

**From:** [Harter, Pamela](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** resubmitting due not lack of my signature  
**Date:** Thursday, August 13, 2020 8:09:14 AM  
**Attachments:** [letter City of PA development 8-20.docx](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Thank you,

Pamela Harter  
765 San Antonio Rd. #86  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

**NOTICE:** This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.

8-12-20

Re: **proposed development on San Antonio Rd. 788-796**

To whom it may concern,

My name is Pamela Harter. I am a homeowner and taxpayer at 765 San Antonio Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303. My family has owned the property for over 40 years. I am also on the HOA board at Green House II.

I am concerned about the proposed project at 788- 796 San Antonio Rd. for many reasons. I will start by saying I am not opposed to development and smart growth. I am opposed to poorly considered development when traffic and parking are not considered. Or the full impact of a development is not considered.

- **Noise pollution** has and will continue to disrupt peace and quiet for years. Very negative impact on residents.
- **Traffic congestion-** total grid lock on San Antonio
- **Safety** cars will take a shortcut to try to beat the grid lock by coming into the complex and rushing to get to the other driveway and exit- very dangerous
- **Safety-** gridlock and access for emergency vehicles
- **Parking and density.** Adequate parking is needed. We depend on our 10 to 12 parking spaces along San Antonio Rd. have the parking for 40 years.
- **EIR** – does not seem legal to use this approval for other properties.
- **High Water table-** importance for protecting underground water- this is California after all
- **High density development** with little regard of impact of residents

**Noise pollution:** Our communities, both Greenhouse I and Greenhouse II, are adjacent to each other. Both condominium complexes are severely affected by the year and a half long, and still ongoing, hotel construction across the street. The contractor was given an allowance to start early before 8:00 am and also to pour cement in the middle of the night. Many of our residents are impacted severely by constant noise. There has been no peace and quiet.

**Traffic congestion:** Furthermore, our traffic is very congested and gridlocked on San Antonio. This is obviously due to being a main artery from east to west and that there has been massive development on the west end of San Antonio and the construction is still ongoing with another very large project that is relatively new.

**Safety and gridlock and access for emergency vehicles:** I have witnessed frustrated drivers caught in gridlock take a shortcut throughout complex to try to jump the line on 5 or 6 cars. This is very dangerous because they are in a hurry. I have been stuck in traffic coming from 101 for 20 or more minutes to drive a half mile distance. With severe gridlock an emergency vehicle will have a hard time getting into the complexes.

**Parking and density:** How much parking is the garage going to accommodate for this project. They can not push this under the rug and dismiss it. How are the retail businesses going to have adequate parking.

**The Street parking:** our condominiums have been able to use street parking -10 -12 spaces- along San Antonio Rd., for 40 years and are needed for residents and visitors. It is outrageous that you are considering taking it away because the demographics have changed since these condominiums were first built and we now have higher numbers of people living here now. Much greater density.

**EIR** – does not seem legal to use this approval for other properties

**High Water table-** protecting underground water, impacts of diverting the water with deep garages below water table. We cannot squander the underground water.

**High density development:** with little regard of impact on residents and quality of life. Traffic and parking are of great concern. The traffic is very grid locked. Parking is needed for the residents.

Pamela Harter

Concerned homeowner, longtime resident City of Palo Alto, taxpayer

VP Board member Greenhouse II

765 San Antonio Rd. #86,  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

831-818-3100

## Nguyen, Vinhloc

---

**From:** Scott O'Neil <scottoneil@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 12, 2020 9:27 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Unconventional idea for bike safety at Leghorn & San Antonio project

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Hi,

I had an idea for a bike safety mitigation at the Leghorn project. The site is directly across the street from The Greenhouse, a large multi-family community with a lot of lawn space that is increasingly expensive to water.

What if The Greenhouse were incentivized to open up a public right of way around an edge of their property, terminating at Sutherland, a residential street on the other side? This would open up basically all of Palo Alto to cyclists at the Leghorn project without having to use any difficult streets.

Moreover, it would help improve safe bike access to-and-from Mountain View. As you surely understand, bike safety within our towns is often stymied by lack of safe interfaces at the borders. A Sutherland-Greenhouse-Leghorn pathway would open up a new safe avenue. I've often wished for such a right-of-way when biking in the area.

-Scott

P.S. I might be able to help an interested party get in touch with their HOA board. Feel free to let me know if that is desired.

**From:** [Palo Alto Forward](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Item #3 Public Hearing on 788 San Antonio Road  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 11, 2020 9:18:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [Support for Housing on San Antonio.pdf](#)

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear Chair Templeton and Planning & Transportation Commission members,

I am writing on behalf of Palo Alto Forward in support of the staff recommendations with regard to the 788 San Antonio Road housing project and expansion of the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) to selected other areas on San Antonio Road.

As you know Palo Alto will be required to develop sites and policies in support of 2 to 3 times the city's housing goals under the current Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. The previous city decision to eliminate San Antonio Road sites was made with the hopes that sites in downtown, California Avenue and parts of El Camino would be sufficient to meet our housing goals. This has not happened and it is time to broaden the areas where new housing is allowed.

The proposed project at 788 San Antonio will make a needed addition to our housing stock as well as demonstrate the viability of the area for new housing. Approval of the project and needed zoning changes will send a signal to regional and state agencies that Palo Alto is taking our increased housing goals seriously and providing zoning and incentives to make such housing feasible.

