



Planning & Transportation Commission Action Agenda: November 16, 2022

Council Chambers & Virtual
5:00 PM

Call to Order / Roll Call

5:14 pm

Vice Chair Summa called the meeting to order.

Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted the roll call and announced all Commissioners were present with the exception of Chair Lauing; Commissioners Roohparvar and Templeton.

1. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Planning and Transportation Commission Meetings During Covid-19 State of Emergency

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, read aloud the protocols and procedures for hybrid meetings.

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved to adopt the resolution.

SECOND

Commissioner Chang seconded.

Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 4-0.

MOTION PASSED 4(Chang, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Summa) -0 – 3(Lauing, Roohparvar, and Templeton absent)

Commission Action: Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Motion passed 4-0 (Lauing, Roohparvar, Templeton absent)

Oral Communications

The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Three (3) minutes per speaker.^{1,2}

1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Vice Chair Summa invited members of the public to share their comments with the Commission
2 on items, not on the Agenda.

3 Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, announced there were no public speakers for
4 the item.

5 **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

6 The Chair or Commission majority may modify the agenda order to improve meeting management.

7 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, said there were no changes from Staff.

8 **City Official Reports**

9 2. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

10 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, announced that the last two meetings for the Planning
11 and Transportation Commissioner (PTC) would be held on November 30, 2022, and December
12 14, 2022. At the November 30, 2022 meeting, PTC would discuss the Park Avenue project and
13 at the December 14, 2022 meeting, PTC would be discussing a Development Agreement
14 Amendment, state legislation, and updates to Title 18. Concerning the remaining Council
15 meetings for the year, on December 5, 2022, the Council would be considering the project at
16 1700 Embarcadero Road. The Council would also be considered in December the accessory
17 dwelling unit (ADU) Code changes, the 575 Los Transco project, and the Permanent Parklet
18 Program. She noted that the Commission must discuss and decide on Council representation
19 for April and June of 2023.

20 Vice-Chair Summa recalled there would be a joint meeting with City Council on the Housing
21 Element as well.

22 Ms. French confirmed that the meeting was scheduled for November 28, 2022.

23 Commissioner Hechtman reported on the City Council's action on the Temporary Retail
24 Ordinance that was presented to the Commission on August 31, 2022. He shared that the
25 Staff's recommendation was not the PTC recommendation but rather was to make the
26 temporary ordinance permanent. He recalled two Commissioners were absent from that
27 meeting, but the PTC agreed unanimously that the ordinance was not ready and recommended
28 the ordinance be continued in its temporary form. If the Council decided to make the ordinance
29 permanent, PTC had highlighted four items that should be addressed before the ordinance
30 became permanent. He said traditionally, Staff recommends PTC's recommendation to Council,
31 but in this case, the Staff recommended its original recommendation to PTC to make the
32 ordinance permanent. Staff indicated that the four items highlighted by the PTC were not

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 included in the ordinance, but could be included if that was the will of the Council. He
2 expressed his frustration about that process and frustration that the Staff Report did not
3 explain why Staff was not recommending the PTC's recommendation. Council asked and
4 Director Jonathan Lait explained that Staff was very busy, making the ordinance permanent
5 took the pressure off Staff, and changes could be done later. The Council asked how long would
6 it take to include the proposed changes made by the PTC and Director Lait answered 18
7 months. Council adopted PTC's recommendation to leave the ordinance temporarily and gave
8 Staff 18 months to make the changes. He encouraged Staff to avoid making a recommendation
9 to Council other than the PTC recommendation and where it felt it need to do that, suggested
10 including in the Staff Report why it did not agree with the PTC's recommendation.

11 MS. French announced that Item Number Three had a hard stop at 6:00 pm due to Staff
12 members having to leave for a community meeting. She suggested any additional comments on
13 the topic be shared during Commissioner comments.

14 **Action Items**

15 Public Comment is Permitted. Applicants/Appellant Teams: Fifteen (15) minutes, plus three (3) minutes rebuttal.
16 All others: Five (5) minutes per speaker.^{1,3}

17 3. Review Draft 2022 Comprehensive Plan Implementation Annual Progress Report and
18 Draft 2022 Housing Element Annual Progress Report and Recommend City Council
19 Authorize Transmittal of the Reports to the Office of Planning and Research and
20 Department of Housing and Community Development, Respectively, by April 1, 2023.

21 Vice-Chair Summa read the item into the record.

22 Ms. Clare Campbell, Long Range Planning Manager, mentioned that the status provided
23 reflected the work that had been completed through October of 2022. Staff did not anticipate
24 that the status would change by the end of the year. Staff's recommendation was for the PTC to
25 review the programs, provide feedback and recommend Staff carry forward those comments to
26 the City Council to consider in the spring of 2023. An alternative recommendation was to have
27 Staff return to the PTC in February 2023 with responses to the Commission's comments and
28 present the finalized versions of the Annual Progress Reports.

29 Ms. Chitra Moitra, a Planner, announced the presentation would provide a high-level summary
30 of the implementation programs of the Comprehensive Plan as well as the programs for the
31 current 2015-2023 Housing Element. She noted the State mandated the annual reporting per
32 Government Code Section 65400. The report must be submitted by April 1 of each year to the
33 Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and the Department of Housing and Community
34 Development (HCD). Also, the Municipal Code required the PTC to annual review the
35 implementation programs and provide feedback. The Implementation Chapter contained 410

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 programs and they were distributed among the seven elements in the Comprehensive Plan. For
2 each program, the Implementation Plan identified the lead department or agency, the timing
3 for that program, and the anticipated level of effort and status of the program. The
4 implementation status for the year 2022 was six programs had been completed, 32 were
5 partially completed, 287 were ongoing and 85 were pending. She noted the number of pending
6 programs had decreased since 2021 but the number of ongoing programs had increased. Since
7 the adoption of the Implementation Chapter in 2018, 78 of the programs had been completed
8 which equated to 19 percent of the total programs. Based on prior feedback from the
9 Commission, she shared that 29 programs had changed their status since the year 2021.

