatibility? Minimal community impacts? High building standards may result in nice buildings, but don’t necessarily have any correlation to livability or minimizing impacts. Too vague.

Program L1.18.1 [L34]: Where is Table L-1? See comments above re Development Performance Measures.

Policy L1.20 [L36] and Table L-2: See comments above re Community Performance Measures.

Policy L3.2 [L45]: Add new program L3.2.2: Scrutinize new projects with basement bedrooms for potential occupancy in excess of single family residential density limits and risk of illegal conversion to short term rentals.

While I appreciate the tremendous work staff has invested here, I find that the outcome does not fully reflect the discussion and requests made by members of the landuse committee and the landuse committee. I request that we convene for yet another subcommittee meeting prior to presenting the land use element as a whole, and specifically performance and livability (community) measures, to the CAC. I think we need to have votes and options for performance measures. This is needed because Development and Livability measures are so central to the Comp Plan and the EIR.

Development performance measures (Measures applied to new development)

- What is the relationship between these performance measures and the EIR scenarios?
- My understanding was that Council was looking for sustainability related performance measures in addition to standards/requirements? If performance measures are implemented, then all the standards related to efficient use of resources and minimizing environmental impacts should be implemented as performance measures?
- c. Facilitating Affordable Housing: Allow flexible height limits to facilitate a mix of multi-family housing, including affordable units, micro-units and housing for seniors and people with special needs

Is this included or scratched out? (the c is scratched out) Is staff proposing flexible height limit to allow affordable housing as a development performance measure? The height limit issue is presented as policy options for CC to decide. As proposed, I think that this development performance measure essentially mandate that projects exceed the height limit?

- d. Urban forest, open space, and habitat:
Preserving or increasing canopy cover or a percent vegetated/open space areas – Open space areas can be paved – and this is controversial (visualize a landscaped area planted with trees vs. concrete plaza) – I see this as a controversial issue which may need to be decided by Council.
- Green Building Requirements
Is new development required to comply with all of the Green Building requirements?

Community Performance Measures (Measures that evaluate key livability outcomes from both existing and future development)

I think we should use the term “Livability Measures” to include both social and environmental criteria. These are truly aimed to measure cumulative impacts of existing and future development and are critical to our ability to plan for the future and to avoid divisions and conflicts in the community.

So it is important to add the measures that members of the Landuse and the Sustainability Subcommittees asked for: LOS, Parking, Urban Forest/canopy. I would also add biodiversity (based on CBC and SBC bird counts), noise, air quality, safety – all the impacts that are usually found of less than significant impact on a project-by-project level, or are exempt from CEQA, but can cumulatively impose harm on the community. If staff feels that these added criteria are not needed, they should be presented to the CAC for a vote.

Building Design

In the City Council meeting of August 15th, showed (again) how important design/architecture are to our community’s sense-of-place. Several councilmembers looked for compatibility in terms of and scaling, harmonious transition, character and style, and maintaining neighborhood Character. I think that the language from the existing plan that addresses these issues should maintained in the new plan.

Airport

FAA rules mean that the airport must operate 24/7, like a freeway.

Policies and Programs

I think polishing and trimming is needed for many policies and programs, and it would be beneficial to allow the subcommittee time to work on these (committee work thus far focused on big issues, but now additional work is needed before this element is finalized).

For example, why do we need policies to support existing regulation? If we believe that regulation is not followed, then we should strengthen it (for example, Policy L-6.12). Also, are there low-priority programs that can be removed? Why are trees not included in Program L6.13.2? Policy L-6.15 and Policy L-6.16 are identical.

Overall, I think the subcommittee’s work is not complete and the element should return to the CAC.

Thank you,
Shani Kleinhaus

Land Use CAC

Notebook: Palo Alto Comp Plan CAC

Created: 8/16/2016 7:36 AM

Updated: 8/16/2016 8:28 AM

Author: Elaine Uang

URL: <http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/report/another-inconvenient-truth/>

General comments:

As suggested at last month's meeting please provide an index of the Land Use Element goals and key subsections (ie L-1 Growth Management, L-2

As suggested for Transportation Element, please put the policies and programs first, and the narrative last, or intersperse the two. We should not be asked to read until page L-32 to get to the first Land Use Policy

This Land Use Element is so important because it has the potential to upgrade our broken land use and transportation policies that can help our community address climate change issues, and simultaneously address social equity. I encourage my colleagues to read the following report: [Another Inconvenient Truth: To achieve Climate Change Goals, California Must Remove Barriers to Sustainable Land Use](#)

Specific Comments (in order of priority)

Policy L-4.2 - I have repeatedly asked for Coordinated Area Plans for the Downtown Area and California Avenue and all of ECR, to create pearls on a string. I would like to raise this again with the committee and request a straw poll vote. CAPs for Downtown, Cal Ave and all of ECR the the best way for us to measure performance metrics to gauge development impacts. The are also the right tool to coordinate and integrate our sustainable transportation goals, and to accomplish our urban design, public space objectives. We need to a new program calling for a CAP for Downtown and extend the Fry's piece to include the whole Cal Ave/Park Blvd corridor. Otherwise we will fail our nascent downtown Transportation Management Association (and any future TMAs), not be able to meet housing needs of our existing residents, or be able to support the small businesses in our community. Our neighbors in the region use CAPs or similar processes as planning tools and community engagement efforts, we need to begin this process.

76% of recently polled residents said housing affordability is their main concern and there has not been enough discussion at committee or subcommittee level about how we can complement our Housing Element through Land Use Element changes to address this. We have not yet looked at the Land Use map. Right now only 3% of our land is designated multifamily dwelling and 0.7% allows mixed use. Looking at where multifamily zones can occur or policies to increase the ratio of housing in commercial mixed use areas have not been discussed. I am appalled by this Land Use draft and do not think this is ready to go to city council yet.

Trying to abolish childcare as a use at Charleston, Edgewood and Midtown Shopping Center ignores two segments of the population that don't often take time to engage

civically: young children and parents of young families. Because they do not show up, does not mean it is not a problem. During the Community Services & Policies Element discussion, Heidi Emberling and I both mentioned that child care is a highly underserved use in the community - Santa Clara County only has childcare spaces for ~35% of its 3-5 year olds, and there is less space for infant care (age 0-2). While PA has more than Santa Clara's average, there is still much greater demand for child care than supply. Just as schools and shops are neighborhood anchors and community spaces so are childcare centers. Paring childcare centers with neighborhood retail can actually reduce trips - you can pick up your kid, then pick up some milk or a birthday present, all in one trip. Removing childcare as a use from Midtown, Charleston and Edgewood is a terrible idea and is direct conflict with several other policies in Land Use:

- L 1-2 Focus on attracting and encouraging land uses that address the needs of the community. (child care is very much needed by our community today)
- L4-19 Encourage a variety of neighborhood retail shops and services (services available in Midtown today include child oriented activities which are beloved, well used and fantastic!)

Retaining or re-using ground water is important, but eliminating basement construction in single family residences is not a Land Use Policy, but a zoning ordinance update. Dan Garber's memo has illustrated that notrees or adjacent structures have been damaged from groundwater removal of basement projects, and the movement is based on very little evidence that damage occurs. While more can be done to preserve the groundwater, this issue does not rise to Comp Plan level.

I also support retaining references to bathrooms in Goal L-4. Many groups in our city would use public facilities, we should make them available where possible.

From: Steve Levy [mailto:slevy@ccsce.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 9:25 AM
To: Lee, Elena
Subject: At place memo

I want to revisit the options for specific plans.

Based on conversations with many people, I wish to add specific plans for downtown, Cal Ave and San Antonio to the list of potential specific area plans forwarded to council.

I realize there are timing and resource issues but

1. These areas have the most discussion and controversy re specific projects.
2. Our process has been to forward minority positions.

So I would like a vote on expanding the area plan list.

