



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2015

Mitchell Park Community Center – El Palo Alto Room  
3700 Middlefield Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

**Call to Order:**

**Co-Chair Garber:** All right, folks, let's get started. Robin, will you please call roll?

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

**Absent:** Filppu, Jacobs, Titus

**Robin Ellner:** It looks like only three are absent tonight.

**Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you.

**Oral Communication:**

**Co-Chair Garber:** Now would be the time for anyone who would like to speak on anything to speak, but I'm seeing no cards. Why don't you just go ahead?

**Phyllis Cassell:** Is that better? Okay. I'm Phyllis Cassell, and I'm speaking for Ellen Forbes, who is president of the League of Women Voters of Palo Alto. You're talking tonight about—wanted to have raised general issues. A few of the League of Palo Alto objectives that we would like to emphasize in the Land Use Element are as follows. Maintain the urban growth boundary. The lands between Foothill Expressway and Skyline Boulevard within the Palo Alto sphere of influence should retain the maximum possible undeveloped land with safeguards to protect the natural quality of the land. Likewise, the land between Bayshore Freeway and the Bay within the Palo Alto sphere of influence should retain the maximum possible undeveloped land and land uses, and the area should be low-density and of low-intensity uses. Increased density is best located within the urban boundary, with increasing intensity along transportation centers and major transportation routes. Housing. The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports policies and programs that improve the diversity of housing opportunities for all economic levels and ages; ensures that all housing is open to everyone without discrimination; and offers a range of types of housing including second units, small multiple-family buildings that are integrated throughout the community as well as larger housing developments. If Palo Alto desires hotels at 2.0 FAR, why not small-unit housing developments at 2.0 FAR? Complete streets. The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports policies that promote efficient flow of traffic; minimize the use of the private automobile; and encourage the use of alternative transportation modes. The roadways should be designed to handle all modes of traffic and to encourage biking and pedestrian use. Mass transit should be facilitated and should be connected to residential areas, commercial centers, and places of employment. Safe routes to school are critical. Climate change. The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports the integration of policies and programs into the Comp Plan that improve and protect the environment and reduce pollution from climate-warming gases and other pollutants. Palo



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 Alto is a small city that stretches from the Bay to the top of local mountains. It is rural, suburban and  
2 urban. It is a university town with cap and gown issues. It is a research community full of innovation. It  
3 is a diverse community that needs housing and business commercial uses to balance the large  
4 employment demands in the region. Palo Alto wants change, and it doesn't want change. It is a  
5 challenge to write a Comprehensive Plan that covers all these issues and needs, but not only must it be  
6 done, it is important to keep this process moving forward at a steady and deliberate speed. It is  
7 important to complete the process in a timely fashion. Thank you.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think that is our last speaker.

## 10 **Staff Comments:**

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have the opportunity for staff comments. Do we have any this evening, Jeremy?  
12  
13

### 14 **1. CAC Communications/At Places memos**

15  
16 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, thank you. Can everyone hear me okay? Good evening. It's great to see  
17 everybody again. Sorry I missed you last month. I'm over all my little illnesses, so I'm glad to be back to  
18 see everyone. I had two very quick update points I wanted to make. Number one, related to CAC  
19 communications and the at-places memo process. I'd sent an email out right after the last meeting  
20 describing the current process. I know that there's been some ongoing frustration about being able to  
21 communicate and when information is being transmitted to the CAC from other CAC members. We  
22 went back and looked at the policy again. Having had a very clearly defined policy on when we wanted  
23 to get information to you, we decided it's best to leave things as they are right now. We do actually  
24 seem to think they're working pretty well. Now that we have a matrix system in place, you should see  
25 your comments being written down there. I just wanted to open up if people had any additional  
26 questions about what we were doing, people understood the at-places concept. I know there had been  
27 some confusion about that based on the email that I had sent out. I just wanted to open that up, if  
28 there was any further comments or concerns or questions related to how we're doing things. Does  
29 everybody seem to get it? You're welcome to email me offline if you want to have another  
30 conversation, but continue as you see fit. If there are comments that you'd like to provide to the CAC  
31 and you don't feel like you're going to have enough time at the meeting, send them to us. We will make  
32 sure that they're provided at places which is at your place. They'll be included in all of the materials that  
33 we subsequently distribute to you. Jennifer, it looks like you have a point.

34  
35 **Jennifer Hetterly:** My only concern about the at-places comments is that anything that's in writing that  
36 doesn't get raised during the discussion isn't subject to debate by the entire group until the matrix  
37 comes out. In the case of the Community Services Element, the matrix and the draft came out just  
38 before our action meeting. Had we not spent the time to do it last month, we would have missed the  
39 opportunity to address many of those comments that were submitted in writing. They would have just  
40 automatically been included in the draft, because they were in the matrix.

41  
42 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you for that. Part of it is, I think, we're kind of learning how to do this and there  
43 were timing issues related to when elements of that particular Element were coming forward. I think



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 moving forward we hope to give you more time to look at things and spread it out a bit. I appreciate  
2 that.

3 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Just one more thing. I would encourage people to provide thorough comments as  
4 early in the process as possible, so that they get integrated into the matrix in time for us all to know  
5 them. Thank you.

6

7 **Jeremy Dennis:** Great advice. Annette.

8

9 **Annette Glanckopf:** (inaudible) how this works. I have two things. One, I had written a little comment,  
10 and I think it'd be really helpful that sometimes some of the updates are really hard to follow. I don't  
11 know if there's any way, in at least our packets, that you could indicate who made the recommendation  
12 on the new changes, so we could at least follow to see if our ideas got included. That would be really  
13 helpful. I was talking to a planner from another city, and they say they routinely do that. I also have  
14 another thing. I don't know if you have time for one more oral communications. Keith just came in, and  
15 he couldn't find a parking place. I don't know.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy, why don't we take Keith when Jeremy's finished?

18

19 **Annette Glanckopf:** Okay.

20

## 21 **2. January 19, 2016 DEIR meeting discussion**

22

23 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you, Annette. Secondly—we will go over this as an action item—I wanted to  
24 make you aware we've made a few changes to the calendar. One of the changes is related to timing on  
25 when we're bringing forward a conversation around the Draft Environmental Impact Report. We're in  
26 the final stages at the staff level, reviewing that document. We want to bring it to a joint session of the  
27 CAC and the City Council on January 19, which necessitated a change in the meetings, that you'll see in a  
28 little bit, to the 26th. This is the first time that we've done a joint session, and we're still kind of working  
29 out some of the details. There'll be more to come, but I wanted to give you an introduction into what  
30 we hope to do that evening. The Draft EIR will not be at the meeting itself. It's actually going to still be  
31 in production, but we hope to introduce a set of—start the conversation about what we're trying to do  
32 with it. For those of you who don't know, the Draft EIR at its core has four scenarios that were  
33 developed by the City Council and a public process in 2014, 2015, early 2015. These scenarios  
34 demonstrate a range of land use decision-making that could happen in the City that provided us with  
35 essentially a set of data. We can see based on if you do X, Y, Z, A, B, C, these will be the effects in the  
36 community. Those scenarios are very different from one another. Some relate more to growth  
37 management, some relate to moving housing in different locations, some relate to incorporating  
38 sustainability measures related to transportation. They're standalone scenarios, so there's a level of  
39 analysis is impossible within them. They have concepts that can be moved around per Council direction.  
40 You'll start to see materials related to this in early January as we get that ready for the Council meeting.  
41 It should be, I think, a really dynamic conversation with this group and the Council and the public, I'm  
42 sure. It really is these nice snapshots of the kinds of choices that we could potentially make in the  
43 community, what those impacts look like, then from there make new choices, decide we like this piece  
44 here or like that piece there. Put them together in a new scenario, and that would affect some of the



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 work that we do here. I just wanted to introduce the concept. I don't want you guys to freak out when  
2 it comes. I want you guys to call me, because it's a little bit different than a normal EIR. I think it adds  
3 tremendously to what we're trying to do. It gives information to you as decision-makers and to the City  
4 Council as decision-makers that most people don't normally have this early in a process like the Comp  
5 Plan. You'll understand if you make a set of land use decisions that look like whatever; I don't want to  
6 pick on any particular one because I'm not promoting anything. That will mean these traffic patterns  
7 can change or this impact could occur. That's invaluable, and I think that's really helpful. I just wanted  
8 to throw it out there. I wanted you guys to know it's coming. I don't know if there's any questions on  
9 that. I'm just keeping it high level tonight, because we obviously have a lot of work to do. Thank you.  
10 I'll turn it back to the Chairs.

11  
12 [Discussion returned to Oral Communications.]

13  
14 [The following speaker was heard after Staff Comments.]

15  
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Keith, if you would identify yourself as you stand up. There's a microphone over there  
17 in the corner. You'll have three minutes. Afterwards you can fill out a card. Thank you.

18  
19 **Keith Bennett:** Okay, thank you. This is my first time at this event; I'm pretty much a novice here. My  
20 name is Keith Bennett. I was involved in forming Save Palo Alto's Groundwater which you probably saw  
21 a guest opinion in last week's *Palo Alto Weekly Online*; you might have seen it there. I've spoken a few  
22 times at Council meetings and Planning Commission meetings. Not Planning, Policy and Services  
23 Committee meetings. Groundwater, I think, is important. It has impacts for sustainability. I think it's  
24 particularly relevant in the context of our policies and procedures surrounding basement construction,  
25 both residential and general basement construction. I believe that there are good techniques for  
26 constructing basements, so it's not necessarily an either/or choice of basements. A related issue to that  
27 is managing the—when you build a house and you build a basement, there are also considerations as to  
28 how the basement affects groundwater recharge. I know that a number of the houses, for example,  
29 these are more zoning things, but they run the downspouts directly into storm drains which obviously  
30 means it's not going to recharge the groundwater and things like that. I don't have any particular  
31 requests here. It is in 18 and in 22. I have seen under sustainability guidelines that do relate to  
32 groundwater management. I'm certainly willing to talk to people who have an interest in this area and  
33 give you my opinion and what we've found looking at things. I'll just end there.

34  
35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you.

36  
37 **Agenda Items:**

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's go to our Agenda Items.

39  
40 **1. Action: Approval of Minutes**

41  
42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Approval of Minutes, are there any amendments to the Minutes or may I hear a  
43 motion? Don.

44 **Don McDougall:** Motion (inaudible) that's on page 2 (inaudible).



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1  
2 **Co-Chair Garber:** This is on page 2; forgive me, which paragraph?  
3  
4 **Don McDougall:** The paragraph where the motion is.  
5  
6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Down here, I see.  
7  
8 **Jeremy Dennis:** Looks like there's a couple of wrong words there. I would suggest that we could change  
9 it to refer the draft Element to the subcommittee and work with staff to revise. I think that makes more  
10 sense.  
11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** A second please. Anyone? Annette, thank you. All in favor say aye. Opposed. That  
13 passes unanimously. Thank you.  
14  
15 **2. Action: Approve special meeting on January 26<sup>th</sup> 2016 and amended schedule**  
16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** We also have to approve a special meeting on January 26th, 2016 and an amended  
18 schedule. Jeremy, do you have comments prior to asking for a motion?  
19  
20 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, briefly. As you saw in emails from Elena, we were asking for this special meeting to  
21 accommodate the January 19th joint meeting with the City Council. I believe we've heard back from  
22 most of you. We will have a majority of the CAC in attendance for that meeting. Thank you for  
23 accommodating us.  
24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I have a motion to approve that meeting? Don.  
26  
27 **Don McDougall:** I would like to see (inaudible).  
28  
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Please, go ahead. Are you on the microphone?  
30  
31 **Don McDougall:** If this is a living document, is there any reason why the subcommittee meetings  
32 couldn't be put in here, since they get scheduled and if we're trying to keep track of everything? It  
33 makes the document bigger, but I don't think it creates any extra work.  
34  
35 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you. I've been reluctant to put too much in the way of subcommittees,  
36 especially beyond a certain date, because not only have the members not been announced—because  
37 it's a living documents, things do change. I haven't programmed those in frankly. Immediate ones I can  
38 certainly do from now on, that I know are coming up. I'm happy to do that moving forward. Future  
39 ones, later on, can be more challenging (crosstalk).  
40  
41 **Don McDougall:** That's all I'm asking, the ones we know about. If this is sort of a living document and  
42 accessible.  
43



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't want to be argumentative, but we developed this particular schedule as a  
2 communication tool with the City Council. They really wanted a schedule every time we go back to  
3 them to show how their process and your process are intertwined. I think we can come up with a  
4 supplement that shows the subcommittee meetings, but I'd sort of like to keep this as our  
5 communication tool with them.

6  
7 **Don McDougall:** Hillary, I don't mean to be argumentative, is that what you just said? I recently met  
8 with a couple of—casually, it wasn't a meeting or anything. I just met with a couple of, and their first  
9 question was, are there any subcommittee meetings happening. If this is meant to communicate with  
10 them, I would think that that would be a useful communication so they know. They were the ones that  
11 created the subcommittee, and it has to be minuted and announced and formal and whatever. I don't—  
12 I do care, I guess.