10 Mr. Tim Wong, Senior Planner, gave an update on the 5th Cycle, 2015-2023 Housing Element.
11 He highlighted the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the 5th Cycle was 1,988 units.
12 As of November 2022, 116 net new units were added. The City achieved 53.4 percent of its
13 RHNA obligation and this included over 127 percent of the above moderate requirement. Over
14 99 percent of the Housing Element programs had some progress made through the 8-year cycle
15 and the only program that did not make progress was moving the PTOD from California Avenue
16 area to the Downtown District. The City accomplished permitting 218 units for very low income,
17 65 permitted units for low income, 29 permitted units for moderate, and 750 permitted units
18 for above moderate. From the year 2021 to 2022, the programs completed changed from 21 to
19 24, partially completed changed from 11 to 16, ongoing changed from 35 to 31 and pending
20 changed from five to one. He reiterate 2022 was the last year for the 5th Cycle Housing Element
21 and the new 6th Cycle Housing Element's data reporting would be changed significantly.

22 Ms. Moitra stated next steps would be either Staff would return to the PTC in February or
23 would be presenting the final documents and PTC's recommendation to the Council in March of
24 2023.

25 Commissioner Chang asked what the pending status meant.

26 Mr. Wong answered that pending meant no action was taken. He remarked in the new Housing
27 Element, there was a program that addressed the PTOD but in a slightly different way.

28 Ms. Moitra confirmed that the answer was true for the Comprehensive Plan programs as well.

29 Commissioner Chang asked if any pending programs would not be carried forward into the new
30 Housing Element.

31 Ms. Moitra concurred all the programs would be continued to be implemented in the coming
32 year.

33 Commissioner Chang inquired if the statuses would change from now to the end of the year.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Moitra predicted there would be no change, but Staff would be in touch with the
2 departments to confirm that.

3 Commissioner Chang wanted to know if there were implications for the State as a result of only
4 filling part of its RHNA obligation for the 5th Cycle.

5 Mr. Wong answered there were no repercussions for not fulfilling the City's RHNA.

6 Vice-Chair Summa announced that Commissioners Roothparvar and Templeton had joined the
7 meeting.

8 Commissioner Hechtman recalled that the updated Housing Element had identified housing
9 sites that were listed in the current Housing Element but were never developed. He
10 remembered those sites had an elevated status and that was an impact of the City not meeting
11 its RHNA obligation.

12 Mr. Wong confirmed that was correct in that any rollover sites had a by-right provision if the
13 developer proposed that 20 percent of the units be affordable.

14 Commissioner Hechtman referenced Attachment B and noted the last two columns in his
15 revision were blank. He asked if that was intentional.

16 Mr. Wong apologized and noted those columns should not have been included in the
17 attachment.

18 Commissioner Hechtman noticed in Attachment C the 2022 column and the overall status
19 column had the same information.

20 Ms. Moitra confirmed they were supposed to be the same.

21 Vice-Chair opened the public comment portion of the item.

22 Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, announced there were no public speakers.

23 Commissioner Hechtman appreciated staff responding to the Commission's request to show
24 the differences between the years and the definitions for the terminology used. He said it was
25 terrific that 99 percent of the Housing Element programs were in progress and that 87 percent
26 of the programs in the Comprehensive Plan were in a status other than pending.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl asked how the City's credibility to produce housing was affected by the
28 5th Cycle's low housing counts.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Wong stated the 5th Cycle production was not a factor in the City's 6th Cycle RHNA. He
2 predicted that moving forward, that will change due to the State's enforcement department.

3 Commissioner Reckdahl asked what reporting components would be different for the 6th Cycle.

4 Mr. Wong explained the 6th Cycle Housing Element focused on housing production and Staff
5 continued to secure more funding sources for affordable housing production.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl predicted the City will continue to struggle to meet its moderate, low-
7 income, and very low-income allocations.

8 Mr. Wong mentioned that a portion of the City's Business Tax would go toward affordable
9 housing production. Also, the Housing Element included a program that provided additional
10 incentives for affordable housing.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl mentioned he was impressed the City accomplished 31 percent of its
12 very low-income obligation for the 5th Cycle. He asked if those numbers included Wilton Court.

13 Mr. Wong answered yes and the preservation of Bona Vista.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if there were other sites with very low-income units.

15 Mr. Wong could not recall any developments at this time.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl was concerned the State would discredit the City for the poor
17 implementation of its Housing Element programs.

18 Mr. Wong explained the Housing Element requirements had changed drastically and the City's
19 past performance would not affect the City moving forward.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl asked how many programs are in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

21 Mr. Wong could not recall but explained there would be a lot more implementing objectives.

22 Ms. Campbell announced that Mr. Wong must leave but she would answer any housing
23 questions.

24 Commissioner Templeton echoed Commissioner Hechtman's comment concerning Staff's
25 response to the Commission's requests made in prior meetings. She echoed Commissioner
26 Reckdahl's comment and wondered if the reports should include how many housing proposals
27 the City rejected.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Campbell stated that was not one of the requirements for the Annual Progress Report, but
2 future reports would include that.

3 Commissioner Templeton suggested if Staff had draft templates of the new reporting
4 categories, those should be shared with Council and PTC.

5 Commissioner Chang echoed the comments of Staff being responsive to the Commission's
6 requests. She asked how the City compared to neighboring jurisdictions concerning moderate,
7 low, and very low-income housing production.

8 Ms. Campbell answered Staff would have to do additional research to provide an answer to
9 that question. She noted that Staff would include in the Council's report the response to PTC's
10 questions and those would be forwarded to PTC as well.

11 Vice-Chair Summa shared the concern about how the City will achieve affordable housing. She
12 recalled that Palo Alto had nearly twice the amount of units of affordable subsidized housing
13 when compared to the City of Mountain View and the City was led by a small percentage when
14 compared to the Bay Area. Palo Alto also had the first inclusionary requirement in the State.
15 She referenced C-1.182 on Packet Page 24 and shared that La Comida would soon need a new
16 location in North Palo Alto.

17 MOTION

18 Commissioner Hechtman moved the Staff recommendation.

19 SECOND

20 Commissioner Chang seconded.

21 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 7-0.

22 MOTION PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa, Roohparvar, Templeton) -0

23 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Pass 7-0

24 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 660 University [21PLN00341]: Recommendation
25 on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Planned Community (PC), to Combine 3
26 Parcels (511 Byron St, 660 University Ave, 680 University Ave/500 Middlefield Rd),
27 Demolish Existing Buildings (9,216 SF Office) and Provide a New Four-Story Mixed-
28 Use Building with Ground Floor Office (9,115 SF) and Multi-Family Residential (all
29 floors) Including a Two Level Below-Grade Parking Garage. Proposed Residential
30 (42,189 SF) Will Include 65 Units (47 Studios, 12 1-Bedroom, 6 2-Bedroom); and

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Allow Replacement of Existing
2 Office Floor Area in the Multiple Family (MF) Land Use Designation.