Sent my iPadn

From: Hamilton Hitchings [mailto:hitchingsh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 10:45 PM
To: Lee, Elena; Gitelman, Hillary; Costello, Elaine
Subject: CAC Land Use Element Comments

My Comments on the latest Land Use Element:

- I think Performance Measures offer a valuable tool for the city to help mitigate impacts. However, if not implemented and enforced properly could be ineffective as we've witness with some of the zoning codes. That is why I am in favor of the "All of the Above Approach" for this comp plan. If the performance measures do work effectively and achieve their desired outcome over the extended period of this comp plan as I envision them, I'd be in favor of making them a primary form of growth management the next comp plan. The desired housing growth can still be achieved in the most aggressive DEIR scenario 6 with an "All of the Above Approach", which is what I support for this comp plan while we try out Performance Measures.
- I'm not in favor of exempting "self mitigating projects" from the Office R&D cap because that reduces potential housing development.
- Policy L-1.19 Development Performance Measures please add back in all the items covered under existing development standards including parking, canopy, water, energy, green buildings displacement, glare, noise and shading, LOS & design guidelines and increasing affordable housing (not maintaining). Its important that its in the Comp Plan since zoning can be changed at any time.
- Policy L-1.20 I disagree with staff's idea of omitting many of the development and community performance measures because they are already covered under the existing zoning for several reasons. For example, reducing using neighborhoods for employee parking. First, they have not been sufficiently effective so need to be strengthened and secondly they could be watered down in the future.
- I would like to see the language around Community Measures strengthened to achieving specific goals, such as traffic/trip caps, canopy cover, greenhouse gas emissions reduction, parking rather than the current weaker language.
- Neighborhood Impacts including Noise, Glare, Size, Scale & Neighbor Compatibility and nearby LOS for major intersections should be Development Performance Measures
- Child Care Options - Remove final sentence in second option since Alma Plaza should not allow child care either
- L1.17.2 and L1.17.3 remove last sentence "Development in excess of the cap may be permitted during this re-evaluation process if the percentage of commute trips to/from Downtown by single occupant vehicle is than ___ percent". This was not discussed in the LUE sub committee and I don't agree with it. There are many other reasons to not approve office/R&D projects, such as the need for more housing.

The Land Use Element and DEIR scenarios 5 & 6, which appears to be the ones most folks favor, are tightly related. Scenario 5 is housing centric moderate growth and Scenario 6 is fast housing / residential growth. Here are my comments for both the CAC and as input to the upcoming city council meeting on the DEIR scenarios:

- Raising the 50' height limit should not be part of Scenario 5
- Likewise streamlining the permitting process to grant developers a "right to build" should not be part of Scenario 5 and many residents would strongly oppose it even for scenario 6.
- We should not be including converting commercial to residential in the Neighborhood Community Centers
- A different approach to Conditional Use Permits rather than employee density on existing buildings could be to use them to only permit use for small offices & startups/companies for new buildings.
- Lots of items to increase housing but basically none to increase below market housing. I'd like to see a 25% below market housing requirement for new multi-unit housing and if we go above 50 feet, then 50% for any incremental space added as a result of that.



Stanford University

August 16, 2016

Land Use and Community Design Comments

Whitney McNair, Director Land Use Planning Stanford University

Cumulative Cap

- It is unnecessary for the Comprehensive Plan to include a cumulative cap, performance measures, community performance measures, and an annual cap.

Cumulative Cap: Office/R&D vs Office/R&D and Hotel

- It is unclear why hotels are part of the cumulative cap. Hotels, if located in convenient locations, serve the needs of the community and can reduce trips. If there is a concern with the size of recent hotel developments, that should be addressed through zoning and the FAR bonus for a hotel, and not via the inclusion of future hotels in a development cap.
- If the CAC chooses to include hotels, conduct a study to consider a cap in more detail.

Annual Limit Options

- If there is a citywide annual limit, there should be an additional allotment for the Research Park with a mechanism to rollover unallocated square footage.
- The SUMC should be excluded from the cap.
- There are issues with a separate and unique “trip cap” for the Stanford Research Park that must be addressed:
 - This idea is not coordinated with the Transportation Element.
 - The idea may be inconsistent with the TDM efforts currently underway in the Research Park to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips.
 - It is unclear how a trip cap would be implemented. Prior to requiring a trip cap, the City should address questions such as:
 - What is the baseline?
 - How would current vacancies and development rights be accounted for?
 - How would it count cut-through traffic? Currently 60% of the trips on Page Mill Road are cut-through trips, not attributable to the Research Park.
 - How would it be monitored? There are over 150 driveways in the Research Park.
 - What is the implementation schedule?
- Staff and the traffic consultant should develop these concepts further before one option is selected.



Performance Measures Vs Community Performance Measures

- In Table 2A: New Community Performance Measures, #3, “% of commute trips to employment centers by SOV,” there is a proposed Community Performance measure that is similar to a mitigation measure in the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measure Trans 1A in the Draft EIR requires new development projects to prepare and implement TDM measures to achieve a designated percent reduction in trips. Therefore, this concept should be a Performance Measure and not a Community Performance Measure.
- If the Comp Plan is considering new targets on existing development, this is a new concept not analyzed in the Draft EIR and should be clearly understood before it is considered and presented to the City Council.
- Performance Measures on new development can be required through the approval process. However, it is unclear how the City proposes to achieve the Community Performance Measure targets. The expectation and mechanism to achieve each measure should be clearly understood before each is considered in the Comp Plan.

Building Heights

- The zoning ordinance should be modified to establish criteria and conditions that must be met in order to allow building heights higher than 50 feet. There are select locations within the City where additional building heights may be appropriate and there should not be a specific limitation.

Land Use Map and Land Use Designations

- Mixed Use: (and Program L6.13.1) Office uses should not be prohibited in mixed-use projects. This is too prescriptive and may eliminate appropriate mixed-use options in areas like the Research Park.
- Research/Office Park: There is conflicting language about permitted uses and those requiring a conditional use permit.
- Institutional: The land use categories are for informational purposes only and are inconsistent with Stanford’s land use designations within unincorporated Santa Clara County. These inconsistencies should be corrected, or these land use categories should be removed. Map L-2 should show the land use designations for Stanford’s lands in unincorporated Santa Clara County and Map L-6 should remove reference to lands outside the City Limits or Sphere of Influence.

Map Comments

- **Map L-2.** This is a map of Stanford University Land Use Designations and is meant to show the lands outside the City. Stanford’s lands should be treated consistently. The “Medical Center” and “Shopping Center” are both located within the City of Palo Alto and should be removed from the map, like those of the Stanford Research Park. Mixing the two causes confusion and inconsistencies.
- **Map L-3.** Since the Community Plan references the Stanford Medical Center Development Agreement, the boundary of the “Stanford Medical Center” should follow the area covered by the development agreement to avoid any inconsistencies.
- **Map L-6.** Stanford’s lands within unincorporated Santa Clara County are depicted on Map L-2 and should not be replicated on this map.

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Staff Report:

Child care. Keep child care as an acceptable use in neighborhood commercial centers.

Draft Element:

Goal L1

Program L1.4.1[L5]. Poorly written : replace the words “and actions that attempt” with “and to work”

Policy L-1.9[L13] This policy favors hotels in transit areas and is in direct conflict with the Housing Element which encourages housing along these areas. Housing near commercial areas, which include downtown and Cal Ave, makes much more sense than hotels. **Delete this policy.**

Growth Management Policy Options

Please note that the existing comp plan does not use the word “cap” The current term is “limit.”

Why I oppose caps or limits on non-residential growth. An arbitrary limit or cap on non-residential growth is a non-analytical political sledgehammer. We can do better than that. To achieve the two-pronged goal sought by limiting development of office/R&D space -- to reduce commute traffic and to address the jobs/housing imbalance -- changes should be made in the zoning code to de-incentivize office development and to incentivize multi-family development. This can be done with changes to the zoning code, such as reducing FAR allowed for office/R&D and increasing FAR for residential uses. There is a start here in Program L1.17.5 [L31]. I suggest putting more teeth in that program.

