Call to Order / Roll Call

Approximately 6:02 pm

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called the roll and announced that all Commissioners are present with the exception of Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

Oral Communications

The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Five (5) minutes per speaker.¹

Chair Hechtman explained that oral communications are for the public to speak on items that are not on the agenda.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called on Jennifer Atkinson.

Jennifer Atkinson requested that members of the public be allowed to turn on their video during public comments of the Action Items.

Ms. Klicheva noted that if speakers wish to have their videos on, she will promote them to panelists.

Chair Hechtman inquired if there are any reasons why applicants or members of the public are not allowed to have their video on.

Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, concurred that it is allowed if they so wish to have their video on.

Ms. Klicheva announced that there are no other speakers for oral communications.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

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

¹ The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
² 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 ten (10) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
³ The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak from five (5) to three (3) minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.
Chair Hechtman remarked that he has no agenda changes, additions, or deletions. He inquired if any Commissioners or Staff have changes they wish to make to the agenda.

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning, announced that Staff has no changes.

**City Official Reports**

1. **Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments**

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning, thanked the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) for the work and accomplishments they had over the year 2021. City Council reappointed Commissioner Chang and appointed Keith Reckdahl to PTC for the year 2022. Mr. Reckdahl was a Commissioner on the Parks and Recreation Commission, he was a member of the North Ventura Coordinated Area (NVCAP) Plan Working Group and he is a current member of the Housing Element Working Group. He acknowledged that this meeting is Commissioner Alcheck’s last meeting with PTC and he thanked Commissioner Alcheck for his service to the Commission and the City. He asked how long Commissioner Alcheck has served as a PTC Commissioner.

Commissioner Alcheck answered just short of 10-years.

Mr. Lait requested that Commissioner Alcheck join the January 2022 PTC where Staff will present him with a Resolution recognizing his service to the City. At their Monday meeting, Council extended virtual meetings for all Boards and Commission through February 2022.

Chair Hechtman noted that PTC’s first meeting in January 2022 is on the 12th.

Commissioner Alcheck confirmed that he will be at the meeting.

Chair Hechtman reminded Commissioner Summa and Vice-Chair Roohparvar that they are PTC’s liaisons to Council for January 2022. Staff will confirm with the Commissioners if there are PTC items on Council’s agenda for their January 2022 meetings.

**Action Items**

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

2. **PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 985 Channing Avenue [21PLN-00167]: Request for Public Hearing of a Preliminary Parcel Map to Remove Recorded Height Restrictions on the Underlying Parcel Map. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with**
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Guideline Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions). Zoning District: R-1 (Single Family Residential).

1. Chair Hechtman read the title of the Action Item into the record. He explained that the item was supposed to be heard by PTC on September 8, 2021, but per the request of a neighbor, the item was continued to October 13, 2021. The Commission received the Staff report and took public comment on October 13, 2021. The item was continued to November 10, 2021, but that meeting was later canceled, so the item was continued to December 15, 2021.

2. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, reported that there is no new information from the prior meeting. The question that was raised during the October 13, 2021 meeting by PTC was is using the Preliminary Parcel Map process the best mechanism or should there be a Map Amendment. Based on conversations with outside legal counsel, Staff concluded that the Preliminary Parcel Map procedure is an acceptable process for the project. State law also defined two additional processes that can change the Final Map. Those were Certificate of Correction and Amending Map. Both processes are more limited both in terms of the scope and what those processes are allowed to do. Staff requested that PTC recommend to Council that they not make the findings in the absence of the subject height condition. An attorney representing the neighbors submitted late a letter that raised new substantial concerns. Given the late submission of the letter, the applicant requested that PTC either disregard the letter or continue the hearings so that the applicant team can prepare a response. If the Commission decides to hear the item and deliberate on it. He recommended that the Commission allow the applicant team to present their project and hold public comment regardless of whether the Commission dismisses the late submission or not.

3. Chair Hechtman mentioned that the letter submitted by the opposing party was sent today in the afternoon.

4. Mr. Yang confirmed that the letter was received today in the afternoon.

5. Chair Hechtman announced that he did read the letter and the letter raised several legal concerns. He predicted that many of the Commissioners will want to know the City’s opinion on the letter and that Staff may not have a prepared response. He suggested that the Commission continue the item to allow Staff and the applicant more time to prepare a response to the letter.

6. Mr. Yang stated that he is prepared to make a statement if that is the Commissions desire.

7. Chair Hechtman asked what process would the Commission be interested in taking; reopening public comment or move to continue the item. He mentioned that his original intention was not to reopen public comment.
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1. Commissioner Alcheck suggested that public comment not be reopened and that the Commission proceed with Commission deliberation. If the Commission has questions, those should be directed to legal Staff. He shared that his least preferred option was to continue the item.

