



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

**Tuesday April 19, 2016**

Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room  
1213 Newell Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

**Call to Order: 5:30 PM**

**Co-Chair Keller:** Call the meeting to order. Secretary, will you please call roll.

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

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

**Oral Communications**

**Co-Chair Keller:** Our first item on the agenda is Oral Communications. I have quite a few cards. The microphone is over there. The first speaker will be Rebecca Byrne, to be followed by William Macrae. If you could go to the microphone, and then the person behind you can go and prepare. Is Rebecca Byrne here?

**Rebecca Byrne:** I'm right here.

**Co-Chair Keller:** Go to the microphone, which is over there in the corner. You'll have 3 minutes.

**Rebecca Byrne:** Can I start just whenever?

**Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. Go ahead, start.

**Rebecca Byrne:** Hi guys. I'm happy to be here speaking with you. I'm from an organization called Housing Choices Coalition. We find housing for adults with developmental disabilities. Usually these individuals have extremely low incomes as they only survive off of Social Security. I'm here mostly to discuss the height as well as the land use design. As far as height limits, I think relaxing the restrictions on these can really help out our clients as generally relaxing height regulations help cities to serve more extremely low-income people. As I said, most of our clients survive solely on Social Security. Additionally, the new mixed land-use design can really help out our clients, because living near retailers is crucial for their independence, so



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 living right above retailers would be amazing for them. Just when you consider these two  
2 things, again, the new mixed land use design and the height limitations, please consider the  
3 developmental disabilities community, because this could really, really help them out. Thank  
4 you.

5

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next speaker is William Macrae, to be followed by Justine  
7 Burt.

8

9 **William Macrae:** Hi there. First, thanks for taking the time to listen to everyone. I live in Palo  
10 Alto, up by Greer Park. I work Downtown. I wanted to make a similar comment but from a  
11 slightly different direction. I'd encourage you guys to think about relaxing the height limit a  
12 little bit. Fifty feet seems very constrained for basically the current state of the Bay Area. In  
13 particular, I would love if I lived downtown, not where I do. It feels sort of weird and selfish for  
14 me to talk about how I don't enjoy my 15-minute bike ride or 10-minute drive after the  
15 previous comment. To sort of nail it down more, I think actually a lot of the problems that we  
16 see as negative, whether it's parking or traffic or so on, I see coworkers who live driving  
17 distance but would rather live walking distance. If you make that housing available to them,  
18 they will live there. I'd encourage you to consider doing that. It's nice for the environment. It's  
19 nice for the individuals that live there. It's actually really good for the economy. I think it's a  
20 challenge. I understand the concerns of residents that don't want to see skyscrapers, and I  
21 don't think anyone is asking for that. I think a fifth story is not that egregious. I would claim a  
22 sixth or seventh isn't, but maybe we can agree on the fifth. Thanks, and please think about it.

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Justine Burt followed by Neilson Buchanan.

25

26 **Justine Burt:** Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity for public comment. Thank you,  
27 Elaine Uang, for alerting me to this opportunity to share the following idea with you all. My  
28 husband and son and I moved to Palo Alto 2 years so my son could attend the excellent public  
29 schools here. Unfortunately, we've now fallen in love with Palo Alto, and we would love to stay  
30 here, but we can't afford to buy. Have you looked at the MLS listing lately? The cheapest  
31 house is 1.7 million, and of course that's 20 percent under what the real estate agent thinks it's  
32 going to go for, so it'll be \$2 million, way out of our price range. If there were a zoning change  
33 around the train stations, within a mile, people could do things, like four families could come  
34 together and buy a tear-down and then \$2 million for the house and then \$2 million to build  
35 and permit four units, and then we could have a walkable, dense area near each of the three  
36 train stations. It would only be 1 million each instead of 2 million each. That would take a  
37 zoning change. I know there's a lot of resistance to zoning changes to allow for more  
38 densification, but I urge you to take a look at Paris. If anyone's ever been to Paris, a lot of the  
39 housing is three or four, maybe five stories tops. It's lovely there. Every time I go to Paris, all I



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 do is eat lemon tarts and baguettes for 10 straight days, and I still lose weight because it's such  
2 a great walkable place with wonderful mass transit. The three, four-story buildings don't seem  
3 too imposing. That could be the Downtown areas for Palo Alto, around California Avenue and  
4 University Avenue. I encourage you to take a look at zoning changes within a mile of the train  
5 stations to allow for that kind of sharing economy, where families could do things together that  
6 they can't do separately. Thank you.

7

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Neilson Buchanan to be followed by Elaine Meyer.

9

10 **Neilson Buchanan:** I'd like to talk about the height limit as a sacred value in Palo Alto, not one  
11 that will be discarded lightly. I think it is critical to the flavor and any reasonable scenario for  
12 the foreseeable future. Like any religion of sacredness, there's got to be exceptions. I think the  
13 debate really ought to be about what exceptions do we really want to make. This afternoon, I  
14 really would like to talk about seniors and the height limit. By seniors, I really want to talk  
15 about the market of seniors that are over 75 years of age. There's a lot of chatter going on. I  
16 don't want to begin to enter the debate that seniors under 75 are anxious to abandon their  
17 homes or that they should. That's very treacherous ground in my opinion, because I don't think  
18 you understand the market of older citizens that are under 75. I come today talking about my  
19 experience as administrator of a hospital, where we paid a great deal of attention to older  
20 patients. Over half the patients in any hospital are Medicare patients, which is 65. Senior  
21 housing, particularly the continuing care retirement centers like the VA, the Forum and  
22 Channing Housing have enormous potential because they have congregant housing. It's  
23 designed clinically and sociologically to serve a certain set of seniors. That's a really important  
24 concept because, I think, in the long run the Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto community  
25 is going to need a series of Channing Houses, if you will, whether they're organized for profit or  
26 not. I encourage this group to think through where those could be sited. This is a wonderful  
27 example to build high. These organizations are not effective unless they have high density, and  
28 there's no way to have high density except by building up for this particular market. There are  
29 four levels of care, from pretty spry to dementia that you typically find. People who run those  
30 organizations are great advisers to you. They can tell you in a New York minute the  
31 fundamental minimum size for efficient operations. Other facilities to consider in this market  
32 would be nursing homes and extended care facilities. Those two can be built up high, and  
33 almost by definition are going to have to be that way because there's not enough lateral space  
34 to be able to build affordable care at that level. Be glad to come back and talk about the over  
35 75 market. That's something I know a little bit about. The other market, below 75, is far too  
36 complex and uncertain. Thank you

37

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine Meyer to be followed by Linnea Wickstrom.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Elaine Meyer:** Good evening. As many of you know, I have been keeping track of housing  
2 construction in Palo Alto for many years. That is construction of multiple housing, not  
3 individuals, not remodels, not private, just added multiple housing. Rather than give you a  
4 spreadsheet, because I think you probably have enough paper to deal with, I'm just distributing  
5 the URL. The URL, the list, is on a Google sheet; it's very easy to look at, to sort, to search. It  
6 should be easy for you to find out. That's what I'm here for. If you don't mind passing it. Thank  
7 you.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Linnea Wickstrom to be followed by our last speaker, John Kelley.

10

11 **Linnea Wickstrom:** Good evening, good afternoon. It's me again. Linnea Wickstrom, I'm a 40-  
12 plus, 45-year resident of Palo Alto. I have a disabled adult son with autism and an 88-year-old  
13 mother who may not be able to live by herself forever. I have two interests here. Number one  
14 is urging the provision of high-density housing for people, young adults, adults with  
15 developmental disabilities. As Rebecca said, it would be nice if that could be multistory. It  
16 should also be transit-oriented, as my son is lucky enough to live right now at 1585 Studios in  
17 Mountain View, put up by Housing Choices in the city. I would like to see a lot more of that. I  
18 will note again, as I always do, that housing for people with developmental disabilities can be  
19 done with very, very little parking because they do not drive generally. The long haul request  
20 that I have, on a more personal note, is for AUs. I would like a place for my mother, if I need it.  
21 I will need a cottage, for instance, in my backyard when I can no longer do the stairs. For the  
22 long, long haul, it would be appropriate for my son or for a caregiver for my son living in my  
23 house. Personally, I have a 10,000-square-foot lot with a 2,000-square-foot house on it. I am  
24 200 yards off El Camino and the Number 22 bus, walkable distance from shopping, banks,  
25 pharmacies of all types, which would mean potential jobs as well as all the things that an  
26 individual who doesn't drive with developmental disabilities needs to live independently. As far  
27 as I know, I haven't really investigated, the main thing holding me back is parking. As one  
28 speaker here said last time I was here, it would be nice if we could prioritize people over  
29 parking. Thanks again for your consideration for both placement of high-density housing for  
30 people with developmental disabilities and consideration of AUs. Thank you.

31

32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next speaker is John Kelley, to be followed by our now last  
33 speaker, Bret Anderson.

34

35 **John Kelley:** With a segue like that, I can't resist. I think I was the one who was here last time  
36 saying I really believe in people over parking. I'll just repeat that statement. I think I was here a  
37 couple of sessions before that, and I encourage you all to be courageous and bold in what  
38 you're doing here. I'll just say that again. I think you should really be bold, because we now  
39 have, this Committee has the community has an example of real boldness. Monday night, the



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 City Council got up there and did something really historic. The City has now committed itself  
2 to a Climate Action Plan, the key principle of which is that we're going to have 80 percent  
3 reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2030. Mr. Friend, the City Manager, other  
4 members of the staff and the entire City Council with one absence, none abstention, voted  
5 unanimously for those principles. What I would like to say to you most importantly tonight is  
6 it's now your duty to act upon that message which our leaders, our community elected leaders,  
7 has sent back to the community, that this is a principle that we as Palo Alto embrace. Now, it's  
8 your job to start implementing that. I want to offer a couple of concrete suggestions. The first  
9 is in parallel with the CAC, the S/CAP committee has been meeting, I think, for over a year now  
10 to wrestle out some of the details of how we can achieve those goals. You all know how much  
11 time you spent thinking about planning issues, about transportation issues. S/CAP has been  
12 doing the work thinking about climate issues and how we're going to address those, both from  
13 a mitigation perspective and from an adaptation perspective. I encourage you, as the very first  
14 thing you should do tonight, invite the S/CAP people here to talk to you, have a joint meeting,  
15 show the Council you've listened to what the Council did the other night, and embrace that and  
16 understand that there's got to be interaction between those two groups. I charge you with  
17 doing that. The second thing I'd say, Mr. Buchanan, I think, was actually kind of going the same  
18 direction I was. Climate change is the morale issue of our time. We need to set aside those  
19 religious (inaudible) that have been hanging around Palo Alto for too long. It is not going to  
20 matter if we have a 50-foot height limit if we are all standing in 2 feet of water because of sea  
21 level rise. Let's get that through our heads. We need to do something about that. We need  
22 flexibility not hard, no exception, bright line rules for the next 50, 100 years. That's what you  
23 should be thinking about. I will end by saying that I too think we need to like not think of a 50-  
24 foot height limit as a hard, fast, no exception rule. We should either get rid of it or we should  
25 just say anytime it's important to the community, anytime the community needs or the needs  
26 of the planet command us to do otherwise, we can set aside that limit by a vote of our elected  
27 officials, by the vote of the City Council. We need to have that kind of flexibility. While I totally  
28 support the people here who are advocating on flexibility on behalf of underserved  
29 populations, those who have developmental challenges, those who have got other special  
30 needs, I think that holds for everybody. The gentleman who spoke before about young people  
31 wanting to have other options, not everyone is wedded to a car. Let's bury this 50-foot limit  
32 and put it aside, and let's have this committee take up its duty now to deal with climate change  
33 in partnership with the S/CAP committee. Thank you.

34

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Final speaker is Bret Anderson.

36

37 **Bret Anderson:** As a resident of south Palo Alto in the flood zone, I can second the last couple  
38 of speakers in terms of having a vision of an improved quality of life that is also sustainable and  
39 will prevent some of the negative risks that we have coming with climate change. In principle, I



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 think that what we know about human health and happiness is very significantly tied with  
2 community and proximity to friends, family, having walkable communities, having healthy local  
3 sources of food. All of those things, I think, drive in the direction of higher density for our  
4 community, that is, more pleasurable lifestyles and also less cars, less dependence on the  
5 automobile. I think, if we keep in principle the idea that the automobile is a necessary evil in  
6 developing the future community because driving 3,000-pound hunks of metal around is quite  
7 dangerous and should be considered a privilege and something that has secondary benefits or  
8 has secondary consideration compared to biking, walking and going about life, that does not  
9 create a significant threat to our environment or to other people. Considering the car as kind of  
10 something we need to move away from because we are improving our lives and trying to  
11 increase the quality of life, I think, also thinking in the future about the way transportation is  
12 going to work, driverless cars are coming. We know that within 10 years, we'll probably be  
13 significantly down that road. That's not a long time when you're talking about the built  
14 environment. That will probably decrease the need for vehicles by about 90 percent. It will  
15 also relieve parking problems. I think we should think about a world where we don't need  
16 parking, so much parking, and we can build pedestrian areas around transit. We can build  
17 smaller dwelling units, because those are attractive to people who care about living close into a  
18 community. These larger, more luxurious units are really not that conducive to community  
19 building or a desirable quality of life, walkability, proximity to friends, family, proximity to  
20 stores. I think if we envision ourselves in a future that looks like that, then the guidelines and  
21 objectives that we would have for land use and building regulations will head us in that  
22 direction, and we should not fear that as a future for the community and not to be worried  
23 about this constituency or that constituency not going for that type of a vision of the future.  
24 That's my two bits.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

27

28 **Staff Comments:**

29

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Now, we'll turn it over to Hillary Gitelman.