13  
14 **Jeremy Dennis:** Happy to, Don. Thanks.

15  
16 **Don McDougall:** Therefore I would move that we adopt the January 26 meeting as scheduled.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** And the amended schedule.

19  
20 **Don McDougall:** I would say we adopt the whole amended schedule.

21  
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Okay. A second? Jennifer. All in favor. Opposed. That passes unanimously as well.  
23 Thank you.

### 24 25 3. Land Use & Community Design Process Discussion

26  
27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Land Use, Community Design process discussion. I don't know if staff has some  
28 immediate comments. I do want to note that there's been a slight change to the makeup of the  
29 subcommittee. Lisa is going to be stepping off, and Stephen Levy is going to be stepping back on. We  
30 had a bit of confusion from the last meeting. I thank Lisa for her ...

31  
32 **Female:** (inaudible)

33  
34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Perfect. We're all perfect there. Stephen, who was on and then found that he wasn't  
35 actually, is on. Back to the normal. Jeremy, any introductory statements?

36  
37 **Female:** (inaudible)

38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** As Stephen said, be careful what you wish for. Any initial comments here?

40  
41 **Jeremy Dennis:** Just very briefly. I think the staff report spoke to itself. We want to just kind of kick off  
42 this conversation. The way we're structuring it is it's an opportunity to hear from each of you on some  
43 of the highest level issues that you want to hear more about as we move forward. Sorry, I have to hold  
44 it up. The cord is not long enough. This is an opportunity to hear from you on some of the highest level



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 issues within the Land Use Element. That helps us prepare for our future meetings with you and the  
2 kind of issues that you want to hear about. Given the way that the schedule's designed right now, we're  
3 not going to see Land Use again for a little while. We're going to go back to some other Elements and  
4 drafts and such. We didn't want to get too far down the road of getting in too deep on Land Use and  
5 then not revisit it for some time. I also, in the spirit of the holiday season, thought yet another three-  
6 hour meeting this close to Christmas would probably be spirit killing. I thought we'd try to keep it a little  
7 shorter tonight. That's my brief staff report.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Garber:** What we'll do this evening is use our typical structure, where we'll start to my left.  
10 You'll each have three minutes, and then we'll have an opportunity for open comments after that using  
11 your hand to be recognized. With any luck, we will get out early.

12  
13 **Alex Van Riesen:** Dan?

14  
15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes. Alex.

16  
17 **Alex Van Riesen:** I just have one question. I just noticed on the email that you sent with regards to the  
18 replacement meeting for the CAC on January 19th, on tonight's summary it says it's January 29th which  
19 would be a Friday. On the email, it says January 26th which is a Tuesday.

20  
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** As it does on the schedule. Jeremy, I'm assuming it's the 26th.

22  
23 **Jeremy Dennis:** The 26th (inaudible).

24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Apologize. Thank you. With that, Whitney, you have the honor of starting us off.

26  
27 **Whitney McNair:** I'm not sure I'll sit to your left next time.

28  
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Unfortunately, there's likely to be a very large gap to my left.

30  
31 **Whitney McNair:** I'll be quick. In the staff report ...

32  
33 **Female:** (inaudible)

34  
35 **Whitney McNair:** I'll be quick. In the staff report, there's some language under—excuse me while I find  
36 it. It's goal L-2, enhancements of community with development design to foster public life and meet  
37 Citywide needs. There's the idea that the Council supported and encouraged us to consider the use of  
38 coordinated area plans throughout the community or in key locations. I just want the group to be open  
39 to looking at the opportunity for a coordinated area plan or a similar type planning document  
40 throughout the Land Use Element. One of the places—I'm just not sure how it's going to lay itself out  
41 when we get the draft Element. It may be appropriate in areas like Goal L-5 which is in high quality  
42 employment districts, each with their own distinctive character and each contributing to the character  
43 as a City as a whole. The community or the CAC might want to consider these coordinated area plans in



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 particular areas. They've been implemented in just one place within the community, but there are a few  
2 that are in draft form. If it's something the Council supports, I would just have us look at that.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Julia.

5  
6 **Julia Moran:** Just a couple of comments as well. First off, Goal 5 as revised, the new ways to encourage  
7 collaboration among the public property owners in the City, I know that we don't get to choose the  
8 goals. It would be nice to under that make sure that we're including business owners. Public infers  
9 public, but property owners aren't the people populating the businesses within them, so business  
10 owners and individual renters. At least within the packet we got, there's a lot of language about the  
11 Mills Act and historic properties. I'm not sure if it makes sense here or in the emergency preparedness  
12 section to have something about earthquake standards. There's several large buildings in Downtown  
13 that still haven't been updated to current earthquakes standards. I think somewhere that needs to be  
14 included. The urgency interim ordinance on ground-floor retail, I think it's important that the language  
15 about that is strong in what we do. I know that the plan is to make that long term, but I think it's really  
16 important for the health of our Downtown. Sorry if I'm being too detailed or not high, either way.  
17 Program L-26 which talks about establishing the following unranked community design priorities for the  
18 University Avenue multimodal transit station area, I think either we need to include that we want to go  
19 forward with some type of plan whether in transportation or here with changing where the express  
20 Caltrain goes to or we need to include in that the other large areas such as the Stanford Research Park,  
21 East Bayshore. Lastly, on the Urban Forest Master Plan section, I'd like—which is Goal L-9. I recently got  
22 a south Palo Alto survey to see about how to improve the urban forest in south Palo Alto. I think part of  
23 the issue is resources, both money—the cost of water for people who live in low-income housing and  
24 senior citizens who might not be able to get to the trees and maintain them. I think having some type of  
25 policy within the urban forest to help make sure that we are supporting that for those who need the  
26 help.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thank you. Elaine.

29  
30 **Elaine Uang:** I guess on the very high level, I know that the goals have been outlined, but I would  
31 suggest also that staff recommend a base document to work from so that we eliminate confusion. I  
32 mean, we've seen a lot of confusion between the two drafts. Figuring out where we're going to start  
33 from, whether that's the '98 Plan or the PTC revision, maybe you already have an answer to that. I think  
34 really it would help all of us in terms of process and going forward in throwing out solutions. I think that  
35 the one really important thing we need to do is really look at the nexus between the employment  
36 centers and the transportation demand. I was really struck by this land use map from the existing  
37 conditions document, 8-4, that really outlines in pink where the "employment centers" are separate  
38 from the mixed use centers. It's pretty clear that a lot of these employment centers are actually not that  
39 transitable, so we really need to start thinking about what is that connection. I know a lot of people  
40 often conflate traffic in our streets with things like road diets or complete streets programs. We're not  
41 also taking into account where the major, major employers are, by 101 especially on the south side of  
42 town and the VA and SRP and things like that. Really taking that into account and then reconsidering  
43 what can be done near the transitable areas which we are currently highlighting as mixed use. On that  
44 particular note, I would love to see us really coordinate and prioritize housing, especially in those areas,





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 and maybe find some other zones where housing makes sense, where housing currently exists, where  
2 upgrades or programs and policies to sort of preserve or improve. I think the Alma corridor comes to  
3 mind because of the real wealth of multifamily housing that exists right now. Downtown, again  
4 referring back to that 8-4 map, the mixed-use centers and their type linkage with transit corridors is  
5 something that we really need to look at. I mean, we should be looking and referring to this map, any  
6 map, at all times and not just sort of getting lost in the language and the words, because the physical  
7 layout of our City really governs all of this. I'll second again Whitney's comment about coordinated area  
8 plans as a tool. I'd do a slight different bent which is that I think we really need to go beyond what SOFA  
9 did and look not just at land uses and programs or use of, like, this childcare or housing. We really need  
10 to think about the transportation aspects, think about the parking management for that area,  
11 coordinate it with other transportation tools that we have going on in the City. That hasn't been done  
12 very tightly and very closely. I mean, we have stress areas in, like, even Midtown for example, and of  
13 course Cal. Ave. and some of the other places. I would even argue that places like East Meadow,  
14 because it's a major employment center or at least it's designated as an employment center on that  
15 Map 8-4, we need to start thinking about the transportation linkages and the transportation sort of  
16 software, the policies. That's it.

17

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes, Jeremy.

19

20 **Jeremy Dennis:** I'm sorry. I wanted to make just a quick comment to something Elaine said. Thanks for  
21 your comments on the base document. You can always assume that the document you're working from  
22 is the '98 Comp Plan. That's my understanding of the direction of the Council. Always assume that  
23 unless you're otherwise told. I know some confusion comes in when the Council goes through a process  
24 of developing the goals, and they may take some goals verbatim from the PTC revisions. They might  
25 amalgamate some. Always assume that you're working from the '98 Comp Plan unless otherwise  
26 explicitly stated. We may find in the future that there's a particular policy or program that the Council  
27 wants to include that came from there. We will point that out very explicitly. That doesn't preclude you  
28 from using that as a source document in good ideas. If you're getting that message, that's the wrong  
29 message I'm sending. Always start from the '98.

30

31 **Don McDougall:** You'll get the Council to agree that that's what we're working from?

32

33 **Jeremy Dennis:** That's my understanding what they're doing.

34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's keep moving. Lisa, three minutes.

36

37 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** At the top level, I think the biggest thing for the City is really just what's our plan  
38 for growth? I think it's kind of obvious. I think it should be planned. This is my personal belief; I think it  
39 needs to be a mix. I'm not one side or the other of the whole debate about what to do with Palo Alto  
40 growth. I think it just needs to be thoughtful. My personal beliefs are that it's a mix. I would love to see  
41 more subsidized housing, so we're not all people here that have lots of money. I think second units  
42 make sense. I think in some places higher buildings make sense, high density. In others, it doesn't. I  
43 think some business, some residential. I like the ground-floor retail. I think it's that mixture of it. I  
44 worry having seen—I was born here. I think this is an incredibly vibrant place. I worry that if we



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 become just a bedroom community, we become stagnant. I'm very much for the mix. I also like the mix  
2 of the cost of living here which would include the second units and the apartments and subsidized and  
3 things. I just think the diversity is critical. That's number one. Number two is how we tie this all  
4 together, the environmental, the trees, the parks, having the community centers. Again, a planned  
5 approach to it but keeping the heart of Palo Alto. Many of us are lucky to live in areas that you can walk  
6 to Downtown. There are parks right there. I think everyone in our City should get to have that kind of  
7 thing, again as a long-term goal. The policies are already here; the goals are here. Again, what we talk  
8 about the most important things. The third would be the partnership with the region as well as just our  
9 neighboring cities, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Stanford for sure, how we partner on some of the usage  
10 of this including the transportation connections that we make there. That would be my third kind of big  
11 topic. I'll use my last 30 seconds just to say that I very much appreciate getting to be part of this and  
12 getting to know you all. We brought some See's candy to pass around. I hope it wouldn't be disruptive.  
13 I'll just pass it to share, to say thank you and happy holidays whatever holiday you celebrate.

14

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** We'll be taking a 30-minute break. Thank you, Lisa. Doria.

16

17 **Doria Summa:** In no particular order. Second units, I think that they're okay, but they should only be  
18 allowed in smaller lots if they can do so by respecting the FAR and the setbacks, I believe. I have some  
19 concerns about the Cal. Ave. concept plan area because it's never been adopted and the neighborhood  
20 meetings were quite some years ago now. I wonder if it's still as relevant as it could be. I think maybe  
21 there should be some work on that. Right off the bat under land use distribution, I think that this graph  
22 is pretty misleading because it mixes urban parks and open space and preserve all as one giant chunk.  
23 The urban parks being—we already have a deficit per capita in our urban parks. It makes it look like  
24 there's a lot more. I think that should be corrected to actually call out with more specificity those  
25 definitions so people can see that the urban parks, we're underserved there.

26

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Doria, forgive me. Which graph was that, on which page?

28

29 **Doria Summa:** It's like the second page in the content.

30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

32

33 **Doria Summa:** Let's see. I also think there's a map that has view corridors for open spaces, and I think  
34 we should maintain those. I think that's Map L-4, if I'm right. I think that the Downtown Design  
35 Guidelines are, at this point, weak because they're not mandatory. I think they're confusing for  
36 applicants and the public alike. I think those guidelines should be made mandatory. In terms of—I think  
37 it's Policy L-9. In terms of mixed use, I think one of the most underutilized portions for housing is mixed  
38 use. When we have in our Downtown and in our C zones, I think we should have mixed use that has no  
39 office, because we have so much already. It should be retail on the ground floor and then all housing  
40 above. I think that should be done also within the present height and site development guidelines. Let's  
41 see. It would be nice to explore really realistically having some below market rate housing that's  
42 designated for certain community workers such as teachers, etc. The Stanford Research Park. They still  
43 have quite a lot—I think it's like 150,000 square feet to develop there. I think going forward we should  
44 let them develop that, but they should have to mitigate all of the impacts of those developments before



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 they're approved, including and mostly single vehicle trips. I think we have to get much more serious  
2 about that. At this time I think we should limit office growth completely, because the Research Park is  
3 our largest employment center. It still has so much to go, and we should be renovating our current  
4 stock when necessary. I don't think that we should be increasing the jobs-housing imbalance at this  
5 time. Let's see. That's it.