5. Chair Hechtman understood from Staff that if the public hearing is reopened, the applicant and the public will be allowed to share comments with the Commission.

7. Mr. Yang confirmed that is Staff’s suggested process.

8. Commissioner Lauing supported both options of continuing the hearing to a later date or allowing all parties to share comments with the Commission.

10. Commissioner Summa summarized that the applicant has requested a continuance because they have not had ample time to review the late submission. She echoed Commissioner Lauing’s comment about process. She remarked that she cannot ignore the statements that were mentioned in the letter.

14. Chair Hechtman agreed that the applicant has requested a continuance and that he is sensitive to their request. He supported the applicant’s request for a continuance.

16. Commissioner Alcheck requested that the applicant clarify if that is their preferred option.

17. Garrett Sauls, Planner, confirmed that he spoke with the applicant and they preferred that the item be continued so they digest and prepare a response to the letter.

19. **MOTION**

20. Commissioner Summa moved to reopen the public hearing in response to the new information, take public comment and then continue the meeting.

22. Chair Hechtman clarified that the applicant is not prepared to provide comments on the letter. He suggested the motion be to continue the meeting without public comment and then at the next meeting reopen the public hearing.

25. **MOTION RESTATE**

26. Commissioner Summa moved to continue the item to a date uncertain.

27. **SECOND**

28. Commissioner Lauing seconded the motion.

---
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1. Commissioner Templeton stated that if there is a concern about whether to reopen public comment. The applicant can provide a letter of rebuttal and the Commission would not have to reopen public comment.

2. Mr. Yang clarified for Commissioner Templeton that the motion is now to continue the item to a date uncertain.

3. Commissioner Templeton apologized and announced she supports the motion.

VOTE

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called a roll call vote. She announced that the motion passed 5-1 with Vice-Chair Roohparvar absent.

MOTION PASSED 5(Chang, Lauing, Hechtman, Summa, Templeton) –1(Alcheck) -1(Roohparvar absent)

Commissioner Alcheck encouraged PTC to consider Commissioner Templeton’s comment regarding whether to reopen public comment or not. He stated that reopening public comment, that will set a precedent for late submittals derailing the City process. He wondered if Legal Staff had changed their recommendation based on the information that was received.

3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI JUDICIAL/LEGISLATIVE: Review of the Castilleja School's Requested Conditional Use Permit and Variance per Council Direction March 29, 2021, and Review of a Draft Ordinance per Council Direction Amending Section 18.04.030 Regarding Definition of Gross Floor Area in the R1 Zone for Below Grade Garages. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Published July 30, 2020 and the Draft EIR was Published July 15, 2019 (Continued from the December 8, 2021 meeting)

Chair Hechtman read the item into the record. The item was heard on December 12, 2021, where PTC took public comment and heard the rebuttal from the applicant.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, announced that there is no new information that Staff wished to present.

Chair Hechtman suggested that the Commission take a short break to allow time for the applicant and their team to join the meeting.

[The Commission took a short break]

Chair Hechtman invited the Commissioners to ask clarifying questions of the applicant.
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Commissioner Chang requested that Staff call out the names of the applicant team.

Ms. French obliged.

Commissioner Chang understood that Castilleja has a desire to have enrollment be increased to 540 students. She wanted to know how 540 was identified.

Nanci Kauffman, Head of School for Castilleja, stated that the school understood from the beginning of the process that the school cannot generate more car trips to and from campus. The recommendation of enrollment to 540 students is the maximum number that the school’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) can accommodate and not create more trips. The increase is not driven by revenue but by the desire to educate as many girls as possible. Many neighbors compare Castilleja’s square foot to other schools and argue that 540 students are too many for the campus. She argued that most schools have more field space and the Fire Marshall has expressed that Castilleja can accommodate more than 540 students and still be compliant with fire regulations.

Commissioner Chang inquired if the increase to 540 students is mainly to increase the high school enrollment.

Ms. Kauffman confirmed that is correct.

Commissioner Chang found that information helpful because high school students use the campus in different ways than middle school students. She asked why must the increase take place on one campus and has the school explored having two campuses like so many other schools.

Ms. Kauffman explained that other schools add a new campus when they have added a new division to the school. Castilleja is not adding a new division and there is a big difference between having a middle school and high school combined versus having them separate. It is less desirable to have 6th grade girls be with 12th grade boys on the same campus than having 6th grade girls be with 12th grade girls.

Commissioner Chang agreed that Castilleja is very dense and that it is denser than the City’s public schools. Stratford Elementary School does not have fields and they have a lower density than what Castilleja will have with its increased enrollment. She asked if the school is worried about the high density coupled with underground classrooms and the mental health state of the students being in underground classrooms.