31

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks Arthur, and thanks to all of you. Happy April. Here we are at another  
33 meeting. I wanted to extend thanks particularly to Elena and to those of you who participated  
34 in the housing delegation to the City Council, those of you who have participated in the  
35 Community Services Subcommittee, the Land Use Subcommittee and the Transportation  
36 Subcommittee. We have been very busy in the last month. Also on the subject of  
37 subcommittees, I wanted to just acknowledge that at the Land Use Subcommittee, I understand  
38 there was some confusion stemming and concerns stemming from the question of public  
39 comment. In the future, staff is going to take a more active role in ensuring that we do invite



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 public comment but that it be for a limited period of time at these subcommittees. I think our  
2 hope had been that we could leave these kind of loose and casual, but if we need to, we will  
3 add some more structure to the subcommittees going forward.  
4

### 5 **1. Introduction of Elaine Costello, new project manager for the Comp Plan Update.**

6 **Hillary Gitelman:** One of the things I want to do tonight is introduce Elaine Costello, to my left.  
7 Elaine has agreed to join us as a staff person and project manager for this effort. She'll be  
8 working part-time as a contractor for the City. I've known Elaine for years. She was the  
9 community development director in Mountain View for years and really has a lot of experience  
10 like an accomplished professional who actually really likes this kind of general plan project.  
11 We're very happy to have her. Her first charge is going to be to meet with all of you. We've  
12 asked her to reach out to you and meet with you in small groups, maybe two or three people at  
13 a time, find out from your perspective how this process seems to be going, any concerns you  
14 have, any adjustments you think we should consider in the coming months. We're delighted to  
15 have Elaine. I think you'll enjoy working with her, as I know we will. We will at a staff level,  
16 working with Elaine and Andrew, be sorting out kind of roles and responsibilities for the whole  
17 team. I think there's no question there's enough work to go around for all of us. We'll get that  
18 straight in the next month or so. In the time being, I ask that you continue to use Elena, not  
19 Elaine, Elena as your point of contact. She's been doing a great job, and she'll continue to field  
20 your email questions and make sure they get routed to the appropriate people. Let's see.  
21

### 22 **2. Recap of discussions at City Council, including March 21 meeting of housing sites and** 23 **programs and schedule revisions.**

24 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just to recap what's happened since the last time we met. At the City  
25 Council, I think we're going to hear a report from the delegation to the City Council's March  
26 21st meeting on housing issues. The delegation will give you a report on that. Just last night, as  
27 one of the speakers referred to, the City Council had a discussion of the draft S/CAP which is  
28 going to be relevant to the work we do on a number of elements in the Comp Plan. When I  
29 conclude my remarks, I'm going to invite Gil to say a few words about that. Just so you know,  
30 we anticipate convening the Sustainability Subcommittee now, going forward on a monthly  
31 basis to try and help us develop that synthesis between the S/CAP and the Comp Plan elements  
32 that needs to happen. Of course that subcommittee's work will come back to the full  
33 committee for review as needed as the elements come forward. Next up for the City Council  
34 will be a discussion on May 16th. I actually saw that this was incorrect in the schedule we gave  
35 you. It was a week later, but it's May 16th. Will be a discussion on the fifth scenario for  
36 analysis as part of the EIR. If you're interested in contributing to that discussion, May 16th is  
37 the date. We have postponed the hearing on the Draft EIR. Those of you who are planning to  
38 provide written comments or come to the Council and provide comments on the Draft EIR,



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 please know that that's been postponed to June 6th. We have scheduling challenges down at  
2 City Hall and, for whatever reason; we had to juggle things around. As a result of postponing  
3 that Draft EIR hearing, the comment period for written comments on the Draft EIR will be  
4 extended to June 8th, so 2 days later. You can come and make oral comments at the Council  
5 meeting or you can provide written comments. They will be treated the same. All substantive  
6 comments will be responded to in the Final EIR when we prepare that. That Final EIR will  
7 include responses to comments we receive on the fifth scenario analysis, which obviously we're  
8 trying to define the scenario so that it can be analyzed, so that we can get public input, blah,  
9 blah, blah. It's a many-step process. I hope you'll consider participating in both of those  
10 discussions on May 16th and June 6th. Let's see. I'm going to try, vainly I think, to fill in for Dan  
11 and support Arthur tonight in chairing this meeting. We are, as the staff report indicated, trying  
12 something new. You should find these cards at your place. Red, green yellow, they mean what  
13 you would expect. Red is "I don't agree." Green is "I agree." Yellow is "yeah, I could consider  
14 that under certain conditions, maybe that's a good idea." We're not thinking of this as a voting  
15 system per se. it's really in lieu of the experiment you had last month on trying straw polls. We  
16 thought we'd try something new. As the committee members make their comments, if you  
17 could use your cards, hold up your cards to indicate your support, opposition or your "I'll think  
18 about it." Don is demonstrating. If you could just hold up the cards. We're not going to count  
19 votes. I think it's okay for the nonvoting members of the committee to participate. If we find  
20 that it's more useful to count the votes and we start tallying things up, we'll reconsider that.  
21 Let's just give it a try this month. If we don't like it and we want to go back to straw polls, we  
22 can do that for sure. Andrew and his colleagues have used this in other communities, and it  
23 was a good way to just get a "right off the bat, is there like one person that likes that idea or is  
24 there a whole group of people who like that idea." I think it might help us as the committee  
25 starts to comment. Yeah, Len.

26  
27 **Len Filppu:** Is this a formal request by someone to show the cards or are we just randomly  
28 doing an applause meter as people talk?

29  
30 **Hillary Gitelman:** That's a random applause meter. It's just an idea. We're going to try it out.  
31 If we hate it, we won't do it again. Let's give it a go. I like the colors too. It's kind of intuitive.  
32 Let's see if it works. Elena, Andrew, did I miss anything? Great. Then I'm going to turn it over  
33 to Gil to say a few words about last night's meeting and next steps on the S/CAP, and then we'll  
34 proceed to other items on the agenda.

35  
36 **Gil Friend:** Thank you, Hillary. Hello everyone. For those of you I haven't met, I'm Gil Friend.  
37 I'm the City's Chief Sustainability Officer. I've been the person on point for developing the  
38 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. As you've heard from Hillary and a number of speakers,  
39 the Council last night endorsed the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent by





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 2030. If you haven't been tracking this issue, you should know that Palo Alto has already  
2 reduced emissions 36 percent. It's a fairly stunning accomplishment. I don't think there's a city  
3 in the country that has done that. By our estimates, what we're calling "business as usual"  
4 programs already under way at the state and federal level and already decided on here in Palo  
5 Alto should take us to about a 52 percent reduction by 2030. What's notable there is that the  
6 California goal is 40 percent. With what we've already done and already decided, we're  
7 exceeding the goals of one of the leading programs in the world. The question was what next,  
8 what additional. The S/CAP summarizes a series of measures that could take us to 80 percent  
9 by 2030. Let me be clear. It's called a Sustainability and Climate Action Plan because it's not  
10 just about climate. I agree with some of the speakers that this is the moral issue of our time,  
11 but it's not the only issue. It happens to be one that connects a lot of the others. If you look at  
12 the ten main topic areas in the plan, rethinking mobility which we've had occasion to talk  
13 together about in some previous meetings; building an efficient and electric city; zero waste  
14 and the circular economy; getting smart about water; municipal operations; the utility of the  
15 future; community behavior and culture and innovation; climate adaptation; regeneration and  
16 the natural environment; and financing all this stuff. If you add all that together, the climate-  
17 specific elements are about a third of the mass of the text; the other elements are about two-  
18 thirds of the mass of the text. It's a lot easier to talk about climate because you can count big  
19 numbers and make dramatic statements, but there's a lot more for us to think about in here.  
20 The guiding framework for all this work, as we've talked about here and at City Council several  
21 times over the last couple of years, is how can we improve quality of life and build and protect  
22 prosperity and build the resilience of this community to withstand changes, both expected and  
23 unexpected, that we may see in the future. The draft is available, of course, on the City Council  
24 website in connection with the agenda from last night's Council meeting. There are a number  
25 of corrections we're going to make of some typos, so we'll have a corrected draft up probably  
26 early next week, maybe late this week. I'll make sure words gets out to you, so you can get a  
27 copy of those and peruse. You'll notice, as you look at this, that there are many measures that  
28 are familiar to you, many things that are sort of "mom and apple pie," some that are dramatic,  
29 some that are frankly a bit controversial and bold. For example, we talk about significant  
30 growth in the electric vehicle population in Palo Alto. We already lead the state, but we  
31 propose to lead the state far more in the future. Some people question whether something like  
32 that is feasible, given the kinds of growth rates we're looking at. In fact, we just learned a  
33 couple of weeks ago that the country of Norway has established a policy that as of 2025 only  
34 electric vehicles will be sold in Norway. Holland has passed that through one house of its  
35 legislature. India is considering a similar measure. Closer to home, two weeks ago again Tesla  
36 took preorders for a quarter of a million cars in 2 days. What that says to me is that our normal  
37 ways of planning, where we look at past trends and extrapolate the future by projecting the  
38 trends forward, might not work in the world that we're moving into. It's a challenge, because  
39 most of our planning apparatus is built on that. We need to plan into uncertainty. I would say



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 not just looking to extrapolate from the past, but to think about where do we want to be,  
2 what's the kind of community that we want to have, what are the measures that will get us  
3 there, and let's figure out the best ways to implement them in ways that are practical and  
4 economic. The Council resolution, just in a nutshell, endorses the 80 percent reduction goal. It  
5 endorses the general framework of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan as the basis for  
6 the next round of discussion as we dive into more detail and look at how we implement,  
7 supplement things that are missing in the initial draft, perhaps shift some emphasis. It supports  
8 the guiding principles that we present here in terms of design principles and decision criteria  
9 that we hope can provide a framework for all of the specific discussions, and then has directed  
10 staff to come back to Council within 2 months with a process, as Hillary referred to, to design  
11 the integration of the work of the S/CAP and the work of the Comp Plan. There's a lot of  
12 overlap as you can hear between the different elements. The probable ultimate result of that,  
13 as many cities have done, would be to incorporate the Sustainability and Climate Plan by  
14 reference as part of the Comp Plan and to bring specific elements in from the S/CAP to specific  
15 elements of the Comp Plan to inform particular sections. We had a meeting with senior staff in  
16 the City with the City Manager today to map out that program. As Hillary said, we'll be working  
17 closely with the Sustainability Committee and some other mechanisms that we'll be working  
18 out over the next couple of weeks to ensure that these things inform each other, are consistent  
19 and support the kind of aspirations that we have in the community. I'll leave it at that. Do we  
20 have time for any questions or you want to just move right along? Where are you? Take a  
21 couple of questions if there are any. Whitney.

22  
23 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. As we embark on tonight looking at the Land Use Element, what  
24 would you say are the most important components of the S/CAP that we should keep in mind  
25 as we look at this element of the Comp Plan?

26  
27 **Gil Friend:** I think a few things. One is that land use and mobility and transportation are  
28 inextricably connected. We tend to treat them separately for understandable reasons, but in  
29 the real world they tie together closely in terms of generating demand and so forth, number  
30 one. Number two, we have the opportunity to advance a concept that Hillary brought forward  
31 just over a year ago of zero impact or performance-based zoning, where we encourage,  
32 perhaps require, perhaps support development that does not add energy impact, water impact,  
33 greenhouse gas impact or transportation impact. Sounds fanciful, but there are communities  
34 just south of here in Mountain View that have trip caps as a condition of development and  
35 many other examples from other cities. That goes to some of the questions about how much  
36 density, where, how. This is potentially an additional parameter in how we think about that.  
37 Third I would say is the relationship of land use and the built environment to the natural  
38 environment, how we preserve and protect the ecosystems that both give Palo Alto its  
39 distinctive quality but really also support everything that we value. Again, one place where that



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 ties together with transportation is you think about the percentage of this city that is paved  
2 and, therefore, impermeable, so water runs off and has to be treated, compared to a city  
3 where, as one speaker suggested, what if there were 50 or 80 or 90 percent fewer automobiles  
4 and less demand for paved space, what does that do to quality of life. These are some  
5 challenging things to talk about, because there are a number of elements tangled together, and  
6 they don't make as much sense separated. We've seen impressive examples from cities around  
7 the world. One thing that I would encourage you to do as you read the Plan and as we come  
8 back together for some additional discussions is let's look outside our own experience and what  
9 we know already, see where the emerging trends are, be selective and not just adopt things  
10 because they're there, but choose the elements that make sense for this community. We're in  
11 a time of enormous innovation around climate, around technology, around transportation and  
12 around comprehensive planning, so we have a great opportunity here.

13

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** As is our practice, please put your tags upright if you want to speak. It doesn't  
15 do any good for your tag to be facing you, because you already know your name. If you could  
16 take your tag face out, that would make it a lot easier for me because I'm very bad at names.  
17 Thank you. We only have a few minutes, so we'll ask a few questions. I think (crosstalk) ...

18

19 **Gil Friend:** I'll be happy to come back for continued discussions.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** We need to go on. Bonnie.

21

22 **Bonnie Packer:** Thanks, Gil. This is very exciting, but I have one question. If we're talking  
23 about development would have zero impact, yet we want to have infill development because of  
24 the mobility aspects, how would we ensure that this requirement for zero impact doesn't in  
25 fact prevent the development from occurring? Let's say it's for housing, affordable housing. Do  
26 you understand the dilemma?

27

28 **Hillary Gitelman:** Bonnie, I'm sorry to interject. Can we defer that kind of discussion to a later  
29 venue? I think that's a fascinating observation, that that's a dynamic we need to address. I  
30 don't know that we can answer that on the spot tonight.

31

32 **Gil Friend:** I'll just say the brief answer is that it's going to require innovation both at a policy  
33 level and innovation from builders and developers, but that happens in the world. Let's see  
34 how do we get there.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think the next one was Bob.

37

38 **Bob Wenzlau:** Just got to use this guy. I thought John Kelley's remarks about having some  
39 integration or collaboration between our Sustainability Subcommittee, which I'm on, and the



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 working group that backed the S/CAP would be really good. I actually believe that it would be  
2 better to have that forum at the subcommittee level, because we want to be able to have  
3 discourse, and this forum is more testimony based, making your remarks, and not one that  
4 lends itself to discourse. I hope we can get that planned. I appreciate Elena finally getting the  
5 Sustainability Committee at least speaking that we're going to meeting. I've been distraught  
6 that that process has been delayed way too long. That's all.

7

8 **Gil Friend:** Thank you.

9

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Bob. Steve. Could you put your name tag down after you've  
11 spoken? Thank you.

12

13 **Stephen Levy:** For Gil or Hillary, if you and Council are going to discuss how the S/CAP and the  
14 Comp Plan are related, can you come back to us before we make decisions on elements that  
15 will be influenced? Gil made a whole bunch of points about transportation and land use  
16 integration with Climate Action Plan, and yet it looks to me like we're scheduled to finish up on  
17 the Land Use Element before the subcommittee can come back or you can come back. How do  
18 we do that? It was Mayor Burt's question, how are the S/CAP and the Comp Plan related. We  
19 ought to have that information before we finalize a Land Use Element, it seems to me.

20

21 **Gil Friend:** That's certainly the intention. Our job is now to work out the process of how to do  
22 that. The vote was just last night, and we just got the directive last night. We've had a first  
23 planning meeting on it today. We've immediately scheduled another one for early next week.  
24 Hopefully over the next couple of weeks, we'll have an idea of how to proceed and how to  
25 certainly engage all of you in that process. I'll defer to Hillary, who knows your process better  
26 than I do, to lay out how that might happen.

27

28 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'll just make one observation about all of the ideas that Gil just articulated in  
29 response to Whitney's question about sustainability principles or values that are in the Land  
30 Use Element, I hope you agree with me, are already in the draft that you have before you  
31 tonight in some form. I think we're asking you as a group to think about whether there are  
32 ways that those ideas, those germs can be somehow drawn out in the document We're looking  
33 at the subcommittee to help with that process. As Gil indicated, we have to work out this  
34 timing thing, chicken and egg, subcommittee, Land Use Element, Climate Action Plan. We will  
35 be doing that and let you know as that process is firmed up.

36

37 **Gil Friend:** To be clear, I don't think we see dramatic conflicts and inconsistencies between  
38 these drafts. There are differences of emphasis. Some go into more depth in different places.  
39 The S/CAP by the nature of it as a normative rather than extrapolative document is setting



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 some aggressive goals, but those are things for you to consider and see how they work in with  
2 the work that you've already done. Arthur, I think we have one more.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani was next.

5

6 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I'd love to see a future with no driveways and no roads. I think that would fit  
7 well into what I would like to see as part of the zero impact, which is no reduction of the  
8 acreage of parkland in the City per person and no reduction of tree canopy. I think those were  
9 not evaluated, and so I see those are really important pieces of any kind of what was written  
10 here as dynamic growth management. I agree with Arthur that adaptive growth management  
11 is a better term for that. I wanted to talk about that later, but I wanted you to hear that  
12 specifically, Gil.

13

14 **Gil Friend:** Thank you. My own inclination would not be no reduction in those areas, but  
15 perhaps expansion of those areas enabled by some of the other policies that you all will be  
16 considering.

17

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think what Shani was talking about is no reduction in per capita in  
19 those areas over current. Alex.

20

21 **Alex van Riesen:** I just wanted to ask will we be sent whatever, the summary, the S/CAP that  
22 you presented to the City Council?

23

24 **Gil Friend:** I'll send to staff a link to the corrected document certainly by early next week. We'll  
25 try to get that done this week. I just want to get some updates in it. The Plan itself, the draft  
26 Plan is about 66 pages. There's about twice long, about 123 pages of appendices for those of  
27 you who want to go geek out into analyses and assumptions and so forth. For most people, the  
28 draft itself, the 66-page draft will suffice, but we'll get you both of those

29 .