6

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

8

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. Looking through the documents you gave us, one comment I have is that it  
10 talks about housing for seniors. I think we should include the people with developmental disabilities just  
11 like we heard previously. There were quite a few people that came to talk about that. There are a  
12 couple of issues under implication of Housing Element for Land Use Element. I'm not sure that I support  
13 the Programs H-2.2.7 and 8. I think they need more consideration and we need to discuss that  
14 somehow. One of my concerns with making secondary units and that sort of thing is that we're going to  
15 lose a lot of the kind of interstitial spaces in the City that now we have trees and we have fruit trees and  
16 we have life occurring in them. I'm not sure if there is a possibility of limiting lot size but also perhaps  
17 limiting how much extra space a second unit can take, so that they have to on about the same footprint  
18 that already exists, maybe only a little bit more but not a lot. I also think that the East Meadow concept  
19 plan is kind of stale by now. Things have changed so much since that was adopted, that we need to  
20 reexamine what can be done there. Maybe there's opportunity in that whole area along Charleston and  
21 Fabian to find other solutions than an office park. I have a few other things. I do think that the  
22 basement issue, basements should be added to FAR. The groundwater issue needs to be solved.  
23 There's no reason why people should pump all that water and just let it go somewhere. I was going to  
24 offer a new policy because one of the things that I'm really missing here—we have some reference to  
25 the Urban Forest Master Plan in the chapter, but I think we need to look at a new policy which will  
26 incorporate a lot of ecological aspects. I called it ecologically resilient landscape. It would integrate  
27 biological habitat considerations in sustainability programs, in urban parks, streetscape and urban  
28 design, would regenerate oak woodland as a foundation of a thriving urban forest—that will be  
29 reflected in the Urban Forest Master Plan as well—to support ecosystems for native plants, pollinators,  
30 birds and of course people. I had a few programs under that. Implement Palo Alto Urban Forest Master  
31 Plan obviously. There are a few documents the San Francisco Estuary Institute put together looking at a  
32 vision for a resilient (inaudible) landscape. I think those can be used to guide how we look at ecology  
33 within an urban setting. I would like to see an ordinance that protects birds from collision with windows  
34 and other urban developments and manmade structures. I think there could be and it's time for  
35 guidance for landscaping and maintenance of landscaping and setbacks. I have a few more, but maybe  
36 later. Thanks.

37

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Shani. Annette.

39

40 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think I got more detail than anyone. My big concern is how we manage our  
41 growth, which we obviously are doing, and preserve the quality of life. My big issues are preserving  
42 residential neighborhoods, our neighborhood centers and how we manage the growth in commercial. I  
43 think that the single story overlays, individual review and potentially a new definition for conservation  
44 districts are absolutely vital. We need to have more of those and stronger rules. Second units, we're



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 going in that direction. Arthur wrote a really brilliant letter that I think I would totally agree with.  
2 Maybe we could distribute that at a future meeting. My real concern with second units—we must do it  
3 very carefully because the devil is definitely going to be in the details—is the use of these for Airbnb.  
4 Not only does that increase the density, people in the neighborhoods, more traffic, more noise, but it  
5 really sort of breaks down community, because you've got people coming and going. As we look at that,  
6 we really have to figure out how to limit these, maybe geographically or nights per month, etc. When  
7 we look at the neighborhood centers, I'm a little concerned with some of the recent redefinitions of  
8 permitted use. I think there's only three neighborhood centers. Alma Plaza is no longer a retail center.  
9 I don't think medical or teaching should be allowed in these small, little spaces. It should be all retail.  
10 I'm a big believer in ground-floor retail and have helped to implement that in Midtown. I agree with the  
11 Citywide cap, not just in the selected areas that have been done, but totally Citywide. I think that'll help  
12 moderate growth. I have a real concern about home offices. I'm not talking about one or two people  
13 working out of their house. There are, at least in Midtown, quite a few instances where you have  
14 multiple people and lots of traffic and lots of activity. We need to get our hands around that. As far as  
15 the commercial development, I think we all know that if High Speed Rail comes, that is going to be one  
16 of our biggest challenges. We have to do something about grade separation. One of my big things is  
17 Code enforcement. Thank you, Hillary, for hiring someone new. I think that we need to really get after  
18 some of the people that continually violate this and have very serious penalties and advertise that so  
19 more people don't do that. A lot of people have talked about sustainability of our neighborhoods. I also  
20 agree with implementing the Urban Forest Master Plan, and I think there needs to be a little bit more  
21 flexibility with landscaping, tree placement and actually more species on the protected tree list. We just  
22 can't lose some of these beautiful specimens that we have. I did write a letter. I think I could probably  
23 talk for half an hour on any of these points, but I'm just going to end it there and pass the mike.

24

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Annette. Mark.

26

27 **Mark Nadim:** In several policies, like L-9 and L-29, there was the mention of mixed use. With the  
28 current demand in office space and the higher return in office space compared to residential, the mixed-  
29 use developments these days are mostly office and maybe one or two units of residential and maybe  
30 one or two units of retail. Either we have to redefine the mixed use or have multiple steps or multiple  
31 stages or definitions of mixed use. Some would have more retail or more residential or no office. We  
32 may want to include that especially with the Cal. Ave. development that's ripe for development right  
33 now. For Policy L-16, which talks about small neighborhood-serving retail, it's something we may want  
34 to encourage or have it required as part of the development. Whenever a development has a certain  
35 number of units, we need to have a small retail with maybe five, six retail units that would serve the  
36 neighborhood or the multiple blocks in the area. Program 45 with the development of the—Program  
37 45, create zoning standards and design guidelines for commercial, hotels and conference centers. We  
38 may want to also add to it small retail centers that mainly have small restaurants to discourage workers  
39 from driving to Cal. Avenue basically during lunchtime to reduce traffic. There is Policy Number 47, the  
40 East Meadow Circle area as a potential site for high density. Although there has been a development,  
41 again there is no retail there that would serve the residents. They have to go and drive everywhere to  
42 get where they need to go. For the public art, Policy 72, one of the things that we have especially when  
43 we have a building three or four stories tall, they might have some walls that are just blank walls, which



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 we can add murals to them to make them more pleasant and basically break down the tall wall effect.  
2 That's all I have. Thanks.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Mark. Adrian.

5

6 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you all so much. I thought the report was pretty good overall. I especially liked  
7 some of the focus on the area plans. I think that's a really important direction for Palo Alto to go. My  
8 three top ones, I'll just go through them from small to big. I think there can be a lot more focus on  
9 transportation and land use interactions, particularly around parking whether that's the parking ceiling  
10 or the ground floor. Transit-oriented development programs, there's not much of an emphasis on that  
11 in our current Comp Plan. Also greenhouse gases, what are we going to do to address that issue in the  
12 upcoming Comp Plan? The two goals that kind of line up with these two are Goal L-7 and L-3. Both of  
13 them talk a little about safety in neighborhoods and commercial zones. I think there's a growing  
14 discussion that safety, especially at a City level, does have to do with greenhouse gases. Something for  
15 us to consider. The second issue is that these policies barely address affordability. I want to echo Lisa in  
16 what she said that we need diversity of affordability, whether that's second units, multistory family  
17 housing, expanded options in what folks might do with their own property. This City has some of the  
18 highest median rents, some of the highest sale prices in the country. I think that's something we need  
19 to take seriously. Finally, the last issue is a lot of these policies really tack towards preserving existing  
20 ownership and providing benefits for existing owners and buildings or businesses. I think we have to  
21 also think about how we're going to accommodate future growth. We talk about growth management.  
22 What about growth enablement? I actually think that's a really important discussion for us to have.  
23 What do we think we want? How is it going to fit into the City? Where is it going to go? How are we  
24 going to serve it in terms of transit and financing? One thing that Palo Alto hasn't touched on much in  
25 this Plan is performative zoning. What do we actually want from our future buildings? Maybe it's not  
26 specifically about commercial serving or retail or on the ground floor. Maybe it's about the  
27 performances these buildings provide to the community in terms of interactions at the ground level or  
28 retail services. It might not be built into the zoning. I think we're missing a bit of an opportunity in just  
29 thinking of land use in the same wrote way. Maybe there's some new ways that we can learn from  
30 some other cities or countries that are doing some interesting things.

31

32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton.

33

34 **Hamilton Hitchings:** We're experiencing a significant housing shortage. There are many good programs  
35 in the Housing Element that was completed in 2014 to address these, many of which still need to be  
36 implemented. We need mixed-use retail plus residential zoning for California and University Ave.,  
37 zoning that supports small studios and one-bedroom apartments, second units that reduce minimum lot  
38 size required, and parking requirements but retain the FAR requirement. For the Density Bonus  
39 Ordinance, we should allow only one on-menu concession for affordable housing which is to provide  
40 more small units and no off-menu concessions. We should also do more for City employees including  
41 teachers. San Francisco just approved a \$310 million bond for teacher housing. Cupertino seeks to build  
42 the largest teacher housing project in California. We have a program in the Housing Element, 3-61, that  
43 seeks to study this, but we must do more and actually create affordable housing especially for teachers  
44 and emergency responders. There are currently ten unfilled police positions in this City that are very



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 hard to fill. What else can we do to add to the Land Use Element to help address housing? Every time  
2 we build an office building, that is another lost opportunity for housing. Free markets currently favor  
3 office buildings, which is why so little new housing is being built. I've heard many Palo Alto residents say  
4 we need more housing but not more office buildings. Therefore, I propose L-8B, incremental new office  
5 building capacity beyond a maximum size shall not be allowed where that maximum size is 5,000 square  
6 feet for all of Palo Alto, exempting Stanford Research Park. This will allow anyone to rebuild an office,  
7 build a new small one or add to an existing one without any additional approvals beyond what there was  
8 before the office cap. However, I'm also going to propose an office cap similar to what the Council has  
9 already approved—I meant they can add up to 5,000 more—which is the following, L-8C, an office cap  
10 for Palo Alto shall limit new office construction to 30,000 additional square feet per year based on which  
11 projects most effectively mitigate their impacts. However, medical offices under 5,000 and offices  
12 under 2,000 square feet shall be exempted as shall Stanford Research Park. L-8D, Stanford Research  
13 Park must reduce new incremental car trips they plan to add by 150 percent prior to the approval of  
14 new building permits for that incremental capacity. Thus, Stanford can continue to build out the  
15 Research Park per the original plan as long as they are effectively mitigating their additional traffic  
16 impacts proactively. L-8E, all new buildings shall fully mitigate their impacts for traffic and parking.  
17 Lastly, I've heard many Palo Altans say they do not want to raise the height limit above 50 feet even for  
18 housing, and I concur. Thank you.

19

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Hamilton. Jennifer.

21

22 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I get that we need some more density and diversity in housing. Sorry. How about  
23 that? Is that better? I have to look straight forward. I think we do need some more density and  
24 diversity in housing including below market rate. However, just like commercial growth with parking,  
25 residential growth has disproportionate impacts on parks and community services and other community  
26 infrastructure. I think as we think about housing, we also have to consider policy guidance that limits  
27 just how far we're willing to go in terms of housing growth. I also think we have to add programs to  
28 anticipate and manage those impacts, expand the park infrastructure. As Doria mentioned, most of our  
29 parks and open space is not our neighborhood parks. In fact 96 percent of it is really inaccessible except  
30 to very able-bodied people without using a car. I think we need to emphasize residential and retail as  
31 the preferred mixed-use design overall. I think we need to define desirable balance of retail by type for  
32 Downtown and California Avenue. We say we want a mix of this and this and this and this, but we don't  
33 say in there what percentage in this area and this area and this area. Really, if you pick from the menu,  
34 you could pick ten of this and one of this. I think we need to be clearer about what the balance is that  
35 we're looking for. Stanford Research Park is a primary contributor to our housing and traffic pressures. I  
36 think we should be looking at the development agreement. I'd like to know a lot more about that. Look  
37 at ways to work with Stanford to locate not just housing, but mixed-use housing/retail within the  
38 Stanford Research Park, neighborhood retail. I'd like to find ways to link new building permits to  
39 mitigating increases in traffic, as Hamilton mentioned. The California Avenue concept area plan, I think  
40 we should emphasize residential retail in the Fry's subarea, in particular increase the minimum  
41 residential component for that subarea. I think we need to add a policy that really prioritizes park  
42 creation within the Fry's subarea. That should really be a prime opportunity. If we miss it because we  
43 didn't push for it, we'll all regret it, I think. The East Meadow concept plan, I think we should have  
44 neighborhood retail in the West Bayshore subarea. We have a lot of housing there, and we're looking at



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 possibly having more housing there. They're completely unserved. Instead of increasing housing near  
2 neighborhood centers, I think we should be thinking also about adding neighborhood retail and services  
3 within our existing neighborhoods rather than building up and making more people who live there use it  
4 while retaining travel across town to get there. We ought to have it so folks have something within their  
5 neighborhood. I agree about second units. We have to respect the FAR and setbacks, don't just adjust  
6 them for smaller lots. I agree with the member who said about basements. Basements should also  
7 absolutely be counted in FAR. I'll leave it at that.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Bonnie.

