

From: [Karen Ambrose Hickey](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Castilleja Plans
Date: Monday, September 2, 2019 4:55:23 PM

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

Commission Members,

I would like to provide input regarding the Castilleja School Project. I had a briefing from a friend who attended as I was dropping my graduated Paly student off at college.

The points I would like to make:

- 1) Impact on the Neighborhood and Environment
- 2) Other schools and business that addressed capacity demands within Palo Alto
- 3) Recommendation

Impact on the Neighborhood.

First and foremost, we all must remember that Castilleja was a boarding school so there was limited enrollment and obviously minimal traffic. Between 1994 and 1996, they phased out of being a boarding school and became a commuter school; this was due to declining enrollment. So, the intent of the school being within a very residential neighborhood was a very sound idea until 1996 when it became a commuter school. At that point, the need for student drop-off and pick-up began on a regular basis. With the creeping (and unlawful) growth of enrollment, the school has maximized it's space.

The proposal to create an underground parking facility, while taking out 75 trees, is clearly in the wrong direction for a world that is facing severe climate change. In addition to the impact on our air quality, the plan also severely impacts the safety of the Bryant Street bike route. As you are very aware, many students use this route as well as individuals like my husband who uses Bryant Street on a regular basis for bike transportation to and from work.

During the meeting, the question was posed about the water table. It appeared that there was not an answer to this question from the presenter. This, given the severe water shortage that we commonly have within California and earth quakes, seems to be a MAJOR concern.

It was articulated that there will be a traffic problem with the proposal. Cars will be traveling on Embarcadero, and likely their cars will be idling (again impacting air quality) as they await entrance to the Bryant Street entrance. It is a single treaded process with exit on Emerson. Students are expected to just jump out, kind of like a run by drop off as they gather their bags and school materials. Likely not going to happen.

You obviously have not been on Embarcadero at school drop off on a rainy day. With the overflow of Stanford traffic (and yes THEY also continue to build), the road is one big chokepoint. And if you listen to the Churchill closure proponents you have more traffic funneling in. Even running and bicycling on the sidewalk is more dangerous with cars looking for quicker cut throughs.

Other schools and business that addressed capacity demands within Palo Alto

Castilleja is not the first school to seek major expansion and many other private schools are supportive of what happens with Castilleja so they can do the same. I won't belabor these because others have.

However I went to a small Catholic GIRLS high school in a West LA neighborhood. We never grew our attendance or school site. Sports facilities are elsewhere. Students couldn't bring a car until senior year. The school still exists peacefully with the homeowners. No lies. No expansion. Still a high quality education for commuters. It's harder to get in as class sizes haven't grown.

Other examples are Harker and Keys. Even Pinewood has a facility away from the main campus.

The

Recommendation

The request from Castilleja to expand, and quite honestly ask the community to trust them given the years of disregard, is not reasonable at all and would become a slippery slope for other private institutions to emulate. I am a home owner, parent, and an educator. I believe 100% in education for ALL. We all make a difference and singling out girls is disrespectful, speaking from a woman's perspective.

The scenarios I propose are:

1) Castilleja, be like Harker and PAMF and find a new larger campus to expand the ever increasing demand (which is majority [>75%]outside of Palo Alto) to a new location. This will clearly be in the best interest of Castilleja long term. See how it has benefited Harker and PAMF. Both are consistently growing.

2) Castilleja create a second campus like was done by Keys School. The argument that they want the upper class students to mentor the middle school students is not valid. Of course we would LOVE that for our public schools but we know there are space restrictions. There are other methods to mentoring middle school students, all it takes is some planning and thinking outside the box.

I laugh at this. At my high school we had a Grade 1 to 8 next door and we did nothing with them. You might get a few interested in early childhood development but honestly why aren't they helping East PA?

3) No construction changes can be done on campus until after the number of students is at the agreed upon capacity limit. Castilleja must be capped at the designated enrollment and require shuttle service from designated locations to the

campus. A certain number of staff and student designated parking passes can be put in place with the Palo Alto Police Department involved in violations. This is what is done at Paly and Gunn high school. Local students can bike, even E-bike to school, however this will be a minority of students [$< 25\%$]. The bulk of students [$>75\%$] would be required to take the shuttle; this is beyond the shuttle that is currently provided from Caltrain. The school must be fined if they go beyond the enrollment limits; this is similar to what happened with Sand Hill Properties and the grocery market. If the law/rules are broken, fines must be enforced and get steeper until corrected.

It is a major lesson that needs to be taught to all students and overall people. Rules and laws are not meant to be broken and then just apologize and not make changes. It is really teaching poor values to the students and community. It leads to rules and laws being ignored and realize that money can pay to not obey - creating even more of a socio-economic divide. That is clearly not a community and world value I feel we want within Palo Alto.