Any cap or limit or trigger should address only net new square footage – it should not include conversions from one non-residential use to another. Again, this is another non-analytical political sledgehammer – staff has not defined what converted uses the cap would apply to. CAC has not agreed to include conversions, yet the staff report assumes this is the case. IT IS NOT.

It is absurd to ask CAC to come up with numbers for any kind of limit or cap without CAC having data on the history of development and data on what new square footage is possible based on current zoning in the various areas under consideration and what would be possible if the current zoning were changed as I suggest above. Without more information, any number CAC comes up with would clearly be a non-analytical sledgehammer based on no data and no analysis.

If a cap is adopted, however, it should include hotel uses, but not include conversions unless the conversion is from residential to office. The cap should apply only to net new square feet.

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

I choose no annual limit. Instead the comp plan should have a program to explore the adoption of zoning changes to encourage residential development. If an annual limit is adopted, exempt Stanford Research Park.

I choose no downtown cap. But if a downtown cap is adopted, do not try to exempt small offices – there is potential for abuse. Also, if it is adopted, apply the limit to hotels too.

What is the point of the Community Performance Measures? What will the City do with the information from the monitoring of community measures? Will a particular action be triggered if, for example, VMT is not reduced by 5% per year?

Remove the PAUSD items from the Community Performance Issues. Class size and spending per student are affected by many factors outside the control of the City, in particular, state funding, state requirements and revenue from real property taxes. These items are not directly affected by the amount of development in the City.

More on growth management:

Following is the memo I sent in July and asked that it be shared with CAC. I do not think that has happened.

To: Elena Lee and Elaine Costello
From: Bonnie Packer
Date: July 25, 2016

Re: Growth Management of non-residential development as discussed by CAC on July 19.

Existing Policy L-8 states that the limit for new non-residential development was established in response to transportation issues outlined in that 1989 Land Use and Transportation Study. **Since the original growth limit was related to traffic issues, any non-residential growth management policies in the updated Land Use Element should be related to and connected with traffic reduction measures proposed in the updated Transportation Element.**

In the draft updated Transportation Element, there are many policies and programs, which if implemented, would have the effect of reducing traffic and traffic congestion. Have there been studies to determine whether or not there is a meaningful correlation between the amount of traffic and the amount of new non-residential growth over the years – given that the growth limit was created to address traffic issues?

The trigger (or limit) in this updated Land Use Element should be tied to a traffic indicator of some sort. Would it be possible to develop a ratio of non-residential growth to traffic which, when this ratio becomes out of balance, it would trigger an effort to re-evaluate both transportation policies and development policies?

Below are some additional questions that I hope will be answered by the staff before the next CAC Land Use meeting:

How does the current annual limit work? Has it been operating as a moratorium on development? When in a developer's application process does it apply? Isn't the limit an incentive for a developer to simply wait until the following year with his/her application?

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Has there been a study to show the potential for growth in areas zoned for office and hotel? That is, given the existing zoning requirements which place limits on height, FAR, setbacks, etc., how much actual growth potential, measured in square feet, is there in these areas? Would a proposed cap/limit/trigger be based on this information? If not what would it be based upon?

If the word "cap" or "limit" is replaced with a word such as "trigger" what would occur if the trigger was reached? The existing comp plan says that the City will re-evaluate development policies and regulations when the limit might be reached. So, in reality, the limit was always intended to operate as a trigger to re-evaluate. [BTW: The existing comp plan does not call this a "cap" - it is called a limit.]

Thanks for considering these issues. Please share this memo with the Land Use Element sub-committee and the rest of CAC.

Comments on Other Goals:

Goal L2

Cross ref to Transportation Element

Goal L3

Policy L3.2 [L44] Preserve residential uses from conversion to office or short term vacation rentals. [NEW POLICY] [L44] This is stated in a very broad and confusing way and should not include the air B&B issue. I suggest: "Consider changes to the zoning code to de-incentivize the conversion of residential uses to office uses in commercial zones. "

The issue of short term vacation rentals is much stickier and should probably not be included in the comp plan. This is a current issue that the City Council could consider addressing after checking with the City Attorneys on how to do this.

Program L3.2.1 [L45] address a different issue than the one stated in Policy L3.2 as it addresses retail being converted, as well as residential. I have the same concerns as stated above.

Program L3.3.1 [L47] In R1 and R2 neighborhoods the city cannot legally control whether a property owner wishes to rent or not rent the property. Please check with City Attorney before putting these draconian ideas in the comp plan.

Goal L4

Program L4.1.1 [L56] please define formula retail or put more info about these limits on Cal Ave in a side box.

Program L4.2.1 [58] The CAP for South El Camino includes the Buena Vista Mobile Home Park – yet nothing is said in the program about affordable housing. Please add language that the plan should consider housing for very low, low and moderate incomes.

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

L4.2.3 [L60] The CAP for Fry's should relate somehow to the CAP for South El Camino – as they are so close to one another.

Policy L4.3[L61] It is unnecessary to spell out that broad community involvement should be encouraged in planning for coordinated area plans. This policy should be eliminated or as an alternative simply add the words “with broad community involvement” in Policy L4.2 [L57]

Policy L4.19 [L85] The parking and circulation in Midtown needs work. This should be addressed somewhere.

Goal L6

Building Heights: I favor option 4. Policy L6.10 [L107]

Policy L6.14[L117] and L6.15 [L118] say the same thing. Don't we already have an ordinance limiting the height of fences? Why do we need this? In any event, the concern is with obscuring the view of the **front** of houses – on corner lots, homeowners should be able to have fences to obscure the sides of their houses.

Delete this as being too vague and unenforceable:

If a proposed development would affect a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the City's Historic Resources Inventory, consider whether it is eligible for inclusion in the City's Inventory prior to the issuance of a demolition or alterations permit. (NEW POLICY) (Comp Plan Draft EIR Mitigation Measure CULT-1b) [L123]

Goal 7

Policy L7.16[L143] It is absurd to include in the comp plan a statement that all new development must meet state codes. That is a given. Maybe it could be reworded so that it says “Ensure that developers understand their obligation to meet state codes.....”

Goal L8

Cross ref to Community Services Element

Policy L8.4 [L151] Expand this Policy to specify the Civic Centers: Mitchell Park, Ricnonada Library, Art Center, Cubberley.

Policy L8-5 [L152] Expand the breadth of this policy by adding the words “cultural, musical and artistic” “better urban spaces for civic, musical, cultural, and artistic programs, events and exhibitions.”

Goal L9

Bonnie Packer's comments on August 16, 2016, Land Use Element Packet

Cross ref to Community Services and Transportation elements. Cross check to see where there may be overlaps.

Program L9.2.1 [L158] As stated, this program is a bit overreaching and may be unnecessary. Much of this is already addressed in the zoning code. Please check the code to see if this is really necessary. For example, there are a lot of homes along Embarcadero with typical R-1 setbacks. Page Mill Road in the Open Space district has a huge setback requirement. Soften language to say "Evaluate existing zoning code setbacks to ensure that setback requirements along these routes are appropriate for non R-1 scenic areas.

Goal L10

Program L10.21[L187] Two separate ideas here landscaping and bike path. Make it two programs.

Comments on Land Use and Community Design Element
August 16, 2016
Arthur Keller

The Development Performance Measures and Community Performance Measures still need work. The CAC should consider whether additional changes should be discussed at today's meeting and referred to the Land Use Subcommittee and return on the Consent Calendar at September's meeting.

