

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Cervantes, Yolanda](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: FW: Newell Bridge comments - Jerry Hearn
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 10:54:35 AM
Attachments: [Newell Bridge DEIR comment.docx](#)

Yolanda M. Cervantes
Planning & Community Environment
City of Palo Alto
Yolanda.cervantes@cityofpaloalto.org
650.329.2404

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeremias, Michel <Michel.Jeremias@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 9:30 AM
To: Hodgkins, Claire <Claire.Hodgkins@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: FW: Newell Bridge comments - Jerry Hearn

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Hearn <hearnbo@redshift.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 8:49 PM
To: Jeremias, Michel <Michel.Jeremias@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Newell Bridge comments

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

Dear Michel,

Thanks for getting me motivated to make a few comments. I will be at a graduation tomorrow night and out of town for several weeks, so won't be able to come to the public meetings. I hope the comments prove useful.

Best,
Jerry

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Cervantes, Yolanda](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: FW: Newell Road Bridge Replacement - Angie Evans
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 12:26:07 PM

Yolanda M. Cervantes
Planning & Community Environment
City of Palo Alto
Yolanda.cervantes@cityofpaloalto.org
650.329.2404

From: Jeremias, Michel <Michel.Jeremias@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 9:31 AM
To: Hodgkins, Claire <Claire.Hodgkins@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: FW: Newell Road Bridge Replacement - Angie Evans

From: Angie Evans <angiebevans@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 11:00 PM
To: Jeremias, Michel <Michel.Jeremias@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Newell Road Bridge Replacement

Hi Michel,

I'd like to comment on this because I use it everyday to get to and from work but I have some questions. How long will each of the construction options take? Will there be additional work connected to fix the left turn onto Woodland?

Thanks so much,
Angie

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Architectural Review Board](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Wireless Resolution provision
Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 5:14:00 PM

Dear Chair Furth, Vice-Chair Baltay, Mr. Hirsch, Mr. Lew and Ms. Thompson,

With the thought that you may be interested, I am writing to let you know that last night City Council removed from their Consent Calendar the Item with which Staff sought to eliminate the provision of the Wireless Resolution that prohibits locating cell towers in full view of residents' windows.

Staff's proposal—or, I hope, some new, less drastic version of their proposal—is now scheduled to be considered as an Action Item on June 17th.

Thank you, as always, for everything you are doing to protect the quality of life in Palo Alto as the telecom industry applies to install dozens and dozens of cell towers in residential neighborhoods.

With best regards,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Stump, Molly](#)
Cc: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(Internal\)](#); ["Lydia Kou"](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [UAC](#)
Subject: Open Response to Molly Stump re Amending Wireless Resolution
Date: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 2:54:42 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Ms. Stump,

Thank you for responding to my request for information.

I am writing now because you are asking Council to remove on June 3, 2019, via the Consent Calendar process, one of the Items in Exhibit 2 of the Wireless Resolution—a Resolution they just approved on April 15, 2019. In doing so, you are asking them to remove a fundamental protection for the residents of Palo Alto.

The Item you are asking Council to eliminate is Item 22 of the “General standards for all WCFs located on Wood Utility Poles.” The purpose of the standard expressed by Item 22 is to ensure that, when residents look out the upper-story windows of their homes, they aren’t looking right at unsightly cell tower equipment. Specifically, the Item states: “WCF equipment and antennas shall be located on poles such that they do not fall within the horizontal plane defined by a 45 degree angle extending 50 feet from the center point of upper story windows, doors, balconies and other openings.”

According to the Staff Report, the reason Staff wants Council to remove Item 22 is that “... there are significant questions regarding its interpretation as written and there is some risk it would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods.”