Ms. Kauffman stated that she has never heard about density as it relates to students on campus until she began the process of increasing enrollment for Castilleja. The campus has enough
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classrooms to accommodate 540 students. However, the future of education is having a variety of different types of classrooms and different types of spaces. The underground classroom is designed to have significant amounts of light and is a better space for the art curriculums.

Commissioner Chang asked what assurances can Castilleja provide to ensure that enrollment will not exceed 540 students because currently, the school is over-enrolled.

Ms. Kauffman explained that she self-reported to the City that the school was over-enrolled and Castilleja followed a process to reduce enrollment over time. That plan has been successfully implemented and an independent auditor annually reviews the school’s revenue, directory, and records and verifies enrollment.

Commissioner Chang agreed that girls' education is a public benefit. She inquired what percentage of applicants are from Palo Alto and what percentage of those applicants are admitted to the school.

Ms. Kauffman answered it is between 25 and 30 percent.

Commissioner Chang inquired what the overall admission rate is for Castilleja.

Ms. Kauffman remarked that the admission rate varies from year to year. Typically, there are several hundred applications for 6th grade and several hundred for 9th grade. Of those applications, 60 girls are accepted for 6th and 60 are accepted for 9th grade. The school would like to increase 9th grade acceptance to 85.

Kathy Layendecker, Associate Head of School for Castilleja, confirmed that the acceptance rate is low for 9th grade and that is what the school is trying to increase through its enrollment increase.

Commissioner Chang asked what is new in the proposed TDM Plan compared to the TDM Plan that was presented in March 2021.

Ms. Layendecker stated that the point of the TDM Plan is to decrease the number of trips per student. That way as enrollment grows, the school can maintain no net new trips.

Elizabeth Hughes, Castilleja’s TDM Plan expert, explained that the school and herself together reviewed all existing and proposed TDM measures and then added additional features to those measures. When the enrollment reaches 540 students, the TDM plan will mitigate the school’s peak parking demand shortfalls.

Mindie Romanowsky, land use counsel for Castilleja School, explained that after the draft Conditions of Approval were written, Conditions #20 through #27 set forth a very detailed set
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Staff suggested that the school hire Ms. Hughes to draft a TDM manual as a way to implement the plan. She encouraged the Commission and the public to thoroughly review the TDM manual to understand the exact measures that Castilleja will be required to follow.

Commissioner Chang agreed that she will review Conditions #20 through #27 and compare it to the TDM Plan.

Chair Hechtman apologized that he did not mention this at the beginning of the item but requested that Commissioners disclose any supplemental disclosures that they may have. He disclosed that Preserve Neighborhood Quality of Life (PNQL) provided him with a binder with the same information that the other Commissioners received before the December 8th, 2021 meeting.

Commissioner Templeton confirmed that she also received the same binder.

Hearing no more disclosures, Chair Hechtman called on Commissioner Templeton to ask questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Templeton appreciated Commissioner Chang’s questions and the applicant’s answers. She requested that the applicant share why the buildings have to be modernized.

Ms. Kauffman explained that the existing buildings are at an age where they cannot be renovated to facilitate 21st-century teaching and do not meet current sustainability standards. The materials that will be used for the new buildings and the increase of natural light will help increase student wellbeing.

Commissioner Templeton stated that it is important to remember the condition of the existing structures throughout the discussion. She commented that through her personal observation, the existing buildings are past their useful lifespan. She inquired how Ms. Kauffman describes the school.

Ms. Kauffman stated that Castilleja is the best option for middle and high school girls in the area who want to explore themselves as strong leaders for the future.

Commissioner Templeton asked how are the existing structures helping the school meet that vision.

Ms. Kauffman remarked that Castilleja is doing an outstanding job despite the limitations of the existing structures. She added that she was not sure how much longer the school can continue to perform well with the existing structures.
Commissioner Templeton acknowledged that she has had concerns about the need for an underground garage and that Castilleja has received direction from the City for how much parking is required.

Ms. Kauffman remarked that the origin of the underground garage came from discussions with neighbors. The design and location of the surface buildings were designed around the underground garage.

Commissioner Templeton recapped that the City is requiring the school to adequately park the site and the community has expressed support for an underground garage.

Ms. Kauffman answered yes, but also underground parking is encouraged in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) called out underground parking as the preferred alternative.

Ms. Layendecker understood that the EIR and the Comprehensive Plan favor underground parking for sustainability reasons and will increase surface green space.

Commissioner Alcheck stated that Castilleja was established in the 1890s and he wanted to understand what the motivation was to start an all-girls school in Palo Alto.

