

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Norman H. Beamer](#); [Greg Welch](#); [Becky Sanders](#); [Beth Rosenthal](#); [Holzemer/hernandez](#); [Flaherty, Michelle](#); [Bob McGrew](#)
Subject: Please accept corrections/clarifications
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 8:13:25 AM

I composed my earlier email in a hurry before a early morning tour of Budapest. Changes are marked with brackets.

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

On Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 12:22:38 AM PDT, Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com> wrote:

I am on vacation and cannot attend your meeting. Unfortunately I have had little time to collect data for your discussion on May 30. Here are my areas of agreement and disagreement. Also there is a section for what I consider as major assumption **[s]** warranting indepth staff work.

Agreement

1. The requirements for very low income housing are generally correct. I have personally surveyed all of PAHC properties and subjectively there seems to be very low spillover from most properties. Exceptions are projects with very high density and working population which deserves [depends] upon automobile to work.
2. Auto ownership per capita may fall particularly as Stanford students and faculty concentrate on campus. The very nature of how Stanford organizes its students and faculty is unique. Housing and transportation services create unique impact on city staff analysis and I don't see that level of sophistication in staff forecast.
3. I agree with potential of shared parking in mixed us **[use]** has potential.

Disagreement

1. Studies of Palo Alto apartment parking are not documented by sources and potential conflict of interest. Any data from apartment owners and association must be considered with its inherent bias. For example, spillover from EPA apartment**[s]** continues further and further outside ever expanding no overnight parking RPP. I personally observed obvious spillover on the latest edge of this RPP. Please survey Lincoln. Please survey Curtner and Ventura which suggest higher density and high level of car ownership. It is quite possible homeowners and tenants do take alternate

mode of transportation to work.

2. There is no evidence whatsoever that car ownership is **[in]** high income area such Palo Alto has decreased in total. Ownership per capita may fall particularly as Stanford students and faculty concentrate on private housing. Does the data include or exclude campus centric housing?
3. Please discuss appropriate application of national and California trends to Palo Alto dependency upon car ownership. Also Palo Alto hardly qualifies for ready use of mass, public transit. Remember what Caltrain officials said about the Stanford GUP: There is no assurance that Caltrain in the future would be able to meet Stanford's stated reliance to meet needs of commuting employees, students and faculty.
4. I personally **[and informally]** have asked local Peninsula experts about the ability of any new level of Caltrain capacity to serve the growing expectation of TOD (commercial and housing) development along the entire Caltrain corridor. My person **[al]** inquiry is immaterial. The issue is that there is no known systematic survey or analysis of the impact of major TOD development. Therefore, **[staff]** assumptions are purely speculative.
5. Assumptions about senior housing may be speculative. Surveys should be undertaken with Channing House and Vi. I know from my own research of continuing care facilities (aka retirement centers) auto ownership is higher than common assumptions. The local market force**[s]** demand great amount of living space per unit and parking per unit.
6. Assumptions about effective TDM are also speculative. There is no evidence that city staff can monitor and enforce **[TDMs]**. Every sensible developer**[s]** will agree to TDM and there is no evidence in the FY19-23 operating and capital budgets to suggest that city government is prepared to manage parking or traffic with TDMs. In my honest appraisal of PA TMA, it will require**[d]** 2-3 years to prove its effectiveness. I am 110% supportive of expanded TMA as soon as possible to reach its minimum level of operational effectiveness.

Other factors

1. Survey of condo housing and parking is a missing metric. Resident leaders have started survey on condo parking, vehicle ownership, bedrooms, spillover parking and use of secure garage spaces. Use of garages is a particularly unknown factor as storage is a factor both for condos , **[apartments]** and private homes. Higher density per housing unit and downsizing appears to shift more storage to garages with displacement of overnight parking onsite and offsite. This is a factor to be considered before PTC makes conclusions.
2. City Council and staff avoid the high cost of free parking like the plague. I understand City decision to delay parking management(ending of free parking). But this is one of the key drivers of many assumptions considered on May 30. Until free parking is ended for University and California Ave commercial zones, there will be very limited impact on decreased use of autos in Palo Alto.
3. If Palo Alto want **[is forced]** to accept state mandated pressure for parking and traffic, then problems are likely to worsen. Is there a way to reduce the amount of political pressure and guesswork upon professional city management?