3 Vice-Chair Summa introduced the item.

4 Chair Lauing recused himself from the item due to his recent appointment to the City Council.

5 Ms. Emily Foley, Project Planner, reported the applicant was requesting that the City allow the
6 existing office to be rebuilt as well as an increase in the allowable density. The project was a
7 Planned Home Zone (PHZ) to include a new four-story mixed-use building, two levels of
8 underground parking, a height Exception to the 35-foot limit, and reduced setbacks. The project
9 is located along the entire frontage of University Avenue between Byron Street and Middlefield
10 Road. Surrounding uses included Lytton Gardens, Hamilton, and various medical offices and
11 apartment buildings. She summarized the PHZ/Planned Community (PC) process. The
12 application was heard by Council in a prescreening in October 2021, a formal application was
13 submitted and Staff review was ongoing. The PTC would hear the item first, then it would be
14 sent to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and then return to the PTC for its formal
15 recommendation to the City Council. The project was undergoing a California Environmental
16 Quality Act (CEQA) review. The Notice of Preparation was currently circulating until December
17 5, 2022. She reviewed the site plan, the proposed floor plans, and the roof plan. She shared
18 photos of the evaluations from the surrounding three streets and the interior of the site as well
19 as summarized the proposed materials to be used on the project. She noted that PTC should
20 consider the height and Daylight Plane, setbacks along Middlefield Road, office use, and parking
21 when considering the project. The proposed height was 45 feet 5 inches to the top of the
22 parapet with a maximum height of 60 feet 11 to the top of the elevator tower. The Zoning Code
23 required a maximum height of 35 feet when adjacent to RM-20 with a 15-foot allowance for
24 mechanical equipment. She noted though the project exceeded the height limit, the project
25 complied with the Daylight Plane. She mentioned there was a special setback along Middlefield
26 Road and a 16-foot setback along Byron Street and University Avenue. They proposed to reduce
27 those setbacks to 10 feet along Byron Street and Middlefield Road and 6 feet along University
28 Avenue. She noted that there were places along the building's facade where the setbacks were
29 larger. Concerning parking, the project would utilize a Transportation Demand Management
30 (TDM) Plan to receive a 20 percent reduction in required parking space. The project proposed
31 88 parking spaces and the TDM plan was under review by the City's Transportation Division.
32 Concerning office use, the current language in the Comprehensive Plan allowed a density of
33 eight to 40 units but the office was not currently an allowable use on the site. The applicant
34 requested that the existing medical office be maintained and replaced south of Middlefield
35 Road near Downtown and the South of Forest Area (SOFA) neighborhoods. Also, the allowable
36 density is increased to 130 dwelling units per acre (du/acre). Staff recommended that the PTC
37 provide feedback, receive public comment, and recommend that Staff forward the proposed

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 project to the ARB. An alternative motion was to decline to move the project forward at which
2 point the project would return to the PTC with changes.

3 Mr. Boyd Smith, applicant, mentioned the project was a collaboration with Palo Alto Dental
4 Group and the dental group had owned the land since 1934. If the project proceeded to
5 construction, the dental group would move to a different location within the City's boundaries.
6 The project was received well by the Council during the prescreening hearing and the feedback
7 had been incorporated into the design. He concluded that they had received hundreds of
8 signatures in support of the project.

9 Mr. Ted Korth, KSH Architects, showed the existing site location and noted several other four-
10 story buildings in the area were mostly all residential projects. He shared several context
11 photos of the surrounding properties and intersections. He mentioned that the setbacks
12 provided landscaping on all four sides of the project. The two proposed lobbies faced University
13 Avenue and were tucked in. The ground floor building would be raised 30 inches above grade to
14 satisfy the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) requirements for flooding. He
15 shared a rendering of the proposed structure at the corner of Middlefield Road and University
16 Avenue as well as Byron Street. He reviewed the underground parking facility that preserved an
17 existing oak tree. The building was stepped back away from the tree to preserve it. The ground
18 would include a garden space for the office area. He restated the project included 65 dwelling
19 units which were a combination of studios, one bedroom, and two bedrooms with balconies.
20 The fourth floor included outdoor terraces to satisfy the Daylight Plane near the adjacent
21 residential project. A roof deck was proposed that faced University Avenue and was a setback
22 from the lower levels of the project. He shared additional elevations and renderings of what he
23 had previously described.

24 Mr. Paul Lettieri, landscape architect, reported that the proposed planters would be located
25 mostly over the garage structure but the planters were proposed to be sunken and low in
26 height. Concerning the existing oak tree, the project's arborist recommended not disturbing the
27 ground near the tree and leaving the existing asphalt pavement around it. The proposal was to
28 build a deck on top of the existing asphalt to minimize changes to the tree. The planters near
29 the tree would be pre-cast containers that sat on gravel. Along the interior of the site, and
30 around the site, were pedestrian connections for move-ins and trash removal. Stormwater
31 treatment was accommodated in the planters around the building. He mentioned several of the
32 street trees would be removed due to declining health. He shared a photo from another project
33 that showed what a deck around a tree looked like but emphasized that was not the design the
34 project was proposing. The roof deck had two active areas at the end with a passage seating
35 area connecting them. He shared images of the proposed planters, fencing materials, bike
36 racks, lighting, and paving. Also, he shared that the project contained over 90 percent of native
37 plantings for the site and shared images of those.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Vice-Chair Summa asked clarifying questions for the Staff and/or applicant.

2 Commissioner Hechtman asked if the biology category included in the Environmental Impact
3 Report (EIR) was related to trees.

4 Ms. Foley answered yes, it pertained to the protection of the large oak tree. She mentioned
5 ground penetrating radar was being conducted to map the tree's roots.

6 Commissioner Hechtman inquired if the two existing office buildings were legal non-conforming
7 structures.

8 Ms. Foley recalled they were grandfathered in but were non-conforming to the Comprehensive
9 Plan.

10 Commissioner Hechtman restated that if the project was not constructed, could the existing
11 offices continue to be used for office?

12 Ms. Foley concurred that a section in the RM-20 zoning discussed grandfathered uses and that
13 referred to the professional and medical office uses in the neighborhood.

14 Commissioner Hechtman asked when the City determines du/acre, was that based on the
15 actual dwelling units proposed of the different sizes, or was there a standardized size for a
16 dwelling?