The provisions for increased FAR and reduced retail requirements are similar to city policies already applied in other areas to make housing feasible. Palo Alto Forward supports the staff recommendation to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the potential historical building issue. The applicant has made provision to recognize the historical significance of the building on site and on a website. As with the North Ventura area Palo Alto Forward believes there are appropriate ways to acknowledge our history without denying much needed housing.

We have reviewed the EIR and note as indicated in the staff report that other potential environmental impacts are not significant or can be mitigated.

Please move the project and expansion of the HIP area along San Antonio forward as the next step in showing that local control in Palo Alto is consistent with adding the much needed housing.

Gail A. Price  
President, Palo Alto Forward Board

# PALO ALTO FORWARD

August 12, 2020

Re: Item #3 Public Hearing on 788 San Antonio Road

Dear Chair Templeton and Planning & Transportation Commission members,

I am writing on behalf of Palo Alto Forward in support of the staff recommendations with regard to the 788 San Antonio Road housing project and expansion of the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) to selected other areas on San Antonio Road.

As you know Palo Alto will be required to develop sites and policies in support of 2 to 3 times the city's housing goals under the current Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. The previous city decision to eliminate San Antonio Road sites was made with the hopes that sites in downtown, California Avenue and parts of El Camino would be sufficient to meet our housing goals. This has not happened and it is time to broaden the areas where new housing is allowed.

The proposed project at 788 San Antonio will make a needed addition to our housing stock as well as demonstrate the viability of the area for new housing. Approval of the project and needed zoning changes will send a signal to regional and state agencies that Palo Alto is taking our increased housing goals seriously and providing zoning and incentives to make such housing feasible.

The provisions for increased FAR and reduced retail requirements are similar to city policies already applied in other areas to make housing feasible. Palo Alto Forward supports the staff recommendation to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the potential historical building issue. The applicant has made provision to recognize the historical significance of the building on site and on a website. As with the North Ventura area Palo Alto Forward believes there are appropriate ways to acknowledge our history without denying much needed housing.

We have reviewed the EIR and note as indicated in the staff report that other potential environmental impacts are not significant or can be mitigated.

Please move the project and expansion of the HIP area along San Antonio forward as the next step in showing that local control in Palo Alto is consistent with adding the much needed housing.

Gail A. Price  
President, Palo Alto Forward Board

**From:** [Ted O'Hanlon](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** PTC 8/12, Item 3: 788 San Antonio Rd  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 11, 2020 9:32:18 AM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Greetings Commissioners

At tomorrow evening's PTC hearing the 102 unit project at 788 San Antonio is on the agenda.

In advance, if you are available and would like to connect for a brief Q&A, please let me know. We could do this by phone or video.

In advance, thanks for your consideration and review of the project.

Best Regards,  
Ted O'Hanlon  
Project Executive  
[tedohanlon@gmail.com](mailto:tedohanlon@gmail.com)  
415.317.5070 mobile/text

**From:** [slevy@ccsce.com](mailto:slevy@ccsce.com)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Cc:** [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Shikada, Ed](#)  
**Subject:** 788 San Antonio project and HIP expansion  
**Date:** Monday, August 10, 2020 12:02:07 PM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear Chair Templeton and PTC members,

Supporting the staff recommendation for the 788 San Antonio housing development and expansion of the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) to a broader area along San Antonio will provide three positive outcomes:

1. It will expand the available housing sites in our city, something urgently needed on several grounds,
2. It will move forward a project adding more than 100 new homes including 16 reserved for low income residents, and
3. It will send a signal to regional and state agencies that Palo Alto is serious about expanding housing opportunities and affordability

#### Background

This will be the first housing proposal to come before PTC since the 6th cycle (2022-2030) regional housing needs determination for the Bay Area was approved by the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Palo Alto's new city allocation will be between just over double the current allocation to probably three times or between 4,500 and 6,000 units.

The new Housing Element that Palo Alto needs to prepare must identify sites and policies to meet the overall unit goals and also by income group. The staff recommendation will be a step forward in meeting both of these goals.

The regional and Palo Alto RHNA goals include units for low, middle and higher income groups. A focus solely on units reserved for low income residents is not only difficult (only one has been approved recently after a long process) but also is contrary to the RHNA guidelines. And such a focus overlooks or dismisses the great need for housing that is affordable and available for moderate/middle income residents who do not qualify for subsidy but also cannot afford the \$2-3 million median prices for single family homes.

It is also true that many units reserved for low income residents come about as part of market rate developments that must meet the city goal of 15% BMR units including the proposed housing at 788 San Antonio.

I urge the commission to adopt the staff recommendation and not add conditions that affect project feasibility as housing projects must make financial sense (pencil out) to get financing and move forward,

#### The EIR

The proposals both for the project and HIP expansion got good marks in the EIR with many insignificant findings and some that can be easily mitigated. Please approve the staff recommendation for a Statement of Overriding Consideration for the potential historical building. There are ways proposed by the developer to preserve the memory of this building as with the cannery site in North Ventura that do not prevent the much needed housing from being built.

#### Local Control

I support local control if it means, as it should, that Palo Alto gets to decide how best to meet our housing goals. I do not support local control when it means Palo Alto gets to decide not to meet our housing goals. We do not have local control that says in Palo Alto you do not need a driver's license or sales of alcohol and tobacco to 10 year olds is legal. We do not get to pick which state laws and goals we wish to meet.

Support the staff recommendation and send a signal that Palo Alto intends to find ways to broaden housing access and affordability.

Stephen Levy