I look forward to PTC and Council discussions later this year. My bottom line is that too many naive assumptions are being made. Adequate staff analysis has not been

done because Palo Alto Planning Department does not have the resources to manage parking real time or in the future.

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

From: [CeCi Kettendorf](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Inadequate parking for multi-family developments
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 8:08:31 AM

Dear Commissioners:

The premise that Palo Alto has high quality mass transit would make a cat laugh. Until the day that Palo Alto's infrastructure is built to accommodate a car-less citizenry, Palo Altans will need vehicles and a place to park. Additionally, even those few residents who do not themselves drive will require parking for caregivers, agency officials, deliveries, contractors, visitors, friends and lovers.

By underparking the Ventura/Wilton 60 unit condo project, City Council has screwed the residents of the Ventura neighborhood who will have to absorb the extra 30 to 90 cars from that complex onto the narrow streets of the Ventura neighborhood, every day. It is a neighborhood of minorities who keep a low profile, a neighborhood which had not organized.

So it was easy for City Council to cave to a developer who wants to profit at the expense of those who live there. It is of note that, when City Council considered this issue, Greg Scharff asked thrice, without explanation, that Town and Country and Midtown be removed from the Overlay. Could it be that he was protecting his LLC real estate next to those sites from similar detriment while imposing a parking detriment on the Ventura neighborhood?

Why NOT build sufficient parking? The answer is that the developers want maximum profit, building units rather than parking spots. Betrayal of the public trust will be the paramount issue in Palo Alto in the November election. City officials who sacrifices neighborhoods to the profit of developers should be unseated.

I was present at the PTC meeting when you considered the Ventura/Wilton project. One of your commissioners, who was out of personal control, controlled the meeting at large. He shouted, accused, pulled his hair, leaned to the side, stood and pointed at an attendee who had addressed you from the podium previously. This commissioner sneered rhetorical questions at his fellow commissioners and city staff. The fact that his fellow Commissioners and staff stared forward in silence tells us you must be *so used* to his behavior! His reappointment by the Council progrowth majority is reflective of a contempt for the rule of law. The Council condones the Commissioner's disrespect for the chamber and the people because he votes their way. It is a slap in the face to those who come to city chambers in good faith expecting to be heard, who instead have their concerns derailed and unheard because of out of control antics.

The Ventura neighborhood was not heard that night. The Ventura neighborhood has not been heard at all.

CeCi Kettendorf

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Norman H. Beamer](#); [Greg Welch](#); [Becky Sanders](#); [Beth Rosenthal](#); [Holzemer/hernandez](#)
Subject: Parking requirement for various forms of housing
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 12:26:50 AM

I am on vacation and cannot attend your meeting. Unfortunately I have had little time to collect data for your discussion on May 30. Here are my areas of agreement and disagreement. Also there is a section for what I consider as major assumption warranting indepth staff work.

Agreement

1. The requirements for very low income housing are generally correct. I have personally surveyed all of PAHC properties and subjectively there seems to be very low spillover from most properties. Exceptions are projects with very high density and working population which deserves upon automobile to work.
2. Auto ownership per capita may fall particularly as Stanford students and faculty concentrate on campus. The very nature of how Stanford organizes its students and faculty is unique. Housing and transportation services create unique impact on city staff analysis and I don't see that level of sophistication in staff forecast.
3. I agree with potential of shared parking in mixed us has potential