I hope that you take this request from Castilleja very seriously. It is the tip of the iceberg - the decision that is made will be the guideline for subsequent requests.

I believe in educating ALL children. Do what is right for the future of Palo Alto so it can remain the gem it once was. Why are you putting their needs before the kids of your own city?

Karen Hickey
Newell Road

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [geetha.srikantan](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [geetha.srikantan](#)
Subject: 407 Lytton Ave - CUP concerns and alternate proposal
Date: Saturday, August 31, 2019 2:24:59 PM
Attachments: [407LyttonLetterToPTC.pdf](#)
[01272017_YahooMail_Re_407_Lytton_Ave_-_ABC_Application.pdf](#)

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

From
Dr. Geetha Srikantan
385 Waverley Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Date: August 31, 2019

Dear Planning and Transportation Commissioners, City Officials,

This is regarding a notice I received from the City of Palo Alto, on August 1, decision that the city has made to Tentatively approve with conditions the beer and wine at the indoor and existing outdoor rear patio of cuisine at 407 Lytton Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94301.

My home at 385 Waverley Street is adjacent to 407 Lytton Ave, the side yard shares a fence with 407 Lytton Ave and my and kitchen/dining area are 10.6 feet of the existing rear outdoor patio of 407 Lytton Ave.

1. Negative Impact on Peaceful Residential Environment

In the past year or so, the noise level has increased substantially, in the rear patio of 407 Lytton Ave.

Restaurant clientele are present in this rear patio, during mealtimes – that is lunch 11am – 3pm and dinner 5pm – 10pm. Occasionally, the clientele includes large and/or noisy groups, which causes the noise level to rise substantially.

The occupants and operators of this property have been using this rear patio for a range of activities - construction, repair, cleaning, heavy chopping, cooking – during hours of the day and night, much before and much after the hours of operation of the restaurant. This has been an intrusion on the quality of home life for myself, family and

house-guests. This has an undesired impact on sleep, peaceful environment in the hours when people are back from from work on weekdays, and on the weekends.

Adding alcohol service at 407 Lytton in the rear outdoor patio, would only make the noise situation worse.

I am also concerned about health and safety of having alcohol service in the rear patio – as the handling of glass containers and serving cups/glasses and continuous alcohol odors during the day and night – would be an additional intrusion on my residence as well as that of neighbors.

Consider also the possibility of inebriation of clients and any damage resulting from this – to people or property – at either rear patio of 407 Lytton or my or a neighbor’s residence.

2. Past Behavior

From my observations over these past few years, operators of the restaurant have not been respectful or in compliance with City rules on permitted hours for construction and repair activity – there have been many occasions when work went past the permitted hours, and I have on occasion had to go over to speak to the manager.

There are also loud conversations late into the evening, during the cleaning and other activities, after the restaurant is closed. Given past behavior, and lack of compliance with City rules and regulations, there is no reason to believe that the operators are capable of operating within City rules and regulations.

3. Procedural Issues

I received the notice from the City (*attached: City Notice 1 and 2*) on August 1, 2019, it is post-marked July 29, 2019. I emailed and spoke to Emily Foley, mentioned as the contact person in the Notice, on August 2, 2019 – and learnt that August 2, 2019 was the last day to file for a hearing, as the 14-day period was ending that day. It appears that Notices were not sent properly with sufficient notice to the neighbors. This, by itself, should be grounds to invalidate any approval granted by the city.

4. Previous Communication

Note the previous communication on this matter, in January 2017 - where the occupants of 407 Lytton Ave had filed for a similar permit and the city had responded that there is no further response since January 27, 2017 (*attached: 01272017_YahooMail*).

5. Proposed Resolution

I am strongly opposed to the service of any alcohol - beer or wine - on the existing rear outdoor patio at 407 Lytton Ave, during the day and evening, every day, would seriously impact the peaceful enjoyment of residential spaces adjacent to this restaurant. Per ABC licensing rules, ABC would not license a new retail location within 100 feet of a residence unless the applicant can establish that the operation of the proposed premises will not interfere with the quiet enjoyment of the property by residents. (Section 23789 and Rule 61.4).

Refer <https://www.abc.ca.gov/licensing/frequently-asked-questions/>

I respectfully urge the city to

1. Cancel any past approval for service of alcoholic beverages in the rear outdoor patio at 407 Lytton Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94301 – for the reasons mentioned above.
2. Limit the use of the rear patio, for all restaurant activities to:
9am - 8pm, Monday to Friday
10am – 6pm Saturday and Sunday
3. Identify the mechanism for city enforcement of the above and communicate to myself and

neighbors in a timely manner.

4. Identify who is responsible in the city to receive complaints, what details need to be provided, contact information for the same – to make this available to myself and neighbors in a timely manner.