30 **Elena Lee:** Staff actually sent a link to that. I can resend it if needed.

31

32 **Gil Friend:** If you'd hold off. There are some corrections to make in that, so let me make those  
33 corrections, and then get people that up-to-date one. They're minor, but some of the numbers  
34 vary a little bit.

35

36 **Alex van Riesen:** Sorry about that, Elena. I must have lost it. My second question was I  
37 wanted to pick up on something one of the citizens mentioned, the idea of having folks who'd  
38 worked on the S/CAP. It seems to me there would be an advantage at some point to have them



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 come and share their discussion with us. I don't know if that's a discussion point at some point  
2 or how we might follow up on that.

3

4 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you for that question. I think right now we're thinking that that might  
5 happen at the subcommittee level. Let us try this out a little more and see how we think the  
6 process would best serve both projects. With that, let me thank Gil. We should probably move  
7 on. Thanks to Gil for his work last night for coming this evening to give you a short summary  
8 and for your engagement on these issues. Much more to come.

9

10 **Gil Friend:** Thanks Hillary. I'm sorry I can't stay with you for the rest of the meeting. I need to  
11 catch a train. I look forward to seeing you again at a future meeting and to meeting with the  
12 subcommittee in the very near term. Thank you.

13

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you very much.

15

16 **Agenda Items:**

17

18 **1. Report from the CAC housing delegation to the March 21 City Council meeting**

19

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** First agenda item is report from the CAC housing delegation on the March 21st  
21 Council meeting. If we can basically have a very brief summary of anything you want to say. I  
22 think that the speakers of that were Doria and Elaine. Is that right? I think only two of you  
23 spoke. No, Lydia and Elaine. Do you want to say anything?

24

25 **Elaine Uang:** Really preparing to say anything. I think we just tried our best to get the range of  
26 ideas out, just to present them to Council. As we know, we all had a lot to say, but we really  
27 just wanted to kind of provide Council with kind of a sense of all the opinions on the CAC for  
28 consideration with respect to the Housing Element.

29

30 **Julia Moran:** I would just add that I think that the timing was obviously extremely short over  
31 the weekend and there was no structure. I think all four of us were pretty frustrated with that.  
32 I think what we did kind of did an umbrella of the issues that we saw. I don't know if it had  
33 much of impact since it was just some people feel this way, some people feel that way. I think  
34 with more time and more structure we could have a more thorough and impactful  
35 presentation.

36

37 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria.

38



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Doria Summa:** I agree with Julia. Through no one particular person's fault at all, the timing was  
2 very short and difficult. I also agree it was kind of like because we're a fairly polarized group  
3 and that was a little micro team. It was particularly challenging, but we worked pretty hard on  
4 it. Some of us had more time than others because the first time we were able to meet was  
5 Sunday evening, so it was kind of last minute. I really appreciate everyone's time. I appreciate  
6 Elena helping us and keeping us informed of everything. I will say that I think it's very  
7 important as we move forward with many delegations or subcommittees that we make sure  
8 that we are sticking true to what we agreed to say and respectful of all of the opinions of other  
9 people in the group. That's it.

10

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lydia.

12

13 **Lydia Kou:** I agree with everything my colleagues said. Thanks.

14

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I just want to apologize for having the short timeframe. It was  
16 shorter than it might have otherwise been, but there was a little confusion in terms of giving  
17 instructions. Sorry about that.

18

19 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can just say a couple words of follow up. I thought you guys did a  
20 fantastic job particularly given the short timeframe. You conveyed, I think, to the Council very  
21 effectively the complexity and the differences of opinion on housing issues. I think partially as a  
22 result of that and the other testimony that Council received, ultimately the Council gave staff  
23 direction or requested that we come back to Council with some assessment of the feasibility of  
24 taking on some housing program ideas before the Comp Plan Update kind of as a separate work  
25 task. When I went home that night, I was a little disappointed. I was like, "We wanted input for  
26 the Comp Plan, not more work." In retrospect, after more thought, I think we learned through  
27 the Council's questions and direction really what their thoughts are in terms of informing the  
28 Comp Plan process. Clearly there's an interest in exploring micro units, units that don't have  
29 significant impacts where you might have limited parking that don't create traffic impacts.  
30 Clearly there's an interest on the part of some Council Members on exploring workforce  
31 housing, ways to incentivize workforce housing and different nontraditional housing types, all  
32 of those ideas. We didn't get direction in exactly the way I thought we might, our collective  
33 effort, but I think we heard some good ideas from the Council. We'll continue to build on them  
34 as we go back to the Council with the information and responses they requested. Stay tuned.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 **2. Status update on the revised Draft Community Services and Facilities (CSF) Element**  
2 **from the CSF Subcommittee**

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next thing is the status upon the draft Community Services and Facilities  
4 Element from the Community Services and Facilities Subcommittee. Who was on that  
5 subcommittee and wishes to report? Bonnie.

6  
7 **Bonnie Packer:** Elena sent us a tracked version of the draft. It was based on a meeting we had  
8 over a month ago where the subcommittee got together. We did a fantastic job editing. We  
9 streamlined and we combined policies and programs so that there wasn't repetition. We really  
10 worked hard in keeping the content. The content is great. I think, based on this committee,  
11 there's a lot of good stuff about reaching out to everyone in this community, not just the  
12 people who always use the services. A lot of good stuff on not only the physical health of our  
13 community but mental health. The way it's been rearranged is very clear. I think when you see  
14 the final draft at our next meeting—is that when it's going to be on the consent calendar? I  
15 think you'll like it.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Anybody else want to say anything? Don.

18  
19 **Don McDougall:** I would echo what Bonnie said. I think one of the things we did was push the  
20 whole idea of broad participation. The previous plan said we're going to allow participation and  
21 not necessarily challenge diversity or whatever. We tried to change the wording so that it was  
22 really to encourage broad participation in the community and to eliminate all diversity. The  
23 previous plan was pretty specific about what kind of diversity it was dealing with, and we tried  
24 to make sure that we were dealing in all diversity. One of the things we removed that people  
25 should be aware of, the previous Plan had statements about leadership within the whole  
26 community, our neighbors and whatnot. We felt for this particular thing there was no reason  
27 for Palo Alto to believe that they were leading the community. I thought the other thing we did  
28 was a really good job of taking children and youth and teens and seniors and special needs and  
29 dealing with support and opportunity and engagement so that we were really participating in  
30 the community. I do want to add relative to the land use discussion tonight that the draft  
31 eliminated some of the groupings of kinds of parks and stuff that we had. I think that grouping  
32 was useful to help us understand the land use and the various pieces. It still talks about the  
33 national recreation and parks as a standard, and we had previously said we shouldn't be  
34 referring to specific nonprofits that's not a government organization, that's just a nonprofit. I  
35 question why we should continue to use it. I think we need to put some deliberate work into  
36 defining what a park is and what an open space is and what a gathering space is—the term gets  
37 used all over; there's no definition of it—and what a preserve is. Byxbee Park, in my mind, got





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 put into the preserve space. I find it hard to believe that we're preserving the natural good of  
2 something that's a land use fill.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have our first examples of colored cards up. Ellen, briefly.

5

6 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Mine is a comment on the report on March 21st. What was interesting to me  
7 was that the subcommittee's report was followed by 31-plus comments from the general  
8 public. I saw the Council listening to them with great interest there. They really echoed a lot of  
9 things that were said. I think the Council got an earful of what the citizens think.

10

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jen, you were on the committee.

12

13 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just wanted to add about the Community Services Subcommittee. I think  
14 we all found it extremely helpful that the Community Services Division staff were there to work  
15 through it with us. Having their expertise and experience to rein us in or tell us what they feel  
16 like is feasible versus not feasible was really a huge help to the process. I encourage the  
17 inclusion of line staff in subcommittee meetings like that in the future.

18

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'll just make an editorial comment for a moment about the idea of  
20 using nonprofit organizations for standards. How many people in the room use Wi-Fi? Did you  
21 realize that was organized by a nonprofit called the IEEE 802.11? That's a nonprofit that creates  
22 standards recognized by the American National Standards Institute. A lot of nonprofits create  
23 standards, and that doesn't make them bad.

24

### 25 **3. Report from the April 6 Land Use Subcommittee meeting**

26

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Now we go to the report from the April 6th Land Use Subcommittee. What I'd  
28 like to do is if you are on the Land Use Subcommittee, if you could put your cards up, so I can  
29 call on you. Since I'm not that good at names, if you could make sure that your names face me  
30 that would be helpful. We'll start with Stephen. You'll have the usual 2 minutes and change.

31

32 **Female:** (inaudible) open communications or what we feel about these points (inaudible).

33

34 **Co-Chair Keller:** As we usually do with this, since this is kicking off the land use, you'll bring  
35 your points for this, and then you won't speak on the next go around, on the rest of the go  
36 arounds. First, what we have is the committee members speak first, and then the non-  
37 committee members speak afterwards. Any points you want to make related to the  
38 subcommittee or any point that you want to make, this is your opportunity to do it on the first  
39 go around. Thank you. Stephen.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 **Stephen Levy:** I want to start by thanking Elena for the hard work at the committee and the  
2 incredible work trying to work toward a collaborative memo. I basically agree with what Elena  
3 summarized in the meeting. We were divided on two issues. One that Arthur has correctly  
4 renamed the adaptive growth management, and the other was on the height limit. My own  
5 position supports what John Kelley said. I believe in flexibility. I believe in what Neilson said. I  
6 would certainly support raising the height limit for housing in specific locations and for specific  
7 purposes. I live next to two beautiful, seven to eight-story apartment buildings. I have friends  
8 in Channing House. I worry about what might be appropriate seniors as they age, and I also  
9 want to include opportunities to get additional subsidized or below market rate housing in  
10 exchange for taller buildings. That's my position on that. I support the adaptive grown  
11 management tools. We're talking about a plan to 2030. I can't anticipate all of the things that  
12 will happen between then and now. I don't believe in 2016 setting fixed limits to 2030. My  
13 own metrics would probably start with parking and traffic impacts. Those seem to be the most  
14 important, but I definitely favor flexibility for the Council as we think about this Comp Plan and  
15 the alternatives. I do think that on both of these issues, I respect and support what all of the  
16 speakers said and look forward to hearing back from Gil and the S/CAP folks how those  
17 concepts connect the S/CAP to the Comp Plan.

18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Alex.

20  
21 **Alex van Riesen:** I agree with Stephen's sort of appraisal of how the meeting went. It seemed  
22 to me that at the end of the meeting, while there was certainly division between the—there's  
23 strength on the division on both sides. There was an openness to considering particularly  
24 development of a new zoning idea with retail and housing versus retail and office or retail and  
25 office and housing or something. I think the desire to look at some zones in Palo Alto where we  
26 could do that and think about that more creatively. I think there was some openness to  
27 flexibility, but the question was for what and how that would be done. I'm happy to leave it at  
28 that.

29  
30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Annette.

31  
32 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think I wrote most of my comments about my feelings. I am probably in  
33 the minority, and that's fine, about increasing the height limit. There's always exceptions to  
34 rules as Neilson said. The thing I'd really like to talk about is housing is a major need, and I think  
35 everyone realizes that, all different levels. To me, what I'd really like to see is a more aggressive  
36 plan for the City, because the most important thing with housing is finding the land to do it.  
37 You could have any kind of zoning or plans or whatever, but unless you have a specific location  
38 with a developer willing to build and the political will of the community, it's not going to go  
39 anywhere. I would like to really suggest that we advocate strongly that the properties on San



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 Antonio not be hotels. It's a perfect place for a large development. I'm really fascinated by  
2 what San Jose is doing, which is buying older hotels that are sort of shabby and reusing them.  
3 There are apartment complexes—there's one for sale on Middlefield—that, I think, if we really  
4 are serious about this, we have to put a plan together using federal funds, etc., to find  
5 locations. That to me is the primary thing. I really have to make a comment about Paris, which  
6 is one of my favorite cities. The reason Paris works is the buildings are gorgeous; they're  
7 fabulous architecture. They all are the same height, and they're all very compatible, and  
8 they're all next to each other. I don't think we have that situation in Palo Alto. I wanted to say  
9 for any of the larger developments, I think we should really look very carefully about what  
10 office, large dense office, not onesies, twosies, that we support. Any kind of mixed use should  
11 really be the focus on the retail with housing. There's a real question when you look at what  
12 came out of the Business Registry about how much retail and what types are actually used and  
13 where they are in the City. I know a lot of people threw darts at not having accurate data on  
14 that, but I'm really concerned about the types of mixed use, retail, that would be allowed in a  
15 center. One last comment about the coordinated area plans. I just think if we're going to do  
16 them, we need to start immediately. Everyone, I think, is in agreement with Fry's, but let's not  
17 wait until things are developed. Let's have a fast track to do the plans.

18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Len.

20  
21 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. I'll share my comments on the content of the issues later. I just wanted  
22 to make one point about the meeting itself. Unfortunately I missed it because we were on  
23 spring break and had a scheduled vacation out of town. I'd like to urge staff to consider giving  
24 an option for subcommittee meetings in the evening. I've served on a couple of the  
25 subcommittees. The Community Services and Facilities were all in the evening, and that was a  
26 result of people voting for that time. Now, we have an option of either the morning or the  
27 afternoon. I'm unable to attend in the afternoon, so I've missed several different  
28 subcommittee meetings. It isn't just about me. I raise this issue because I figure there's some  
29 flash cards going on. I know it must be difficult. Maybe the person who staffs the evening  
30 meeting can come in at the evening meeting for that day. I don't know how exactly to do it.  
31 I'm all about having the greatest possible participation. Thank you for listening.

32  
33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hamilton.

34  
35 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First I want to thank Elena for doing a great job organizing and running our  
36 first Land Use Subcommittee meeting as well as writing up a nice summary which she sent to all  
37 of you. In terms of comments, I wanted to first talk about dynamic growth management. I'd  
38 like to see new development in commercial zones to not increase net car trips or the use of  
39 public parking. I'd like to preserve L-8 with its existing commercial caps for Downtown and the



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 City as a whole. I'd like to see another metric considered for dynamic growth management,  
2 which is the housing to jobs ratio. A key part of sustainable growth is having housing close to  
3 jobs. With one of the nation's highest housing to job ratios and 3X that of Santa Clara County,  
4 I'd like to have an office cap in place as long as we're above a certain housing to jobs ratio. I'd  
5 recommend 2.0. The office cap should apply to all of Palo Alto except for Stanford Research  
6 Park. In terms of the 50-foot height limit, the height limit was the Palo Alto community's way of  
7 saying enough to overdevelopment. The last election reflected residents' dissatisfaction with  
8 recent overdevelopment. In Palo Alto, we do not have a housing crisis; we have an affordable  
9 housing crisis. Today there are plenty of rentals in Palo Alto. We need more below market  
10 housing and affordable housing, and that's where our focus should be. New micro units have  
11 been billed as the solution but often rent above current market. For example, 555 San Antonio  
12 on the corner of El Camino—I got this from Lydia by the way—where market rate studio units  
13 of under 600 square feet go from \$2,800 to over \$4,000 per month. It would be a disservice to  
14 our community to raise the height limit to enable more luxury micro units like these. Switching  
15 subjects slightly, Mountain View gives priority for BMR to qualifying public safety workers and  
16 school teachers when not in conflict with federal or state law. I'd like to see Palo Alto adopt the  
17 same priority system. I've included a link to that webpage in my comments. One last point.  
18 There is also a need for subsidized housing very low income and developmentally disabled. We  
19 should have a program to provide more subsidized housing for these folks. Thank you.

20

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** Doria.