Comments on Requested CAC Votes

1. The staff report states, "The current 'performance measure' terms do not include the words 'sustainability' nor 'quality of life.'" Yet the Requested CAC Votes question 1 includes the word phrase "performance measures to promote sustainability instead."
2. Regarding Requested CAC Votes question 3, if Stanford Research Park is not included in the annual limit, then alternative standards are needed. For traffic, these should include *declining* trip caps, strict, enforced TDM measures with penalties, and LOS improvements along Charleston-Arastradero corridor and the Page Mill Road-Oregon Expressway corridor. Because the SRP is more "permeable" and has less defined boundaries, a trip cap would be harder to measure than the one for Stanford University.
3. Regarding Requested CAC Votes question 6 (Downtown cap exemption), if small offices of less than 5,000 square feet may be exempt, it should mean that the new project has no more than 5,000 square feet total including existing office space, not that the first 5,000 increase in office space is exempt.

Comments on Table 1 (Diagram of Cumulative Growth Management Options and Choices)

1. Regarding Annual Limit for SRP, it should be clear that instead of having an annual limit SRP is subject to trip caps and TDM measures. How are these enforced? Can we have data on how much growth there has been at the SRP each of the last 10 years, and what the projects have been? In particular, SRP growth must be tied to LOS improvements along Charleston-Arastradero corridor and the Page Mill Road-Oregon Expressway corridor.
2. Regarding the Baseline for the Cumulative Cap, although the SUMC and the VA are exempt from the current cap, that does not eliminate their impacts. So when calculating the new Cumulative Cap based on the 1989 land use study, we should consider decreasing the remaining cap based on their impacts. That is, we can take the impacts of these "exempt" projects into account without limiting these projects.
3. Regarding Performance Measures (for category "Other"), these are applied to new development. The citywide Performance Measures must include LOS.

4. Regarding Downtown, we should consider limits on the square footage that can be occupied by any one company to prevent crowding out of other office space uses.

Comments on Table 2 (New Development Performance Measures and Community Performance Measures)

1. Instead of “Measures,” they should be called “Metrics.” Metrics make clear that they are numeric measurements of desirable qualities rather than policies.
2. Performance Measures applied to new development should also include loss low-cost office space, particularly individual small offices, and replacement by higher cost office space designed for larger companies. We are losing space for small businesses that serve our community, and replacing it with larger R&D companies.
3. Community Performance Measures should also include reduction in LOS (particularly where Level F) and corridor travel times. The park acreage per capital should refer only to district and neighborhood parks, not to open space (such as Foothills Park and the Baylands).
4. Development Performance Measure “c” (Facilitating Affordable Housing: Allow flexible height limits to facilitate a mix of multi-family housing, including affordable units, micro-units and housing for seniors and people with special needs) is a policy proposal masquerading as a performance measure. In particular, it is not written as a metric. It can be debated by the CAC as a program to consider amending zoning ordinance accordingly, but not as a performance measure.
5. Community Performance Measure PAUSD spending per student should be indexed for a suitable inflation metric.
6. Add a development performance measure of “Spillover parking: percent reduction of spillover parking in surrounding neighborhoods, if any.” (If there is no spillover parking, before or after, than the project receives 100% score.)

Other Comments

1. The change to the numbering [Lxx] from the previous draft makes it harder to track comments and changes.
2. Ensure that policies and programs removed from one element to be moved into the other element, notably Land Use and Community Design, actually get inserted. In particular, this policy was not inserted when it was supposed to be moved:
“Require an assessment of school impacts prior to the approval of development projects that require legislative acts, including general plan amendments and zoning changes.”
3. Land Use definitions: Residential: Single Family Residential: (pp. L-20ff) We should separate single family residential (R-1 and RE) and low density residential (R-2 and RMD) in terms of Comp Plan Land Use designations. The current zoning ordinance limits second units to parcels of 8100 square feet or larger. So that’s 10 units per

acre. The City has not yet adopted a policy to lower that threshold, so we should not change that to a maximum of 14 units per acre. Also I do not believe that churches require CUP, as per rules under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA).

4. Land Use definitions: Commercial: Mixed use: (p. L-25) There was a change for regarding 3.0 FAR without mention in the staff report. It now reads:

Most typically, mixed use developments have retail on the ground floor and residences above. This category includes **Live/Work**, Retail/Office, Residential/Retail and Residential/Office development. Floor area ratios will range up to 1.15, although development located along transit corridors or near multi-modal centers will range up to 2.0 FAR **with up to 3.0 FAR possible where higher FAR would be an incentive to meet community goals such as providing affordable housing**. The FAR above 1.15 must be used for residential purposes. FAR between 0.15 and 1.15 may be used for residential purposes. As of the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan, the *Mixed Use designation is currently only applied in the SOFA area*.

First, Live/Work should be deleted. It has not been successful in Palo Alto. The three live/work buildings in Palo Alto are used exclusively for non-residential uses.

Second, the increase to 3.0 FAR was not discussed at the last CAC meeting and is not an appropriate replacement for the previous language “resistant to revitalization.” Finally, this language should not be changed to affect policy that only applies to SOFA (see italics). So please delete the boldface language.

5. Land Use Definitions: Open Space: Streamside Open Space. (p. L-20) The word “natural” was removed. This policy should not apply to channelized creeks. Without condemning hundreds of houses along a channelized creek, it is impossible to restore a channelized creek to a more natural state. These creek channels were build several decades ago to provide flood protection.
6. Reinstate under Policy L-5. “Avoid land uses that are overwhelming and unacceptable due to their size and scale.” Now Policy L-1.4 [L4].
7. Policy L-1.9. [L13] “Sites within ~~or adjacent~~ to existing commercial areas and corridors are suitable for hotels. Prohibit Give preference to housing versus hotel use on sites adjacent to single family neighborhoods.”
8. Program L1.13.4. [L22] “Assess non-residential development potential in the CC, CN, and CS zoning districts, and convert non-retail commercial FAR to residential FAR, where appropriate. Conversion to residential capacity should not be considered in Town and Country nor in neighborhood centers. Net loss of retail uses shall not be allowed.”
9. Policy L-1.1.6. [L25] A cap on peak period trips is not sufficient. We need reductions in peak period trips over the current level, and we need reductions in LOS for

affected intersections. See comments above.

10. Program L1.17.2. [L28] “Limit new office development in Downtown to 45,619 square feet, using January 1, 2015 as the baseline. Monitor this development on an annual basis, tracking new square footage as well as commute trips by SOV and parking demand. Reevaluate this Downtown development cap when the amount of new office and hotel square footage entitled since January 1, 2015 reaches 67 percent of the remaining allowed square footage and concurrently consider potential changes to the cap and/or to the amount of additional development permitted by the City’s zoning ordinance. Development in excess of the cap may be permitted during this reevaluation process if the percentage of commute trips to/from Downtown by single occupant vehicle is less than percent.” Development should also be limited based on the number of RPP permits being sold, not only SOV vehicles (which is hard to measure).
11. Program L1.17.6. [L32] “Evaluate and adjust the zoning definition of office uses allowed in downtown to and consider ways to prioritize for small business and startups and limit occupancy by any one tenant.”
12. Policy L-1.20 [L36] and Table L-2. Community performance measures must add LOS and corridor travel time in addition to VMT.
13. Program L2.2.1. [L39] “Explore whether there are potential *appropriate* locations to allow small-scale neighborhood-serving retail facilities such as coffee shops and corner stores in higher density residential areas.” These should not be allowed in single family or low density residential areas, but can be consider for higher density housing.
14. Policy L-3.3. [L46] “~~Implement Support~~ efforts to preserve more affordable housing units such as cottages, other small homes, and rental housing units in existing neighborhoods.”
15. Program L3.3.1. [L47] “Explore revising development standards and fees to discourage the loss of housing units or the replacement of rental housing units to ownership housing units.”
16. Policy L-3.5. [L50] “In appropriate locations, encourage a mix of smaller housing types such as micro-units, studios, co-housing, cottage, clustered housing and secondary dwelling units, to provide a more diverse range of housing opportunities and preserve existing housing units of these types.”
17. In Policy L-3.7 [L52], why is “unit” changed to “development” in “Ensure that multifamily buildings entries and outdoor spaces area designed and arranged so that each *unit/development* has a clear relationship to a public street”? Should it instead be “housing unit”?
18. Program L4.2.1. [L58] I think the coordinated area plan should extend further north than Curtner Avenue, all the way to Matadero Road on the west and the Fry’s