Ms. Kauffman shared that Castilleja’s original mission was based on the need to prepare more young women to be qualified to apply to Stanford University. The current mission went beyond that and placed girls in an environment that will prepare them for roles that go beyond college.

Commissioner Alcheck explained that PTC receives many comments around public benefit and that has become very limited in scope. He remarked that his view is that public benefit can achieve a larger goal that serves community values. He asked if the public benefit of increasing enrollment is any different than when the school was first established and is that part of the value.

Ms. Kauffman responded that just having the single goal of educating girls for college is not the best preparation for adulthood and a contributing member of society. The school has changed its curriculum to be able to carry those skills into adulthood.

Commissioner Alcheck gave the example that the City’s green initiatives are not to make the local air better, but to participate in a global movement to improve the environment. He acknowledged the comments that question if the school serves enough residents and he asked if it is the school’s view that educating more girls is more of a global public benefit.

Ms. Kauffman confirmed that is correct and that schools around the world base their institutes on Castilleja’s model.
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Commissioner Alcheck inquired if the school has a targeted student-to-teacher ratio and would change with increased enrollment.

Ms. Kauffman concurred that the new campus will have larger class sizes but the school does not anticipate hiring more faculty. Education is moving to a system where students are more independent and student/teacher ratios will not be as connected to class size as it was in the past.

Commissioner Alcheck wanted to understand if Castilleja participates in discussions with other local schools and where education is headed.

Ms. Kauffman shared that Castilleja has an active connection with Palo Alto High School. Castilleja also has partnerships with elementary schools in Palo Alto and East Palo Alto.

Commissioner Alcheck recalled that Castilleja was able to open earlier than local public schools when the pandemic started. He asked if there was a dialog with public schools on how Castilleja was able to achieve that. He mentioned that his questions are to better understand the public benefit.

Ms. Kauffman remarked that Castilleja is one school and it was easier to manage the Covid-19 pandemic than the larger local school districts. She noted that per the existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Castilleja cannot open its campus to the community. The school would welcome that kind of connection with the community.

Commissioner Alcheck appreciated the comment that Castilleja cannot open the campus to the public because of the regulations in the existing CUP.

Ms. Kauffman added that Castilleja’s campus is used for a summer program called Peninsula Bridge and 20 percent of students use the school’s tuition assistance program.

Commissioner Alcheck asked how will the new campus facilitate better well-being and education for the students.

Ms. Kauffman stated that the new campus will be transformative for teachers and students.

Commissioner Summa wanted to know if the TDM will be year-round and cover evenings and weekends.

Ms. Layendecker clarified that the TDM Plan is not specific to times and days.

Commissioner Summa restated that the no new net trips requirement will apply to events and summer school.
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Ms. Romanowsky acknowledged that there are Conditions of Approval that specify when TDM is applied.

Commissioner Summa was curious why Castilleja was moving forward with the underground garage given that the Fehr and Peers study showed that the school has enough surface parking. Also, she asked why Castilleja was proposing 54 parking spaces be located in the front.

Ms. Layendecker articulated that the school is following the City’s Comprehensive Plan that favored underground parking over surface parking. Also, in the early stages, neighbors pushed for an underground garage and more green space which the underground garage facilitates.

Robert Eckals, parking consultant, acknowledged that the school has used the available public parking spots on the streets because they are the adjacent land use.

Ms. Romanowsky added that the underground garage helps Castilleja meet its parking requirements as well as met the school’s objectives of having a playing field and preserving the homes on campus.

Commissioner Summa commented that she does fully understand why the garage is needed if the school can fully park the project with its existing surface spaces.

Ms. Romanowsky further explained that the school has objectives it would like to meet, the neighbors pushed for the underground garage, and the City’s Comprehensive Plan along with the EIR all recommended fewer surface parking spaces. Castilleja followed that guidance and planned their project around having an underground garage.

Commissioner Summa recalled that a prior PTC Commissioner had concerns that the TDM Plan would not capture both traffic and parking when folks drop their students off outside of campus. She wanted to know if the school has was to mitigate that concern.

Ms. Kauffman explained that with the new travel rules for faculty, the visitor lot on campus has become empty, and visitors will be instructed to park in that lot along Bryant Street.

Ms. Layendecker added that everyone is required to register their car with the school. Castilleja staff patrol the neighborhood and look for Castilleja cars that are parked outside the campus.

Commissioner Summa stated that it is not only an issue for parking but traffic.

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning, stated that in the traffic analysis that was presented to Council, events were included in the a.m./p.m. peak and average daily trip counts. The TDM Program has measures that specifically address events and traffic monitoring. If the Commission feels that the analysis is insufficient, that feedback should be shared with Staff.
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Commissioner Lauing proclaimed that the parking study was very optimistic and highlighted that there is enough existing surface parking to park the project. He inquired if the applicant agrees that the existing surface parking spaces are adequate to park the project with enrollment increased to 540 students.