But please consider:

1. Item 22 provides an important protection for residents, a protection that is provided nowhere else in the Resolution or Ordinance. If Staff wishes Council to remove Item 22 while Staff, to quote the Staff Report, “further explore and evaluate” this just-approved-by-Council provision of the Wireless Resolution, Staff should also assure Council and the residents of Palo Alto that in the interim no applications for cell towers sited near multiple-story homes will be approved by the Planning Director.
2. Staff’s rationale for asking Council to remove Item 22—that “... there are significant questions regarding its interpretation as written and there is some risk it would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods”—is singularly unpersuasive.
 - a. What exactly are those “significant questions” regarding the interpretation of Item 22 to which Staff refers? I ask because most of the other twenty-one

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19
items on the “General Standards” list are at least as subject to interpretation as Item 22 is. Consider, just as one example, Item 16, which states: “Safety signage shall be the smallest size possible to accomplish its purpose.”

Where Item 22 establishes a standard that is completely objective (e.g., a 45 degree angle, 50 feet), Item 16 establishes a standard that is completely subjective.

- b. Even if Staff’s assertion that “there are significant questions regarding [Item 22’s] interpretation as written” were plausible—and it is not—the solution would not be to remove Item 22. The solution would be to rewrite Item 22 so that it is less subject to interpretation and to ask Council to approve the new language.
- c. Staff’s assertion that there is risk that this standard “would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods” is problematic:
 - As United Neighbors has repeatedly noted, the City—in approving side-mounted cell tower designs for wooden utility poles—is, in effect, incentivizing the placement of cell towers in neighborhoods with above-ground utilities (i.e., in neighborhoods where there are wooden utility poles). That’s because the side-mounted wooden utility pole design is cheapest and easiest for telecom companies to install and maintain. Indeed, most of the wireless companies’ 150-and-counting applications to install cell towers here are for sites in neighborhoods with utilities that are still above ground. The bottom line: How is incentivizing cell tower placement in single-story residential neighborhoods any different than incentivizing placement in neighborhoods with aboveground utilities?
 - More basically, Staff’s assertion that “...there is some risk [Item 22] would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods” has no face validity. Here’s why: The Resolution identifies four “standard designs” for WCFs located on wooden utility poles. Two of those designs—1) undergrounding ancillary equipment, and 2) locating ancillary equipment within a shroud at the top of the pole—would put cell tower equipment out of sight of second-story windows. In other words, the problem that Staff says concerns them can be solved—easily solved—unless Planning Director Lait intends to allow Verizon, AT&T, et al. to install *only* side-mounted ancillary equipment in Palo Alto’s neighborhoods with aboveground utilities.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19
Staff's assertion that "...there is some risk [Item 22] would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods" is based on a false premise. To wit, there are no neighborhoods in Palo Alto that only have two-story homes, and there are no longer neighborhoods that only have single-story homes. So how can there be an incentive to place cell towers in single-story residential neighborhoods rather than two-story residential neighborhoods, when neither exists?

3. Here is what Palo Alto's Architectural Review Board's April, 2019, Statement to City Council regarding cell tower design says: "Radio and power equipment, either exposed or concealed by a shroud, mounted on the side of an existing streetlight or utility pole are not appropriate design solutions." The Board has also repeatedly refused to approve side-mounted designs submitted by telecom companies.

If City Staff would heed the counsel of these experts, the problems Staff claims that the language in Item 22 represents would vanish. More importantly, residents of every neighborhood, whatever the characteristics are of the homes in that neighborhood, would benefit from a ban on side-mounted equipment.

4. Staff should explain to City Council and the residents of Palo Alto what has prompted Staff to ask Council to remove Item 22 from the Wireless Resolution—not just modify it, but remove it—a few short weeks after having asked Council to approve the Item. What occurred in those weeks that prompted the abrupt change in Staff's position?
5. My prior comments regarding Staff's assertion that "...there is some risk [Item 22] would incentivize placement of WCFs in single-story residential neighborhoods" aside, United Neighbors is pleased to see City Hall finally acknowledge that it is wrong to incentivize the placement of cell towers in any one type of neighborhood over any other type.
6. Finally: For almost two years, Palo Altans have been urging City Council and City Staff to ensure that the mass deployment of cell towers in Palo Alto's residential neighborhoods complies with Palo Alto's aesthetic and other ordinances. Yet here we have Staff asking City Council to *remove* an important protection for residents from the just-approved-by-Council Wireless Resolution ... and no one notifies us? Come on, play fair!