17 Ms. Foley concurred it was based on what was being proposed but the size of the unit was not
18 taken into account.

19 Commissioner Chang recalled that the Housing Element Ad Hoc Committee of the PTC had seen
20 a feasibility study for the parcel and asked if Staff was aware of that feasibility study.

21 Ms. Foley mentioned that Long Range Planning Staff did review the feasibility of various sites
22 but those were based on the densities of the current Comprehensive Plan policies.

23 Commissioner Chang noticed in the title on Packet Page 107, the proposed residential square
24 footage was 42,189 square feet but there was a different number in the table on Packet Page
25 116.

26 Ms. Foley commented the applicant resubmitted the plans on November 8, 2022, and Staff
27 made last-minute adjustments. She noted the plans included a summary table on the second
28 page and those were the accurate square footage.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 An unknown female speaker with the applicant team believed the inconsistency was attributed
2 to the resubmittal. The unit count and size of the units did not change. The lobby area was
3 reduced in size with the reshuffle of the elevators on the ground floor.

4 Commissioner Chang asked why the setbacks were so deep on Middlefield Road and University
5 Avenue.

6 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, explained the setbacks were a placeholder to expand
7 the roadway for increased car volume.

8 Commissioner Chang asked how the proposal compared to what could be developed under the
9 State Density Bonus.

10 Ms. Foley remarked that Staff could return with that data at a future meeting.

11 Ms. French asked if Commissioner Chang wanted to see a table that compared the proposal to
12 a potential State Density Bonus project.

13 Commissioner Chang stated that would be great, especially highlighting the difference between
14 the number of affordable units. She asked how tall Lytton Gardens and Hamilton are.

15 Ms. Foley answered they had a similar number of floors but she did not know the exact height.

16 Commissioner Chang asked how affordability was distributed across the different unit types.

17 Ms. Foley answered in some ways it was up to the applicant but since it was a PC, the PTC could
18 make a recommendation.

19 Ms. French added that the affordable units could not be distinguishable from the market rate
20 units.

21 Commissioner Chang explained that the parking spaces were associated with a particular type
22 of unit and she wanted to understand how the affordability was layered into the parking
23 distribution.

24 Ms. French understood the spaces were not assigned and were calculated based on the City's
25 Parking Codes.

26 Commissioner Chang referenced Packet Page 116, middle of the table where it said rear yard
27 Daylight Plane, and she asked what side of the project was considered the rear.

28 Ms. Foley answered the façade facing Byron Street was the rear side of the building. She
29 explained that the properties across Byron Street were zoned RM-20 and that was why the

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Daylight Plane applied. Typically, the rear setback is an interior lot line but Staff supported the
2 setback encroachment because there was a buffer caused by the street.

3 Commissioner Chang inquired if the City used a standard metric to determine the employee
4 count for office spaces.

5 Ms. Foley mentioned the City required one parking space per 250 square feet of office.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl noticed the elevator shaft was 20 feet above the roof.

7 Ms. Foley explained because the elevator provided access to the roof, the elevator shaft had to
8 be taller.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl commented that typically an elevator would service the top floor of a
10 building and then the roof would be accessed by stairs.

11 Ms. Foley confirmed that was correct.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl asked the applicant to explain their mixture of unit sizes.

13 An unknown male speaker with the applicant team said the mixture was based on similar
14 projects in Palo Alto and was based on Council's feedback. He noted they were open to any
15 feedback on the mixture.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl asked for further explanation about their mixture studies.

17 An unknown male speaker with the applicant team explained that unit mixes were different for
18 downtown areas versus the outskirts and that what was proposed was similar to other
19 downtown residential structures. He added that typically families did not live downtown.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl expressed concern about the ingress and egress onto Middlefield Road
21 being close to a busy intersection.

22 An unknown male speaker with the applicant team understood through discussions with Staff
23 that placing the driveway on University was not feasible. A driveway onto Byron Street would
24 conflict with the existing tree.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if it would be only right turns leaving the garage.

26 An unknown male speaker with the applicant team was almost positive it was a right turn only
27 out of the project.

28 Vice-Chair Summa invited members of the public to share their comments.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called the speakers.

2 Ms. Carol Gilbert, a resident and Board Member for the Hamilton, stated she spoke on behalf of
3 the many residents of the Hamilton who opposed the project as proposed. The property was
4 located on a “senior corner” next to several senior residential structures. She agreed it was the
5 perfect location for housing, but she wished to see it have more affordable senior housing. The
6 proposal boasted about public benefits but the proposal was filled with requests to amend the
7 City’s requirements. The project did not fit the location or the needs of Palo Alto. She wanted to
8 see more low and very low-income units and the project should balance greed with need. She
9 concluded that the renditions shared by the applicant did not show cars or parked cars and that
10 was not the reality of the location.

11 Ms. Leah Prince, the attorney representing the residents at the Hamilton, stated as outlined in
12 her letter, the density and intensity of the project were too much. The proposed affordable
13 housing was woefully inadequate to justify a significant increase in density, height, site cover,
14 floor area, and decrease in setbacks. She mentioned in her letter she outlined what a State
15 Density Bonus project would provide concerning affordability. She added that affordable
16 housing would make a less than 1 percent impact on the City’s RHNA. She said that the
17 residents of Hamilton encouraged the PTC to recommend the project’s density be reduced
18 before moving forward. Also, the residents encouraged the use of the general office to be
19 removed from the application.

20 Ms. Klicheva announced that the next speaker would receive 10 minutes because Leroy Barnes,
21 Nanny Martin, Gene Park, Peter Stirick [phonetics], and Justin Forbes donated their time to
22 him.

23 Mr. Christopher Reem shared he had been a resident of Palo Alto for 51 years and was
24 currently a resident of the Hamilton. He shared concerns about how the project would impact
25 the neighborhood and that was why he, and many residents of the Hamilton, opposed it.
26 Concerning the existing tree, he shared the tree had a 50-inch diameter trunk, and a 90-foot
27 canopy, and should be preserved at all costs. He believed what was planned to preserve the
28 tree would protect and preserve the tree. He noticed that on the drawings, the building comes
29 right up to the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) and the TPZ was labeled as 30 feet. So, the tree TPZ
30 was intruding into the building by 15 feet. He stated that the tree limbs will encroach into the
31 balconies and the applicant will have to cut back the limbs quite a bit. He worried that potential
32 damage to the roots and the drastic trimming of the limbs will off balance the tree and it would
33 fall onto the Hamilton. He requested that the City’s arborist review the plans and the tree.
34 Concerning parking, the parking proposed was 82 spaces and that was inadequate. The street
35 parking on Byron street, University Avenue, and Middlefield Road were always full. He
36 requested that be reviewed further. Concerning egress onto Middlefield Road, folks leaving the
37 project will always want to turn left which would cause major congestion with the nearby

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 intersection. Concerning the office use, he did not support having an office use on the parcel.
2 Concerning density, he agreed with Ms. Prince's comments. Concerning the rooftop deck, the
3 amenities on the roof will cause noise impacts to the neighbors and he found it not appropriate
4 for the area.