Ms. Layendecker confirmed that the parking study showed that with a 14 percent parking reduction, Castilleja will meet all parking requirements.

Commissioner Lauing remarked that Council directed PTC to review surface parking and underground parking. The Commission needed to understand why there is a need for an underground parking garage. He acknowledged that there have been mixed comments from the public about the underground garage. He inquired if Castilleja foresaw the school receiving any benefits from a Residential Parking Program (RPP).

Ms. Kauffmann confirmed that they are not requesting an RPP.

Commissioner Lauing noted that TDM can be improved if sophomore and junior students are removed from the calculations. He asked if Castilleja plans to do that.

Ms. Layendecker concurred that would be a further reduction if sophomore and junior students were removed.

Commissioner Lauing inquired if Castilleja agrees with the Fehr and Peers report that the school will have an additional six parking spaces because not as many teachers will be driving to campus.

Ms. Layendecker agreed.

Commissioner Lauing wanted to understand if the school has explored having additional satellite parking lots with shuttles.

Ms. Layendecker emphasized that the City requires that the project meet parking requirements and satellite parking does not help address that requirement. The school already has satellite parking that are within walking distance to the school.

Commissioner Lauing inquired how often will the proposed TDM data be audited.

Ms. Layendecker responded that the official monitoring reports will happen three times a year and then there will be real-time measurements happening as well.

Chair Hechtman suggested the Commission take a short break.
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[The Commission took a 10-minute break]

Commissioner Lauing understood that the figure of 540 students is not a permanent cap but what the school can reach without having new net trips. He wanted to understand how the school determined that 25 students per year is the right number to annually increase enrollment.

Ms. Kauffman could not speak to the future of the school but the campus was designed to house 540 students. She shared that 60 students per grade for high school is too small and the proposal aims to right-size the school in terms of what Castilleja would like to offer to students.

Commissioner Lauing inquired if the school foresaw any risks that may come up.

Ms. Kauffman remarked that she has not thought about what can go wrong with the project. She emphasized that the school has tremendous confidence that it can meet the no new net trips to campus.

Chair Hechtman mentioned that Council included in their scope of inquiry the concept of temporarily relocating the school during the construction period. He requested that the applicant share how easy or difficult that may be for the school.

Ms. Kauffman confirmed that the school explored the concept of having a temporary campus, but they cannot guarantee that space would be available.

Ms. Layendecker confirmed that Castilleja is open to exploring a temporary location and that it would be good for the school. She concurred with Ms. Kauffman’s comment that finding a place would be difficult.

Chair Hechtman shared that Council has expressed concern regarding the enforcement process for the TDM and ramifications if it is not followed. He stated that he expected that Castilleja will comply with all rules and regulations. One idea he had was to limit the number of sophomores, juniors and seniors who can park at the school if noncompliance occurs.

Ms. Kauffman explained that families who join the school are expected to abide by the rules and regulations. It is particularly difficult to tell an existing student who does not live in Palo Alto not to drive to school.

Chair Hechtman requested that the applicant team summarize the infraction plan.

Ms. Hughes explained that the first section pertained to the period of construction to a maximum enrollment of 540 students. The consequences for each infraction increased in severity as the infraction count increased. The second section pertained to infractions that are
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Chair Hechtman inquired if there is an overlap between the two sections.

Ms. Hughes understood that to be correct but invited Ms. Romanowsky to confirm.

Mr. Lait confirmed that there is overlap. He acknowledged that Staff is still examining those areas of the TDM Program and requested that the Commission provide any feedback they may have.

Ms. Romanowsky requested that PTC provide feedback.

Chair Hechtman explained that the two tables read as though they were intended to be sequential, but he predicted that there may be overlap. With that said, he remarked that he did not understand how the first step in each plan work together.

Ms. Romanowsky agreed and noted that it should be clarified.

Chair Hechtman inquired if the second table requires consecutive reports like it does in table one.

Ms. Romanowsky restated that Castilleja is required to do three reports per year until trust is established.

Chair Hechtman clarified that the second table does not use the word consecutive but the first table does. He asked if that was intentional.

Ms. Romanowsky confirmed that the language should track and the reports should be consecutive.

Chair Hechtman addressed the second table and noted that the first three infractions use “subsequent year” terminology, but the 4th and 5th infraction does not use that term.

Ms. Hughes explained that the differences between the infractions were reflected in the consequences.

Chair Hechtman predicted the fourth box in the second table should read “the first and second report in the subsequent year”. Meaning the subsequent year after the third consecutive report that shows exceedance.