So there is no ambiguity: Palo Alto's "Wireless Communications Facilities" website—the website to which Staff refers residents for up-to-date information on wireless-related issues—makes no mention of the proposed revision of the

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19
Wireless Resolution. If one didn't know better, one would assume you were trying to sneak something past City Council and past the residents of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration. And, of course, please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: Stump, Molly <Molly.Stump@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2019 5:18 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>; Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: RE: June 3, 2019 City Council Consent Calendar Item

Ms. Fleming –

The answers to your questions are in the published material, linked here:
<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/71447>

Molly Stump
City Attorney



Molly Stump | City Attorney
City Attorney's Office
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
D: 650.329.2171 | E:molly.stump@cityofpaloalto.org

Please think of the environment before printing this email – Thank you.

This message contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee, you may not use, copy or disclose the message or any information contained in the message. If you received the message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message.

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 6:32 PM
To: Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>

Subject: June 3, 2019 City Council Consent Calendar Item

Dear Albert Yang,

The following item is on City Council's June 3, 2019, Consent Calendar: "Adoption of a Resolution Amending Objective Standards for Wireless Communications Facilities on Wood Utility Poles in the Public Rights of Way to Correct an Administrative Error."

I would appreciate it if you would tell me what the "administrative error" was, and what the correction of that error is that you are asking Council to approve on June 3rd..

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Karlette Warner](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Fw: Stanford Development Project--General Use Permit
Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 5:44:38 PM

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Karlette Warner <karlette46@sbcglobal.net>
To: planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org <planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: Supervisor.Simitian@bos.sccgov.org <Supervisor.Simitian@bos.sccgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019, 5:36:50 PM PDT
Subject: Stanford Development Project--General Use Permit

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am unable to attend the May 30 hearing on the subject project, and I am therefore sending my comments via email:

1. My overriding concern is that this project is too large! Where is the justification for the huge increase in people (nearly 10,000)?
2. Palo Alto and surrounding areas are already at a breaking point in terms of traffic congestion. Stanford is proposing only about 25% of the housing needed for the increased population. Where will the others live? How will they get to Stanford on our already crowded streets?
3. Open space is gradually being taken over by development. This is just one more instance of open space being gobbled up. Our quality of life is suffering.

I urge you to take action to reduce the size of Stanford's project, for the good of us all.

Thank you.

Karlette Warner
[REDACTED] College Avenue
Palo Alto

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Jeff Kmetec](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Cubberley plans
Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:44:00 PM

Dear City Leaders,

There is much excitement about investing in Cubberley, and I hope it moves forward as a resource to our entire community, enhancing the quality of life for many for decades to come.

However, converting a Public Facility to private housing is a concern. Fifty years from now, Palo Alto could be double the population, with many of the residents living in small apartments. Public facilities will be more precious than they are now.

Such conversion is a permanent choice that forever devalues our city life. Desperately needed housing is better achieved through densifying current Residential, and by converting Commercial to Residential.

I also question the compatibility of residences in the middle of random noisy, crowded events. I suspect the residents will complain, and public activities will be curtailed, further diminishing our public facility.

I recently completed the construction of the new clubhouse in Greenmeadow (as the project leader), and I strongly believe in the value of community activities. Please, let's not diminish them.

Sincerely,
-Jeff Kmetec
■ Tioga Ct.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Tracy Mallory](#)
To: [ParkRec Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Housing at Cubberley
Date: Monday, May 27, 2019 8:23:59 AM

Please do not proceed with any plans for housing on the main Cubberley site.