10  
11 **Bonnie Packer:** In thinking about this Comp Plan, I think all of us should have a sense of history. I think  
12 some of you know I was on the Citizens Committee that worked on the '98 Plan back then. Back then,  
13 we were concerned about the lack of business vitality. Today, we're concerned about too much  
14 business vitality. What I wanted to impress on all of us is that when we look at this Comp Plan, we have  
15 to make sure the language is nimble. This isn't the place to put in specific numbers about caps for this  
16 or for that. We may want to put in language about programs to review data to decide when caps may  
17 be appropriate. This is a Plan that's going to be around for another 10, 15, maybe 20 years because it  
18 takes 10 years to do a new Plan anyway. Let's think about that. I know right now we're all reacting to  
19 office. Ten years from now, maybe these companies will be gone, and we'll be reacting to something  
20 else. The demographics, again, will change. We weren't as concerned about seniors 20 years ago. Now,  
21 all of us became seniors, and now we're concerned. One thing that hasn't changed in the 20-so years  
22 since that Comp Plan is the need for housing. We can talk about second units, but that doesn't do much  
23 for the numbers; that's nothing. There are eight second unit applications approved a year. If you really  
24 want housing and you don't want to impact the need for parks and tree canopy and those kind of things,  
25 you really do have to identify more places in the City where dense housing is appropriate. Preserving  
26 neighborhoods is a fine thing, but if you want to preserve neighborhoods, you'll have to create different  
27 kinds of neighborhoods elsewhere. I think the existing Housing Element—I don't know if our group is  
28 getting the newest Housing Element. The Housing Element that's in the binder that we got is the old  
29 one. Wait, I'm holding up the wrong thing. This one. This is the new one, and that wasn't in the binder.  
30 You might want to look at that. It doesn't go far enough in my mind because when we were working on  
31 the Housing Element, people were a little skittish about growth. They were afraid to put in more  
32 density. I think we shouldn't be afraid, and we should suggest in this Comp Plan to keep on reviewing  
33 the opportunities for higher density, etc. Also, as far as having retail residential in neighborhoods and  
34 having good transit, if you have more people living in an area, those people will shop more and support  
35 the mom-and-pop stores and support the buses and the shuttles that go by. You need to have the  
36 infrastructure and the will to build the infrastructure to support the housing and vice versa. The housing  
37 will support the transit. As we do the Transportation Element, think of that as a basis for the  
38 infrastructure that we need in order to support the additional housing units we would like to see. The  
39 other thing I was going to say in the three minutes—I won't say it.

40  
41 **Co-Chair Garber:** Next round. Amy.

42  
43 **Amy Sung:** Good evening, everybody. As I looked through all the goals, my thought was about the Goal  
44 6. It says that we are promoting high quality, creative urban design. I am thinking that in Goal 1, it says



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 the Citywide 50-foot height limitation and it has been respected since the 1970s. I don't know what the  
2 historic perspective was, so prior to 1970 what the height in general was. That height was set in the 50  
3 was that the new height is that, like, trying to bring about. I really like to know ... I was too excited. My  
4 question is what is the rationale behind a 50-foot height limitation? Where there's a height limitation  
5 and the FAR, I just think it takes a lot of creativity to (inaudible) a neighborhood and appearances. Also,  
6 I wanted to comment on the Program L-26; that's under Goal 4 about the Downtown multimodal transit  
7 center. I think that is very, very vital that we have a vital and thriving City center, and it promotes mixed  
8 use. What I envisioned in mixed use is you have housing and medical and performing arts, shopping,  
9 very, very interesting retail. I think that is the way to promote quality of life. Of course, I think that  
10 everybody stress about the park space. The other one is about the housing. We really need to have a  
11 hard look at where to put additional housing. We have a lot of people who express interest in living to  
12 transit centers and corridors, the smaller units, high density along our transit centers in Downtown,  
13 University and California Avenue, also close to the Mountain View boundary where San Antonio  
14 Shopping Center (inaudible) is. I think those might be the areas for consideration. Also, the areas where  
15 the Fry's is, I think those are the areas that presents a very, very creative and wonderful opportunity for  
16 the zoning. I'm done.

17

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Amy. Heidi.

19

20 **Heidi Emberling:** Hello. Can you hear me? This is one you have to hold close, unlike yours where you  
21 can hold it further away. Great comments, good food for thought. I am interested in somehow  
22 representing clustering schools and community centers, services together somehow. I don't really see  
23 that written out anywhere in particular. What I've noticed is—we live in Barron Park. The kids don't  
24 really have any place to hang out. They go to Walgreens or Happy Ds. That's pretty much where they  
25 hang out. There's not a lot of other alternatives. All the afterschool activities, I know we're not talking  
26 about transportation, but they're very difficult for my kids to get to. She's in a district-wide musical  
27 which is all the three middle schools together, so kids from Jordan are having to get over to JLS, Terman  
28 over to Jordan for these rehearsals. It's difficult; it's easier in the summer when the light is out. Biking  
29 there and back, they have to cross El Camino, the train tracks, Alma, Middlefield, all on Arastradero,  
30 Charleston. I don't feel that it's very safe for them. Activities are always, like, there might be a dance  
31 class at Cubberley. My son is in the School of Rock in Midtown, but there's nothing anywhere near  
32 where we are in Barron Park for them. Again, they choose Walgreens or Happy Ds, or they go to the  
33 park if it's not cold, of course. Adding some youth drop-in centers or teen drop-in centers. I know  
34 Stanford was looking at developing teen centers in the community that are modeled after centers in  
35 New Zealand called jigsaw centers or in Canada called head space centers. These are, like, drop-in  
36 places for youth and teens, kind of like the teen center right here at Mitchell Park, across the way, but  
37 just standalone places. I'd like to see something about clustering schools and community center sort of  
38 activities. Housing for seniors and walkable communities. I have aging parents and young children, so  
39 I'm trying to not have to leave Palo Alto, but somehow have my parents come here. There's no  
40 affordable housing. I don't know how we're going to work that out. They probably won't be in Palo  
41 Alto. It's difficult. I'd like to see more mixed use designations as well. I really enjoyed seeing, of  
42 course—I'm sure you all can guess—the focus on childcare incorporated throughout the other Element.  
43 I'd like to continue that; I didn't see anything related to that in the draft conditions report. I know it's  
44 not as detailed as it will be. Thank you.





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Heidi. Don.  
2

3 **Don McDougall:** I'm going to take you at face value relative to a high-level discussion and not much talk  
4 about what's in the goals. My concern is, if I look at the background statement that's there on page 2,  
5 that it says that the Land Use and Community Design Element identifies three major components that  
6 together constitute the City's structure. It talks about residential and commercial and employment. If  
7 you look at all of the content, I think you would agree that, number one, transportation is a huge part of  
8 the whole land use. In terms of what constitutes the City's structure, I think it needs to be recognized  
9 that that's part of it. I also think that the definition of residential neighborhoods does not embrace the  
10 concept of higher-density housing, all of which everybody has talked about an awful lot. None of these,  
11 even the five now that I've expanded it to talk about whether it's open space or Downtown parks or  
12 whatever, I would argue that in the background thinking that we do as a group and that staff does in  
13 terms of preparing this that there needs to be probably six different components to the structure. I  
14 argue that because if you look at the goals, the goals are—there are nine of them—attractive City,  
15 community, neighborhoods, pedestrian-scaled centers, employment, buildings, historic, culture and  
16 public space. None of those in fact really are identified with the three or six, whatever, components  
17 that create the structure. I would encourage the subcommittee in looking at this to actually build a  
18 matrix of these components of the City's structure, the expanded ones particularly including  
19 transportation and higher-density housing, with the goal set so that you can see where there's  
20 transportation in the community part, where there's transportation in the employment part as  
21 somebody brought up, where there's transportation in the historic or building part. I think a matrix of  
22 where things are included would be useful. I think we end up adding things where we're at, at the  
23 moment. The other thing I would comment on is on page 4 of the introduction. It talks about a number  
24 of programs in the existing Element, which we've been told we're working from, that are dealt with. The  
25 second one there says housing for disabled is complete. I think it's been mentioned that the  
26 developmentally disabled has not been addressed at all. I think to say that was complete is wrong.  
27 Further down, for example, there are six different things that are parking. To reinforce the fact that  
28 transportation and parking are part of the structure, that was already in the other Element. It says  
29 we're going to create parking for something between an average and a peak condition. I'm not sure that  
30 that's necessarily the conditions that we're operating on today. I haven't commented at all on any of  
31 the goals; I'll write that up and submit it at Jeremy's invitation. I would say that the concept of growth  
32 management and growth enablement is really important. I think the concept of data driven in  
33 everything we're trying to do needs to be reinforced throughout all of these. Thank you.  
34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Don. Ellen.  
36

37 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** We've set a pretty high bar for us to make three high-level ideas in three minutes. I'll  
38 take care of two of them pretty fast. I think the first two are the collaboration that is necessary between  
39 all the neighborhoods and all the adjacent communities. It's not a one-shot and one-city problem. The  
40 second thing I'll say is the emphasis that I find in the current publications, gateways, I concur. I think the  
41 gateway between Stanford and Palo Alto needs to be improved, so that it becomes a real picture and  
42 kind of a sightseeing place that you want to know that you're going to this gateway, and this is Palo Alto,  
43 and really give you a character and a place on the map that identifies the City. I really want to talk about  
44 an asset, land use that I think you have forgotten. That is the Palo Alto Airport. There is a goal in the



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 Transportation Element, which I meant that on the subcommittee we never got to, but I will see to it we  
2 go back there. This airport is a jewel that we have inherited in total from Santa Clara in 2014. The  
3 airport celebrated this year 80 years at its Baylands position. I think it's interesting to know that it was  
4 first opened near College Terrace, but the neighbors complained about the noise and the sound.  
5 Doesn't that sound familiar? It got move down to the Baylands, and they have operated there for 80  
6 years. A lot of us know people that had flying lessons there. It's a recreation place; it's a goal. I would  
7 like to see it again as a real place where people go to learn, to experience or learn to fly. What they can  
8 learn to fly is not only small aircraft and maybe someday even become pilots. The big market is to learn  
9 to fly drones. These drones are coming, and it's going to be a problem to everybody in Palo Alto. It's  
10 going to be also a great asset. Coincidentally, yesterday's *Wall Street Journal* had a feature article which  
11 was then summarized today in the *Daily Post* about pilots must register drones. There are going to be  
12 millions of these drones under Christmas trees this Christmas. If the drone is half a pound up to 55  
13 pounds and you're 13 years of age, it must be registered. Now, there are also lots of rules, like they  
14 can't fly higher than 400 feet and so forth. I'd like to see the Palo Alto Airport become the center for  
15 drone pilot training.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Ellen. Lydia.

18

19 **Lydia Kou:** A lot of people have already said everything that I actually was going to say. I want to  
20 emphasize what Jennifer said was very much in line with what I had. I do want to also emphasize the  
21 office and R&D cap. That should be something that is adopted into this Comp Plan in terms of keeping  
22 growth at a limit. It shouldn't be for the short term; it should be for the long term throughout this new  
23 Plan's time. As well, it should be totally inclusive of Stanford Research Park. The next is what Annette  
24 said about mixed use and about protecting neighborhoods. While mixed use, especially those with  
25 ground-floor retail and housing above it, I think that's very important in order to help the supply of  
26 housing. However, at the same time, I think the neighborhoods needs to be preserved. In the League of  
27 Women Voters, what Phyllis was saying as an Oral Communication, Palo Alto is a small city, and it's rural,  
28 suburban and urban. We should keep the rural places as rural, and suburban as suburban, and identify  
29 where are those that are urban. I think we already have that, so how do you preserve that is what I  
30 think we should move forward with. Lastly, someone talked about enforcement. I think that's  
31 something that should be in here as a program or a policy. Everything that we do needs to be enforced  
32 and also, as Bonnie said, measured. That's it. Thanks.

33

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

35

36 **Stephen Levy:** I want to thank everybody, starting with Phyllis and Lisa and virtually going around the  
37 room, and support the call for more housing options for all sorts of people. I have two points that really  
38 haven't been made. One is that the Council in giving us instructions had Part G of their motion that  
39 asked us to look at more housing options for seniors, particularly in walkable communities with access  
40 to services. I think it was Point I that said look at housing supply for families of all sizes, of all ages, of all  
41 abilities, and of all incomes. I really hope we do that. I would ask everybody to ask the question that  
42 Nancy and I ponder. We bought a home here 38 years ago. No way could we do that now. Without  
43 knowing everybody's situation, I bet if we went around the room, many if not most of you are in that  
44 situation. We lose all of us and people like us. Those single-family homes that we want to preserve are



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 not going to get cheaper. Expanding access and expanding choice for people of different abilities and  
2 sizes and income and ages means new housing. That's the first point. The second point—I think Elaine  
3 brought it up; a number of people have brought it up—is that the Transportation Element and the Land  
4 Use Element and really the Housing Element have to work together. That's how we can plan for this  
5 growth and minimize the impact on traffic, on greenhouse gas emissions and on parking which seems to  
6 be ... I don't know. I think Jeremy said a while ago that we were going to get to the interaction between  
7 the Elements at some point. I don't see how we can progress too much further without recognizing that  
8 where we place development of any kind and what the transportation options are are really connected.  
9 The third point, I want to take Council Members DuBois, Schmid and others, up on their offer and Staff's  
10 offer to revisit the Housing Element, not to change the number of units but to relook at the location in  
11 terms of what we now know about demographics, about what everybody said in the room about the  
12 right places for housing. I think the Staff would agree that what we put in the adopted Element was  
13 what was possible and didn't require any major policy changes, but might not be the best sites for us to  
14 consider. We're going to have a meeting with the Council, and I'd really like to take them up on that  
15 offer. Second, there's a long paragraph in here from SB 375 that most of you know and support because  
16 it's the climate change legislation that asks us to look at reducing greenhouse gases. It also asks us to  
17 look for providing housing for all types of people, for all the population and jobs that are ...  
18

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Steve. Bob.