Ms. Hughes confirmed that is correct.
Chair Hechtman suggested that the fourth box in the second table should read “the first and second report in the subsequent year”, meaning the subsequent year after the third consecutive report that shows exceedance.

Ms. Hughes concurred.

Chair Hechtman recommended that be clarified as well.

Ms. Romanowski noted that the document language was a collaboration between Staff and the applicant team. Any suggestions from the PTC will be incorporated into the document.

Chair Hechtman emphasized that the rules must be clear. He asked Ms. Hughes if she has ever done a TDM Program that is as extensive as Castilleja’s plan to address traffic generation for 650 people.

Ms. Hughes mentioned that she worked on a project that had an 80 percent car-free entitlement that was approved. Many of her projects had a TDM reduction of 30 to 40 percent, but Castilleja’s TDM Program is above 50 percent.

Chair Hechtman emphasized that he is wondering about the population that the program is serving.

Ms. Hughes stated that most of her programs address much higher populations.

Mr. Eckols noted that schools are unique situations in terms of TDM. There is a different synergy with schools than corporations and that synergy results in a successful TDM program.

Commissioner Chang inquired why enrollment is currently at 426 instead of at 415.

Ms. Layendecker clarified that the school is currently at 422 students enrolled. The City’s original enrollment plan was to reduce enrollment to 438 and then hold steady at 438 until a new CUP can be issued. The City came back and recommended that the school continue to decrease enrollment due to the process for a new CUP taking longer than normal.

Commissioner Chang agreed with Mr. Eckols’ comment that schools are different than corporations because of the drop-off and pick-up operations. She commented that with Castilleja’s TDM, the traffic component is particularly important. She inquired how will drop-off and pick-up at the garage be enforced.

Ms. Romanowsky clarified that Project Alternative Four has a distributed drop-off plan where drop-off and pick-up is scattered around the campus. The school has educational documentation that is sent to families enrolled at the school and enforcement officers on site.
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Ms. Layendecker added that Castilleja has created a TDM culture at the school through education and enforcement. Drop-off and pick-up areas were designed to avoid queuing and is carefully managed.

Commissioner Chang remarked that monitoring traffic is important and she wanted to know how trips to the drop-off locations at Kellogg Street and Bryant Street will be counted.

Ms. Layendecker informed that there are driveways at those locations and driveway counters will be used.

Commissioner Chang asked how the applicant team determined which consequence coincided with each infraction. She shared that she asks the question because it will promote transparency.

Ms. Layendecker explained that mitigation strategies over time become outdated. She agreed that transparency is important and requested that the CUP be flexible to allow the school to implement different solutions as strategies become outdated.

Commissioner Chang agreed but argued that it is important to distinguish between additional measures and more severe measures.

Chair Hechtman closed the public comment period and moved the item into Commissioner discussion. He reminded PTC that its role is to share feedback with Staff and then have Staff return with that information at a later meeting. He suggested that PTC take each item one at a time and provide direction to Staff. He inquired if there are items that should be discussed at a later time.

Commissioner Alcheck inquired if Commissioners are allowed to discuss any topic instead of going in order. He suggested that PTC provide broad comments and allow Commissioners to speak to items they are interested in speaking to. With that said, he recommended that the topic regarding special events be moved to the top of discussion topics. He explained that there may be topics that Staff should broaden their approach as opposed to narrowing down the concepts.

Commissioner Lauing supported Chair Hechtman’s approach of taking the items one by one.

Commissioner Chang agreed that the Commission should focus on the topics Staff has presented on. She understood that there are big picture discussions that need to take place but acknowledged that those comments can be shared at a different meeting. She disclosed that she is not prepared to discuss parking Options D and E and surface parking/adjustments as well as temporary campus/construction phasing.
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Commissioner Summa agreed with Chair Hechtman’s approach and agreed with Commissioner Chang’s comment that the list has changed from what was presented. She asked what discussion topic #8, Other, means.

Chair Hechtman explained that Council’s motion has instructed PTC to explore specific issues. Discussion topic #8 allowed Commissioners to provide comments on areas that may not be on the list but are relevant.

Commissioner Summa suggested that the Commission discuss Dudek’s report on square footage.

Chair Hechtman suggested that Commissioner Summa hold her comments on that until discussion topic #8 comes up. He recommended that discussion topics #2 and #6 be switched. He invited each Commissioner to speak for up to 5-minutes on each discussion topic and encouraged Commissioners to disclose what additional information they need from Staff if any.

Discussion topic #1 was in regards to the Text Amendment. Commissioner Summa reported that she was happy that Council determined that the underground garage should be counted towards GFA. She commented if Citywide legislation that applies to only one property is the best solution to solve the problem. That is not typically the method that the City uses and is considered to be spot zoning. She expressed her concern about setting a precedent if the amendment is adopted. Also, the amendment was unfair and provided a special exemption for one parcel. She requested that Staff provide other approaches that the City can take.