22

23 **Doria Summa:** Thank you for the comments, my colleagues. I think a lot of them are very  
24 thoughtful. I also wanted to thank Elena for guiding us through the meeting. It was a little bit  
25 difficult in places. I appreciate staff, they have clarified the speaker time, because that was also  
26 kind of a bump in the road for us. Let's see. With regards to the five key things that we looked  
27 at. The height limit, I prefer to exhaust the potentiality of the 50-foot height limit. There's a lot  
28 of, a lot of buildings that can achieve that height before, I think, we should consider raising the  
29 height limit. I don't see any need for it until we have exhausted that potentiality and we  
30 understand the true demand. I very much favor housing for the most vulnerable. I agree with  
31 Hamilton that expensive micro units don't do a darn thing for us. I noticed that Domus on the  
32 Boulevard, a building that has been open for more than year—it's actually in Los Altos but it's  
33 right on the border on El Camino—has really expensive units, and it has a lot of vacancies. I  
34 don't think that those expensive new units are solving the problem. As to relaxing it in certain  
35 areas, I don't think it should be relaxed in certain areas. If we're going to consider relaxing the  
36 height limit, which again I'm not for at this time in Palo Alto, I think it should be for specific  
37 projects that have demonstrated that they have true public benefit. Relaxing it across the  
38 board in areas like PCs is likely to be abused by developers and not provide real public benefit. I  
39 do think that on—let's see, where am I—on parkland acquisition, I think we mostly agreed



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 about that. I think we thought that maybe the fees should be higher so we could achieve more  
2 of the standard that we want per capita. I'm also especially interested in the City pursuing  
3 aggressively sites that become available, especially government agency sites which exist in Palo  
4 Alto, which are being abandoned. Palo Alto should snap those up. I think by law they're  
5 supposed to offered to us first. That's that.

6

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

8

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you, Elena, for a fabulous job. About the height limit, I think the idea  
10 of finding properties that can be built and developed like the City itself and that way you don't  
11 displace people who already live in them or you can develop parks in them. That's really  
12 attractive to me. I know that San Jose is doing some of that, and I hope Palo Alto, like Annette  
13 said, can look into the potential to doing that. I also agree with Annette about the hotels over  
14 in San Antonio. It's very disappointing that they were removed from the Housing Element to  
15 hotels. I think we should make a strong recommendation from this committee to reverse that  
16 decision. One of my biggest concerns with increasing the height is I'm not sure it will solve the  
17 problem we're trying to solve. That's why I'm really looking for a specific project to solve  
18 specific problems. I'm worried about displacement. People do get displaced in every city  
19 around here, not just where the jobs to housing ratios are high. It's happening in San Jose; it's  
20 happening everywhere. We have to think about who are we going to serve and then  
21 specifically create those opportunities. It's really important to create housing for seniors that  
22 need that type of housing. It's really important to produce that for people with disabilities. I  
23 really don't think that just saying we'll throw all the noodles on the wall and something will stick  
24 is a good approach. For the Coordinated Area Plans, I agreed with the others that it would be  
25 nice to start with some of those as soon as possible. We should potentially start with Fry's but  
26 really looking at a somewhat bigger area than only that, maybe extend all the way to California  
27 Avenue. For parkland acquisition, I agree with the others that parks will be needed. The more  
28 people we have, the more you need parks. We were thinking that there should be fees that are  
29 dedicated to park acquisition and that really looking for people to be willing to sell their home  
30 or bequest it to the City would be a really good solution. Even if it means that the tax base is a  
31 little smaller, we can still get some lots here and there in areas. We can do a dog park or  
32 something for people in our neighborhoods. That was another one. I said what I wanted to say  
33 about adaptive growth management. We need to include parkland per capita and the urban  
34 forest and the canopy not per capita, as an absolute. We shouldn't go down in our ability to  
35 maintain our forests. Thank you.

36

37 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.

38



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Amy Sung:** Thank you so much, Elena. Everybody, thank you. Indeed, you did a phenomenal  
2 job of incorporating many different opinions that I expressed at the subcommittee meeting. I  
3 actually wanted to follow up on setting up meeting time for subcommittee to meet. I wonder if  
4 we can adapt. If we can't participate at the meeting in person, can we do a teleconferencing or  
5 call in? I wanted to touch upon this height limit. I really will support the flexibility. I think land  
6 use is a reflection of changing times. The world does not stand still. If we look back at 50 years  
7 ago, Palo Alto looked tremendously different from what it is today. Fifty years later, I think Palo  
8 Alto will be in whatever form it will be. Land use is a mechanism, is a tool for us to help  
9 facilitate hoping that we will shape guidance and the blueprints for the future. I am very  
10 hesitant to set a hard limit, because we don't know what that limit will have, what impact on  
11 the future environment. I wanted to circle back to Gil that was here and talk about the meeting  
12 about S/CAP planning from the meeting yesterday. Really I just think that the driverless cars  
13 are coming. It was conceivable even just 10 years ago, and right now is really happening. In our  
14 doing planning, I think we need to provide that kind of flexibility and just things that is beyond  
15 our current imagination. For the high density, this is a place that attracts a lot of people. Just  
16 as a population grows, it is a trend. It is happening global-wise. Can I just finish? I really think  
17 that we wanted to accommodate. We hear people coming from the public expressing their  
18 ideas and their desire to live here. Facebook gives incentives for their employees to live within  
19 walking distance, gives them bonus, gives them incentives. When they were here in Palo Alto  
20 and also right now they're in Menlo Park. This is a kind of community that we wanted to  
21 encourage, to have high-density housing that is provided for all sorts of sectors that Palo Alto  
22 can accommodate. I also think that we need to have some sort of special zoning for protected  
23 sectors like teachers.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Amy. Ellen.

26

27 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** As an owner of a condo and lived on the ninth floor for 30 years intentionally  
28 because I could walk to work from that location and a current resident on the eighth floor of  
29 Channing House, I'm in favor of having height limits not apply to senior housing and to  
30 employed housing. I liked every single comment the public gave tonight to this Council, and I  
31 endorse it.

32

### 33 **4. Discussion of the Land Use & Community Design Element**

- 34 a. Height limit
- 35 b. Coordinated Area Plans
- 36 c. Parkland acquisition
- 37 d. Fostering mixed use
- 38 e. Dynamic Growth management tools



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. If you are not on the committee, if you could put your tag up,  
2 that'd be helpful so that we can call on the people who are not on the committee. Thank you.  
3 Lisa, are you on the committee? Do you want to speak? No, great. Bonnie is first.

4  
5 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm glad to hear that there are some here who did not agree with the City  
6 Council decision to move housing sites from that area on San Antonio Road. I think we may  
7 want to suggest that we add that that San Antonio area to be another Coordinated Area Plan  
8 and that we work somehow with Mountain View. I know Arthur doesn't like Coordinated Area  
9 Plans, because he said they never did them before. If we really pressure the City Council,  
10 maybe we'll get them done. Like people are saying, let's move ahead. If somebody just says  
11 there's too much traffic and there's been no studies done, and that's the reason to move the  
12 housing sites, that's not good planning. As to height limit, I agree with what people are saying.  
13 We have this pedestrian transit oriented development overlay district that applies in  
14 Downtown and in California Avenue because they're near transit. Those areas are the areas  
15 where the height limits, particularly for affordable housing and senior housing, the height limit  
16 going a little higher, not too high but just a little higher, maybe to accommodate six stories, let's  
17 say—I don't know how many feet that would require—five stories. Just a little bit more just in  
18 those areas. We already have policies and programs to ensure that there's good transitions to  
19 the neighboring area, so it could be done nicely. The other thing I want to mention is the  
20 parkland acquisition. The draft policies that we looked at today. I think it's a good idea,  
21 because I love the parks, and I think people need parks for physical and mental health.  
22 However, I would like to add to that that if there is land available and it's in a transit oriented  
23 area and it would be perfect for a good housing development or maybe a mixed use with retail  
24 and housing above, that parcel should not be acquired for parkland, but other parcels maybe.  
25 I'm talking near the train station. Do you want a park right near the train station?

26  
27 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (inaudible) think that should not be eliminated.

28  
29 **Bonnie Packer:** We need housing; there is a housing crisis. I have not heard that there is a  
30 dearth of parkland crisis. I have not read a single article about that, but everywhere you read  
31 articles about housing.

32  
33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think Elaine, are you next?

34  
35 **Elaine Uang:** I'm going to start quickly with mixed use. I think there is a lot of room for  
36 creativity in designating mixed use combinations. I agree with the residential retail; that's really  
37 important to see and to push. I also want to have us consider something like public facilities  
38 plus housing or maybe medical plus housing. I was walking in Portland today, and I actually—  
39 not today, this weekend—saw an urban, sort of storefront library which was cool. It was kind



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 of like a book store, where all the books were kind of in the window, and it really just lured you  
2 in. Why can't we do something like that and pair public facilities, maybe public land and think  
3 about housing and just couple that? We also have to set the right incentives. I think getting the  
4 right housing is about getting the right incentives. This is kind of where I'm going to start  
5 launching into the height limit topic. I think height is going to be an important tool and an  
6 important incentive going forward for the creation of housing, particularly BMR units, just given  
7 land costs. I mean, we did not expect, I think, when the 1988 Plan was written that land costs  
8 were going to be what they are today. We need the flexibility. We need to allow developers,  
9 whether that's nonprofit or for-profit, the flexibility to develop what they need to build. It  
10 works from an urban design perspective too. It helps with the creation of walkable  
11 communities. If you can trade height for a little of ground-floor space so you can get public  
12 space, public plazas, parks, mini parks that is really going to help us get the communities that  
13 we want. On the point of—I'm going to switch to dynamic growth metrics, because I actually  
14 think that they should be coordinated with the Coordinated Area Plans. You can't implement  
15 metrics like VMTs and trip caps and mode share goals like for single occupancy vehicles and  
16 bikes and things unless you kind of cordon off an area and evaluate what kind of transportation  
17 is coming in. I'm glad Gil pointed out the link between transportation and land use. In my  
18 comments, I pulled out this map from the existing conditions document which shows where the  
19 employment centers are. Elena pulled some numbers for me. We have 1.5 million square feet  
20 left of developable space and only 46,000 of that—just listen—1.5 million of developable office  
21 space and only 46,000 is left in the Downtown cap. Do we really want lots of office space on  
22 the Baylands? Do we really want lots of office space by East Meadow? With all due respect,  
23 SRP is great, but I'm not sure that's really where we want that development.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Julia.

26

27 **Julia Moran:** I just wanted to echo agreement with what Amy and Steve and Elaine were saying  
28 about flexibility. I think it's extremely important as we go forward. Also to preserving the  
29 culture of Palo Alto, I've been researching a lot and listening to a lot of stories about what Palo  
30 Alto was like 30-plus years ago. Hearing about the Beatles coming and staying at the hotel on El  
31 Camino; hearing about Grateful Dead's history in the area, the Varsity Theatre, like Lydia  
32 Coates' [phonetic] food market. It sounds amazing. It sounds like there was a huge, vibrant  
33 community. I think that more than the specific amount of people is what we want to continue  
34 to have in this community, and that requires us to have a vibrant community with people of  
35 different ages, different abilities, and different socioeconomic backgrounds. In order to do  
36 that, I think we need to be flexible with height limits in certain areas. I think that increases  
37 density. I also would say that, like Elaine was saying, I think we need to incentivize our  
38 developers to create what we want. We have extremely valuable land, and we can do that. I  
39 moved here from a completely different type of city, Brooklyn, in a new construction building





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 where the developers were forced to build beautiful, waterfront parks in front of the building.  
2 It was an amazing community resource because we pushed it and made it happen. I think there  
3 are a lot of really positive things we can do to add to our community as we add development.

4

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Whitney.

6

7 **Whitney McNair:** For the items that we're speaking about tonight, the height limits, I don't  
8 believe that there should be a set, fixed 50-foot height limit. I believe it's in conflict with a lot  
9 of the provisions that Gil was talking about tonight, in particular with sustainable development  
10 and linking it with transportation. Oftentimes a higher-density development might be best  
11 suited near transit, and in certain locations it might be appropriate. Also higher-density  
12 development, you can get the same amount of square footage on something which is taller. If  
13 you push it down, it also just promotes more sprawl. It has more paved areas, and I think those  
14 are in conflict with the direction that the S/CAP is going. Also, we've identified a number of  
15 different types of housing options and different types of buildings that might be better suited if  
16 they exceed the 50-foot height limit, and that's just with a few people coming to this group.  
17 There might be a lot more. There's also a lot of buildings that are already existing in Palo Alto  
18 that exceed the 50-foot height limit and fit fine within the community. For mixed use, I don't  
19 believe there should be a limit precluding office within a mixed-use development. Again, if  
20 you're looking to reduce trips, putting office near transit might be the better solution to get  
21 people on transit. It is actually a good combination to have with either retail and/or housing.  
22 By precluding it altogether, I think it's trying to solve a problem about trips which might be  
23 better solved with a mixed-use development in an appropriate location. Lastly about dynamic  
24 growth management tools, we haven't talked a lot about that tonight. In the staff report, one  
25 of the comments from staff is should we be identifying potential metrics. I just don't feel like  
26 we understand what the problem is we're trying to solve. Until we do that, I don't think it's  
27 appropriate that we identify what the metric is going to be in order to solve a problem we don't  
28 know what it is yet.

29

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Mark.

31

32 **Mark Nadim:** We've been talking about the height limit, the 50-foot or higher or lower. I think  
33 it would be more descriptive if we talk about number of stories or number of floors a building  
34 has. A lot of people would relate to it more than just a number of feet. One thing that came up  
35 earlier, that the diversity of retail would depend also on height limit and stuff, I don't think that  
36 would reflect the right thing. I mean, the diversity of retail can be anywhere in any number of  
37 type of buildings. One of the other items that came up, talking about the development along  
38 San Antonio Road, actually I think that the Downtown and California Avenue are more ripe for  
39 mixed-use residential than San Antonio. The other thing is the type of mixed-use buildings,



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 most of them are mostly either—we're talking about micro units, one bedroom and two  
2 bedrooms and that's about it. A lot of other people would like to see larger units. People who  
3 want to move out of their homes, single-family homes, especially seniors, the empty-nesters,  
4 over 50, they'd like to go to an apartment, but two bedrooms is too small, and of course one  
5 bedroom will not fit. I mean, we should think about units that are three or even four  
6 bedrooms, whether it was for seniors, for below market and for people in general. That's it.

7

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer.

9

10 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I support retention of the 50-foot height limit. That being said, I'm not  
11 categorically opposed to specific, limited exceptions. I am skeptical about them, however. I  
12 think you have to be very careful about how they're defined. I think they should only be  
13 allowed for very specific needs, special needs communities, inclusionary housing beyond the  
14 required minimum. I think if you're going to allow an exception like that, you have to get  
15 something for it that you wouldn't get without it. I also think that you can build those projects  
16 without changing the height limit. You can get exceptions now to the height limit for various  
17 projects that serve those kinds of public needs. That's it on height limits. Coordinated Area  
18 Plans, I'm okay with identifying the two different areas in the proposal, but I think the  
19 boundaries need to be better defined and the guidance about what the area plan should  
20 address needs to be beefed up quite a bit. I think the South El Camino corridor doesn't define  
21 an east or west boundary, so I think it potentially could be too big for a CAP. In contrast, I think  
22 Fry's is too small. I think it has to include the PTOD. I don't see how we can direct target new  
23 growth and density to a particular area without planning around how we're going to integrate it  
24 into the broader picture. In terms of guidance, I think the language of the new programs is just  
25 too vague, wide open, doesn't really tell anybody what we want to achieve out of that plan.  
26 I've listed in my written comments several details from the deleted programs that I think should  
27 be carried over into the new programs. Parkland acquisition, I support the proposed additions.  
28 I like the idea of increasing the in-lieu fees, and I'd also like to add a program to pursue  
29 opportunities to dedicate City-controlled land as parkland to protect and preserve its  
30 community service purpose in the future. Here I'm talking about places like the community  
31 garden right out the window there, which has long served a park-like, community-serving  
32 purpose, but is not dedicated parkland, so there's nothing protecting it from changing over to a  
33 different kind of use in the future.