5 Mr. Alan Brauer, owner of 630 University Avenue, was concerned about noise and driveway
6 access during construction. He shared his tenants were mental health professionals and that
7 the extra noise and congestion in the area will impact their clients. He asked where were the
8 construction vehicles going to be parked and would that limit the access to Bryon Street. Also,
9 he wanted to understand if the proposed zoning change applied to only the project or was it a
10 general zoning change.

11 Ms. Klicheva announced that there were no more public speakers.

12 [The Commission took a short break]

13 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if the City arborist has reviewed the plan.

14 Ms. Foley confirmed they had and it was an ongoing review. She emphasized that the
15 protection of the tree was a priority for the project and that a proposal would not be moving
16 forward if there was not adequate protection.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if the TDM applied to the residential parking or the office
18 parking.

19 Ms. Foley answered it applied to both uses.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl was confused about how the TDM would be applied to the residents.

21 Ms. French concurred with her experience TDMs were only related to residential projects, but
22 she noted that the concept of TDM had not been around long.

23 Commissioner Chang asked how the ground penetrating radar worked.

24 Ms. Foley explained it was a survey of where the tree roots were located in the ground. The
25 project will implement mitigations and use standard best practices to protect the tree
26 concerning excavation.

27 Commissioner Chang shared that several Council Members asked during the prescreening
28 whether the residents in the development would be able to purchase Residential Parking
29 Permits (RPP). She wanted to understand if the project could be excluded from the RPP to
30 encourage folks to not own a car who lived in the structure.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. French explained the City did not have any experience in doing that but with it being a PC,
2 the City could impose conditions.

3 Commissioner Chang shared the Council was concerned about carving out one corner inside the
4 RPP for the project.

5 Mr. Caio Arellano, Assistant City Attorney, confirmed that yes, the existing RPP may have to
6 change but the City would have to evaluate the program in combination with the proposed
7 TDM. He answered that the City could not exclude the project from participating in the RPP.

8 Commissioner Hechtman recalled the Sobrato project was excluded from the surrounding RPP.

9 Commissioner Chang agreed and requested Staff explore it further because it would elevate
10 some of the concerns concerning density.

11 Ms. French clarified the Sobrato project was a Development Agreement and the terms were
12 negotiated. That was different than the proposed project.

13 Commissioner Chang referenced Packet Page 117, Table Two, and read it proposed 1.5 parking
14 spaces for two bedrooms. She believed two spaces were required for two bedrooms.

15 Ms. Foley confirmed that was correct

16 Commissioner Chang stated similarly, it stated 1.2 spaces were required for one-bedroom units
17 and it should be one space.

18 Ms. Foley concurred and noted that the plans showed the correct calculations.

19 Commissioner Chang asked how the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking was factored
20 into the parking requirement.

21 Ms. Foley answered typically ADA parking was included in the required parking. The project
22 would have unassigned parking and the ADA parking was an addition to the required parking.
23 The plan set indicated 73 spacing because that included the two ADA spaces.

24 Commissioner Chang stated that the 73 required spaces were a result of the incorrect math
25 outlined in the table.

26 An unknown female speaker with the applicant team concurred Staff was correct.

27 Commissioner Chang stated that the 20 percent reduction in parking was a drastic reduction
28 and she had concerns about that. She asked if the parking would be assigned to the units or if

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 was it a first-come-first-serve for the residents. The table in the Staff Report implied that the
2 spaces were assigned to the units.

3 **An unknown male speaker with the applicant team** remarked the idea was to have parking
4 assigned to the units but only for folks who opted in to have a parking space.

5 Commissioner Chang mentioned the affordability was attached to the units but the parking
6 space was not attached to the units.

7 **An unknown male speaker with the applicant team** remarked the team would like to hear more
8 feedback on that from the Commission because Commissioner Chang was correct. If the
9 parking is decoupled, then affordable units should perhaps have a parking space that would be
10 offered at an affordable rate and folks would be allowed to opt-in.

11 Commissioner Chang shared that folks leasing the two-bedroom unit would likely have four
12 residents living in the unit. She emphasized it was really difficult to live without a car when you
13 have children.

14 **An unknown male speaker with the applicant team** assumed a two-bedroom unit would come
15 with a parking space. He mentioned they would evaluate it further.

16 Vice-Chair Summa was concerned about the parking issues Commissioner Chang mentioned.
17 She recalled that the workforce housing project on the corner of El Camino and Page Mill was
18 exempted from the RPP and she believed the proposed project could do that as well. She
19 mentioned that before the President's Hotel was remodeled, many of its residents were
20 purchasing permits for parking. She cautioned the staff, the Commission, and the City about
21 making assumptions about what folks would do before they gave up a car. She agreed with
22 Commissioner Chang that folks of lower incomes had a stronger need for a car. Concerning the
23 tree, she asked if the old Tree Ordinance or the new Tree Ordinance applied to the project.

24 Ms. Foley wanted to check with Urban Forestry.

25 Vice-Chair Summa stated the new Tree Ordinance had more protections for trees and was
26 concerned the raised deck may impact the tree. She believed it would be better for the tree if
27 the project abided by the new Tree Ordinance. In general, she shared the concerns raised by
28 the public and had concerns about the impacts of extending the ability to change the office use
29 to a general office. She stated per Sections 18.52.040 and 18.52.050, substantial proof must be
30 presented before a parking reduction can be approved by the Director of Planning. She said one
31 of the problems with TDMs was they have been granted in the hope that they would work as
32 opposed to complying with the rules that one must demonstrate that a TDM would work. There
33 was no data on if TDMs worked and she recommended Staff reconsidered Sections 18.52.040
34 and 18.52.050. Concerning the special setbacks, she agreed with Ms. French they were placed

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 there to accommodate more cars in the future. Now the City needed more multi-modal streets
2 and the special setback would allow for that. She wanted to see the setbacks retained and used
3 for that purpose. She referenced Section 18.38.150, special requirements for PC, and believed
4 the project did not comply with the section due to the proposed height increase. She believed
5 the project would be better if it were all housing, was more mindful of the setbacks, and had a
6 reduced height. She did not support changes to the office use from medical office to general
7 office.