Disagreement

1. Studies of Palo Alto apartment parking are not documented by sources and potential conflict of interest. Any data from apartment owners and association must be considered with its inherent bias. For example, spillover from EPA apartment continues further and further outside ever expanding no overnight parking RPP. I personally observed obvious spillover on the latest edge of this RPP. Please survey Lincoln. Please survey Curtner and Ventura which suggest higher density and high level of car ownership. It is quite possible home owners and tenants do take alternate mode of transportation to work.
2. There is no evidence whatsoever that car ownership is high income area such Palo Alto has decreased in total. Ownership per capita may fall particularly as Stanford students and faculty concentrate on private housing. Does the data include or exclude campus centric housing?
3. Please discuss appropriate application of national and California trends to Palo Alto dependency upon car ownership. Also Palo Alto hardly qualifies for ready use of mass, public transit. Remember what Caltrain officials said about the Stanford GUP: There is no assurance that Caltrain in the future would be able to meet Stanford's stated reliance to meet needs of commuting employees, students and faculty.
4. I personally have informally asked local Peninsula experts about the ability of any new level of Caltrain capacity to serve the growing expectation of TOD (commercial and housing) development along the entire Caltrain corridor. My person inquiry is immaterial. The issue is that there is no known systematic survey or analysis of the impact of major TOD development. Therefore, assumptions are purely speculative.
5. Assumptions about senior housing may be speculative. Surveys should be

undertaken with Channing House and Vi. I know from my own research of continuing care facilities (aka retirement centers) auto ownership is higher than common assumptions. The local market force demand great amount of living space per unit and parking per unit.

6. Assumptions about effective TDM are also speculative. There is no evidence that city staff can monitor and enforce. Every sensible developers will agree to TDM and there is no evidence in the FY19-23 operating and capital budgets to suggest that city government is prepared to manage parking or traffic with TDMs. In my honest appraisal of PA TMA, it will required 2-3 years to prove its effectiveness. I am 110% supportive of expanded TMA as soon as possible to reach its minimum level of operational effectiveness.

Other factors

1. Survey of condo housing and parking is a missing metric. Resident leaders have started survey on condo parking, vehicle ownership, bedrooms, spillover parking and use of secure garage spaces. Use of garages is a particularly unknown factor as storage is a factor both for condos and private homes. Higher density per housing unit and downsizing appears to shift more storage to garages with displacement of overnight parking onsite and offsite. This is a factor to be considered before PTC makes conclusions.

2. City Council and staff avoid the high cost of free parking like the plague. I understand City decision to delay parking management(ending of free parking). But this is one of the key drivers of many assumptions considered on May 30. Until free parking is ended for University and California Ave commercial zones, there will be very limited impact on decreased use of autos in Palo Alto.

3. If Palo Alto want to accept state mandated pressure for parking and traffic, then problems are likely to worsen. Is there a way to reduce the amount of political pressure and guesswork upon professional city management?

I look forward to PTC and Council discussions later this year. My bottom line is that too many naive assumptions are being made. Adequate staff analysis has not been done because Palo Alto Planning Department does not have the resources to manage parking real time or in the future.

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

From: [Pearlin Yang](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Parking requirement vote
Date: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 11:11:05 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Please vote against lowering the on-site parking requirement for multi-family developments.

In my neighborhood alone, we have plenty of examples of how parking is inadequate with current multi-family developments. One prominent example is Curtner Avenue which is a two-way street populated with many multi-family developments. In the early mornings and evenings, Curtner becomes a one-way road due to the number of cars parked on either side of the road. Many of these parked cars are on the sidewalk to make space for the cars actually driving down the road. Curtner only become a regular two-way street again when residents of the street go to work for the day.

Another example is Park Boulevard. The same thing happens with Park as Curtner. In the section of Park where there are multiple apartments, cars are parked, packed in tightly, up and down the road when the residents are home.

These are just two streets that I witness everyday when I go about my business. There are plenty more problems like this in our city that I do not pass on a regular basis. Current parking standards are already inadequate. Lowering the parking requirement will just exacerbate the problem.

The fact is that residential parking permit programs exist because inadequate parking is a real problem despite what reports claim.