34

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Lydia.

36

37 **Lydia Kou:** Definitely I do not agree with the extension of the 50-foot height limit. I do want to  
38 say thank you to Dan Garber for his research with Enid Pearson at the time. Basically at one  
39 point in this City there was a 70-foot height limit. Obviously that was not something that the



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 City can adhere to for whatever reason. At this point, this 50-foot height limit is basically a  
2 means in order for manipulation and misuse. In conflict with what Gil at sustainability was  
3 talking about is the fact that they don't take into consideration while you're saying that 50-foot  
4 height limit actually goes along with sustainability. The fact is there's a demolition and the  
5 release of whatever toxins that might be there into the air, so how does that even go into  
6 sustainability? I do have great appreciation to Dick Rosenbaum for his leadership and foresight  
7 with many of the policies that we have in place today. He was preserving the culture and,  
8 because of that, we have what we have here today. I am not comfortable with the exception of  
9 exceeding the 50-foot at specific, limited locations or condition. Again, it's a policy asking to be  
10 manipulated and misused. I will leave it to you to come up with language in the policy that will  
11 convince otherwise. Coordinated Area Plans make sense that time and resources limited to  
12 start with the two. Extend office space cap to become Citywide cap with no exceptions and all  
13 areas monitored. Did we ever get the rail corridor study? That has a lot of reference in here  
14 about that. Program L-3 refers to use the land use diagram for the community design  
15 workshop. I don't know what that one is in reference to. It will be nice if we have that as well.  
16 Need better set of boundaries for the South of El Camino corridor. As Jennifer had just said, we  
17 don't know how far that goes into the neighborhoods on the east and west, and that could be  
18 an encroachment and quality of life for the neighbors there. Well-designed complete streets  
19 corridor with a mix in one of the new programs, that's difficult for me to understand as I don't  
20 feel the current streets, complete or not, are well designed. As a matter of fact, within the  
21 south of El Camino, streets that have been forced into becoming complete streets are a mess  
22 and unsafe. I'll leave it at that. I have more. Thank you.

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani.

25

26 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I'd like to respond to a couple of things. One is about the parking at Facebook  
27 and how successful that is. If you go to Facebook during the day and try to park in their parking  
28 lot, they have valet parking that park behind every car parks and other cars. It's not working as  
29 well as the City, I think, was hoping for. Also, because it limits how many people they can bring  
30 in, they're now looking to build temporary housing on their parking lots to allow more people  
31 to stay overnight, so they don't have to supply parking. I'm not against it; I'm just saying that  
32 it's not working the way they anticipated. One more thing is I don't know where they park their  
33 buses. They have a big fleet of buses that bring people in. That's another good thing, but those  
34 have to park somewhere during the day, and I don't know where they are. There's some kind  
35 of externalities that we're not aware of when we planned those things. The number of stories  
36 versus height, I would support the height and not stories. In North Bayshore, Google is now  
37 building a two-story building that's 110 feet tall at the center. I think that's just something to—  
38 again, I'm not against that project, but I think we need to be able to know that things don't  
39 exactly work the way you anticipate. That's another thing. I wanted to bring out something



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 that I care about deeply, and that's the bird-friendly building design. People generally  
2 supported that. There was a program, which is good, that Palo Alto will develop guidelines for  
3 bird-friendly building. Maybe we should include other things as well, like bridges or bus  
4 stations. I think we need the policy level, a policy here. Again recently in San Jose, a developer  
5 that is building something which really would be a big hazard because of the location of where  
6 it is, says there's only guidelines, so I don't have to do it. San Jose did adopt guidelines. I would  
7 like to have a policy level on bird safety, and then we can develop the guidelines later. If it's a  
8 policy, it would be hard to say, "forget it. I don't have to do it." He will get away with that too.  
9 If you have green cards on the birds, please. Thank you.

10

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Don.

12

13 **Don McDougall:** I'm just going to comment. I want to again thank Elena. A good job of  
14 summarizing what the issues were relative to land use. To go backwards through the five  
15 issues. Arthur, I think the idea of having adaptive growth tools is really a much better idea than  
16 the idea of dynamic. There are also modeling, predictive analytics tools. In fact, Hillary, I would  
17 go so far as to say that the City should investigate having an analytics officer who actually has  
18 the capability to deal with that. Several cities have now done that, so it's not just a matter of  
19 collecting data; it's a matter of figuring out what to do with the data. There's no reason why we  
20 can't collect the data and make decisions later. In terms of mixed use, I would like to  
21 encourage Staff to define different kinds of mixed use. I think we've used the concept of mixed  
22 use so much now, whether it's retail or whatever. Is it retail and housing or is it commercial  
23 and retail or is it what? I think it needs some clear definition. In terms of parkland acquisition, I  
24 would agree. I think it was Bonnie who said I don't believe we have a park crisis; we have a  
25 housing crisis. I don't think the first thing we need to do is deal in aggressively acquiring parks.  
26 I don't disagree with Shani's position of we should maintain a reasonable average and so on.  
27 This whole question of being bold, I think at some point we need to decide. We're talking  
28 parks, so let's say we have to have lots of parks. We're talking housing, so let's we're going to  
29 have lots of housing. We're talking traffic, so let's say we shouldn't have any traffic. We're not  
30 making any decisions about what are the real priorities. That's where maybe Council should be  
31 doing more for us. In terms of Coordinated Area Plans, I may be the only in here who doesn't  
32 know exactly what that is. I'm kind of curious why the last one we did for SOFA took 6 years. I  
33 don't like the idea that now we have two; we're going to have the El Camino, and we're going  
34 to have Fry's. Later on we might think of something else. I think in terms of Coordinated Area  
35 Plans, there might be more than one kind of plan. There might be a mini plan, a full plan, a  
36 whatever. We could make some decision, because I think creating this staff burden, to say  
37 we're going to have a Coordinated Area Plan every time we think of an area doesn't make any  
38 sense. In terms of the height limit, I think the idea of saying let's have a height limit, but we'll  
39 allow restricted exceptions makes no sense. We need to be bold and decide and model where



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 and when we can have a height limit. Rather than just simply saying it's 50 feet and exceptions,  
2 let's figure out where the exceptions are upfront.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jason.

5

6 **Jason Titus:** I understand the dynamic and the concerns that people have around density and  
7 building height. It's not that I have an innate trust of developers, but I do feel that if I look at  
8 places in our City right now that provide the kind of diversity and the kind of environment that I  
9 appreciate, we have places like the Presidential. I know that's higher than 50 feet. Yet, there's  
10 a number of folks who live there, who actually might not otherwise be able to live in Palo Alto,  
11 who provide a rich culture, are key members of the community. One of the reasons they're  
12 there is because that is Downtown; it is walkable; they can work Downtown and walk to work.  
13 When you create those sorts of things, you create the environment for a vibrant city. If what  
14 we say is we're not going to allow buildings taller than a limit anywhere in the City or we're not  
15 going to consider doing specific areas, then what we end up with is development on the  
16 Baylands. We get development way out San Antonio. Guess what? No one's walking to work  
17 there. This is where we're guaranteeing we create the problems that we're saying we don't  
18 want around traffic and parking and all these things. They're not having a bunch of office  
19 buildings along stretches of road far from transit or actual retail. I don't view San Antonio mall  
20 as a vibrant, city center or something where you're going to get the same kind of thing that  
21 Downtown Palo Alto has. I believe we should make exceptions and we should recognize that  
22 it's a very clear exchange of value, where we say, "Yes, you can build higher than 50 feet, but  
23 you must do A, B or C, must be for dense." It has a certain level of density; it's not just office  
24 space. You have to offset with green space. A number of things I think we have as  
25 opportunities. Those kind of tradeoffs can allow us to have the kinds of things that I think that  
26 when we talked about the history of Palo Alto or the things that certainly draw people to live  
27 there and have a quality of life. You get that when people can walk to the places they work and  
28 when you can have a density of people there. That's it.

29

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. A couple of things. First of all, we've been hearing a lot of  
31 complaints about parkland crisis—I'm sorry, about housing crisis. A few years ago, I remember  
32 people going to City Council complaining about need for space for soccer fields. How many  
33 people don't remember that? I remember that a lot. There was a lot of issues about soccer  
34 fields. That T-shirt, got space that was going around. That was a particular crisis that  
35 happened a few years ago. I don't think it's going away. With more people living in dense  
36 communities, we will need more parkland for that need. I think that the idea that we won't  
37 need more parkland is not the case. A Coordinated Area Plan is a well-defined concept. There  
38 is no such thing as a Coordinated Area Plan lite. That's what a concept plan is. A concept plan  
39 is a Coordinated Area Plan lite. You don't have different level of Coordinated Area Plans. They



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 are what they are. They're well-defined. The concept plan was sort of a lite version of that,  
2 and we adopted the concept plan for East Meadow Circle. We did not adopt a concept plan for  
3 California Avenue. We should not assume it was adopted, so that may need to be revisited  
4 perhaps. By creating a Coordinated Area Plan for California Avenue including the Fry's site, that  
5 will handle the idea that that one was not completed to the Council's satisfaction. With respect  
6 to San Antonio Road, housing can go there even if it's not in the Housing Element. Secondly,  
7 housing doesn't need a Coordinated Area Plan. It's a tiny little site, a tiny little block. It's a  
8 region on the south side of San Antonio between Middlefield Road and Charleston. That's not a  
9 site that is deserving of a Coordinated Area Plan. In particular, the East Meadow Circle concept  
10 plan was a much bigger area for which a concept plan was sufficient. I don't think a  
11 Coordinated Area Plan makes sense. The idea of an analytics office, I think, is a lot of good idea.  
12 Dan Garber had mentioned to me we should also have a data office, people who gather data  
13 and make it available to people. Maybe that could be combined. I disagree with the idea of  
14 incentivizing what we want. I think what we should do is limit what we don't want. In fact,  
15 what you have is the idea that developers want to build townhouses 2,000, 2,500 square feet  
16 because that's what's most profitable to them. If we don't prohibit that, if that's what we don't  
17 want, maybe we want it, maybe we don't want it, but if we just simply say incentivize, you've  
18 got to incentivize a lot in order to be able to cause small units to be built. I don't think that the  
19 incentives alone will work. Higher density won't get more transit. The idea of higher transit  
20 elsewhere doesn't make sense. The only increases in transit we will get is Caltrain, the 22 bus  
21 and mostly the 522 bus. If you think the 22 bus is going so slow down El Camino, it gets  
22 somewhere slowly. Therefore, the only places it makes sense to think about is near Caltrain in  
23 terms of transit. The VTA is currently studying where to deal with the fact that their ridership is  
24 going through the floor. As a result of that, one of their plans talks about cutting the 35 and 88  
25 buses. Essentially what we're going to have is no transit for Palo Alto except for Caltrain, the 22  
26 bus and 522 bus as well as the buses from other agencies like Dumbarton bus and our own  
27 shuttles and whatever. We shouldn't expect that VTA will provide more services even if we  
28 build Palo Alto to look like Manhattan. They just don't care about us; they only care about San  
29 Jose and the environs. They're bringing BART there to show it. Diversity of retail. The best way  
30 to preserve diversity of retail is not to develop where the retail is. Once you redevelop where  
31 retail is, you wind up with a gentrification of retail. The rebuilt building, that retail costs a lot  
32 more expensive per square foot and, therefore, the diversity goes away when you redevelop.  
33 That is just math. In terms of adaptive growth management, I think I'm the one who  
34 introduced the idea of adaptive growth management to the discussion. I don't like the idea of  
35 dynamic growth management because I think it's the wrong concept. It brings up the wrong  
36 idea. I think that the idea is that adaptive growth management is not an alternative to  
37 quantitative caps. Rather, adaptive growth management is a mechanism for adjusting the caps  
38 based on conditions. When impacts are addressed, the caps can go up a little bit. When  
39 impacts are getting worse, then the caps go down. In fact, because the caps are adaptive, they



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 can actually be lower as a default. You have to think about what the default caps are. The caps  
2 right now are set at about 50,000 square feet per year. We seem to have just developed that  
3 slightly under 50,000 square feet, so that means that maybe it's not a bad idea, 50,000. If you  
4 have adaptive, you can actually set the cap lower because it can be raised automatically based  
5 on conditions. Those conditions require reliable metrics, and those metrics have to be  
6 objective and be clear to people what they are. You can require no new net trips as part of the  
7 condition of development, but that doesn't lead to adaptive growth management because it's  
8 hard to tie traffic to any particular project. In addition, we don't expect that traffic should stay  
9 the same. Traffic is horrible now. Parking is horrible now. We need to get better. The idea is  
10 that we want to reduce traffic, we want to reduce pollution, we want to reduce the single  
11 occupancy vehicle, we want to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases. Therefore, we need to  
12 build a slope that says, for example, in the neighborhoods around downtown, the amount of  
13 commercial intrusion for parking in the neighborhood goes down to close to zero, maybe the  
14 only thing you'd do is for retail workers who can't pay full price, maybe that's the only  
15 commercial parking that you allow there. If you think about that and also traffic, traffic should  
16 be on a downward slope, not staying constant. These are the metrics that we should define.  
17 Based on these metrics, you say if you're addressing these metrics, if the developers and the  
18 commercial landowners get together, the commercial tenants get together and address traffic  
19 in a successful way and parking in a successful way, then we can grow a little faster. That's  
20 what I think is adaptive growth management. It's adjusting the cap based on conditions on a  
21 year-by-year basis, and it's also from point of view of hysteresis. There's a hysteresis effect.  
22 The hysteresis effect is that when you make a change, if you do a whole bunch of development  
23 all at once, the problem with that is that the change happens and it takes a little while for that  
24 (inaudible) to catch up with that. That's why you need to do a year-by-year cap and retain a  
25 cap; otherwise, you'll still have impacts. We're going to start on the second round.

26  
27 **Female:** (inaudible)

28  
29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. Because Lisa didn't speak first in the first round, she'll be first in the  
30 second round. If you want ...

31  
32 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'm sorry for that. I wanted to hear some comments first, because ...

33  
34 **Co-Chair Keller:** If anybody else wants to speak in the second round, please put up your card.  
35 She wants to speak first.

36  
37 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm sorry. I just have a quick question. Thank you all for the first round of  
38 comments. Really fantastic. I actually think there's a lot of agreement on a bunch of stuff, and  
39 then there's a clear disagreement in the room. It looks like we're about evenly split on the



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 height limit thing, whether it should just stay at 50 feet or whether there should be places  
2 where limited exceptions are allowed or a limited increase would be allowed under certain  
3 circumstances. I just have one question for you on that. Obviously that's a question we can  
4 forward to the Council, and they can decide. In the spirit of 55 is the new 40 or 50 is the new  
5 30, the way I understand it—I'm not an architect—just 5 more feet, instead of 50 feet, being at  
6 55 feet, actually provides for a much better building when it comes to the height of retail space,  
7 more modern or contemporary retail space standards and potentially gives you the ability to  
8 get another floor of housing if you're building a residential building.

9

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** You mean still four stories?

11

12 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't know exactly how many stories. The way I understand it 5 more feet  
13 makes a big difference both in retail and in housing. My question for all of you in the spirit of is  
14 55 the new 50, are those of you who are just opposed, forget it, never, we're not going to do it,  
15 no circumstances, is 55 just as bad as 60, 65? Could we get some yellow cards on a 55-foot? A  
16 couple of yellows. That's what I wanted. Thank you.