8 Commissioner Hechtman asked if the two properties were identified in the new Housing
9 Element as potential housing sites.

10 Ms. French predicted it was included in the site's inventory.

11 Commissioner Hechtman suggested that be explored further because many of those identified
12 sites were being upzoned. The proposal, as presented, was evaluated under the current zoning
13 and the existing Comprehensive Plan.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl confirmed that all three parcels were included in the updated Housing
15 Element.

16 Commissioner Hechtman stated that the information presented may be true today but not true
17 for the City's future vision for housing. He supported moving the project forward to the ARB
18 and believed when the item comes back to the Commission that many of the questions raised
19 would be answered. He thanked the residents of the Hamilton for coming to the meeting. He
20 appreciated having folks in the Chambers when normally it was empty due to the Covid
21 pandemic. Concerning the big picture, he stated the proposal was the future of Palo Alto due to
22 the State putting pressure on the City to build more housing. He stated in the future, Palo Alto
23 will become denser. He recognized that the project would cover 1 percent of the RHNA and
24 that was not insignificant. Concerning the office use, he concurred that office space in Palo Alto
25 was very valuable and to remove the office component was unrealistic. He did not feel strongly
26 about allowing a general office but rather felt that the continuation of medical offices was
27 appropriate for the location. Concerning density, he stated the dwelling unit per acre metric
28 was misleading and was providing skewed results. He acknowledged that the proposal was a
29 new product type of Palo Alto. The City wanted more studio units because those units were
30 typically more affordable than larger units. He stated he appreciated the elevation renderings
31 and was not overly concerned about the proposed four stories because of the other four-story
32 buildings nearby. He mentioned it occurred to him that if the fourth floor was removed, that
33 would reduce the height and possibly fully park the project. The downside of that was the loss
34 of 22 units. He emphasized he was not suggesting that, but many components could be
35 explored.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton was very excited about the project and the potential it represented.
2 She acknowledged the comments made by the public but noted that all residents may not feel
3 the same way. She said the City was in the middle of shifting how it handled requests for build-
4 outs like the proposal. She predicted it was presented a year from now, the Commission may be
5 discussing very different things. Concerning the height, she predicted the Commission would
6 not be discussing height a year from now. Concerning the location, she believed improvements
7 could be made for where to put the driveways but that should be considered by the ARB.
8 Concerning the density, again she predicted the Commission would not be concerned about the
9 density a year from now. She acknowledged a comment made that they supported housing but
10 not in the proposed location. She believed that was a side effect of an early proposal and
11 predicted a similar project would be proposed all over the city. Concerning parking, she
12 supported having some parking but suggested folks be more flexible. She noted it was not
13 coming across as the biggest concern of the project for her. Concerning medical versus general
14 office, she was not convinced that forcing the parcel to remain medical office would be in the
15 best interest of the neighborhood. The determination of that change should be left up to
16 demand. She appreciated the landscaping, the balconies, and quality materials, and in general,
17 she supported moving the project forward.

18 Commissioner Chang appreciated the applicant putting more larger units in the proposal. The
19 Council had indicated they wanted to avoid the Alta Local workforce housing product on the
20 site. She found it appropriate to have more density on the site but reiterated that there may be
21 negative side effects as was mentioned in the discussion. She believed there would be some
22 painful near-term consequences concerning cars and parking. She also believed it was an
23 appropriate location for more height as well as appreciated that the units were rental units, the
24 preservation of the oak, and the landscaping choices. She mentioned that due to the parcels
25 being close to two arterials, she was very concerned about the proposed reduction in the
26 setbacks and unintended consequences. Reduced setbacks eliminated the chance for the City
27 to have a bike superhighway along Middlefield Road in the future. She stated that the City's
28 infrastructure did not match the City's future needs. Also, reducing setbacks could cause a
29 safety concern concerning speeding cars potentially hitting the building. She referenced Packet
30 Page 112 and highlighted the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines that identified the block as
31 an entryway to downtown. Any reduced setback would create an undesirable entryway to the
32 downtown. She stated her biggest concern was that the affordable units would not be
33 affordable. The calculations indicated that the rent for an affordable moderate-income studio
34 would be \$2,355 to \$3,537 per month. She said if the market could bare that for market-rate
35 units, she was not concerned about higher density, but it was unrealistic to say that a small unit
36 rented for \$2,355 was affordable. She mentioned if the units were larger, she would not have
37 the same affordability concern. While the City wanted more units, the units must be livable
38 spaces.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Roohparvar generally was in favor of the proposal and wanted to further explore
2 what the potential could be for the project. She reviewed the project as for the baseline, the
3 office existed, and the City was receiving a bonus with the residential units. Concerning RHNA,
4 she appreciated the prospect of the project being 1 percent of the City's RHNA. She wanted to
5 understand how 65 units compared to how much the City typically built in a RHNA cycle. She
6 noted she was not concerned about affordability because she predicted supply and demand
7 would resolve that.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl agreed with Commissioner Hechtman that units per acre were not the
9 right metric. He agreed the proposal was for a very big program and yes, the neighbors would
10 be impacted by it, but the City also had a large RHNA obligation. He stated uncomfortable was
11 the new normal when it came to housing in Palo Alto. He was nervous about the preservation
12 of the tree and the driveway onto Middlefield Road but predicted those could be resolved. He
13 shared his skepticism of TDMs and parking in general. Concerning the office use, he wanted to
14 see it remain a medical office. He agreed that the reduced setbacks were a concern and
15 believed they should not be changed in a piecemeal fashion. He wanted to see setbacks
16 considered as a big picture and not individually. Overall, he appreciated the housing unit count
17 and believed there were merits to the design.