coordinated area plan on the east. “Prepare a coordinated area plan for the South El Camino corridor from Curtner Avenue to West Charleston Road/Arastradero Road, as shown in the diagram below. The plan should articulate a vision for the corridor as a well-designed complete street with an enhanced pedestrian environment including wider sidewalks, increased building setbacks, public open spaces, safe pedestrian crossings at key intersections, trees and streetscape improvements. Mixed use residential and retail development on shallow parcels should be encouraged to support a more walkable and *bikeable* environment along the corridor, with appropriate transitions to and adequate buffering from the surrounding single-family residential neighborhoods. The plan should also foster improved connections to surrounding destinations.” (Changed language in next-to-last sentence is from previous policy labeled [L126]).

19. Revise new Program L4.2.2 [L59] as follows: “Consider preparing a coordinated area plan or concept plan for the portion between San Antonio Road and city limits and between East Charleston Road and Middlefield Road, which was not included in the East Meadow Circle Concept Plan.”
20. Add new program L4.12.1 as follows: “Continue preparation of the California Area Concept Plan, as it has not yet been adopted by the City Council.” This was deleted but there is no program calling for a coordinated area plan for the California Avenue area. “Prepare a Coordinated Area Plan for the Cal-Ventura area. Use the landuse diagram from the Community Design Workshop as the starting point for preparing this Plan. [Replaced with new program calling for a Coordinated Area Plan for the California Avenue area] [Previous Program L-30 [L123]]”
21. Policy L-4.7 [L69] “Ensure that University Avenue/Downtown is pedestrian-friendly and supports bicycle use. Use public art, trees, bicycle racks and other amenities to create an environment that is inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists.”
22. Policy L-4.9 [L71]: Change as follows: “Maintain Stanford Shopping Center as one of the Bay Area’s premiere regional shopping centers. Promote bicycle and pedestrian use and encourage any new development at the Center to occur through infill, potentially including housing and mixed use development on existing parking lots, while continuing to supply adequate parking.” Infill development on the Stanford Shopping Center has resulted in shortages of parking in certain areas.
23. Why is this deleted? “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.”
24. Drop Policy L-4.15. [L80] “In Town and Country Village, encourage a vibrant retail environment and urban greening. [Previous Policy L-33] [L80]” Do we really need to say this?
25. Policy L-5.2. [L87] “Provide landscaping, trees, sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and connections to the citywide bikeway system within Employment Districts. Pursue opportunities to build include sidewalks, paths, low water use landscaping,

reclaimed water, and trees and remove grass turf in renovation and expansion projects. [Previous Policy L-43]”

26. Program L5.4.2. [L91] “Evaluate the optimum number of future hotel rooms for Palo Alto and consider reductions in the allowable floor area ratio as ~~necessary~~ appropriate. [NEW PROGRAM] [L91]”
27. Policy L6.13.3. “Consider revising development standards in the Community Commercial, Service Commercial, and Downtown Commercial Districts (CC, CS, and CD) and the Neighborhood Commercial District (CN) along El Camino Real ~~and Alma Street~~ to incentivize the conversion of non-retail commercial FAR to residential use.[NEW PROGRAM] [L115]” Delete Alma Street.
28. Policy L6.14 and L6.15 are the same. “Discourage the use of fences that obscure the view of houses from the street. [(Previous Program L-52)(NEW POLICY)]”
29. New Policy L-7.7 [L129] should be changed as follows. “Recognize mature oaks, redwoods, and other large trees as important physical elements of the community that contribute to historic character. Limit development that does not preserve these trees.”
30. Revise Program L7.12.1 [L139]. “Continue to use a TDR Ordinance to allow the transfer of development rights from designated buildings of historic significance in the Commercial Downtown (CD) zone to non-historic receiver sites in the CD zone, but without any parking exemptions. Revise the TDR Ordinance so that transferred development rights may be used only for residential development on the receiver sites.”
31. Policy L-8.4. [L151] What are “Civic Centers”? “Encourage small-scale local-serving retail services, such as small cafes, delicatessens, and coffee carts, in Civic Centers. [Previous Policy L-63]”
32. I’m not sure what is the intent of Policy L-8.8 [L155]. “Encourage religious and private institutions to collaborate with the community and surrounding neighborhood.” And why was the requirement for compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood removed? I don’t recall anyone on the CAC requesting this change. Please restore to the original.
33. Policy L-9.2 [L157] regarding scenic routes should refer to University Avenue only between Middlefield Road and San Francisquito Creek. “Recognize Sand Hill Road, University Avenue between Middlefield Road and San Francisquito Creek, Embarcadero Road, Page Mill Road, Oregon Expressway, Interstate 280, Arastradero Road (west of Foothill Expressway), Junipero Serra Boulevard/Foothill Expressway, and Skyline Boulevard as scenic routes.”
34. Public Spaces. (page L-73 of redline) This says the material was moved, but I don’t see it there. “NEW PROGRAM: Develop an ordinance that will require development projects of a certain size or location to prepare an analysis of potential

shade/shadow impacts to 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. Projects that are shown to shadow open spaces during these times shall mitigate these impacts through building and site design features. [Comp Plan Draft EIR Mitigation Measure AES-4] [L256] [Note to CAC: This Section Moved From Goal L-3 Residential Design]”

35. Program L10.1.1 [L183] “Relocate the terminal building away from the Runway 31 clear zone, allowing for construction of a new replacement terminal.” This should make sure it is a replacement terminal not an additional terminal. The current language is ambiguous and ambiguity should be avoided.
36. Program L10.1.2 [L184] “Prepare an Airport Master Plan in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration requirements to address long-term facility needs and the future of PAO, including limiting hours of operation, elimination of leaded fuel, and mandatory noise limits. City staff will ensure that the Airport Master Plan conforms with the Baylands Master Plan to the maximum extent feasible.” Also change Program L10.2.3 accordingly. “Revise lease agreements with flight schools, clubs, and rental service operators to require that those parties inform pilots of ~~voluntary~~ noise abatement procedures.” Don’t emphasize noise abatement procedures as being voluntary. Indeed they should be mandatory.
37. Policy L-10.3 [L191] “Phase out ~~Encourage~~ the use of ~~alternatives to~~ leaded fuel in aircraft operating in and out of Palo Alto Airport.” We should eliminate the use of leaded fuel, not merely discourage its use.
38. Replace the picture of the building with clearly shown “University Art Center” on page L-12. This use no longer exists. Instead use the buildings across Ramona street by Coupa Café or the Wine Room.
39. Gateways (Page L-14) should include San Antonio Road and Oregon Expressway/Page Mill Road. You probably don’t want to mention the Chaucer Street bridge, considering the history of flooding it caused. It is slated for replacement.
40. Add new policy: Require a CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for new and expanded private schools in any zone to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses and to require TDM (Transportation Demand Management) measures.