17

18 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Hillary, just going around—I'll make my comments. I wasn't picking up  
19 that there was a split, sort of 50/50. It seemed to me it was more a minority totally against it  
20 and majority for something, not go loose and do everything. I think it might be worth just a  
21 vote on it before we're done just to be clear.

22

23 **Hillary Gitelman:** Why don't we talk about whether we do that later today or at next month's  
24 meeting when we frame up actual alternative policy language? We could do that. Thank you.

25

26 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I appreciate getting to kind of go last here. I would say when I first joined  
27 the CAC, I thought I would be totally firm that I would never break the height limit partly  
28 because my mom was the one of the ones who pushed it through in the '70s after the 525  
29 University was built and 101 Alma and all that stuff. It was really getting out of control,  
30 mushrooming. It was changing, I would say, the sense of the town. What I feel now is I think in  
31 selective, strategic, going to what you said Jason, and specific case, I would give up the height  
32 limit. I would never give up the height limit to the point where a whole area is all high  
33 buildings. That's a big city; I don't like it; that's not what I want. Some mix of higher and lower  
34 targeted to the specific things we want to incentivize around affordable housing, subsidized  
35 housing, whether that be for disabled, for seniors, for low income. As we've all talked about, I  
36 really like the economic diversity. I think if we don't give developers the economic incentive  
37 that they can go higher and make more money by having more units, we're never going to get  
38 that lower cost. That's my belief. I've come around, I would say, 180 on this, to the height. I do  
39 believe that, but I would make it very, very specific and very much tied to specific commitments





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 that are enforceable, not just best efforts. That can also tie to more parkland. To your  
2 example, it could be tied to the "no cars needed." I could do it, again, limited. I would hate to  
3 see our town go big all over the place. It would really change the flavor in a way I just wouldn't  
4 like. Second thing of the main items is the parkland. Any chance we have to acquire more  
5 parkland, I think we should do it. I think our open space is one of our biggest priorities, and it  
6 never comes back. You can always give it up, but it never. If we get the opportunity, acquire,  
7 and then we can decide what we would do with it, ideally for open space and adding parks as  
8 our population increases. Thank you.

9

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Steve.

11

12 **Stephen Levy:** Thanks, Lisa, for that great history. The committee and the question we were  
13 asked was about housing . I was here about 5:25; they were talking about three big office  
14 buildings. We're talking about housing. I really support what you and Jason said, but I also  
15 support what Neilson said. I like Channing Housing. I live probably closer to Channing House  
16 than most of you. I think you get amenities and opportunities with ten stories or nine stories  
17 that you don't get with four stories. The one thing we know that's going to change between  
18 now and 2030 is the increase in the number of people over 65 and over 75 and over 85. I want  
19 to be able to build another Channing House or an assisted care facility. If ten stories or eight  
20 gets me amenities, I'm happy that 55 is the new 50 but, as I said, I live next to two beautiful  
21 buildings that are beyond that. You get more units in a finite space. You produce the housing  
22 that we need with less land. It's not all over town. It's in the area where I live. It's next to me.  
23 If the Council can write really good rules for the office cap about what you get and what the  
24 architecture is, then that same Council ought to be able to write really good rules that have the  
25 limitations that you and Jason and others talked about. I'm not afraid that the Council can't  
26 write a tight height limit.

27

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie.

29

30 **Bonnie Packer:** I have a question about the role of this particular subcommittee. I've served on  
31 two subcommittees so far, the Community Services and Transportation. In our subcommittees,  
32 we looked at all the issues the way they came out of CAC, and we didn't substantively play  
33 around with these issues. We just tried to make sure that the draft element reflected the ideas.  
34 What I'm hearing that's come from this subcommittee is kind of the other way around. It's like  
35 it's taking and creating new substantive ideas and bringing them back to the CAC, rather than  
36 taking stuff from the CAC. It seems that way to me from what I'm hearing. I could be wrong. It  
37 could be not what the directions are, but that's what I perceive. If I'm wrong, feel free to  
38 correct me, and I'm sorry. It's also seems to me that maybe the subcommittee is not evenly  
39 balanced in terms of perspectives on growth or no growth. That's what I'd like to throw out. I



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 also have a couple of other points on (inaudible) major issues, and those are in my comments,  
2 so I won't take my time now.

3  
4 **Hillary Gitelman:** Bonnie, I just want to respond to the subcommittee question. I think this  
5 subcommittee like the others has done a good job of kind of surfacing those issues where  
6 there's disagreement on the committee, so that they can be further discussed by the  
7 committee. If we continue to have disagreement, the disagreements will be forwarded to the  
8 Council. I think it's a fairly well balanced committee, and they did good work in the sense that  
9 that summary that Elena provided talks about where the subcommittee saw a clear path based  
10 on the input from the full CAC and where there's still an issue, where there's still going to be  
11 disagreement. Annette is waving her hand, so we're going to get to you. Just after Julia, you're  
12 next so you'll be able to respond.

13  
14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure, go ahead and respond to that.

15  
16 **Annette Glanckopf:** I want to make it really clear what the first meeting of the land use did.  
17 We were asked to look at five issues. We weren't asked to just talk about the Comp Plan Land  
18 Use Element. What came out of it was just really related to what staff asked us to do.

19  
20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Julia.

21  
22 **Julia Moran:** Just very quick. I forgot to mention before. I'd like to see—I mentioned this in  
23 other areas—the language just to be stronger. Otherwise, what's the point? Instead of explore  
24 ways to encourage dedication, I think we should just be saying encourage dedication or an  
25 option is to create. I think throughout we should be a lot less passive and really say what we  
26 want and say it strongly.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette. I'm not going exactly in order. We're going approximately in the  
29 order people put up their tags. Although, the first few we didn't count them exactly in order.

30  
31 **Male:** (inaudible)

32  
33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. That's why this round is the popcorn round where people go in  
34 whatever order. If you have spoken, if you could put your tag down, that would be helpful.

35  
36 **Annette Glanckopf:** I was really ready to hear everyone else's comments. I just wanted to  
37 come back to my concern about tall buildings. Let's forget about the 50-foot height limit for a  
38 second. I've always been a proponent of really developing a very attractive streetscape. One of  
39 my major concerns has been commercial next to residential. Location, location, location. As



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 we continue to develop, not only do we have to make sure that we protect our residential areas  
2 in lots of ways, but also we can really encourage some sort of compatibility. When I think about  
3 this issue, I wanted to point out that last night, if anyone listened to the very poignant City  
4 Council meeting on the single story overlays, you really heard from the silent majority of people  
5 how architecture, space and design is so critical for them. To me, unless we do this very, very  
6 carefully, I don't think this is really a Comp Plan issue 100 percent. As we go forward, and we  
7 develop a project that is not compatible with its streetscape or neighborhood, I think that we  
8 would risk the public coming out in droves as they have in the past. I really did want to mention  
9 that my concern is sort of this compatibility issue along with Code enforcement, which has  
10 really been my big bug for a very, very long time. I want to make sure that whatever we do  
11 going forward we can actually enforce. Even if we do mixed use of retail and housing, I don't  
12 want to see the housing units all of a sudden become Airbnbs or become office. I'll stop right  
13 there.

14

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Len.

16

17 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. To follow up on the silent majority that Annette was talking about, I try  
18 to represent not just my views and my thinking, but the views of the people I interact with  
19 throughout the community and in a neighborhood association. I think the majority who don't  
20 go to the press and who are busy with soccer trips and are not involved in this, but paying taxes  
21 and being good citizens, are really opposed to increasing the 50-foot limit. The last time we  
22 voted on this, I was undecided. I would have held up a yellow card. I might be shading  
23 toward—I'm not going to say yeah. I do have some concerns. I do have concerns with the 50-  
24 foot limit besides the fact that a lot of people whose voices are not heard are opposed to it.  
25 That is that there's a lot of build-out, there's a lot of opportunities to raise existing buildings to  
26 a higher level to accommodate housing needs. I do believe that there can be exceptions for the  
27 vulnerable in our community. It seems to me by the language in the staff report that says as a  
28 way to help build consensus around height limits, maintain 50-foot height limit as a rule but  
29 establish specific, limited locations and conditions under which exceptions could be allowed. I  
30 am not a land use expert, but it seems that developers have the opportunity right now. I think  
31 that there are opportunities for exceptions, PCs, all kinds of things, community benefits and  
32 that sort of thing. Why would we want to codify it even more? I think that that is  
33 mainstreaming an exception that is available now, and it's not in the interests of the majority of  
34 this community. Thank you.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria's next.

37

38 **Doria Summa:** Lots of things to talk about. I do agree with what Len just said. I think that the  
39 language in here is too open-ended. I think the only exception should be those that are very



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 tightly associated with very high public benefits for the most vulnerable among us. I don't see  
2 any reason to raise the 50-foot height limit other than for that. We have a lot of time to build  
3 out one-story buildings to two and three and four-story buildings under the height limit  
4 without—we can contemplate that when the time comes. Let's see. I agree with Arthur about  
5 some of the concept plan areas. Somebody mentioned this, but the rail corridor study really  
6 troubles me. It's being used very heavily for development in particularly the Cal. Ave. area and  
7 Ventura. The rail corridor study was not a concept plan, much less a specific plan or area plan.  
8 It was a study, and it was a study that was very obsessed with land use when it wasn't a land  
9 use study and ignored the needs of improving the railroad itself. I think it's a poor tool to use,  
10 and I think the boundaries are very badly drawn for that and could have very devastating  
11 effects, especially for Ventura, parts of Evergreen and even crossing over El Camino into College  
12 Terrace and a lot of Barron Park. I think that just needs to be rethought and redrawn. A couple  
13 of other just general comments. I think we're going to have to accommodate electric cars way  
14 before, if ever, we need to accommodate for driverless cars. An electric car still needs streets  
15 to drive on and places to park. Specifically about the five items that staff wanted us to  
16 comment on, I didn't get finished there. We talked about dedicating existing parkland that is  
17 kind of in this limbo state. Mixed-use designation, I think that we had really a lot of agreement  
18 about residential and retail only and that we didn't need more commercial office. The one  
19 thing that I wanted to kind of ask to be looked at here is there's a sentence that says we should  
20 keep—that was 2 minutes?

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** You can finish your sentence.

23  
24 **Doria Summa:** I was concerned about the sentence that was calling out keeping the impacts  
25 away from single-family neighborhoods. I think we need to always remember that it should be  
26 all low-density residential neighborhoods.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Shani.

29  
30 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I guess this is to some extent an answer to Lisa's concern. I do think that we  
31 should allow for specific needs to build higher. If you codify that, meaning you give the  
32 entitlement, then you get less in the long term, because they can do—the public benefits that  
33 the developer that wants to develop there has to offer the public is less, because they already  
34 have the right to do it. What you get in return from giving that extra height is less than you  
35 would if that was an exception and wasn't codified as such. It doesn't mean they can't do it.  
36 There's gatekeepers all the time. There's different ways for developers to build higher. It's  
37 actually in the existing Housing Element. We can consider some tweaking. It's already there;  
38 they can do it, but the public benefits that you're seeking, if they don't have that embedded  
39 entitlement, you can get more for those populations and specific needs, whether it's teachers



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 or people with disabilities or elderly, all those groups. You can get more parkland around the  
2 building. All of that, you can get more if it's not entitled right away. Also the other thing that  
3 you get as opposed to if you give the entitlement is you get a full environmental review versus  
4 "it's in there, we just have to go with administrative permission" instead of actually getting an  
5 idea of what is the true environmental impact on the community. For me, that's really  
6 important. I'm not opposed to increasing the height limit for specific purposes in specific places  
7 like you actually said. I don't want to encourage that by codifying it. I would like that to be the  
8 exception, because then we get more information and a better deal overall. That's my belief.  
9 You have some experts here, and you can ask them. I think that is essentially what I wanted to  
10 say.

11  
12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. If you could put your tag down when you speak, it makes it a lot  
13 easier for me to see who needs to speak next. If you want to speak again, we'll clear all the  
14 tags, and we'll pick people again. Please put down your tag if you've already spoken. The next  
15 speaker is Elaine, and then Mark.

16  
17 **Elaine Uang:** Really quickly. I do want to dispute a little bit that only people oppose height  
18 limits and they don't come to Council. It's good that we have a range of people here, because  
19 they talk to different people. I think the height limit's been in place since what? 1978, 38  
20 years. I think a lot of people who are under 40 don't even know we have a height limit, because  
21 they see all of these other buildings that are really tall. They're like, "What height limit? What  
22 are you talking about?" I think it's also important to recognize that there are a lot of people  
23 who don't show up to any of these forums, who don't know there's a height limit. When they  
24 find out, they're like "Why?" I just need to put it out there that we also need to think about the  
25 other group of people who aren't in the room. On Coordinated Area Plans, I want to say I'd like  
26 to support a Downtown and Cal. Ave. plan first. Most of the impacts are coming from those  
27 areas. We have to deal with existing impacts too. They're great tools for new places like Fry's,  
28 but we need to be able to plan those in a good way to integrate development of retail,  
29 residential public facilities, office, parkland and housing. It's the way that we can kind of  
30 integrate those things. To Hamilton's point about a jobs/housing number, I think a CAP is  
31 actually a good place to kind of help frame that development, housing plus jobs, and like do  
32 that in a way that we can start to bring that imbalance down. I think with multifamily  
33 housing—I don't think we need to increase height limits for multifamily sites, but we definitely  
34 need to think about increasing density limits, the number of units per acre. I have an example  
35 of an infill project called Eco Heritage that took two houses and turned it into seven residential  
36 units. They're two Edwardian houses, older homes. They preserved the homes and they added  
37 a whole bunch of new things. This can be done, but right now the restricting thing is the  
38 number of units you can actually put on a parcel. We also have to think about parking, but  
39 that's another story. I think overall there are two policies about maximizing desirable qualities



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 through zoning. I would actually say we need to minimize the undesirable qualities through  
2 zoning including social effect. Lisa mentioned diversity in the community, social diversity.  
3 Housing cost, I think, is another one. L-24 talks about let's have a diverse and inclusive  
4 community, and we have to think about how zoning can do that. I did include an article called  
5 "How Zoning Restrictions Make Segregation Worse." I would encourage all of you to read it.  
6 Zoning is kind of a de facto segregation tool, and we really need to consider the social  
7 implications of what we do.

8

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Mark and then Whitney.

10

11 **Mark Nadim:** First I wanted to clarify what I mentioned earlier about the unit size. Basically  
12 unit size is one level, because currently the three-bedroom homes are three levels. It's a major  
13 feat for seniors. Regarding the parkland, although we do not have a parkland crisis right now,  
14 when we do the mixed-use residential, we will have a parkland crisis. It's better to start  
15 acquiring land for parkland, allocating for parkland right now, just before allocating the rest of  
16 the available properties for mixed use. Regarding the 55-foot limit, actually I do agree with  
17 that. Right now most retail, they don't go with the 10 or 12-foot height. They like to have 13,  
18 14 feet which will affect the number of floors that the building will have. Probably a 55-foot  
19 limit would be an acceptable thing. Regarding the height limits in certain areas, if we can zone  
20 for example Downtown would have a certain number of feet, Cal. Ave., San Antonio and so  
21 forth. To say that the height limit is 50 feet unless there is an exception, everybody is going to  
22 apply for an exception, all the developers. Personally I like the Channing House. The reason it  
23 looks nice, because it's by itself and it's among residential areas. Trying to imagine that a whole  
24 street will be 10, 12 floors, it will be just a scary thing to look at. Going that high number of  
25 floors, I'm totally against it.

26

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Whitney, then Hamilton.