Chair Hechtman inquired if Commissioner Summa is asking a question or directing Staff to bring back more information at the next meeting.

Commissioner Summa understood that any policy directions would require Staff to come back with more details.

Mr. Lait remarked that he is prepared to answer the question now and agreed that there may be questions that need a further review from Staff. He explained that Council directed Staff to explore a Text Amendment and to narrowly craft it so that it would not have broad applicability. He acknowledged Commissioner Summa’s discomfort of having a Text Amendment that is very narrow, but he did not believe that it would be precedent-setting. The City does not have other large parcels where a private school resides. Also, any property owner of an R-1 who is interested in using that Text Amendment would have to come before PTC and City Council. He requested that Commissioners provide specific direction on areas that they feel are not in alignment with Council’s direction.
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Commissioner Summa opined that Staff’s interpretation of Council’s direction that the 50 percent threshold would be based on the parking requirement before the Director’s parking adjustment did not represent Council’s motion. She asked what would happen if Castilleja sold the property.

Mr. Lait remarked that it is hard to speculate what might happen in the future. The CUP runs with the land and if a different private school moved onto the parcel. They would be subject to the CUP. If the parcel was subdivided, then it would be developed into a permitted use.

Commissioner Summa restated if that would it be possible if the parcel contained one house.

Mr. Lait noted that the Text Amendment is associated with the private school.

Commissioner Chang agreed with Commissioner Summa that a Text Amendment may not be the best solution to solve the problem. She expressed her concern regarding the 50 percent baseline versus required parking. The City is giving value on top of value and there will be costs with for those values. If the intent is to minimize underground parking, it should be 50 percent of what is ultimately required for the site. She wanted to understand if the City should be limiting the square foot of space in the underground garage instead of the number of spaces. She asked what is the end goal of the Text Amendment.

Mr. Lait shared that Staff did explore how to regulate space because constructions costs are high. It would be expensive to build extra space when it is not needed. Also, the design of the garage will be reviewed by the PTC and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) through the Discretionary Review process. PTC and ARB can suggest modifications and adjustments if the plans do not meet the findings.

Commissioner Lauing appreciated Commissioner Summa and Commissioner Chang’s comments. He stated that Staff followed Council’s direction and provided what seemed to be the only option to fulfill Council’s direction.

Commissioner Alcheck asked if the City counts below-grade parking in non-R-1 zones towards GFA.

Ms. French answered no.

Commissioner Alcheck stated that the Text Amendment for the underground parking facility is incoherent. The City does not allow single-family homes to have below-grade parking and that has been confused with the notion that below-grade parking in R-1 is forbidden by the Code. The Code has specific rules for single-family homes and they do not apply to non-single-family home developments in any zone. He added that the Comprehensive Plan encouraged
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underground parking with the clear exception that it not be applied to single-family homes. He recommended that the City make it clear what the Code makes permissible and that a non-single-family use can have an underground parking facility in an R-1 zone. Regarding counting GFA to the 50 percent mark, he stated that is inconsistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and he recommended that Staff explore what that rule would mean Citywide. He emphasized that it raised red flags when the City decides to change the existing rules for one specific application. He agreed that above-grade parking facilities are an eyesore and that was clearly outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Hechtman confessed that he did not watch the March 29, 2021, Council meeting when they discussed the project. He shared that to make the Text Amendment applicable, it has to be a historic resource on a parcel that is 6-acres or larger. He inquired if those specific components were suggested by Council or was that Staff’s effort to find criteria for a narrowly crafted ordinance.

Mr. Lait answered it was Staff’s effort.

Chair Hechtman stated that the concept is that the requirement is broadly applicable to any non-residential use in a residential zone but with a narrow application.

Mr. Lait agreed and understood that Council was trying to respond to the application that was before them.

Chair Hechtman understood that Council was explicit that the applicant should have no more than 50 percent of the required parking underground. He mentioned it was less clear whether Council was insistent that the 50 percent concept be incorporated into the ordinance.

Mr. Lait responded that the language in the motion is what Staff and the Commission are working with. Staff is open to other interpretations of the motion. Staff interpreted it as 50 percent of the GFA would be exempted, the other 50 percent would be counted and it was vague about how to assign different square footages.

Chair Hechtman requested that Staff bring back a more flexible version of the ordinance that allowed for the possibility of other uses of the ordinance in the residential zones for non-residential uses. Also, an ordinance that allowed Staff or Council the ability to allow greater than 50 percent to not count toward GFA if certain objective criteria are met. He was concerned that the ordinance will have to be amended to fit another project in the future.