20  
21 **Bob Wenzlau:** This is a tough part of the table down here.

22  
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don (inaudible) my mike.  
24

25 **Bob Wenzlau:** One of the things I wanted to ask Jeremy was could you do something to get us that  
26 Climate Action, Sustainability Plan. It's been promised so many times, and I feel like we need that plan,  
27 because a little bit we're flying blind with that Element. This is just a high level thing. It says use of data  
28 and the ability to model or do something predictive with the land use changes we're making. I feel that  
29 we're sort of throwing stuff at the wall, but we don't really have any analytics or data that's helping us  
30 predict. I don't know if that's what the EIR does, so that then we can see the repercussions of the  
31 choices and the alternatives. That's where I'd like the Climate Action Plan to kind of get wired in, so we  
32 could see the impact of scenarios. One area that I wanted to emphasize was—I don't understand all this  
33 stuff; maybe it doesn't go in here—the issue of land use for infrastructure. My story was trying to do  
34 this anaerobic digester and get 10 acres for composting. It got crosswise with parks. Broadly, if we're  
35 going to be a sustainable community both in energy and waste management, we actually need some  
36 land for that, but that land keeps getting taken away for infrastructure. We need to do that. Now, Ellen,  
37 I hate the airport. I would like to actually have us consider the hard choice of using the 110 acres of the  
38 airport for other challenges in our community. I do not think in the world of sustainability and the world  
39 of our future that frankly there's a role for this airport. I beg to differ. I sit here and I know that Shani  
40 would differ with me. I look at 110 acres, and I go, "Where could you put firefighters? Where could you  
41 put teachers?" I realize there's a wonderful opportunity for the use of that land. If we're basically  
42 taking our community to try to provide more housing, why do we have a 110-acre piece of paving down  
43 there with planes that are blowing out lead and noise and everything like that? I know it's a dead-on-



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 arrival idea, but someone's got to finally call the pot black and go, "Look, we need the land for housing  
2 and not for these rich folks' planes." Just a happy moment, happy holidays.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Bob. Alex.

5

6 **Alex Van Riesen:** I realize some of these comments may offend or something, but I feel like there's—I  
7 just want to say happy holidays. Thank you. No, I feel like I'm not a big fan of University Avenue. I feel  
8 like University Avenue has become our Santana Row. I realize people like it and want to go there. That's  
9 cool, and we should have a cool place like that. What I'm not excited about is that I feel like it's creeping  
10 over the whole, and it's taking over California Avenue. I used to love California Avenue. I just made a  
11 brief note of the places we've lost in California Avenue; Know Knew Books, Bargain Box, Cho's, although  
12 he's doing quite well in Los Altos right now if you go up there. Village Stationers is closing; I don't know  
13 if you knew that. I had someone say to me the other day in the market, "California Ave., it's just  
14 restaurants and salons." I live closer now down to whatever Charleston Plaza, and I fear that that's  
15 what's going to happen there too. I'm actually good friends with the owners of Rojoz Wraps and  
16 realized they're not going to be able to pay the rent when they finally get around to cranking their rent  
17 up to whatever they can get out of it. I sort of feel like we're a little behind the game in this. I was a  
18 little disturbed that the language of even this doesn't seem to be keeping up with what's happening in  
19 our City. The particular point I wanted to make is no one mentioned that there's language about hotels  
20 in this entire land usage thing. I don't know if it's under retail or what. I want to suggest we have clear  
21 guidelines for hotel development in Palo Alto. I did a brief survey, and I found there's 2,000 rooms for  
22 rent just in Palo Alto a night. Is that enough? We need to have clear data and a report on what's our  
23 vacancy rate, what do we need, why do we need it. The problem is the hotel issue is driven by business.  
24 What's happening is I'm in a unit right now at 744 San Antonio Road that a current developer is trying to  
25 get turned into two Marriott Hotels. You may have read about this. One is sort of some ultra cool one;  
26 one is for boring people. They want to tear it down and build this. I just want to say, if you want to have  
27 a good time, come to our meeting on Thursday morning at 8:30 and watch the people from the housing  
28 across the street come and just tear these people a new one. It's just ugly when they get going, because  
29 they don't want this hotel across from them. I just realized we need a lot more discussion about the  
30 hotels which is driven by business which is driving more traffic or more involvement. Why aren't any of  
31 these places where we're developing hotels are we not thinking about townhouses or other types of  
32 housing? Why? It's happening right now, and it's going to happen before we finish this report. We  
33 need to do—I don't even know. This may be moot by the time we get there. I also want to just lastly  
34 say I want to preserve office space for Palo Alto-based small business, of which I am one. We used to be  
35 at 445 Sherman Avenue. Great building, had rocks on the front. They tore all the rocks off; they tore  
36 down all the little rooms, and they made all open-space office which is a certain style for right now.  
37 Anybody's who's trying to preserve or have a small business for a local community is being driven out  
38 and has nowhere to go. I want to propose that there's some kind of ordinance or rules given to  
39 providing small office space for local businesses within the development of our business sectors.

40

41 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Alex. Arthur.

42

43 **Co-Chair Keller:** The first thing is obviously we're going to have to think about office cap in the Land Use  
44 Element, because essentially that was punted in the long term to the Land Use Element. It needs to be



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 in there particularly since now we only have essentially an interim ordinance. The next thing is that  
2 people talk about the need for housing. Less than 4 percent of the housing stock in Palo Alto is studios.  
3 Less than 17 percent of the housing stock in Palo Alto is one-bedroom. Most of what the developers  
4 have built in the last few years, the last 10, 15 years, has been condos, essentially townhouses with  
5 three, four bedrooms and more. Essentially that has largely driven the increase in School District need  
6 for additional capacity. Therefore, we need to think about smaller units and senior housing, perhaps  
7 limit unit size. Also, when you have higher density, you need to think about more private space. Unless  
8 you're growing parks to correspond with the additional housing which is going to be hard—I think we  
9 need to do it—you need to have more private space for these people who are living in small units.  
10 Perhaps it's time to think about reducing the 2.0 FAR for hotels, because hotels are not going into the  
11 obvious places anymore; those have been used up. Now, we're going to non-obvious places and  
12 intruding into other areas. Maybe the usefulness of that has ended. When you think about adjacency  
13 issues, people talk about preserving R-1. I think that's important. Adjacent to R-1, what happens there?  
14 You don't want an abrupt change in size and scale. Also, for example on El Camino Real, there are parts  
15 of El Camino Real that abut R-1. There are parts of El Camino Real that abut higher density. Therefore,  
16 it's not one size fits all about what goes into El Camino Real. You need to think about adjacency of what  
17 goes next to what. I think it's important to have a precise plan or whatever you want to call it.  
18 Coordinated area plan sounds too much like the area plans that we put together for Cal. Ave. and East  
19 Meadow Circle that aren't really area plans. Eliminate the build-to line on El Camino as well. I associate  
20 myself with Annette's letter. I think that those are excellent comments, particularly retain the 50-foot  
21 height limit which came into effect after there were these giant buildings built in Downtown, such as the  
22 525 University Avenue and such. People were seeing growth in heights and wanted to stop that and  
23 imposed the 50-foot height limit. Grade separations from Atherton to Castro Street in Mountain View.  
24 The next thing is I agree with mixed-use housing and retail (inaudible) El Camino Real. With respect to  
25 square foot per employee, think about the kind of use when you have big bullpens in small office walls.  
26 Essentially you get spaces for startups that have high density. When you have older companies, like let's  
27 say Pallantir where they have individual offices, then you'll have lower densities. Think about the nature  
28 of that. Also finally, think about mitigating not only traffic and parking impacts but also housing impact.  
29 A housing impact fee of \$20 per square foot, which I think is where we're heading towards, means that  
30 in order to build one below market rate housing unit, which is \$500,000 per housing unit, it means that  
31 you have to add 100 employees at 250 square foot per employee, 100 employees in order to have one  
32 below market rate housing unit. That's ridiculous. Mitigate housing, parks, facilities and also the  
33 contingent impacts that housing has when you have that housing impact.

34  
35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Arthur. My comments; one observation, three questions. The observation  
36 is that the demographics of our City are going to be changing over the lifetime of this Comprehensive  
37 Plan that we're casting. We're all going to become much older. As a result and as observed by the City  
38 in their demographic survey that was done seven years ago, the burden on the City to support this aging  
39 community and all the programs that we want which are already the highest anywhere in the Bay is  
40 going to be increasing dramatically. This past year was the first time that the revenues coming into the  
41 City, in the general fund, was—I should say 51 percent of the revenues that were coming into the  
42 general fund were from real estate-related activities. That number will likely grow to about 60 percent  
43 over the next 10 to 15 years. Of that number, that 50 to in the future 60 percent, 70 percent of that  
44 number comes from non-single-family real estate uses. This isn't a suggestion or a plea for growth; it is



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 rather something that we should keep in mind, in the same way that Bonnie had spoken about changing  
2 times, as to what the Land Use Element does. It is the largest engine for revenue in the City. How we  
3 use that money allows us to have the quality of life that we enjoy, allows us to create studies for the  
4 Bay, allows us to create studies for housing, allows us to create studies for groundwater retention,  
5 allows us to do all the things that we like to do and be planful in a way that no other community can be  
6 in the Bay or has been able to do. That's the observation. Three questions. With all the issues that fall  
7 within the Land Use Element, are there areas in the City that the Comp Plan should prioritize over  
8 others? When I use the word prioritize here, I'm not talking about one policy over another. I'm talking  
9 about different areas within the City. Areas that you get fuller discussion because they will have more  
10 long-term impact on our community than others. Two, what is Palo Alto's jobs vision? By the mid-1950s  
11 with the addition of the Research Park, it was a big-time employer and subsequently a startup town.  
12 How many and what kind of jobs should the City support and where should those jobs be? Three, the  
13 scale of the existing zones in the City is many blocks large. The sorts of land use issues our community is  
14 dealing with today, parking, traffic, changes of use and density, the height and mass, character of  
15 buildings, impact us at a much smaller scale than those zones are. How should the Comp Plan best  
16 address the decisioning, the planning that needs to happen at this more granular nature of our built-out  
17 City? Thank you. With that, we can go to an open session here. I know that some of you had additional  
18 comments. We'll start with Hamilton. If you want to be recognized, turn your name tag over.

19  
20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I really like folks' comments about how the Land Use Element, the Transportation  
21 Element and the Housing Element are so intertwined. One thing I want to encourage folks—I sort of did  
22 this at the last moment, but I found it really educational—is to read the new Housing Element from 2015  
23 to 2023. You have no idea how many housing programs there are in there. They cover pretty much  
24 everything people have discussed tonight, and things you might not even be aware of, like you can  
25 exceed the 50-foot height limit if you're near one of the Caltrain stations for housing. You can reduce  
26 parking if it's for seniors. There's all kinds of stuff in there that is very aggressive about housing. I'm  
27 actually fine with it, but I highly recommend you read the new one, because it's hard to really have a  
28 meaningful conversation if you haven't. For those who want facts and data, there's 129 pages of data at  
29 the beginning of that document. There's really a lot to sink your teeth into. You've got to get to page  
30 129 before you actually get to the Element. One thing I would caution us, though, is while I understand  
31 there may be a need for some changes to siting, I think we want to be careful about reopening it up  
32 because there's this whole approval process. Maybe there's some way to address the siting without  
33 going back and redoing the whole Element. My next comments are on the airport. Bob actually had  
34 some specific comments on the airport. It's not a good place to put housing. The reason is because it  
35 liquefies. That means the next major earthquake, anything you built there is going to get the maximal  
36 damage. If you remember what happened in the Mexico City earthquake, the reason the damage was  
37 so substantial is because they built it on a surface that liquefies. It's very water soluble clay. It's not  
38 good for anything you want for a long-term structure, besides the fact it's also at higher risk for sea level  
39 rise. While I like the idea of more housing, it's geologically a terrible place to put it. The last thing is on  
40 hotels. I don't have an opinion on hotels, but one of the reasons the City likes it is because it generates  
41 a lot of revenue for the City. Those are my comments. Thanks a lot.