Additional Detailed Land Use Element Comments:
Elaine Uang – 2016.08.16

- 1) Preventing construction of because of "school impacts" adding students is ILLEGAL. The City Attorney wrote a memo noting the legal tenuousness of that argument. Our Comprehensive Plan should be based on legally sound policy. We did not prevent construction of all the Eichler on orchard land because of school impacts in the 1950s and 1960s. We should not be prohibiting construction of future multifamily housing, town homes, or other types of homes in the 2020s because it will bring a few more students to our schools. If in the future, we have more students than we project, then we should just actively collaborate with PAUSD to accommodate those students or develop new schools sites.
- 2) p8 Staff mentions Quality of Life components like schools, parks, traffic congestion, but we should include housing cost burden as a MAJOR quality of life metric.
- 3) p9 Table 2 Development Performance Measure C: to Facilitate Affordable Housing, we also need to remove density limits, not just allow flexible height limits.
- 4) p11 staff report Table 2a Measure 3, Target: Typo - ITW not ITE
- 5) p L-28 Definition: Multiple Family Residential - we should eliminate density limits for multiple family residential zones and as a committee, we need to look at whether the existing Multiple Family Residential zones and parcels that exist in our city are enough to meet our future housing needs for seniors, adults of different abilities, teachers, PAUSD administrators, first responders, public service employees, nurses, medical staff, and other vital community members.
- 6) Policy L-1.2 Focus on attracting and encouraging land uses that address the needs of the community - this includes housing and child care.
- 7) Annual Limit Options: I support Policy L1.14 (no annual limit) Assure that new development adds to the quality of the community and addresses or avoids new impacts, particularly traffic impacts.
- 8) Downtown Cap Options: I support Program L1.17.1 (no downtown cap) Monitor non-residential development in Downtown on an annual basis, but ensure a trip cap, to limit the amount of total car trips to the downtown area. Percentage of single occupancy vehicles is more difficult to measure and not as effective to limiting total car traffic. Limiting car traffic also leads to greater safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- 9) Table L-2 Community Performance Measures - What do you mean by community diversity? I don't think it's a good idea to maintain similar proportions documented to those in 2015. Communities change and it is illegal to create quotas of different ethnicities, religions who are allowed live in our city. We should be conscious of, but should not enforce or exclude, an economic diversity within our community. Understanding the economic profile of our

residents is a general bellwether, but we should not allow/prevent housing transactions that don't abide by fair housing laws.

10) Program L.2.2.1 mentions "Explore appropriate locations to allow small-scale neighborhood serving retail facilities." This should include neighborhood serving services such as senior centers and child care centers.

11) Policy L3.3. Change language to: "Support efforts to retain + upgrade (not preserve) more affordable housing such as cottages, other small homes and rental housing units in existing neighborhoods". Preserve is not correct, we don't want substandard conditions for our existing housing stock, but we should encourage retention of those housing types and incentives for landlords to upgrade units to higher building standards.

12) Program L3.3.1 "Review (not explore revising) development standards so allowable development standards match what is currently built (instead of to discourage loss of housing units or replacement of rental housing units to ownership housing.) One example is 2341/2343 Hanover Street - two bungalows in College Terrace were downzoned to a single family parcel, so a new single family residence is being proposed to replace the bungalows. These two bungalows should be re-zoned as small parcel multifamily to reflect what is currently built.

13) Policy L3.4 and Program L3.4.1 are redundant. Just work with both City of Palo Alto and PAUSD on the creation of workforce housing

14) Policy L-3.6 "Recognize and contribution of cottage cluster housing to the character of Palo Alto and Retain and allow (not preserve and protect) this type of development." Our zoning laws need to be adjusted to make it legal for this type of housing to exist on those sites and to allow similar development in the future

15) Policy L-4.2 - Add 2 programs for a Coordinated Area Plan for University Avenue (Downtown PA) and all of California Avenue (including Fry's and the Park Avenue Corridor) Without these two CAPs, we cannot manage, measure and monitor any future development (housing, retail OR commercial) and the impacts of any existing development (car trips, bike trips, transit usage, parking demand, etc.) and we cannot create new programs to achieve Sustainable Transportation goals and S/CAP (GHG reduction) goals. In both discussions for the Transportation and Land Use Elements, I have repeated asked for inclusion of both a University Avenue and California Avenue CAP and request a straw poll vote by the FULL CAC Committee to include these CAPs as programs in our Comprehensive Plan.

16) Policy 4.16 - include improvement of bike circulation in addition to pedestrian and auto circulation.

16b) Town and Country should also allow housing - if economic conditions change, and the site has underutilized retail resources, the complex should allow housing, both conversion of retail square footage and creation of new housing. A strong TDM program, including zip car, bike share and other transportation options should be added to create car-light living

17) Policy 4.17 Change to: "Improve community local serving focus and provide safe pedestrian, bike and multimodal access to all three Palo Alto Neighborhood Centers - Charleston Shopping Center, Edgewood Plaza and Midtown Shopping Center. Support their continued improvement and vitality.

18) Policy L-5.1 Change to: "Develop Employment Districts to encourage transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel and provide mixed uses to help reduce number of auto trips for daily errands.

19) Policy L-5.4 "Foster compact employment centers served by a variety of transportation modes" - I want to point out that this is a precise description of University Avenue (Downtown) and California Avenue. Those areas should be mixed use employment centers and continue to be allowed to develop with a mix of housing, retail, office, and public/community uses.

20) Program L5.4.2 - we don't need to develop an "optimum" number of future hotel rooms - caps are silly. Hotels should be collocated to transit hubs to mitigate transportation impact. Plus visitors increasingly do not want to rent cars and prefer to get around using transit, bike, or car ride systems.

21) Policy L-6.9 + Policy L-6.10 I support Building Height Option 3 and 4, but have a stronger preference for Option 4 (Policy L-6.10)

22) Program L7.1.2 - We need standards to assess a historically significant building - I do enough work on older structures to know that many "historic" buildings were constructed using substandard techniques (according to today's standards) and have been compromised by many years of pests or poor maintenance. Some older structures are really not worth saving and can be public safety hazards.

23) Policy 8.4 I agree with small scale locally serving retail services such as cafes, delicatessens and coffee carts but they should be allowable in major parks, not just civic centers. I just returned from Switzerland, where every major park (i.e. Vogsligarten in Luzern, Parc Bertrand and Plainpalais in Geneva) had ping pong tables, oversize chess boards, children's playgrounds, adjacent to a CAFE that served coffee, snacks and adult beverages. It was so civilized.

24) Policy L-9.1 and Policy L-9.2 about scenic routes should be combined, why create two different policies when one is just more specific than the other? This element suffers from too much bloat and needs streamlining anyway.

25) Policy L-9.3 Specific setbacks often have unintended consequences, they can be useful for some things, but we should make sure property owners are granted some type of benefits if there is a taking of property rights for the special scenic setbacks.

26) Policy L-9.10 Ground cover and storm water management are very important too. As I mentioned in my last set of comments, we need to consider that native Palo Alto landscape was mostly grasslands, not major forest. The Urban Forest Master Plan does not have strong language and guidelines for low ground cover plantings to help with urban storm water retention and to cool paved urban ground planes.

27) Program 9.11.1 - I would like to see some note of new infrastructure, like Fiber to the Premises (FTTP) to provide high speed internet access.

28) Program L10.1.2 - The airport should be served by major transportation alternatives, either a local shuttle, regional bus or other options in accordance with our Sustainable Transportation goals and S/CAP Plan.

From: Ken Joye [mailto:kmjoye@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 4:49 PM
To: Lee, Elena
Subject: Re: Upcoming Comp Plan Update Meetings

I have reviewed [Attachment A](#) for the draft Land Use Element and believe that there is a "factual error" on Map L-6: the map appears to show Ash Street transecting Boulware Park. This is a relatively minor issue, of course, but may be something that you wish to address. Also, is the AT&T facility at the corner of Birch & Chestnut designated "major institution/special facility"?

Also, I do have a question about the land use designation for the Fry's site on Map L-6. I thought that area was going to be designated "mixed use", but it appears to be "multi-family residential". Have I misunderstood what is intended for the Fry's site? (I do note on page 27/62 the statement, "As of the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan, the Mixed Use designation is currently only applied in the SOFA area".)