18 Vice-Chair Summa agreed the will City will be seeing taller and denser buildings in the future
19 but that was not the problem with the proposal. There were many factors raised in the
20 discussion that placed too many negatives on the proposal. She said she did not see the project
21 as the beginning of a time when the City would disregard the conditions and impacts of
22 approved buildings in Palo Alto. She mentioned several prior projects that showed that a lot of
23 housing could be built without offices and without impacting the neighborhood. She agreed
24 that reducing the setbacks would be detrimental to the City's ability to reduce cars. She
25 restated the project was not consistent with how the Direct of Planning can grant a parking
26 reduction of 20 percent and that set a bad precedent. She wanted to see the project returned
27 to the drawing board before it progressed further along the process. The plan was not to place
28 all the RHNA obligations on the project and the problems should be fixed before moving
29 forward.

30 Commissioner Templeton mentioned the idea was not to place all the RHNA obligations on the
31 project and she requested Vice-Chair Summa clarify that comment.

32 Vice-Chair Summa stated that 6,000 units could not be constructed on the site but the City did
33 not have to approve projects that were not good for the neighborhood or the structure's future
34 residents.

35 MOTION

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton moved the Staff recommendation to forward the project to the ARB
2 with the incorporation of the comments posed by the PTC and recommendation to see specific
3 adjustments to the setback and parking.

4 SECOND

5 Commissioner Hechtman seconded. He agreed that the project needed more work but felt the
6 process was better served if the project was forwarded to the ARB for their comments before
7 returning to the PTC.

8 AMENDMENT #1

9 Commissioner Chang wanted Staff to reevaluate the affordability aspect of the project relative
10 to the market rate. She requested that because several Council Members had the same concern
11 and believed it was not fully addressed in the proposal.

12 Commissioner Templeton agreed.

13 Commissioner Hechtman also agreed.

14 Vice-Chair Summa shared she wanted to avoid the proposed changes that changed the
15 envelope of the building and could ultimately not be built due to inconsistencies. She restated it
16 made more sense to reevaluate those components before sending the project to the ARB.

17 Commissioner Templeton appreciated Vice-Chair Summa's comments but believed the PTC had
18 provided positive feedback to the applicant that strongly indicated that several aspects of the
19 project needed to be changed.

20 AMENDMENT #2

21 Vice-Chair Summa asked if the maker would incorporate consistency with Municipal Code
22 Sections 18.38.150 and 18.52.050.

23 Commissioner Templeton supported included in the motion that the project must be legally
24 compliant.

25 Ms. Foley asked if the sections referenced by Vice-Chair Summa were the sections that required
26 the 35-foot height limit.

27 Commissioner Templeton remarked if it limited height, she was reluctant to incorporate it into
28 the motion because she wanted to see more height.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Vice-Chair Summa stated these were not exceptions to another area of the Municipal Code that
2 a PC might ask for. It was a special requirement that restricted PCs. She could not support the
3 motion as stated.

4 Commissioner Reckdahl recalled that the proposal was requesting to waive those special
5 restrictions.

6 Ms. French confirmed in past projects the Council had approved a Variance for those special PC
7 requirements.

8 Vice-Chair Summa requested that the City attorney respond.

9 Commissioner Chang commented if there was a way to address the Vice-Chair's concerns, it
10 should be added to the motion. She suggested there be an examination of compliance to allow
11 more flexibility rather than deciding now.

12 Commissioner Templeton supported Commissioner Chang's recommendation.

13 Commissioner Hechtman understood that the Code sections referenced by the Vice-Chair had a
14 flat cap of 35 feet in height. He noted that the proposed project was taller than that and if there
15 was no way to build beyond 35 feet then Staff could have called that out before forwarding the
16 project. He commented it may not have been clearly explained in the Staff Report how Staff
17 was able to determine the project could exceed 35 feet legally and suggested that be shared
18 with the PTC at a future meeting.

19 Commissioner Templeton supported it being an action item for Staff rather than for the
20 applicant.

21 Vice-Chair Summa reiterated that the other section of the Code she was concerned about had
22 to do with the Director of Planning's decision to reduce the parking.

23 Mr. Arellano explained that the purpose of the PC Zone was to provide flexibility when applying
24 standards. He requested to take the discussion and suggestions as action items for Staff to
25 analyze for the PTC.

26 MOTION RESTATED

27 Commissioner Templeton restated the motion which was to forward the project to the ARB
28 which included specific areas of concern and comments made by the PTC; and direction to Staff
29 to come back with more analysis concerning Code Sections 18.38.150 and 18.52.050.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Vice-Chair Summa asked why the City was incentivizing the general office in a zone that only
2 allowed medical and professional offices. She wanted to see a project that was three stories
3 with no office.

4 Commissioner Templeton concurred that feedback was included in the feedback to the
5 applicant and could not support it in the motion.

6 Ms. French read back the motion to the Commission.

7 Commissioner Hechtman was not supportive of including the TDM in the motion and did not
8 believe the Vice-Chair's comments that Palo Alto was doing TDMs wrong. He believed there
9 was more than one interpretation of the Municipal Code and he could not determine how to
10 quantify a TDM up front.

11 Commissioner Templeton clarified that the Vice-Chair was asking for the rationale for how
12 come the Variance that was being requested by the applicant was compliant with Staff's
13 interpretation of the law.

14 Commissioner Hechtman supported that approach.

15 VOTE

16 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 6-1.

17 MOTION PASSED 5(Chang, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Templeton) -1 (Summa no)

18 Vice-Chair Summa restated some of the issues that should be fixed before furthering the
19 project's process. She thanked the applicant for their proposal and the members of the public
20 who attended.

21 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Pass 5-1 (Summa no) (Lauing
22 recused)

23 5. Discussion of Planning and Transportation Commission Bylaws to Add Bylaw(s)
24 Regarding Meeting Attendance

25 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, mentioned that training was being offered on
26 December 13, 2022, for all Boards and Commission on the new laws for the Brown Act
27 concerning remote meeting participation. Per Assembly Bill 2449, Members could participate
28 remotely, without making their locations available to the public, only when there was a "just
29 cause" or "emergency circumstance". The exception was that a Member could not be removed
30 for more than three consecutive months or more than 20 percent of the regular meetings in a
31 calendar year. If the Member did make their location available to the public, the City would list

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 the location on the Agenda and there was no limit under State law as to how often that could
2 be done. She said it was up to the Commission to consider its policy that worked for the
3 Commission as to how many meetings a Commissioner could do remotely. She shared that the
4 Utilities Advisory Commission changed its By-Laws to follow closely to Council’s policy. She said
5 she did not get the sense that all Boards and Commissions would follow Council’s policy.

6 Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, announced there were no public speakers for
7 the item.