Respectfully,
Pearlin Yang
Margarita Ave

From: kemp650@aol.com
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Please do not lower the on-site parking requirements for multi-family developments in Palo Alto
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 8:56:29 AM

Dear All,

I urge you not to go along with lowering the on-site parking requirement for multi-family developments that City staff is recommending. The reasons for not lowering the requirement are as follows:

1. City staff claims that there is 'quality transit' along El Camino that enables residents of the Wilton project and others to utilize public transit and not need a car. The VTA service along El Camino is not anywhere near quality: (1) it only runs north and south, it stops in downtown Palo Alto, where one needs to transfer to a Samtrans bus to continue going north (2) east-west routes are low quality or non-existent, and (3) existing service does not run frequently enough to be called 'quality transit'.
2. The area surrounding the Wilton project already has a parking shortage, including Hong Kong restaurant employees and patrons parking on neighborhood streets. Some Hong Kong employees sleep in their cars while parked on residential streets. Parking demand may be down elsewhere in Palo Alto (no idea where this could be), but it certainly is not down in the Wilton area, nor in the broader Ventura neighborhood area.
3. Another concern is that the City of Palo Alto is using a one-off development, i.e., the Wilton project, to generalize rules for the entire city. Note that the Wilton project is mainly for disabled and low income residents, while other developments in the Ventura area and beyond are less restricted and will likely involve more car-driving residents. Also note that in order for some residents to afford living in Palo Alto, they double or triple up in an apartment so as to split the rent two or three ways. Each of those residents has their own car, so they are actually needing 2 or 3 parking spaces per apartment, which is nowhere close to the .75 requirement.

Thanks for considering my concerns. I urge you to reject City staff's recommendation to lower the on-site parking requirement for multi-family developments in Palo Alto and to broaden your horizons to take into account the entire area surrounding a development, rather than the narrow focus on a single development as if it were a stand-alone development in a perfect world where all surrounding residential and business uses already adhered to sufficient parking requirements.

Regards,

Susan Kemp
Ventura neighborhood resident

From: [Noah Fiedel](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Please do not lower on-site parking requirements without an accurate study of parking demand.
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 9:02:34 AM

Dear Planning Commission,

I read the Fehr and Peers parking "study", and this study is incredibly biased, with a **methodology guaranteed to under-count true parking demand**. Please do not accept this incredibly poor "study" as evidence to under-park buildings, causing a reduced quality of life for the neighborhoods surrounding them.

Specific issues with the study:

1. It completely **avoided counting cars parked on the street** for any reason. E.g. Work vehicles that don't fit in small spaces, residents with more cars than assigned spaces, visitors to residents that don't have visitor parking, etc. Why not survey residents, or check with the DMV, or measure street parking usage surrounding these bulidings?
2. By counting only the peak number of cars and not the number of unique cars, **this study under-counts for any night-workers**, or folks who for whatever reason had their cars parked somewhere else for an evening.

Please see attached photo of **Curtner Ave, which is parked at 100% at peak times**. There are nearly always empty assigned spaces in the complexes. By the methodology of this study, this is a perfectly healthy street where we should reduce parking requirements for these buildings! Nothing could be further from the truth.

Thank you for your attention. Please preserve quality of life in Palo Alto by not lowering parking requirements.

Noah Fiedel
Wilton Ave



From: [Christopher Greig](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Concerns over the Louis Road and Amarillo Road project
Date: Saturday, May 12, 2018 9:56:07 PM

Hello,

I live in the 900 block of Sycamore Drive and am really concerned about the new construction on Louis Road from the Buddhist temple to Moreno. The road is too narrow now and just doesn't make sense. Why is the sidewalk so wide? Are bikes now supposed to be riding on the side walk with the pedestrians? If they are supposed to be in the same lane as cars then it's going to be more dangerous than before. The majority of the bicyclists in the area are elementary school and middle school children who have not been taught about the rules of the road. In the past two years we have also had more traffic using Louis, Ross and Greer as roads to cross the city. These are usually not residents who expect cyclists and are using these roads as other ways to their destinations and not abiding by the 25 MPH rule. I ask you to please come and look at the construction project for yourselves. It might have been a good idea on paper but it looks like a disaster to me.

Thank you,
Christopher Greig
Sycamore Drive
Palo Alto

greig.christopher623@gmail.com

From: [Paul Machado](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Disingenuous
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 2:39:05 PM

You under park projects near the bus/train implying everybody will take mass transit. Once project is built however, folks instead drive and have cars they park in the neighborhood. This is poor planning based on false assumptions. This should not occur.

Thank you

Paul Machado