On page 27/62, the section describing Mixed Use states "This category includes Live/Work, Retail/Office, Residential/Retail and Residential/Office development". If mixed use developments typically have retail on the ground floor and residences above, should the category list read "Live/Work, Office/Retail, Residential/Retail and Residential/Office"? That is, the first use shown ("Live") is always above the second use ("Work")... Should there be a provision for something that is "Residential/Office/Retail"?

Are the phrases "employment centers" and "employment districts" meant to be synonymous? Can one of the two phrases be used uniformly?

I am glad to see that Policy L-4.3 states that neighborhood associations should be invited to participate in the development plans. If you need contact info for the Ventura Neighborhood Association, please let me know.

I am glad to see that there is a new program to address the availability of park space in each neighborhood (Program L9.7.1). In addition to considering the "citywide average", I propose that population density of each neighborhood be used as a weighting factor; denser neighborhoods, such as Downtown North, should have relatively more park space than those with a lower density or those close to "multi-neighborhood parks" (e.g., Embarcadero Oaks is adjacent to Rinconada Park)

thank you for your consideration of the above comments,
Ken Joye
Ventura neighborhood

August 15, 2016

To: Citizens Advisory Review Board
Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan
Land Use and Community Design Element
For: Meeting agenda 08/16/2016

From: Betty Jo Chang
Palo Alto Resident

cc: City Council.
cc: Hillary Gittleman, Director of Planning and Community Environment Department.

Greetings.

INTRODUCTION

My name is Betty Jo Chang. I am a Palo Alto resident, a renter, currently living on Newell Road.

THANK YOU

Thank you for your time and the enormous effort you have devoted to this important work on our City's Comprehensive Plan. Palo Alto could not remain the forward looking city we must continue to be, without the outstanding efforts of City staff, Council, Commissions and Citizen Advisory Committees such as this one.

The words "Freedom" and "Democracy" are deeply cherished in our country. Too oft, these terms are bandied about with little regard to what they mean in terms of true commitment to self-governance. To me, these words mean you – fellow citizens who invest their time, intelligence, effort, cooperative attitude and heart into making our shared home a better place both now and in the future.

I honor your efforts and thank you for your service.

A PROBLEM

I come before you today about a threat to the Residential Housing vision so widely shared by Palo Alto residents. This threat was brought to my attention by the proposed 11 bedroom / 14 bath "single family" residence planned for the corner of Newell and Embarcadero. (16PLN-00222) 1710 Newell Road).

This particular project is a veritable Poster Child for the deleterious effects of what I believe to be some troublesome oversights in our planning processes.

- 1) The current permitting process for residential basement construction, by excluding residential basements from F.A.R calculations, perversely incentivizes construction of housing stock inappropriate to flood prone areas (much of Palo Alto), as well as occupancy densities in excess of the maximum occupancy ratios in the Comp. Plan.
- 2) Although the Comp Plan clearly designates anticipated occupancy rates for Single and Multi-Family residential zoning, there appears to be no mechanism by which conformance with these rates may be evaluated during the Planning department project review/approval process.
- 3) The City's Climate Change adaption program, while estimable with respect to Sea Level rise risk assessments and plans, does not adequately address the increased sheet flooding expected from more frequent extreme storm events in these times of Global warming.

4) The current application of Muni-Code Flood Hazard Regulations (Chapter 16.52) only to FEMA designated SFHA areas, leaves us no regulatory oversight of residential construction with respect to flooding outside these FEMA insurance mandated SFHA boundaries.

MY REQUESTS

=> 1. FAR: I request that the residential basement exclusion from F.A.R calculations be eliminated.

=>2.1 OCCUPANCY RATES: I request that you develop a policy requiring planning review of potential occupancy density for new residential housing projects.

The Comprehensive plan defines Single Family Residential zoning as occupant density of 1-30 persons per acre. And yet, no zoning challenge was raised during planning dept. review with respect to occupant density for the project noted above (1710 Newell).

The lot at 1710 Newell Rd is 12,600 sq. ft. (1/3 of an acre). With it's 11 bedrooms, at 2 persons/bedroom, this dwelling postulates occupancy of 22 persons when the definition of R1 would permit but 10 persons. (1/3 of 30 (max occupancy/acre) = 9.9 persons/1/3 acre). Hence this project appears not only visually but arithmetically defective with respect to size for this R1 zone. However, since no deficiency was reported by the Planning dept. review, I conclude that potential occupant density is not currently reviewed for compliance with the Comp. Plan.

2.2 CONVERSION/RE-PURPOSING OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES: I request that you figure out a way to ensure that when residential housing is re-purposed to high density rental/hotel use, appropriate building code and business management requirements are enforced.

Though they may be currently called single family residential, re-purposing some portion of today's bedroom construction into rental housing (regulated or not), is near inevitable, for housing pressures in this beautiful community will not, ever, go away. We must consider that today's purported single family residential construction also represents tomorrow's potential rental housing stock.

For example, fire sprinkler systems are required for all new residential construction. However Engineering system design reviews of sprinklers are recommended for high occupancy/ risk construction. Housing discrimination in multi-family housing is the law, as is ADA compliance.

=> 3. CLIMATE CHANGE PLANNING: I request that Basement Bedrooms be prohibited east of El Camino Real.

I request that the Comp Plan incorporate guidance regarding regular reassessments of construction permitting in flood prone areas (irrespective of FEMA insurance related designations), and recommend appropriate zoning regulation changes to recognize not only sea level rise, but also anticipated sheet flooding from extreme weather events.

=> 4. FLOOD HAZARD REGULATION. (Chapter 16.52). I request that the Comp Plan recommend incorporating appropriate portions of the Municipal Code Flood Hazard recommendations for managing flood risk construction in areas that are not currently designated SFHA.

For example, Mechanical rooms where both storm water sump pumps and sewage/wastewater up pumping for basement toilets and tubs, are often located below ground. These mechanicals should be either raised or otherwise flood proofed (as 16.52 requires for SFHA zones) irrespective of whether or not the lot lies in a SFHA zone. Habitable basements, especially basement bedrooms, if approved at all, should be subject to Flood administrator review with respect to appropriate flood emergency egress.

MY REASONS WHY

F.A.R exemptions for basement construction creates perverse financial incentives which not only increase the size of new

residential construction, increase the density of R1 occupancy, require substantial dewatering groundwater loss, but also encourage construction that is inappropriate to the low lying flood prone neighborhoods that comprise so much of our city housing stock). Builders are financially incentivized to place even their main floors lower than proper flood damage mitigation and climate change adaptation advice would warrant (2-3 ft. above ground level). They do so to gain the indefensible residential basement exemption from F.A.R calculations.

Further, by permitting basement bedroom construction, we are permitting future housing that will be inaccessible to any residents not fit enough to utilize emergency fire/flood egress facilities that include climbing a 14-foot ladder to get out of a 10 ft. deep basement light well and over the 4 ft. fall guard above it. This is incompatible with our goals for accessible housing. *Nor, for that matter, is it clear just how well such emergency bedroom fire egress plans will work when the power is out, the sump pump is down, and the light well filled with flood water.*

Note in this regard, storm generated shallow sheet flooding of a foot or more has occurred in Palo Alto in: 1940, 1941, 1955, 1958, 1973, 1978, 1982, 1986, 1992, 1998, 2012, 2014.

In the 1978 floods, local neighbors here describe a foot and a half of standing flood waters on Newell and Embarcadero. In the “historic” flood of 1998, flood waters came within two blocks of this intersection from both north and east directions. And yet, we STILL permit projects with basements. Worse, basements are no longer cellars for the jelly and the wine. Nowadays, Basement Bedrooms and baths are all the thing. (*“For the maid, for the nanny, for a Craig’s list rental”*).

As the city news archives note, “All of Palo Alto is in a flood plane”.