8 Commissioner Roohparvar understood that if a Commissioner's location was not available, then
9 the Commissioner has to have “just cause”. If the location was made available to the public,
10 then there was no limit. She asked where the Commission was discussing changes.

11 Ms. French answered the Commission was discussing the Commission’s self-imposed policy
12 concerning the new Brown Act requirements.

13 Mr. Caio Arellano, Assistant City Attorney, explained the Brown Act rules before the Covid- 19
14 Pandemic, the Brown Act rules during the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the new Brown Act changes.
15 He explained that the City Council and several Commissions adopted their policy that stated a
16 specific number of how many times a Member could participate remotely without making their
17 location available to the public. The question before the Commission did it want to put in its By-
18 laws a specific number or follow State Law as outlined.

19 Commissioner Roohparvar asked what it meant to make your location available.

20 Mr. Arellano answered it’s the physical address of the location you are calling into the meeting
21 from.

22 Ms. French mentioned that Agendas are published 72 hours in advance of a meeting and she
23 asked if the Commissioners would have to disclose that address 72 hours in advance for the
24 address to be published on the Agenda.

25 Mr. Arellano confirmed that is correct, but the “just cause” or “emergency circumstance”
26 allowed Members to call into the meeting without 72 hours' notice.

27 Commissioner Templeton believed “just cause” required folks to disclose their health issues or
28 disclose their address or leave the Commission.

29 Mr. Arellano explained that “just cause” was meant to be broad to mean a good reason. He said
30 he would not extend that to say that a Member must disclose publicly why they were not
31 attending a meeting.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton shared that when the Commission returned to meetings in person,
2 there was an understanding that folks would be masked and social distancing would be
3 provided. At the first in-person meeting, those standards were not upheld and she was fearful
4 for herself and the other Commissioners. After that experience, she had not returned due to
5 health issues. After raising her concerns, she was told vaccines stop the transmission of Covid-
6 19 but she shared she had received the vaccine and the booster and still caught Covid. She
7 wanted to have a conversation about practices that could be upheld to keep all Commissioners,
8 Staff, and the public safe. She asked if the reasons stated were “just cause”.

9 Mr. Arellano remarked that the statute did define “just cause” as a contagious illness that
10 prevented a Member from attending in person, but there was no case law to determine what
11 that meant.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl wanted the Commission to be as lenient as possible and should not do
13 anything more than the State required. He remarked found himself more productive when he
14 attended in-person meetings but others may have different opinions.

15 Commissioner Chang agreed with Commissioner Reckdahl that the Commission did not need to
16 go beyond the Brown Act. She supported Commissioner Templeton’s desire to discuss meeting
17 norms.

18 Commissioner Hechtman echoed Commissioner Reckdahl and Commissioner Chang’s
19 comments. He did not want to see a self-imposed constraint discourage folks from applying to
20 the Commission or have existing Members be uncomfortable during a meeting. He
21 recommended that the numbers of days/percentages of regular meetings the Commissioner
22 may attend remotely should be the maximum amount allowed by law.

23 Commissioner Roohparvar agreed there should be a discussion about meeting norms and
24 precautions. She shared she received Covid after being vaccinated and boosted and had long-
25 term side effects from it.

26 Vice-Chair Summa said she never wanted to discriminate against someone who had a health
27 restriction that kept them from attending meetings in person. She supported having a
28 conversation about precautions and meeting norms. She shared she ran for City Council and
29 gave up wearing a mask because she was campaigning.

30 Commissioner Templeton appreciated the Commission being supportive. She agreed it was
31 hard to hear when folks spoke with a mask on and she was comfortable with folks removing
32 their masks to speak. She stated the problem was the duration of the meetings and the
33 meetings being indoors with minimal air circulation.

34 MOTION

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Chang moved to add Section 5.5 to PTC's By-Laws that Commissioners may
2 attend remotely to the extent permitted by State law.

3 SECOND

4 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

5 VOTE

6 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 6-0.

7 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0 (Lauing
8 absent)

9 Vice-Chair Summa asked if Commissioners Templeton and Roohparvar would prefer to continue
10 to attend remotely or if would they come in if the Commission wore masks.

11 Commissioner Templeton stated she felt more focused when she was on Zoom because she
12 could see all of the Commissioners but was comfortable coming in if meeting norms were
13 established.

14 Commissioner Hechtman announced he was happy to wear a mask during meetings.

15 Commissioner Chang agreed with Commissioner Hechtman.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl concurred.

17 Vice-Chair Summa echoed the comments.

18 Commissioner Roohparvar appreciated the discussion.

19 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Summa. Pass 6-0 (Lauing absent)

20 **Approval of Minutes**

21 Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.^{1,3}

22 6. October 12, 2022 Draft Verbatim and Summary Meeting Minutes

23 MOTION

24 Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the minutes as revised.

25 SECOND

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl seconded.

2 VOTE

3 Ms. Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the
4 motion passed 6-0.

5 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0 (Lauing
6 absent)

7 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Reckdahl. Pass 6-0 (Lauing absent)

8 **Committee Items**

9 None

10 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

11 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, shared that the Office of Transportation would be
12 bringing forward a contract for the On Demand Shuttle Service to City Council on December 5,
13 2022. If the Commission was interested, the Office of Transportation Staff could prepare a
14 presentation for the Commission.

15 Commissioner Chang requested a presentation on that item. She asked if the items going to
16 Council that was PTC related would be heard by the Council before the end of the year.

17 Ms. French confirmed those items had tentative dates and it was possible they could be moved.

18 Commissioner Chang requested that the order for vote-taking be rotated so that she was not
19 always the first to vote.

20 Vice-Chair Summa recalled the Commission had discussed that and agreed the names should be
21 called at random.

22 Commissioner Reckdahl commented that the City was doing a test at the Willkie Way bike
23 bridge to improve the traction of the bridge when it becomes slippery. He mentioned Staff was
24 requesting feedback on the traction methods the City had installed.

25 Vice-Chair Summa shared that Chair Lauing was invited to two focus group meetings for City
26 Commission Chairs to discuss closures on Romona Street and California Avenue. Chair Lauing
27 suggested that she go to the first meeting and the new Chair attend the second meeting.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton remarked that Senator Becker was going to be presenting State funds
2 to the City for the Newell Street bridge renewal project on Saturday at 10:00 am at City Hall.

3 Ms. French shared that the City has 24 active TDM programs within the City that are monitored
4 by City Staff.

5 **Adjournment**

6 9:30 pm

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.