28

29 **Whitney McNair:** I wanted to thank the subcommittee for allowing me the opportunity to  
30 weigh in on the five questions that were given to them to answer. They took those very  
31 seriously and allowed me the opportunity to talk. I appreciate that. I do support 55 being the  
32 new 50 or 60 feet being the new 50. I feel like there's some opportunities, like within the  
33 Research Park that don't have residential adjacencies, where a higher building might be  
34 appropriate. Also in Scenario 4 of the Draft EIR, there's the idea of developing housing at the  
35 corner of El Camino and Page Mill Road. At that site, there's an existing office building there  
36 that's about 110 feet right now. I've talked before about the idea of thinking bolder at this  
37 location and about the uses and not just redeveloping the parking lot. Mandating just a 50-foot  
38 height limit next to that existing over 100-foot tall building might not be the best design. It may  
39 be that you have taller buildings nearer the taller office building, that step down to 50 feet at



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 the street might be better. I'm not sure; I haven't designed the site. Reimagining this block  
2 needs some flexibility or what may result is just an extension of what you see along El Camino  
3 right now. The other thing is the key things that businesses look for in a community is  
4 predictability in the process and their ability to grow their business over time. There's value in  
5 knowing what the rules are. I'm still confused about the dynamic and adaptive grown  
6 management tools. The adaptive growth management tools really fly in the face of that  
7 certainty. If the rules change on a case-by-case basis or a year-by-year basis, that's challenging  
8 for the business community. I agree we should be transparent and have reliable metrics, but  
9 one should know and be able to understand the rules ahead of time.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton and then Amy.

12  
13 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I actually had the pleasure of living in Hong Kong on the 36th floor and  
14 working on the 28th floor for a couple of years with my family. Halfway through we looked to  
15 see if we could upgrade—we actually had a pretty nice view. What we found is the majority of  
16 apartments actually stare at the back of another apartment. It's one thing when you're in the  
17 10th floor and it's all low houses around you. It's another thing when someone builds an  
18 apartment building, and you're looking at the back of it. If you extend that concept to the  
19 families who own single-family houses, when you build something big, you're taking a lot of  
20 shade, you're taking a lot of view away from a lot of other folks. That's why, when you have  
21 these large diversities, like why Paris works, because it's about the same height with wide  
22 boulevards in many places. When you have things that have rapid transitions, it's really a taking  
23 essentially from all the other people. How would you like it if someone built a six-story building  
24 right next to you? Transitions are really important. I want folks to keep that in mind. That's  
25 one of the reasons why siting is extremely important even for 50 feet. There are some nice,  
26 very elderly centric facilities. I don't know if you guys are familiar with Lytton Garden. I think  
27 it's three or four stories; it's got medical care onsite, a cafeteria. It's a really nice community.  
28 The height limit isn't the only tool. I think Elaine and Julia were saying density is another tool. I  
29 also think we need to get away from the minimum required below market units required by law  
30 as the gold standard. I think Palo Alto used to have a higher standard. I want to see more  
31 below market. I think we haven't really spent much time talking about that. It's always about  
32 the height limit, the height limit, the height limit. It's not so much about helping people get  
33 more affordable housing. Granted a little bit more is better. Bonnie, we were given a very  
34 specific agenda for that meeting. One of my first comments was we should not try and agree  
35 on the height limit. What we should try and do is frame both positions so that when we in the  
36 subcommittee, the committee go to the Council, we're not going to have a single one. We  
37 should have a nice choice in front of them where we try and get a couple of positions that the  
38 City Council can make a decision from.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy, and then Jennifer.  
2

3 **Amy Sung:** I wanted to start off by the April 1st day, I woke up to this news coming from *Palo*  
4 *Alto Weekly* that City of Palo Alto had decided to adopt the top two floors to be residential on  
5 our City Hall. I thought, "This is my dream come true. I am going to get exclusive rider from  
6 Hillary to market that top two floors." I just thought that was a wonderful joke. However, it is  
7 really just an idea that living and working in the same building really is the ideal of how you can  
8 live and work and housing and entertain in a small area where you can walk to everywhere  
9 without having to drive. I wanted to get back to you. It was at committee meeting we stressed  
10 the mixed use, and there was some discussion about requiring the ground floor to be retail. I  
11 am all for support of having a very nice storefront on the ground floor. I just wanted to  
12 caution—no, express my concern that retail needs to have the foot traffic to support their  
13 business. Therefore, for the retail to be prosperous, they need to have this office and housing  
14 and all the supporting ecosystem to go with it. That's all I have. Thanks.  
15

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jennifer, then Alex.  
17

18 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just want to talk about mixed use for a second. I'm going to expose my  
19 ignorance. I have to say I'm a little bit confused about what is the interaction between the  
20 mixed-use designation at Sheraton or whatever it is over by El Camino and Downtown and  
21 down by San Antonio and the mixed-use projects that are targeted for various other areas that  
22 are not mixed-use zones or mixed-use categories, but are nonetheless targeted for mixed-use  
23 projects. I don't understand what the interaction is there in the sense of if we define a mixed-  
24 use designation of residential and retail, yet there already exists this mixed-use category that  
25 includes all sorts of other mixed uses, which one applies in which location. The reason I ask  
26 that is because I feel pretty strongly that in neighborhood commercial zones there should be no  
27 office in any kind of mixed use. It should be residential retail, and that should be the only  
28 option in that area. I also think in other areas we should be really darn careful about office. I  
29 understand that it's a huge incentive for developers to build because they make a ton of money  
30 off of their office space and because you want your vital retail that gets your walking traffic.  
31 The fact of the matter is with our jobs/housing imbalance every piece of office space we add  
32 adds jobs and every job increases the pressure on the housing. I think it's just crazy to open the  
33 floodgates for all sorts of mixed-use development without imposing a very strong limit on the  
34 office growth. I have two other small points, and then I hope that somebody will explain the  
35 mixed use question. I don't personally think that micro units are appropriate in our suburban  
36 city. I think they're really best suited to big cities. That being said, even in big cities I think  
37 they've been of limited success. If we do do them here, I think they should be limited to  
38 restricted areas where there is a mix of office, retail and residential. Also I think it would be a  
39 disaster if we increase density at Town and Country Village. That's one of the most impacted





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 traffic zones in the City with Paly, Stanford, PAMF, Town and Country Village. I just can't  
2 imagine that we would even consider increasing density there. Thanks.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Alex then Lydia.

5

6 **Alex van Riesen:** I wanted to make a comment about maybe the distinction between diversity  
7 and vibrant. We seem to have been using these comments—I don't believe that more high rise  
8 apartments will lead to diversity. I do believe it will allow for a larger number of people to live  
9 there, but it will just draw the people who can afford and are drawn to that environment. I do  
10 not see it helping the middle class or even the working class or the poor in our City. Although, I  
11 say this again, I would love to see evidence from anyone for what amount of housing would be  
12 necessary to reduce the price point. I feel like we just keep saying this over and over again, but  
13 no one ever produces any evidence that creating super high rises will actually reduce the price  
14 point. That challenge is still out there. Castro versus our Downtown. Today is my anniversary,  
15 and just shows you how committed, I'm here. Last night we went out to CasCal for our  
16 anniversary, and we were talking about this. I asked, "Which do you like? Do you like  
17 Downtown Palo Alto or do you like downtown Mountain View better?" We both agreed we like  
18 downtown Mountain View better. We like it better because it feels more like a community. It  
19 feels more like it's set up better; it's laid out better. You look around; it's not full of high  
20 buildings. We walk around there, and I realize when I go down to Palo Alto it's so commercial.  
21 It feels more like a destination than it does a community. I've said that before. I'd also just add  
22 the example of San Francisco. Bonnie put out a very interesting article today. If you read the  
23 article, it's striking to me that SF is a cautionary tale for us. They've been building new housing,  
24 but it has done nothing to change diversity in that city. It has created more units for people  
25 who can afford it and who want to live there. Clearly all the cool kids want to live there,  
26 because Google buses them up there and brings them back every day for work. I don't see that  
27 changing anything. My list of questions, it's very clear with building these headquarters, we  
28 have major industry here, we've got to come up with some way. Even though people are going  
29 to be coming to this area, are we the ones and why are we the ones that are obligated to create  
30 for them? I guess I'd just like to see someone answer that question. Why is and what is the  
31 problem that we're trying to solve? I know some of that's pollution and transportation. I do  
32 think the market will handle the transportation in a big way in the next few years through the  
33 electric cars. I don't know about driverless cars. The last thing—if I can just finish—is I would  
34 like to see us decide what is the main problem we're trying to solve and why is it the main  
35 problem.

36

37 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Alex just spoke, and now we have Lydia, then Jason.

38



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Lydia Kou:** I wanted to go back to my Coordinated Area Plans just to finish it. The second new  
2 program states enhance connections to El Camino Real and Park Boulevard, but there's no  
3 mention of connections to the west side of El Camino. With the mixed-use residential  
4 developments proposed, are there not going to be kids expected to be in those residential  
5 developments? How are these students going to cross the street? It's very focused on just the  
6 east side of El Camino. Considering the fact that streets are defined and set in their width, the  
7 evaluation of the number of uses on it should be carefully analyzed and evaluated. For  
8 example, Lambert would have been a better complete street than Margarita. Furthermore, not  
9 enough review of existing pathways/alleys that exist in Palo Alto. Although they belong to  
10 other entities, they haven't been approached to be used as bicycle pathways. There is a  
11 pathway between Palo Alto Square and McDonald's. Yes, that's Stanford land, but I don't know  
12 if anybody has approached them. That path actually goes directly, if taken, to Bol Park bike  
13 path. There's another pathway between Cibo and CPI. It runs behind Chimalus, and it too ends  
14 up at Bol Park. Those can be really safe routes for bicyclists as well as pedestrians and a good  
15 way from east to west. Also I noticed as Jennifer had said that many of the excerpts of the  
16 policies and programs in the current element draft should have remained but is proposed to be  
17 taken out. I'm going to send those in and request that they remain. Parkland, I support.  
18 Mixed-use designation, I support a new mixed use, but again it's cautionary. Since I have  
19 questions about enforcement of those mixed uses, in particular retail/office, residential/office,  
20 residential/retail. How and where is that enforcement addressed? Back to Elaine's comment  
21 also about public and residential. It all goes back to enforcement. I think that mostly we need  
22 to develop community trust first. Adaptive growth management tools. The use of Stanford  
23 University's agreement with Santa Clara County is not a good one to use. Stanford University is  
24 a private entity and can dictate and enforce conditions within its boundaries. However, I'm not  
25 confident that they measure performance standards or their impacts outside their boundaries.  
26 Depending on the results, how they read, there are too many ways to not include all necessary  
27 information for true performance standards and to confirm condition is met. Again, I think  
28 expanding the office and R&D development cap Citywide without exceptions and all areas  
29 monitored in addition to growth management tools would make more sense, and it will create  
30 the baseline. Thanks.

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Lydia. Jason.

33  
34 **Jason Titus:** To address the desire to say right now you could already ask for exceptions to the  
35 50-foot limit, if what we do is say there's an out that anyone could go through because there's  
36 an exception process, then we're certainly not telling people what we want. Thus, the kinds of  
37 exceptions people will ask for will not necessarily be the ones that we're interested in. I think  
38 being obscure doesn't help us. If we have a set of things that we believe and would like to see,  
39 whether we want to have more affordable housing or whether we want to have more ground-



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 level retail or we want to have more green space, any of these things we can clearly announce  
2 this is why folks can be allowed to do this. That is the value exchange. If you're clear with that,  
3 that also means developers who are interested in those kinds of projects will come here.  
4 There's no law or requirement saying that developers need to do things here versus other  
5 places. If the only people who will come in are going to be ones who actually can say, "The land  
6 will be so expensive, the rules change often, projects in Palo Alto take much longer than they  
7 take everywhere else." The only folks who are going to come in are going to be the people who  
8 think they're going to make a very high return on investment. Somebody who might have  
9 otherwise said, "I'm interested in doing a development that could have below market housing  
10 and I'm willing to go through an unknown, multiyear process and ask for an exception. I can do  
11 that in Mountain View. I can go do that in Redwood City. I can go do that anywhere." I think if  
12 we as a City say, "Here's what we value. Here's what we want. If you have good ideas on how  
13 to do that, come work with us," we'll build the kind of City we want to have.

14  
15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The first thing, there was a comment about a (inaudible) of growth  
16 management means that you don't have predictability. The rules are predictable. What only  
17 changes is how much building is allowed to happen. Right now under current plans, if more  
18 people ask to build, then it's a beauty contest and that will just continue. One of the things  
19 about adjacency is why don't we think about daylight planes mirroring the adjacent uses. If you  
20 have a CS zone which you might want to make taller and you're right next to an R-1, then you  
21 have to mirror the R-1 daylight plane. Therefore, you are being less impactful on the R-1 if you  
22 have the daylight plane. Think about being the lesser of your zone's daylight plane and the  
23 adjacent daylight plane for that adjacency line, and that would minimize impact. In terms of  
24 the height limit, if we decide to go to 55 feet, it should be 55 feet and four stories, not 55 feet  
25 and five stories. The idea of 55 feet is so that you can have a higher amount of retail on the  
26 bottom and higher floor heights of retail on the bottom. That's the idea of going to 55, not  
27 adding additional stories. Additional stories is another matter. If you want to go there, that's a  
28 different situation. There already is—Housing Element H-2.1.1 talks about increased heights for  
29 certain circumstances, so we don't need to have additional stuff in the Land Use Element for  
30 dealing with that. I think that's sufficient. I think we should think about the idea of a senior  
31 housing overlay that has different standards for senior housing than for non-senior housing. I  
32 think this is 62-plus senior housing which doesn't have impacts on schools and maybe has larger  
33 units than you might otherwise have for the encouragement of small units. Think about also a  
34 special overlay for the idea of housing without kitchens. Casa Olga was housing without  
35 kitchens. It was considered commercial. That means when it got converted to the hotel, it was  
36 not a conversion of housing to hotel and, therefore, didn't actually increase—it wasn't  
37 considered an increase of commercial Downtown. However much that building is, it should be  
38 added to how much commercial we added Downtown, because it replaced a housing use that  
39 was some kind of assisted living housing. We need to think about that. Electric cars, even



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 driverless cars, still need a place to park, need to be able to plug in. They don't just magically  
2 drive around the roads forever charging themselves and not need a place to park. They need to  
3 park somewhere; they need to plug in. That means they need to use parking somewhere.  
4 Driverless cars will not eliminate the parking problem. In terms of El Camino and Stanford,  
5 Stanford Research Park and El Camino, there are two places to consider. One is CPI; do you  
6 really want to build housing where CPI has its hazardous waste facility? No. Now the second  
7 thing is along the Palo Alto Square at El Camino and Page Mill Road. The problem is that's  
8 already PC, so deal with it in the context of PC. You don't need special policies to deal with PCs.  
9 Therefore, when you modify that, it should remain a PC and require that the theater stay there  
10 as a part of that exchange. Thank you. You wanted to say something?

11

### 12 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

13 None.

14

### 15 **Future Meetings:**

16 Next meeting: May 17, 2016 - Mitchell Park Community Center (Topic: Review of the  
17 Preliminary Draft Land Use & Community Design Element)

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. Here we are, we have 20, 25 minutes left, if I'm right. We've made  
19 incredible progress on the five issues that the committee tackled. I was wondering if in the  
20 time we have left we could talk a little bit about next month. By the time we reconvene as a  
21 group, the subcommittee will have met one more time. They will have the benefit of revised  
22 policies and programs. After their meeting, Andrew will prepare a fuller draft with narrative  
23 included, and we'll get that out to this group 1 week in advance of your meeting. We hope that  
24 the sustainability subcommittee will also be able to meet and forward to this group at least 1  
25 week in advance their recommendations about how S/CAP principles can be integrated into the  
26 Land Use Element. You're going to get a lot of material. It's going to look a little different than  
27 what you see here. My question for you, in the time we have remaining, is what do you think  
28 would be the most effective way to get from that position to a recommend to the City Council  
29 or a version that we could send to the City Council.