42  
43 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie followed by Shani.



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Bonnie Packer:** I'd like to comment a bit on our process. We don't really have discussions. We have  
2 people spitting out wonderful ideas. Our process in going around doesn't give us an opportunity to  
3 really discuss the ideas in depth. One of the things I thought we were going to discuss tonight was the  
4 way we would approach the Land Use Element in the meetings that are allotted. I thought we were  
5 going to have three more meetings, but I think it's just two. What I was going to suggest, if we have  
6 three meetings or however we divide it, was that we divide our discussion according to the City  
7 structure. Don alluded to that as well. We had the residential neighborhoods as one area, commercial  
8 centers as another, employment districts as another. If we had one evening focused on issues that  
9 affect the areas where residents live, and that would include not only the single-family and the  
10 multifamily but all the conditional uses that are within these great residential areas, like the religious  
11 organizations, the Y, Abilities United. All these places have huge parking lots. They could be built on.  
12 We can maybe think of some ways to provide incentives for that, like be built on for whatever density of  
13 housing we thought was appropriate. In the commercial centers, if we had a discussion about that, we  
14 could be talking about the nexus with transit, because we would have done the Transportation Element.  
15 We could probably see that nexus better when we have that discussion. Another time would be to  
16 discuss the employment districts. Again, you have the transportation nexus. It would give us an  
17 opportunity to discuss in each of these areas those design guidelines, climate issues, complete streets in  
18 each of those sessions, but as they apply to one, the residential area, two, the commercial centers, the  
19 shopping areas, and three, the institutional employment centers. That's what I suggest, that we not  
20 have these discussions where we jump from one thing to another, but that staff presents, "Now, we're  
21 going to discuss X as a group," and we'll just limit our discussion to X. Then we can have some  
22 meaningful dialog about issues that we may—I'm sure we're going to disagree on certain things, but we  
23 may find some common ground. I think that's it.

24

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, great suggestions. Doria followed by Elaine.

26

27 **Doria Summa:** I wanted to just agree...

28

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Forgive me, Doria. I apologize. It was Shani and then you. I'm sorry.

30

31 **Doria Summa:** That's all right.

32

33 **Shani Kleinhaus:** There are a couple of things or tools that I wanted to bring up before that have to do  
34 with open space and parks and potential of how to get more of that. In Mountain View for North  
35 Bayshore they use two tools. One is the use of transferrable development rights and the other one is  
36 the habitat overlay zone. What they've done in North Bayshore is that near the parks or near the  
37 creeks, there is habitat overlay zone which means that you cannot build higher than what there is now  
38 or one or two stories, I don't remember. Then, if you removed any of those buildings and returned it to  
39 park, buffers, opens pace, you could get developmental rights to build more somewhere else. I think  
40 that for some of the areas in the City these could be good tools. I wouldn't use it uniformly, but I think  
41 it's something we should consider as tools to create more park area or more open space area or restore  
42 habitat in areas where it's possible and preserve it and create buffers in sensitive areas. I don't really  
43 have a lot of answers to prioritize areas. Again, I do think that the East Meadow could be reopened and  
44 looked at again into what potential we have there under current circumstances. I think things have



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 changed. In terms of the jobs, I do think small offices are a real need. I know a lot of people got evicted  
2 because companies, big companies bought the buildings they were in. Now, they are just working from  
3 home or find other ways to not have to commute too far. I think it's needed. Thank you.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Doria followed by Elaine.

6  
7 **Doria Summa:** I would like to share Alex and Shani's concern about small retail. I think when buildings  
8 get redeveloped, we don't just—I mean small office—lose retail, we also lose a lot of small proprietors  
9 who have little offices that serve people. Losing that is just going to mean more driving for everybody. I  
10 wanted to agree with Annette's concerns about Airbnb and Code enforcement. I'd also like to add to  
11 that that there's ground-floor retail loopholes built into the Code where it can convert to office. I think  
12 we should close that in the Code. I wanted to agree with Jen about the Fry's subarea and the need for a  
13 park there. I like Shani's new policy idea about ecologically resilient landscape and Arthur's ideas about  
14 looking into hotel FAR and impact fees. I wanted to add in Goal L-3 which is about residential  
15 neighborhoods. I think that we should add a policy that protects residential streets from being used to  
16 park commuter cars, and that would be Citywide. I think that's it.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine followed by Whitney.

19  
20 **Elaine Uang:** I also want to stress connections to all other Elements, and several have been mentioned,  
21 transportation, housing. Hamilton's right. Having worked on the Housing Element with Bonnie, there  
22 are a lot of really good ideas. I would actually like to see us move beyond that and go further a little bit,  
23 because housing is such a crucial issue. I think we have to also think about how our level of growth has  
24 been relative to the region. I think every city in some ways needs to look at itself and do its part. We  
25 may think that housing has been a lot, and it has had serious impacts with the schools. I think on a  
26 relative basis compared to a lot of other communities, if you look at our trajectory over the last 40, 50  
27 years, it's been very different from some of neighboring communities. Some of our other neighboring  
28 communities have really shouldered the burden in terms of the regional housing demand. I second  
29 Heidi with community services and childcare and after care, community centers and linking land use  
30 with that. I also agree with many of the statements that Shani, Doria, Jennifer have made about parks. I  
31 think looking at the Community Services Element and tightening that with land uses is a really important  
32 thing, particularly since there was an emphasis by Council for healthy communities and healthy  
33 populations. I think we really need to think about the way that our overall land use is and are we maybe  
34 even alienating certain populations, alienating teens, alienating young families, alienating seniors,  
35 alienating those who have real physical challenges within our City. We need to closely look at some of  
36 those, how we can sort of integrate certain functions and services within our residential neighborhoods,  
37 but also our mixed-use areas and employment centers. I think if we think about how—I mean, one of  
38 the things that I would really like to look at is going beyond monoculture. A lot of our traffic problems  
39 are driven by monoculture. You do one thing here, and then you do another thing there and you do  
40 another thing there. There's a concept of maybe you can park once and just do everything all at once.  
41 Communities historically have all grown up around the concept of layering and being very compact. In  
42 the last—I don't know—50, 60 years since the '60s, post-war, I think we've gone away from that. We've  
43 forgotten about really good principles of how to plan our communities and our land use. I think going  
44 back to those principles are good. It's not just good for our communities, good for health, it's





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 environmental sustainability. I want to call attention to this guideline that I found recently from the  
2 League of Conservation Voters, Santa Clara County, environmental sustainability principles for local  
3 government. This was written in 2009 for Earth Day. There are a lot of really great principles that I  
4 would just encourage you to kind of think about as we go through all of these discussions, through all of  
5 the Elements. In light of Paris, local actions have a lot of larger consequences. Especially we know that  
6 for climate change. The present is borrowed from the future. Maybe we have a great quality of life, we  
7 had a great quality of life 20 years ago. Were we borrowing from our life today in terms of affordability  
8 and in terms of our children, our children's teachers? I just want you to think about that. Thanks.  
9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Whitney followed by Alex.  
11

12 **Whitney McNair:** I think, Don, you made a comment about having the Elements sort of—that you don't  
13 repeat everything in every Element. Otherwise, each of these Elements will be just enormous. Plus,  
14 different things belong in different chapters of the Comp Plan. I see them as all pieces to the puzzle,  
15 that when you read them together give you the picture for the whole. What I continually hear as sort of  
16 the most important Elements or the ones that are tied together the most are the Transportation, Land  
17 Use and Housing Elements. I think there's something to be said for that. Those are the significant pieces  
18 within the community. What's missing from that is really the employment districts and the employment  
19 business piece. When you look at the existing Comp Plan, the business piece, there's one policy on the  
20 Stanford Research Park. There's two policies about all employment districts. There really isn't that  
21 much in the land use piece. Where you find that information is in the Business and Economics Element.  
22 I oftentimes see that it's easier to discount that Element with changing politics. It is just a fact. It's sort  
23 of easier to say that isn't appropriate right now. Again, if it's all pieces to the puzzle, then there needs to  
24 be a way to kind of tie all those things together where they have equal weight and not just have three  
25 really important ones and then some that support it. I mean, the same rings true for the parks piece or  
26 the safety piece or different pieces. They all should be sort of considered at the same level.  
27

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Whitney. Alex.  
29

30 **Alex Van Riesen:** I think they had the statistics for businesses and how much they were submitting to  
31 the compliance for the Business Registry. I just wondered if we require 100 percent compliance on that.  
32 It's at 69 percent. It seems like if we're going to do some kind of data for business, we somehow create  
33 some positive and negative inducements or motivators to get 100 percent compliance. I don't see why  
34 we'd settle for 69 percent. Also, I want to agree with those who said about office and R&D cap.  
35 Enforcement, there seems little with regards to that. On page 16, I just want to highlight again under  
36 the numbers that they give for retail space, office, restaurant, there's no hotel. I think those should be  
37 included there. I wanted to highlight at the very bottom it says the City's Architectural Review Board is  
38 charged with design review of all new construction and changes and additions to commercial, industrial  
39 and multiple family projects. There has been increased scrutiny on this process and the desire to see  
40 more harmonious connection between new buildings and the existing environment by some in the  
41 community. I have not experienced that exactly. Again, reflecting back on my experience at 744 San  
42 Antonio, I do think what's driven there is that, if we look at it—I don't know the exact stats and I'd love  
43 to see the differences in how much housing we've built as opposed to hotel or long-term suites. My  
44 suggestion is that money is driving that or there's something behind that that there's a huge gain



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 between these hotels and suites. I guess we have to ask what are we buying there and what are we  
2 losing as we build those units. I also want to agree with the 50-foot height limit. Also, I just want to go  
3 back. Something I mentioned during the services segment is that we need a master plan for Cubberley.  
4 I want to suggest that as a part of the Land Use segment, there's some kind of directive for the City to  
5 have some master plan used for its component. I don't know how the School District factors into this. I  
6 don't know if Heidi's still here. I don't know if you know this, but in 2019 the deal between the City and  
7 the School District is up. The City owns 8 acres; the School District owns 17, I think if I'm not mistaken.  
8 Obviously there's a high-spirited conversation going on about what's going to happen with that 17 acres.  
9 Where is there a plan or where is there an impetus for a plan that's related to these different things that  
10 we're talking about here? How do we integrate Cubberley into these conversations and how do we sort  
11 of force that to happen?

12

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Planning Director.

14

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks. Just a quick response on the Business Registry. There's actually an update  
16 going on tonight to the Policy and Services Committee. I think the data in your staff report is from  
17 August. We've achieved a much better compliance. We're not at 100, but we're really close. I think  
18 that program is up and running. Hopefully in a few years, we'll have good, consistent data on jobs and  
19 employment densities that we can use for planning purposes.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Heidi is not here. We will go to Adrian and then Arthur.

22

23 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. I just have a couple points of agreement and some of disagreement. Start with  
24 the agreements. Dan, thanks for your comments about the jobs balance. I think that's something we  
25 could all focus on in terms of how land use, transportation and jobs all interact and feed into each other.  
26 Maybe it can help guide our next discussions on this topic. A few people brought up the issue of hotels.  
27 I think it's kind of relevant now, because we do have these two projects or one project, two hotels  
28 coming up on San Antonio. Maybe it's worth a bit more discussion on this Committee. Some issues  
29 where I had a little bit of issue. The current interim growth cap on office and R&D space is an interim  
30 cap. I'm not personally comfortable with it being included in the Comprehensive Plan, particularly as we  
31 do look at—some folks have brought up the issue of small office space. To accommodate that, you need  
32 more office space in general actually, and the office cap doesn't help us accomplish that. In terms of  
33 adjacency issues, Arthur, I kind of disagree with you. I'm not always convinced that you need to have  
34 residential next to residential or small scale next to small scale. Sometimes I think you can mix it up and  
35 actually have some pretty interesting results. Of course, that has to be contextualized. The last issue is  
36 a few folks have brought up the Airbnb. I know the Council discussed it a few months ago. They didn't  
37 really seem to come to any conclusion about what's happening, what we should do as a City to regulate  
38 it. I think we all need to keep that in mind. It's such a new use in land use and policy, not many cities  
39 are really successfully tackling it. I would caution us to keep that in mind as we do look at the  
40 Comprehensive Plan and what we may have to do with shared services.

41

42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Arthur and then Julia.

43



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Arthur Keller:** Firstly with respect to Airbnb, people heard that San Francisco turned down their  
2 ordinance. They actually turned the revision to their ordinance. They have an ordinance in place. It  
3 seems to be working pretty well which is why people turned down the ordinance that was proposed  
4 and, therefore, Palo Alto should look at that ordinance and see how well it might apply, the ordinance  
5 from San Francisco. Secondly, the issue of housing sites on the Housing Element list. It's fairly easy for  
6 us to amend the Housing Element list of housing sites and present that to the HCD and get it amended,  
7 as long as we're not changing any policies and programs and whatever. Fairly trivial, as far as I  
8 understand it. If staff disagrees, they can add on there.

9  
10 **Jeremy Dennis:** No problem. I'll wait until you're done, and then (inaudible).