It is out of character with the purpose of the site as a public resource.

It is essentially a conversion of public resources to private use.

It will present public safety issues to have 24/7/365 usage of the site.

It will require additional parking and traffic for the site, where traffic on Middlefield is still not properly addressed and traffic on San Antonio presents much greater problems going forward for all the neighborhoods surrounding the site.

Residents would have to be consulted on events and other usage, making use of the site more difficult and giving a small group special consideration over the public at large.

Finally, it is being brought up very late in a process that has been going on for a long time. That process appears to have worked well, with public input resulting in many excellent choices including (but not limited to) single-layer below-grade parking under buildings and structures, withdrawal of the San Antonio entrance, and movement of the pool into the center of the site. It is a bit of a shame that housing has been brought in at this late stage of the process, possibly delaying or derailing progress already made.

Sincerely,

Tracy Mallory


From: [msbarbor](#)
To: [ParkRec Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Proposal for housing on the Cubberley site: NO
Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 12:36:28 PM

Please do not proceed with any plans for housing on the main Cubberley site.

The height of the proposed structures does not fit within the Historical Designation of the closest adjacent neighborhood, and the height of the other adjacent neighborhoods.

The implications of the proposal to rezone for higher density housing along San Antonio Road will increase future demand for schools and community services and parks in the area. If housing is built at Cubberley, how will that demand be addressed? Cubberley is our last large PF zoned parcel. The purpose of the site is a much needed public resource, particularly in light of the additional proposed housing for the immediate area of San Antonio Road east of Middlefield. **In short, housing converts needed public resources to private use.**

It will create additional parking and traffic for the site. **Traffic on Middlefield is still not properly addressed** with unprotected left turns into Cubberley, which creates backups and risky last minute lane changing to avoid it.

Traffic on San Antonio presents much greater problems going forward for all the neighborhoods surrounding the site, given the **new housing planned for San Antonio Road east of Middlefield.**

The Cubberley Project may impact efficient, safe public street operations in Greenmeadow and on nearby arterial streets (Middlefield, San Antonio, Charleston). Has there been a traffic study of potential impacts of additional traffic that this would generate, as well as street parking? If so, what are the conclusions?

Residents of any housing would have to be consulted on events and other usage, restricting public use of the site and giving a small group special consideration over the public at large. **Public activities may need approvals from potential residents, which could be a major limitation in the use of Cubberley for functions.** Residents will want the residential noise ordinance enforced. **Concerts / parties / events would have to end before 10 pm**, and be limited during the day.

Public input so far has resulted in many beneficial choices, including single-layer below-grade parking under buildings and structures, elimination of the San Antonio entrance, and location of the pool into the center of the site.

The addition of housing is being brought up very late in a process that has been going on for a long time. This can lead to ill conceived plans without regard for long term impacts, as well as undermining, delaying, or derailing the positive progress that has been made.

Adding housing at this final stage is not an opportunity. It will negatively limit future options for needed public facilities and access.

Respectfully,

Martha Sbarbori
John Sbarbori

■ Ben Lomond Drive
Palo Alto, California 94306
■

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 6-12-19

From: [Sonya Bradski](#)
To: [ParkRec Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Request NO HOUSING at Cubberley!!!
Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:42:18 PM

Dear Members of the Parks & Recreation Commission,

Thank you for writing your thoughtful letter to City Council. I hope your colleagues will support it.

I strongly oppose putting housing on top of Cubberley. The city is upzoning a lot of land throughout the city for higher density housing, including Cubberley's backyard on San Antonio Road. We are going to need Cubberley to expand schools and community services more in the future. Our city is growing.

Please recommend preserving PF-zoned space at Cubberley for its intended purpose.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sonya Bradski
[REDACTED] Nelson Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94306
(Next Door Neighbor of Cubberley Community Center for 23 years)