And yet basements are being permitted and constructed anywhere outside the SFHA zones with none of the safeguards to health and safety enumerated in our Muni code Flood hazard chapter (16.52).

These new basement bedrooms represent Housing stock, (bedrooms), that shall be with us, our city, our community, for the next 30-40 years (avg. lifespan of residential housing).

We are building:

Housing stock (basement bedrooms) that are and shall be occupied by neighbors who may be at risk to life during sheet flooding events - events we know to have occurred frequently in the past, and which shall occur with increased frequency in the future due to Global warming extreme weather events.

We are building:

Housing stock that will be available only to those young and able enough to utilize the bedroom emergency egress facilities mandated by current CA fire codes.

We are building:

Housing stock (like the project at 1710 Newell) with 6 toilets, 5 bath tubs, 7 sinks all below ground. All these basement sewage and wastewater outputs require up-pumping to function. Any power outage will render these appliances non-functional. Should power outages accompany flooding, then it may be raw sewage not just water that floats down Embarcadero Road. Yet no resilient power systems are required, nor must mechanicals be water protected.

This is not good. I am worried about this.

We need Palo Alto to continue its leadership position, using innovative and informed best practices with respect to not only natural resources preservation and Climate Change adaptation, but also assurance of safety and accessibility for the new housing we permit to be constructed.

OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

When I read this Draft Comprehensive Plan, I see a widely shared vision of what we want our neighborhoods to be. All

who come here into this Santa Clara Valley - this "Valley of Heart's Delight", come in hopes of a home place:

- Where Natural resource preservation is a core community value, pursued with intellectual rigor, and enhanced through leadership contributions and cooperative endeavors with the Bay area community.
- Where safe residential housing for both today and coming decades is assured through thoughtful Residential permitting and construction regulation, guided by forward looking planning and risk/probability assessments.
- Where children may grow up rich in community resources for learning and playing.
- Where residents of all ages may move safely about the city by walking, on bikes and on shuttles.
- Where physical limitations are accommodated to assure access to our community's resources for the young, the disabled, the seniors. From curb cutouts to walking trails, bike lanes and ADA compliant rental housing, we take pride in our city's commitment to accessibility.

I am grateful for your efforts on behalf of us all, to build and protect this shared vision. I seek your help in correcting the issues noted above - issues that place that vision at risk.

Thank you for your time.

Betty Jo Chang.

Esther Nigenda

Statement to CAC, 8-16-16

Copy to Office of Emergency Services, feedback for Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

I am an emergency services volunteer but I am speaking for myself. Up to this past year I have never given the land use of basements a second thought. Out of sight is out of mind.

You might be wondering how I've linked basements and emergency services. The answer is simple: climate change. Scientists tell us that with climate change we can expect to see stronger and more frequent storms and subsequent flooding, longer lasting drought, sea level and groundwater level rise. All hazards we in emergency services are expected to address, in the present by mitigating and preparing for them and in the future by helping in response and recovery. The advantages of mitigation are that it costs 4 -5 times less than response and recovery and, most important, no human life is hurt or lost. The mitigation I am requesting from this Commission is that all underground construction be also carefully considered in Palo Alto's land use policies.

But, how do basements tie in to climate change? A 2014 document titled "Basement Development Supplementary Planning Document" [1] from a London borough makes various associations between climate change, its effects and basements.

Climate Change: To try to slow down the rate of climate change cities are trying to reduce their carbon footprint by reducing their energy use. The paper just mentioned states "The embodied energy involved in the construction of basements can be considerable – energy intensive construction, materials required for structural purposes (steel and concrete), and a reduced ability for natural lighting and ventilation." This paper proposes that for energy efficiency and sustainable design considerations, basements should be limited to no more than one story.

Floods: Because of their low-lying nature, basements, particularly in areas with high water tables are more likely to flood. Additionally, basements decrease the amount of land available to store and absorb water and change its flow path.

Coupled with changing weather patterns, basement construction can make floods more severe and increase a neighborhood's chance of being flooded.

Drought: Not only are all basements energy intensive, basements built in areas with high water tables require pumping out the water – additional energy is required. To make matters worse, in my opinion, we are throwing away almost all that water (in 2016, 30.88 million gallons of groundwater were pumped out for just ONE basement on Garland Drive, 12 x the amount of water we have stored in the El Camino Park Reservoir). That water which we will need in a severe drought ends up in the Bay and contributes to sea level rise.

In a time of climate change and the need to minimize our carbon footprint, I suggest it make sense to study a change in how, how many (because of their cumulative impacts), and where those basements are built.

Esther Nigenda

[1] [https://www.islington.gov.uk/publicrecords/library/Planning-and-building-control/Publicity/Public-consultation/2014-2015/\(2014-12-05\)-Basement-Development-Discussion-Paper-Dec-2014.pdf](https://www.islington.gov.uk/publicrecords/library/Planning-and-building-control/Publicity/Public-consultation/2014-2015/(2014-12-05)-Basement-Development-Discussion-Paper-Dec-2014.pdf)

From: AP [mailto:apanelli@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Lee, Elena
Subject: Tonight's meeting at Rinconada

Elena,

As a former PTC, IBRC, and PARC commissioner, I have some thoughts to share in public comment. Unfortunately, it does not look like I will be able to attend this evening, so I'd like to submit via e-mail below.

I think that the modern residentialist movement is an understandable reactionary response to piecemeal development and outdated standards.

In the absence of a viable, holistic and (small "c") comprehensive plan, those whose quality of life has measurably suffered will naturally try to put the brakes on any and every project (even if it meets all of the current code).

I think that there is a need for a multi-pronged plan to address the legitimate concerns of the residentialists while

instituting a thoughtfully planned program of coordinated development.

The City is operating on a Comprehensive Plan that is decades-stale and that is non-specific on many issues. I would argue that an updated Comp Plan that addresses the quality of life issues head-on, combined with Specific Plans for Downtown, Cal Ave, etc., would bring together all stakeholders to collaborate and accomplish the goals and objectives of all sides.

Sincerely,

Alex Panelli



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

Tuesday, August 16, 2016

Requested CAC Votes

This memo lists the questions we would like to ask the CAC to vote on at your August 16 meeting. We are providing it ahead of time to ensure all members have an opportunity to consider and understand these choices. CAC bylaws state you must be present to vote; votes will be taken during the meeting only.

For each of the numbered questions below, the options are mutually exclusive. Please vote for only one. The current draft of the relevant policy wording is provided in the Draft Element. Specific policies, performance measures, and numerical cap numbers will be discussed in greater detail by the full CAC.

- 1. Cumulative cap or no cumulative cap:** Should the City:
 - eliminate the cap and use performance measures to promote sustainability instead [L14]
 - adopt a hybrid approach with a cap and performance measures [L16 or L17]

The CAC voted on July 19 whether the cap should cover Office (13 votes) or Office and Hotel (6 votes).

- 2. Annual limit:** Should the City:
 - not regulate the pace of development [L23]
 - regulate the pace of development by maintaining an annual limit on Office/R&D square footage [L24] or [L25]
- 3. Annual limit, application to Stanford Research Park:** Should Stanford Research Park be subject to an annual limit?
 - Yes [L24]
 - No [L25]



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

4. **Downtown cap:** Should the City:
 - eliminate the Downtown cap and use performance measures only [L27]
 - retain a Downtown cap on certain uses [L28]

5. **Downtown cap uses:** Should the Downtown cap apply to:
 - Office/R&D only [L28]
 - Office/R&D and Hotel [L30]

6. **Downtown cap exemption:** Should small offices of less than 5,000 square feet be exempt from the Downtown cap?
 - No [L28]
 - Yes [L29]

7. **Childcare:** Should childcare be listed as a “typical use” in the Neighborhood Commercial designation?
 - Yes
 - No, specify that child care is not allowed in Charleston, Edgewood, or Midtown