11  
12 **Arthur Keller:** With respect to housing impacts, we need to understand what kind of housing we build  
13 and what the impacts of that housing is. We can't just build housing without considering the impacts. In  
14 fact, we don't build housing; it's actually private landowners that build the housing. The City zones for  
15 housing; it's the landowners that build the housing. We need to consider that. Those impacts can  
16 include schools. For example, the School District projections say that there's going to be a slowdown in  
17 the growth of schools. That's because they're not considering any housing that comes online other than  
18 the ones that have already been proposed. If you don't consider any housing unless it's already been  
19 proposed, then of course you'd assume the school growth will slow down. If you basically continue to  
20 build large units, then you're going to have continued growth in schools. People talk about transit-  
21 oriented housing. People want housing near transit, mainly like Caltrain. Housing that's near Caltrain  
22 means we're building housing for people to work in other cities. That's not necessarily what we want. I  
23 mean, I think that the issue is that what we want is housing for people who are working here, so that  
24 we're reducing the commuter load and people can bike to work or whatever. If you're building housing  
25 near transit, that's another thing. That's why I'm in favor of thinking about housing near services.  
26 Transit is just another service. It's really housing near retail, housing near schools, housing near parks.  
27 Those are the kinds of things that are services; they're community facilities. Those are where we will  
28 need to locate housing. I think that that's what we need to consider and think about it in terms of what  
29 the impacts are and think about the kind of housing we want to build. Thank you.

30  
31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Julia and then Steve.

32  
33 **Julia Moran:** Just on what a lot of people have talked about, wanting to preserve the small, mom-and-  
34 pop businesses which I think is fantastic. We need to have much, much stronger incentives for small  
35 businesses if we're going to do that or targeted density. Just to compare, I own a small business in New  
36 York City with about 20,000 people worth of foot traffic a day, and the leases in the area are between  
37 \$100 and \$120 a square foot annually. Here, Downtown leases are \$70 to \$80 a square foot. Along  
38 California Avenue, they're around \$50 a square foot. We're not New York City. We're not going to have  
39 that density. The prices are not realistic if we want to preserve those type of businesses. We need to  
40 figure out a policy in order to do that.

41  
42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve and then Annette.

43



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Stephen Levy:** Is it on? Yeah, I can hear that. It really goes back to what Lisa and others have said.  
2 Housing is who we want to be in 15 years. I joke with Greg Schmid. When I first met him and helped on  
3 his School Board campaign 30 years ago, we were both married, we both had kids in school, we were  
4 both economists. Economists make a decent living, but we don't code. We could own a house and raise  
5 a family. We can't now. In our home, my son and daughter lived near their kindergarten teacher who  
6 was our age. That can't happen now. They don't get that experience, and we don't get the ability to  
7 attract teachers or firefighters or public safety officials to live anywhere near where they work to be part  
8 of our community. Housing is not just buildings and money and impacts and all that. It means we're  
9 just going to be older homeowners like I am, who have lived here for 40 years, or very young rich  
10 people. That's where we're going if we don't allow a diversity. The other point is—I'll be an economist  
11 for a minute, since Dan brought it up. What I hear in the room doesn't compute with being a high  
12 service community. What I hear is let's have limits on office, let's have limits on hotels, let's have limits  
13 on the stuff that produce revenue and support retail. I don't know what. I don't know how we pay for  
14 the services. I think it would be good, Hillary and Jeremy, if there were some way—I know that we're  
15 doing a fiscal analysis of land use alternatives, if somehow that could be brought to us so we don't have  
16 to go to it. I think in the end when we decide on the Land Use and all these Elements, we ought to at  
17 least be briefed on the fiscal impacts and be able to discuss that. Is that going to be possible?  
18

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thanks, Steve. The fiscal analysis is in the final stages of staff review. It will be going to  
20 the Finance Committee on February 2nd. It will be made available widely including at this body. It will  
21 have some of the data (crosstalk).  
22

23 **Stephen Levy:** No, I mean I understand that. I'm saying could somebody come here for half an hour or  
24 do we have to go to it and then we all come back, having just heard what we heard rather than having a  
25 discussion here about it? I'm just following up on what Dan said. That's an important element.  
26

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Annette then Lisa and then Don.  
28

29 **Annette Glanckopf:** Five fast points. The airport, I respectfully disagree. It's a jewel for our City. Not  
30 only is it an issue with liquefaction as far as building housing, but also the wildlife needs to be preserved.  
31 If we ever had a disaster, it would be absolutely vital. Second, I agree with we need retail at East  
32 Meadow and Fry's. Also, there's needs to be open space in any design. I agree with mixed use if it's  
33 tastefully done, mixed use being retail and housing. I think we must find a way. In the past we've been  
34 reluctant to designate sites for one special category for teachers, for first responders. We need to figure  
35 out how to do that. Other cities have. My other concern is architecture. Mountain View has done  
36 some beautiful projects. Our City, I just cringe when I see some of the mediocre designs of our new  
37 mixed use and multi-housing. Commercial zoning, I'm very concerned about the loss of neighborhood  
38 retail due to the rising rents versus their income. Also, the proliferation in every center—Midtown is  
39 just as bad as anyone else—with restaurants and nail salons, I think we could fix that with zoning. Two  
40 similar, large retail, Walgreens and CVS next to each other, that doesn't make any sense to me. Again,  
41 zoning. Finally, we haven't talked about spot zoning or changing zoning. Maybe we haven't had  
42 anything, discussion about PCs. I am very, very concerned when a project comes in and wants to have  
43 zoning changed for the project. Finally, I agree with consistency within the Comp Plan between various



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 Elements and no redundancy. I think it's really big if you try to put everything in every chapter. I'd like  
2 to see things streamlined.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Lisa and then Don.

5

6 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** This is actually following up on what Bonnie was saying and what I'd raised at the  
7 last meeting, what's our role here and what does the City Council really want from us and what can we  
8 add the most value on. I do agree with Bonnie. It's interesting, but so far it seems to me we are just  
9 sharing our personal views, kind of snippets of a piece of something. Even in the action element, I didn't  
10 feel like we were really contributing something that was going to move it very far forward. That is my  
11 view on it. I would like to, not tonight, have a clearer understanding of what really is our purpose and  
12 how can we add that most value to the City Council. My gut feeling is that it's what Bonnie says, pick a  
13 topic and really get with it and potentially even then recommend something back to the staff but also to  
14 the City Council, say this is what we believe and share the ideas and if we can pick some pieces of it. I  
15 just think it will be more useful and maybe move us further along in the planning process, in my view.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** I have some comments, but I'm going to save those until after Don. I think that's the  
18 last card I see. Amy.

19

20 **Don McDougall:** First I want to thank Whitney, I think, for the support of the concept of building a  
21 matrix. If not deliberately building a matrix, that we look at at least thinking in terms of a matrix of  
22 what's in what Element. The idea that these components are different than the goals and  
23 transportation is all through them and where do they all fit. I really want to reiterate I think that's  
24 important. I want to reiterate that I think it's important that it not be just the three goals. I appreciate  
25 Bonnie's support of the idea of looking at it that way, but she stuck with the three initial components of  
26 the structure. I think as soon as you say residential neighborhoods, that's pejorative relative to  
27 residential neighborhoods, Eichler homes or whatever. I think maybe it isn't meant to mean that, but it  
28 implies that as opposed to multifamily, mixed use. I think there should be more than just the three  
29 components to the structure. I think it should include transportation as well. The third thing I would say  
30 is there's been lots of talk about hotels versus retail and whatnot. I support and agree with a lot of the  
31 conversation, but we have to continue to remember that it's all an economic issue. It's sad that we're  
32 losing book stores, but we're not losing book stores just because the retail space is so expensive. We're  
33 losing book stores because everybody's buying their books on Amazon. The economy of the world and  
34 the economy of our neighborhood is changing. We need to find a way to think of the future in what  
35 we're doing, not just today's problems but tomorrow's problems because those economies are  
36 changing. That's substantially what's affecting us. Thank you.

37

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Amy.

39

40 **Amy Sung:** I try not to speak too loud. It just popped into my mind, I wonder what's happening to the  
41 supermarket at the Edgewood Plaza, has been missing for some time. We were so overjoyed when it  
42 came, and it suddenly went away. I actually wanted to talk about affordable housing. In Palo Alto,  
43 there's hardly any house that is sold less than \$2 million. As we promote and want to encourage the  
44 diversity in our City, we need to put the really, really money behind our wishes. I have been thinking



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 that Cupertino, I think have (inaudible), is constructing to support their teachers. In Palo Alto I think that  
2 it is very difficult. I think in my 7, 8 years doing business, I have only come across one teacher that  
3 successfully purchased a house in Mountain View. Affordable housing, I was wondering that you  
4 mention the City revenue comes in largely because of real estate income. In every residential  
5 transaction there is a City transfer tax. I often wonder and being asked what has happened to that pile  
6 of money and has it been tied into affordable housing. I was thinking that if the City or the school can  
7 use that as a part of some sort of index to encourage hiring—how to pay for house these teachers or the  
8 emergency responders people and somehow tied it into the second units, that might be something in  
9 short term we can do. I am really thinking that a lot of windfall had come to our City. If we are serious  
10 about affordable housing, this might be something to look into. Thank you.

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think that's the end of the comments. Bonnie, sorry.

13

14 **Bonnie Packer:** Just a few things. Because I was talking about process before, I wanted to mention  
15 some substantive things. Amy, thank you for mentioning a possibility of maybe using the documentary  
16 transfer tax as another source of revenue for affordable housing. The big elephant in the closet is the  
17 cost of real estate, not only for homes but for office space, all this. I don't know—there's only such  
18 much government can do about the marketplace, but maybe there's something in the Comp Plan that  
19 we could explore avenues where we through policy decisions can affect the marketplace so maybe the  
20 cost of housing would become more affordable for the middle people for whom there are no programs  
21 in place for subsidized housing, for people at the middle income levels. Another item I want to mention  
22 is all this discussion about office caps, it's like it's currently in the news. It's the big hot button issue. It's  
23 a temporary thing. It's kind of like all of a sudden we're reacting very strongly to a situation that people  
24 are concerned about with some drastic measures like caps. It's almost like the way certain politicians  
25 are responding to the terrorist attacks. It's like keep out all the offices because we don't want all these  
26 people coming to our town. I don't think we should put caps in the Comp Plan. If anything, it might be  
27 something you want to look at in the Business Element, but not in the Land Use Element. It's just too  
28 temporary a situation that we shouldn't be putting into a 20-year plan. The other thing I want to  
29 mention—it's mentioned in Land Use Element now and a little bit in the Housing Element—if we could  
30 really focus more on defining good transitions between different uses, that I think would ease a lot of  
31 concerns about preserving residential neighborhoods, multifamily. A lot of our neighborhoods just are  
32 right against commercial centers. We don't have transitions in place. Look at the shallow lots on El  
33 Camino. There are single-family houses right behind. East Meadow Circle is right up against R-1. We  
34 have to think more about land use decisions for those areas that border our different uses. Maybe we  
35 can think of some policies in the Land Use Element for that. Thank you.

36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just a couple of comments on the heels of yours. I do think that one of the largest  
38 issues that we face is the scale of planning. The Comp Plan paints with a very broad brush, but the  
39 issues that we deal with are very granular. Finding ways to focus in on block-by-block sort of  
40 understandings of impacts I think is going to be key. The opportunity to create specific plans, etc., is  
41 going to be the likely place for us to address that. About the limits, I am not afraid of having limits in a  
42 city. What is of interest to me, though, is the Policy L-8 was created—the limit that was created there  
43 was created directly out of the traffic report that was done back in the '90s. That was derived from an  
44 algorithm however close or broadly it was done. There was some data that drove that number into



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 place. I'm very anxious and very interested to learn what the more recent study that's being done is, so  
2 that we can have a more substantive conversation about what the numbers should be and if they should  
3 be applied, etc. I'm sort of waiting for that information until really next year. Hopefully we'll be able to  
4 have a more interesting conversation around that.

## 5 6 **4. Subcommittee assignments**

### 7 8 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** To your, Lisa's and Don's—wherever you went—comments regarding the deeper  
10 discussions. I believe the discussions that we want to have around land and land use is the key piece  
11 that the Council wants us to dig into. As evidence of that, I will share a little bit of the conversation that  
12 Arthur and I and Jeremy have had in the couple of weeks leading up to tonight's discussion where we  
13 had, I would characterize it as a very lively debate about how we were going to organize this first  
14 meeting. We had a variety of opinions, some voiced enthusiastically by all three of us. Occasionally,  
15 they overlapped. We realized, I think, and perhaps in Jeremy's wisdom, that we should perhaps ask you  
16 what's important to you, so that we could get some feedback and begin to understand how we should  
17 structure the rest of the conversations. I think this has gone a long way to helping us with that. I,  
18 personally, and I think the rest of us are very interested in having a more substantive discussion and  
19 potentially debate about a variety of these topics. This is the opportunity for us to air all of this stuff. I  
20 think we all want to get to it. The only downside is that the next time we're going to be talking about  
21 this is in about two months or so. So be it. If there's nothing else...