30

31 **Co-Chair Keller:** On what topic?

32

33 **Hillary Gitelman:** On land use, the whole element. We're trying to get this thing to the point  
34 where we can ship it to Council.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** We're actually dealing with a process question of how we deal with once we  
37 get to come back next time with a draft, how we go on from that draft. Since we have limited  
38 time, can we have 1 minute each? Thank you.



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

### LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm asking a process question. You're going to get this one more—it's going  
2 to be revised one more time. It's going to come back with a subcommittee recommendation  
3 and sustainability committee recommendations. Our charge collectively, as a group, is going to  
4 be to try and frame it and forward it to the City Council.

5

6 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Hillary, can you say what "it" is? Is it an element? Is it ...

7

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** It's the Land Use Element. Yes, the element. I'm asking in the course of a 3-  
9 hour meeting, are we going to be able to take the information from the subcommittees and  
10 what are we going to be able to collectively accomplish in terms of making a recommendation?

11

12 **Alex van Riesen:** Can I just ask a clarification? I guess my clarification is—I think I am now. I  
13 guess my question is are you effectively limiting the discussion to those five points? I think  
14 that's what I'm wondering. When you asked that, what are we considering and how do we  
15 answer that?

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** I thought tonight's conversation and the subcommittee's work limited to  
17 those five points was really important, because those the big issues that we identified based on  
18 the full committee's first meeting on this subject. But we now have to go to the next step and  
19 try and find a way to get to the finish line on this thing and forward a draft to the City Council.  
20 We have a meeting scheduled next month where we would like to make some significant  
21 progress towards that goal. My question for you is how would you like to do that?

22

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We're going to start on this side. Shani, you go first.

24

25 **Bonnie Packer:** I just want to say something about the red card/green card. I think it made us  
26 more polarized than we really are. I think that what I'm hearing about—just for an example,  
27 without going into the substance about the height limits. Most of us would like to see some  
28 kind of massage, a very carefully articulated development of where it would work, where it  
29 wouldn't work and all that. We would probably be able to come to an agreement on—just  
30 saying a blanket thing, yes or no height limit, it's not the way we think. We think in more detail,  
31 so the devil's in the details. I think all of us could probably come to a lot of compromise and  
32 agreement if we had the opportunity to do so. Maybe that's what the subcommittee could do,  
33 on that, on parkland versus not, on the many of the different issues. As to the adaptive data  
34 stuff, I don't know what that's all about. I can't begin to give you an educated evaluation of  
35 what you're talking about. I think it's more than many of us who are not statisticians or  
36 economists can deal with. Anyway, as far as process, if you could figure out a way where we  
37 could sit down and really negotiate and come up with something that captures a lot of the  
38 different nuances that people brought up, we would probably agree with that. I'm hoping.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that in terms of height limit, I do not think that that is completely  
2 achievable. I think that there's sufficient—nuances means difference in this particular case. I  
3 think the best we can do is to have clear alternatives. The Council directed us to give them  
4 clear alternatives with pros and cons that they can then consider. The question is for things for  
5 which there is disagreement, we need to be able to give that and frame that to the Council to  
6 make the decision. I think we need to be able to do that in terms of at the next meeting. Why  
7 don't we start at this end? Shani.

8  
9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** A couple of things I would like to discuss in the committee. One is the  
10 commercial centers. I think the four of them are very different. I would like to see them  
11 treated differently. I think we should have some discussion about each one of them and what  
12 could still be done. Some of them, I think, are set for a long time. I'm especially concerned  
13 with Charleston center because of what's happening all around it, not in Palo Alto necessarily. I  
14 think it would be really important to keep it as a commercial center. It will need to grow. I'm  
15 worried about inclusive things like all commercial centers should do this or that. The other one  
16 is the land use definitions, which I also, like Don, found to be very—like a huge number of them  
17 that seemed like there was a lot of overlap. It would be good to tighten that and maybe ask us  
18 if the definitions are the right ones. I think the S/CAP is kind of through another aspect that we  
19 did not expect. I would like to have more time, because of that. There is a lot of information  
20 there. There are a lot of really good things. I see some of that may come to conflict potentially  
21 with some of the things that we've been discussing here. I expect most of it will not, but some  
22 of it might. I think we may need more time because of that.

23  
24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Doria.

25  
26 **Doria Summa:** I guess we have a minute, and I'll limit my comments now to Hillary's question.  
27 One thing is I don't think we'll be the least bit ready. One thing that I had been wanting to  
28 mention and keep forgetting to mention is that Annette had a very good idea at our first  
29 meeting. That is that we should go through line by line and a lot there won't be disagreements  
30 about. By that, I mean the element line by line. There's so many details in it that we really  
31 have to get right. I think anticipating that we'll have one more subcommittee meeting and we'll  
32 be done is not going to work, especially since we voted as a group to do that at the  
33 subcommittee level. Indeed, we actually said we'd be willing to meet more times. I think  
34 Transportation Subcommittee met five times. I think land use should anticipate at least that  
35 many times. I agree about the S/CAP too, because we hadn't really anticipated that. I think it's  
36 a shame that the draft won't even be done before we're supposed to be done with land use.  
37 We really need that time, and we agreed to do it. I think we should take it. I have a lot of other  
38 comments on general things, but I think you don't want them now, so everyone can speak.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Can I just clarify and make sure I understand? You're saying that the  
2 subcommittee agreed to go policy by policy through this. I guess my expectation was that you  
3 would do that, the subcommittee would do that, forward a recommendation to this group.  
4 This group would have a discussion and decide where some change is needed, and it would go  
5 back to the subcommittee. My hope is that at that point it might be ready to go to the City  
6 Council in some form.

7  
8 **Doria Summa:** I'm not sure if it'll be ready, but it's something that we committed to. Really,  
9 this is the hot potato here, land use. I think the fact that we agreed at Annette's suggestion to  
10 take our time with it, and we all agreed—those that could make the meeting. We had some  
11 people that couldn't come. I don't think we'll be ready that quickly. That was just my  
12 observation about your specific question.

13  
14 **Hillary Gitelman:** Excellent, thank you.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton?

17  
18 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I was really pleased to hear Bonnie's comments about how they went  
19 through the Community Services Element and really cleaned it up. When I have read each of  
20 these elements, I feel like there is a lot that needs to be done. It's been 15 years. We felt the  
21 same was true with land use. Of the five most controversial items that staff brought to us, we  
22 were in pretty solid agreement on three of them. I think we all felt like we agreed on three of  
23 them. The two, one of them, there's clearly two positions we need to frame. Obviously that  
24 should be brought back and continue to have discussion on, so we can really try and get the  
25 framing right. The third one, the last one, the dynamic growth management, we weren't really  
26 able to sort out in that meeting. I think there is an opportunity—there's just a lot of little things  
27 that people who have lived in Palo Alto for a long time understand, like specifics about Alma  
28 center, that the consultants don't understand and aren't really capable of cleaning up to that  
29 level. We just feel like there's a level of quality needed here that's not about controversy. It's  
30 just about having a high-quality document. Lastly, we've had a chance to use the cards. I've  
31 been using them actively. I have to say I'm not a fan. Since I've been one of the most active,  
32 I'm the most guilty. I really like the concept of listening and respecting what everybody has to  
33 say. When I hold up a red card, I feel like I'm disrespecting that person. I want to apologize. I  
34 was trying it out. I'm not a big fan. Thank you.

35  
36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

37  
38 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think Doria and Hamilton said what I was going to say. I think we need at  
39 least—I mean, we're not going to be ready any time soon with the land use. To really rush it, I



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 think, would be a disservice to this whole group. We probably are going to have to have a  
2 number of other meetings. I think Council would respect—since this and transportation are  
3 probably the two things that they really want to massage and weigh in on, they'll respect your  
4 decision to push it out. I also agree with the use of the cards. It does seem to be disrespectful.  
5 One other comment on mixed use, since that was one of the things. Let's not confuse the  
6 concept of mixed use with building subsidized housing. Subsidized housing doesn't have to  
7 have a retail. I think we're using those terms interchangeably.

8

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.

10

11 **Elaine Uang:** Since I'm not on the subcommittee, I'm glad to hear the subcommittee members  
12 thinking that it's a little bit rushed. What I was going to ask was if you do go through it with a  
13 fine-toothed comb and line by line to bring back the next three or four issues that you think the  
14 broader CAC should weigh in on, I was thinking that this can't really be the only five. There are  
15 probably a few others that could use some discussion at least and some positioning. That's all.

16

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Stephen.

18

19 **Stephen Levy:** I think the subcommittee is on agreement on trying to go through the detail. I  
20 think the subcommittee, at least I join with them in agreement. My guess would be five  
21 meetings. I don't mean to be cheeky. It's a long document. I don't like the cards. I don't think  
22 they work. I agree with Hamilton. My concern is that the detail of the element does not  
23 precisely correspond to the big policy areas of disagreement. I find it very hard to write a  
24 height limit or an adaptive growth part of the element. I really want to join with Hamilton and  
25 Arthur in wanting to understand and design a process for those areas of disagreement that  
26 need differing opinions and who gets to write them and how that works. That would be my  
27 thinking. It's going to take a long time. I like Annette's suggestion, but we'll see how it goes for  
28 the first 3 hours, but I think it's going to take a while. I agree that the S/CAP is an additional  
29 piece that I'd like to have time to work on.

30

31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lisa.

32

33 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Both to Hillary's question and the broader, I think probably everyone in  
34 the room cares about the land use. We're all feeling that we're represented in the final, and  
35 that may very well be there are two options or something at the end that go back to City  
36 Council. We legitimately don't agree. I think from a process standpoint, I think it's great that  
37 the subcommittee is willing to do so much work, especially on the drafting and the language. I  
38 think we still need to get some agreement of what are those big ones, likes the height. Fine  
39 that we don't all agree, but let's pick two positions and say half of us line up here, half of us line





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

### LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 up here. We develop it and then, sorry subcommittee, maybe there are two alternative  
2 languages that then go with that. I think that's a better use of our time than the whole CAC  
3 going through line by line, is my view. I think we can get there, but I agree it going to take at  
4 least one more meeting here that's a discussion before the final. Assuming the subcommittee's  
5 willing, I think then more meetings for the subcommittee to do that work.  
6

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** This is fantastic. That sounds really reasonable. I just want to confirm.  
8 We're going to put some time and energy before the next CAC meeting to do a complete draft  
9 with some narrative. We will take a stab at trying to identify these issues where there are  
10 differing opinions. I hope that that will help advance the conversation. We can certainly try,  
11 and then you guys can tell us if we're close or if we missed. We'll try and tee up that  
12 conversation for next time. I definitely hear you. The subcommittee will probably have to do  
13 some additional follow-up and then another meeting with the whole group.  
14

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me speak ...  
16

17 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Just very minor. Same as Hamilton, I felt really rude when I was using the  
18 card.  
19

20 **Hillary Gitelman:** Understood. Thank you for the experiment. We'll put our thinking caps on  
21 and come up with another experiment for next time.  
22

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. First I'm going to speak. Depending on how much time there is,  
24 people may have additional comments. One of the things is that I agree that the subcommittee  
25 should meet as often as necessary in order to be able to go through the entire element line by  
26 line as necessary and with a fine-toothed comb as needed, incorporating the feedback of the  
27 CAC and doing the appropriate synthesis and editing. I do think that if the subcommittee edits  
28 the Land Use Element after the CAC's final meeting on it, it should come back on consent just  
29 like the CSF and the transportation is. I think that's important. The third thing is that it's  
30 actually not necessary to completely resolve the issue, for example, of adaptive growth  
31 management. Some of the things can be left to a study that says evaluate and, if appropriate,  
32 implement an adaptive growth management strategy, and think about what the metrics are.  
33 You can put that as a policy or program in the Comp Plan. You don't have to necessarily resolve  
34 it now. That can be something that can be worked on in the future. Thank you. Didn't speak.  
35

36 **Lydia Kou:** It's just a question of clarification. My understanding was that we didn't quite meet  
37 on the controversial issues. I didn't think that we needed to come to a consensus before taking  
38 it to Council. It should be something that might be left to Council to decide. Right?



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

### LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** That's correct. We achieve consensus where consensus is achievable. Where  
2 there is disagreement, the disagreement needs to be focused and clear, giving a choice to the  
3 Council with pros and cons on each to the extent we can do that, to make the Council make the  
4 ultimate decision. Doria.

5  
6 **Doria Summa:** Just a really quick question for Hillary. I wasn't sure what you meant. Do you  
7 anticipate having a revision out before the next subcommittee meeting?

8  
9 **Hillary Gitelman:** We had originally anticipated that we would take the input from this evening,  
10 including the written comments we got, and do another version of the policies and programs.  
11 It'll look like this but with more comment, bullets and more strikeouts. It'll get messier and  
12 messier. Before the next full CAC meeting, we would do a cleaned up draft that has narrative  
13 and shows the changes from the existing Comp Plan.

14  
15 **Doria Summa:** We'll have the dirty one before it's perfected for the full CAC meeting before  
16 the subcommittee meeting? That's what I was really wondering. Don't you know?

17  
18 **Hillary Gitelman:** I lost you.

19  
20 **Andrew Hill:** The answer is yes. What you're getting before the subcommittee meeting is just  
21 the goals, policies and programs. No photos, no ...

22  
23 **Doria Summa:** Thanks.

24  
25 **Andrew Hill:** Then based on your input and the input from the sustainability subcommittee, we  
26 roll it all up into a preliminary draft element with the photos, with the graphics, with the maps.  
27 That is what the subject of discussion at the May meeting for the full CAC. It's not the final  
28 point of discussion. Putting it all there, we think, is going to give you an opportunity to react.  
29 Of course, we're not going to have only one side of the height limit issue. It'll be with options.  
30 That's the point of clarification, I guess.

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer.

33  
34 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I think it would also be very helpful to have the minutes from this meeting  
35 before the subcommittee meeting, so that we have something to reference to clarify what folks  
36 were saying.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Also, I think that some people's written comments didn't make it  
39 into the summaries in the document that was handed out today. That was the staff report for



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

1 this time, so make sure that all people's comments including from previous times are  
2 incorporated. Also one quick thing about—I heard something about removing distinctions of  
3 parkland. I hope the Community Services and Facilities Element still maintains distinctions  
4 between open space, district parks and neighborhood parks. I would like to see in the future  
5 quantification of those instead of lumping it altogether in open space. District parks,  
6 neighborhood parks are completely different from generic open space. When you see in the  
7 existing conditions report, there's a circle in there. There's a whole big side of that which is  
8 open space, and that includes Foothills Park and Arastradero Preserve and Byxbee Park and  
9 whatever. It completely skews exactly how much. We need to basically make those  
10 distinctions in the future. Thank you. Anything else? Amy.

11

12 **Amy Sung:** I just wanted to ask about meeting as many as possible. For the subcommittee  
13 meeting, will we be able to meet outside of the office hours?

14

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're going to have to talk about that. We'll do what we can, but we're  
16 really struggling with staff issues on that particular request. We heard you, and we'll see what  
17 we can do.

18

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Does staff want to say anything else?

20

21 **Elena Lee:** Thank you. What I wanted to request—I know some of you have done this. When  
22 you receive the packets, if you could confirm receipt either to me or to Robin, we want to make  
23 sure that the couriers are doing their job. I know that some things have been missed, and some  
24 of these are fairly lengthy packets. If you could do that, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

25

26 **Adjournment: 8:30 PM**

27

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'd like to thank you all for hard work today. Thank you very much.  
29 This meeting is adjourned at 8:30.