Thank you,
Yours sincerely,
Dr. Geetha Srikantan

From: [Ann Protter](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Parking in Old Palo Alto
Date: Saturday, August 31, 2019 7:39:22 PM

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

Dear City Council Members,

We live on North California Ave, between High and Emerson streets. During the day it is virtually impossible to park in front of our house due to all the people who park here and walk to work or the train.

Please approve the Old Palo Alto RPP so that we can enjoy our streets once again and our visitors can park close to our houses.

More importantly, it has become dangerous for us -- North California is the main through-fare for many bikers, including tween kids traveling to and from Green Middle School twice a day. Backing out of our driveway when cars are bumper to bumper in front our our house is nerve racking. I am concerned I won't see a biker due to the parked cars.

Our neighborhood has an 89% approval of this RPP, which shows our very strong desire to rectify this problem. We have done everything the city has requested, followed the municipal code, and we hope you will approve it so that we may begin the pilot November 1st.

Thank you,
Ann & Andy Protter
[REDACTED] N California Ave, Palo Alto

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 8-28-19

From: [robell](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Old Palo Alto RPP
Date: Saturday, August 31, 2019 2:10:09 PM

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

I am a resident of Palo Alto. I frequently go to visit my relative who lives in Old Palo Alto on Emerson St. I go during the daytime because I am a senior citizen and do not drive at night.

It is very difficult to find a parking place near my relative because the street parking places are filled with Caltrain commuters. This is quite hard on me because I cannot walk very far.

I urge you to proceed with the Nov. 1 implementation of the Old Palo Alto RPP program!

Yours truly,

Andrew Robell
[REDACTED] Webster St., Palo Alto

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 8-28-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Shikada, Ed](#)
Cc: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); "Greg Tanaka"; [Clerk, City](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#); [board@pausd.org](#)
Subject: Cell towers in residential neighborhoods
Date: Thursday, August 29, 2019 6:18:16 PM

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

Dear Mr. Shikada,

Amy French of the Planning Department tells me that your office will no longer be updating the Wireless Hot Topics webpage. I would appreciate it if you could explain to me the logic behind that decision.

I ask because cell-towers-in-residential-neighborhoods remains very much a hot topic in Palo Alto. For example:

1. Within only the past few weeks, residents have sent dozens of emails to Council regarding this issue.
2. Council unanimously voted on April 15th to direct staff to update the Wireless Ordinance, but staff has yet to do so. Residents would appreciate an update on their progress.
3. Some 150-plus cell tower applications remain in process in Palo Alto. So a lot is happening procedurally, starting with the proposed September installation of cell towers in the Midtown area—installations that were the subject of seven appeals by residents.
4. The Palo Alto School Board and the Palo Alto PTA each have passed resolutions in the last few months calling for improvements to the City's Wireless Ordinance. The City should be reporting on these resolutions to residents.
5. The cell-towers-in-residential-neighborhoods issue continues to be followed closely by the local press—most recently in multiple stories about Los Altos' new Wireless Ordinance and about Palo Altans' reactions to it.
6. Palo Alto's former Chief Information Office and Chief Technology Officer, Jonathan Reichental, is currently under investigation by the California Fair Political Practices Commission for violating gift and conflict of interest laws with respect to accepting tens of thousands of dollars of gifts of travel from the telecommunications industry while he was employed by the City. What Palo Alto has done in the wake of his departure to ensure that such abuses don't recur is a topic of enormous interest to residents.

In short, cell-towers-in-residential-neighborhoods is the very definition of a hot topic. On behalf of United Neighbors of Palo Alto, I strongly encourage you to resume coverage of it.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-151

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 8-28-19

From: [Kurt Buecheler](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Strong support for old Palo Alto RPP
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2019 4:03:32 PM

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

Dear planning commission and city council:

Thank you for your willingness to listen to our intense congestions and parking problems in Old Palo Alto near Bowden park.

The vote matches sentiment of conversations in the neighborhood. We've had troubles for years, the intensity of the problem is way up over the last year, and the neighborhood is unified in wanting this RPP.

We hope you'll pass this RPP without delay and without change. Please approve this on September 16th so we can make progress forward.

Thank you
Kurt Buecheler
[REDACTED] Emerson Street
Palo Alto CA 94301

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 8-28-19

From: [Chris Robell](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Gaines, Chantal](#); [Hur, Mark](#); [Star-Lack, Sylvia](#)
Subject: Old Palo Alto RPP
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2019 2:25:43 PM

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

Dear PTC Members,

As you know, residents of Old Palo Alto have been seeking parking relief for years. As you can see from the City Staff report, residents voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Old Palo Alto RPP (89% favorable with 59% participation rate). There is even more support since the survey was closed.

Please do not delay but rather approve the RPP proposal this Wednesday and send this to City Council for their approval on Sept 16th so the Nov 1st implementation date, as outlined by the city, will not be jeopardized.

Thank you for your help and service to our community.

Chris Robell
Old Palo Alto resident