22  
23 **Male:** (inaudible)

24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah. Then I'll take—is there any more conversation that we need to have around the  
26 sort of continuous improvement topic? We'll come back to you, Ellen, in one second. Go ahead,  
27 Jeremy.

28  
29 **Jeremy Dennis:** Just a few things. First, Arthur, you made a comment around going back to HCD. I think  
30 traditionally we have viewed the specifics related to sites as something a little bit easier to do with  
31 them. I think in recent years that conversation has become a little more cumbersome and challenging. I  
32 just wanted to put that out there. Staff's thinking on what that may mean is something more than what  
33 we've seen in the past related to opening up the process. We'll talk to the Council and see where that  
34 goes. I appreciated Dan's comments just a moment ago. I think this group needs to give itself a little  
35 more credit in that there has been some fun debates and discussions. That has occurred here. We've  
36 also benefited from the fact that we've dealt with some Elements that are in some ways a little easier to  
37 grapple with. They're not as complicated or as controversial. There's been broad agreement on many  
38 of the concepts that have been thrown about. I've certainly heard in the four or five months we've been  
39 doing this some disagreements back and forth. I think that has occurred. Dan and Arthur and I, as we  
40 talked about this, did recognize though that this is the big Element, and this is the Element where  
41 there's going to be some disagreements, and there's going to be some controversies. We want to  
42 provide the best opportunity to vet those with the group. Tonight as an opening salvo—I use that  
43 word—it was good to hear where we think things are going. It helps us get a better idea of how to



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 structure that. We will reinforce every opportunity to provide that kind of venue, because that sounds  
2 like where people want to go. That's very much appreciated, so thank you.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy, do you mean to say we might be disagreeing on something else other than  
5 airports?

6

7 **Jeremy Dennis:** Perhaps.

8

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** All right. Ellen and then Don and then Elaine.

10

11 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** This may be a question for Hillary or Andrew. I see that the digital commenter is going  
12 to go up on January 4 on the land use. What draft of the land use are you going to put up on the digital  
13 commenter? What are you looking for from the people who are going to comment? It would help  
14 guide, because I really like encouraging citizens to give their opinions and give their thoughts. I think the  
15 digital commenter is a wonderful invention, but I'd like to know what you want to get out of it.

16

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure. I can answer that question for you, Ellen. With the similar requests that we've  
18 made of the public with the digital commenter in the previous Elements, we're going to ask people to  
19 comment on a variety of different sections of the Element based on those areas that we think deserve  
20 the kind of attention. It could be a pretty comprehensive set of areas where people can comment. I  
21 appreciate your comments on the success of this. We think it's been incredibly successful. Every time  
22 we put something out, we see more and more people going onto it. I don't have the specific questions  
23 just yet. We're kind of going through that process. We'll let you know what that looks like. As long  
24 you're encouraging people to go on it, we'll take those comments. It's been really great.

25

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don and then Elaine.

27

28 **Don McDougall:** Jeremy, are you suggesting that the next round might be more structured? We had a  
29 conversation tonight where everybody got to talk random topics all the way around, quite frankly.  
30 Would the next conversation be one where we would pick a goal and discuss that, and then go to the  
31 next goal?

32

33 **Jeremy Dennis:** We collectively wanted to hear how the conversation went tonight by just going a first  
34 round and seeing the kinds of issues that people brought up. That gives us some sense of how to  
35 structure things. We'll have a further conversation or two, I'm sure, related to what that specifically  
36 looks like. We have a limited amount of time to do this, to go through all the rest of the Elements, to do  
37 our subcommittee work. I want to figure out ways to balance the Committee's limited time. Right now  
38 we're meeting once a month, and we meet for about three hours to discuss items. We've certainly seen  
39 in previous discussions we don't get through everything. We may only get through a couple of goals,  
40 three goals, four goals. I also want to preserve two aspects that I think we've pretty good at. One is to  
41 allow every member who brings a certain set of expertise, experiences and understanding of their  
42 community to share those items, put them out. That's why you're here, and also to help generate that  
43 further discussion. That's hard to do in three hours, to try to do everything.





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Don McDougall:** Isn't that the opportunity, when you're only meeting once a month, to use the idea of  
2 subcommittees? I think I would encourage staff and the Co-Chairs to readdress the question with  
3 Council whether subcommittees were for a total Element or whether you could take a subsection of an  
4 Element, like the airport, and have a subcommittee that was specific to that, so you'd have fewer people  
5 come back to this group having had serious discussions rather than having everybody (inaudible) that. I  
6 don't believe that the Council meant that we only had to have subcommittees on Elements as opposed  
7 to subsections.  
8

9 **Jeremy Dennis:** I agree with that assessment. I also do not believe that I heard them suggest that there  
10 would be a lot of subcommittees. I think that they recognize just the fact that we have subcommittees  
11 now creates an enormous amount of work. I mean, I'm not complaining. I think the subcommittee  
12 process has been very enjoyable and useful.  
13

14 **Don McDougall:** Could they be...  
15

16 **Jeremy Dennis:** They've also been created to do very specific tasks that were adopted by this body  
17 (crosstalk).  
18

19 **Don McDougall:** Properly used, they could create less work for you, not more work for you, I believe.  
20

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks everybody. I wanted to just add my observations. I think this Element of our  
22 Comprehensive Plan is something special. I think it's special because it's kind of the heart of the Plan,  
23 but also because it's one of the best Elements of the Plan, in my view. I mean, a lot of care and  
24 attention was put into it when it was crafted originally. The organizational structure of it is a little  
25 windy, a little extended—I don't know what the right term is—which is I think why the Planning  
26 Commissioners tried to do a wholesale reorganization of it. The Council has now given us clear direction  
27 to stay very close to the original vision, to stay pretty close to the original goals and to make some very  
28 specific changes. I think that direction plus the thoughts that you've given us tonight will give Jeremy  
29 and the Co-Chairs a good starting place to come back with a real structure for the next conversation. I  
30 think many of you are asking for that, and there is a way to do that whether it's goal by goal or district  
31 by district, organization by organization, or some other means. I think we should we let them debate  
32 that, as I'm sure they will, and come back to us and just be assured that we will have a more structured  
33 conversation. It'll probably include this kind of around the table once or twice, but within that structure  
34 and really try and move this ahead. We did originally have three open forums, kind of brainstorming  
35 meetings on the Land Use Element, and one meeting to wrap it altogether into a draft. I think we're  
36 recognizing—we've already cut out one of those brainstorming meetings. I think we're recognizing that  
37 potentially it's going to take more time. Don is right that the subcommittee may be able to help us to  
38 backfill some of that. We may in the end need to schedule at least another meeting on Land Use before  
39 we're done. Sorry to get long winded about it. Keep up the good work. This is the fun part.  
40

41 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine and then Arthur, and then I think I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.  
42

43 **Elaine Uang:** I just wanted to build off on some of the suggestions made about process and how to  
44 attack some of these big questions. I mean, it seems like in the packet there are clearly some very big



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 chunks that Council directed, L-8 and the growth management piece is one. Housing seems to be  
2 another one that the Council addressed and has been raised here tonight. There's a lot of discussion  
3 about retail preservation and protection, these types of issues. I wonder if maybe that is—those are  
4 three big starting points that we can take for the next two or however many meetings we do Land Use.  
5 Whether we take that tack or we take Bonnie and Don's suggestion of looking at residential  
6 neighborhoods and employment centers and mixed use centers, I do want to put in a good word for  
7 Don's suggestion at a previous meeting which was maybe—I sent this out in my packet. Austin did a  
8 very good community character manual. I might suggest that as sort of homework, however you decide  
9 to organize this—this is after all our Land Use and Community Design Element—that maybe we all solicit  
10 one or two images, good examples of places that we like either here or from other locations, if we're  
11 talking about, say, housing or multifamily housing or if we're talking about employment centers. Use  
12 that and kind of generate a little visual library for us to kind of understand what is good about different  
13 things. We talked a lot about transitions, so maybe that's sort of another way so we can all sort of build  
14 tools and information for each other.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm going to risk my Co-Chair's patience here for just a moment. Straw poll, just a  
17 show of hands. May or may not happen. Would there be greater interest to focus on the issues that  
18 generate the broadest spectrum of comments or to structure conversation around the sort of inherent  
19 structure of the Element? The broadest, by way of example, Elaine's organization of say L-8, housing  
20 and retail—those were generating a lot of comments—versus neighborhood and commercial  
21 employment. I'll just ask you. If you are more interested in having a long conversation around the  
22 topics that generated the most spectrum of comments, raise your hands. Comments today, yeah. I'm  
23 thinking tonight we hear, as Elaine had mentioned, that there were—I'm going to characterize it as a  
24 wide spectrum of comments around L-8, housing and retail. I might include airplane or the airport as  
25 well. Would that be a more interesting or a better way for us to spend our time going forward, to focus  
26 on those things, versus a more evenhanded, structured approach—I shouldn't say evenhanded—a more  
27 structured approach where we talk about, say, neighborhood, commercial and employment centers?  
28 I'm just wondering.

29  
30 **Annette Glanckopf:** I can't agree either one of those if the Council's direction was to keep the Comp  
31 Plan fairly similar. I have always said we should look at the goals one-by-one, because I think you'll have  
32 the discussions in that area. Otherwise, we're just going to be having a wonderful time interacting with  
33 each other as opposed to really getting down to the goals, what we should change in the programs and  
34 policies. I think that will come out of that type of practice or structure.

35  
36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Before we go on, I'd be interested, for those that want to stick around for it, for some  
37 more comments around that. Arthur was next, so let me get to him, and then I'll take some more  
38 comments.

39  
40 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, I'm wondering the degree to which the Council has reserved that they're going  
41 to focus and give us more direction on growth and grown management or whether that's something for  
42 us to deal with. I mean, after all, there's a balance between what we talked about today, about growth  
43 and quality of life, and how that impacts land use. An example of that in consequences is if you build  
44 more housing for families and that means that the schools grows and if there's not more land for



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 building more schools, then there will be more students on a given school site. That means there's more  
2 competition for playground space which means more bullying. There's all these consequences that  
3 come along when you think about things. Therefore, what I'm wondering is the degree to which we will  
4 deal with this ourselves or whether we'll get more direction from Council on the growth management  
5 issues in general.

6  
7 **Jeremy Dennis:** I think it was November 2nd when they had this conversation. The Council split the  
8 discussion into two pieces ultimately, because the discussion was getting lengthy and they wanted to  
9 get through Elements. One was kind of a master motion on a variety of things that they wanted to take  
10 action on. One was related to L-8. They did not complete the L-8 discussion. We're anticipating that  
11 that discussion will continue at some point early next year to finish that aspect of their work. In your  
12 packets on page 5, 6, is the full motion from the full Council. I think it was referenced from a couple of  
13 people tonight. Multiple elements within the motion. There are some that obviously are related to  
14 growth issues, but I do believe that the Council still wants to retain the authority to discuss L-8 at a later  
15 date. We hope to do that again early next year.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Any more comments on process or recommendations for how we structure the  
18 conversation going forward? I kind of got it, but...

19  
20 **Male:** (inaudible)

21  
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Okay, goal-by-goal.

23  
24 **Male:** Or a group of goals.

25  
26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Or a group of goals. Organizing it by goal essentially though.

27  
28 **Female:** (inaudible)

29  
30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Separated out.

31  
32 **Female:** (inaudible)

33  
34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, got you. Bonnie.

35  
36 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm getting a little confused about how we're going to go. If we discuss substantive  
37 issues as a group, I would hope that Staff would get the ideas from that discussion, look at the '98 Plan  
38 and say, "The '98 Plan does that. It addresses that issue. From the discussion, maybe we have to go  
39 further on this particular policy or program." That's what I was thinking. If we go goal-by-goal, policy-  
40 by-policy, we may miss something. When you're looking at what's there, you don't always think about  
41 what else there could be. You're limited by the structure that you're looking at. Do you know what I  
42 mean? If we come at it fresh from "let's talk about all these things we want to see, about how we want  
43 our residential neighborhoods to look when there's mixed use in it, when there's multifamily, when it's  
44 near a park, when it's next door to a commercial center, what do we do about it," then we get ideas.



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 Then you go back and look at what's already written and see how you can enhance what's already  
2 written.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex and then I'm going to entertain Don's motion here.

5

6 **Alex Van Riesen:** Be happy this is a very brief question. On the last page there's the CAC Land Use  
7 subcommittee member list. What needs to happen with that, if anything, before the next meeting?

8 **Jeremy Dennis:** Nothing needs to happen here. That's just the announcement of the list. We'll be in  
9 touch when appropriate to set up subcommittee meetings for that work to continue. Thank you.

10

11 **Future Meetings:**

12 1. January 19<sup>th</sup> Special Joint Meeting with City Council

13 2. January 26<sup>th</sup> CAC Special Meeting

14

15 **Adjournment:**

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don has moved that we adjourn the meeting. May I hear a second? From Annette.

17 All in favor. Opposed. That passes unanimously. It is 8:15. Thank you everyone. Happy holidays.