Mr. Lait mentioned that Chair Hechtman’s suggestion is not consistent with his understanding of Council’s motion. He noted that the policy change that Council did make was that the
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Chair Hechtman did not want to pressure Commissioners to support his suggestion but rather to see it on paper.

Mr. Lait clarified that his comment was not to suggest that feedback should not be given. More that it would be helpful to have one or two approaches that the majority of the Commission supported instead of having several approaches that only one Commissioner supports.

Chair Hechtman restated his concern of pressuring Commissioners to support a concept that they are not willing to commit to.

Mr. Lait noted if a Commissioner supports Staff exploring an approach, they are not required to support that when Staff returns.

Commissioner Lauing mentioned that there have been many comments from the Commissioners and the public that it would be better if the Text Amendment did not apply to a specific property. He inquired if that is enough consensus for Staff to explore other alternatives.

Mr. Lait appreciated Commissioner Lauing’s comment and asked the Commission to identify an order of magnitude.

Chair Hechtman supported Commissioner Lauing’s approach and acknowledged that his suggestion is specific.

Commissioner Summa agreed with Commissioner Lauing’s suggestion. She commented that the need for Castilleja and the situation of what happened with Congregation Kol Emeth may mean that the City should reevaluate the policy’s implications Citywide. She did not support Staff bringing back specific approaches.

Mr. Lait stated that a Citywide policy issue is different than Citywide applicability or broadened applicability.

Commissioner Summa agreed and wanted to understand what is the need for an underground garage when the project is located in R-1 or low-density residential zones and what should be moved forward as a Citywide rule.

Mr. Lait argued that Council directed Staff to make the Text Amendment narrow but PTC wants to broaden it. Also, that Staff should explore the implications of having it Citywide with the suggestion of whether it should be allowed at all.
Commissioner Summa clarified that her suggestion does not strictly apply to Castilleja but is a suggestion to have a broader conversation.

Commissioner Templeton aligned her comments with Commissioner Summa’s comments. She commented that most likely there will be another project who requests an underground parking garage and it will become a pattern. She predicted that because open land is limited, folks will find ways to be creative and work with precedent. She argued that the City should be proactive and be clear on what is acceptable and what is not. She expressed concerns about how much can be placed underground and its impacts.

Commissioner Chang strongly supported Commissioner Templeton and Commissioner Summa’s comments. She stated that if the language is going to be in the Code, then it should have a broader application.

Chair Hechtman mentioned that his concept and Commissioner Lauing’s suggestion that Staff comes back with a more flexible document allowed for a policy discussion and allowed the Commission to make a recommendation to Council. He asked the other Commissioners if they should continue the discussion or move to continue the item to a date uncertain.

Commissioner Alcheck suggested that the Commission continue the discussion. Commissioner Lauing was supportive of discussing special events and then continuing the item. Commissioner Templeton suggested that Commissioner Alcheck provide his comments on any of the discussion topics and then continue the item to a date uncertain.

Commissioner Chang agreed with Commissioner Templeton. Commissioner Summa concurred with Commissioner Templeton.

Chair Hechtman agreed and invited Commissioner Alcheck to provide any comments he has.

Commissioner Alcheck recalled Commissioner Lauing’s question at the being of the meeting whether there are a certain number of events that is the bare minimum for a school. With that thinking, he predicted that events would be set just above the minimum mark. He suggested that PTC consider how many events other institutes have in the R-1 zone. The event data that compared Castilleja to other local schools showed that the City is treating Castilleja differently than how it treats other schools. Regarding no events on Sundays, he strongly expressed that the approach the City is taking is completely incoherent and represents gender bias. He asked if limiting the school is considered a public benefit and if not allowing the public to use the facilities is a public benefit. He was not surprised that an all-girls school that is run by women wants to be the top example for TDMs and he was proud that Castilleja has always stated that
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1. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers. He supported the idea of having a TDM Oversight Committee and suggested that some of the Committee members be non-interested third parties. Regarding an RPP, he commented that the City has not fully grasped how to have a successful RPP and that it is a solution to a non-existent problem. Regarding the Text Amendment, he argued that it makes no sense to apply it to Castilleja or other projects in general. He encouraged PTC to not be complicit in promoting a process that terminates reasonable applications for redevelopment by allowing the goal post to continue to be moved. He encouraged PTC to follow a process that does not apply standards to Castilleja that would not otherwise be applied to other institutions. He concluded by stating that PTC supported a motion that recommended approval of Castilleja’s CUP and the proposal before PTC now is more restrictive.

Chair Hechtman inquired if the item will come back to the Commission at the January 12, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Lait suggested that PTC hold a special meeting on January 19, 2022, to continue the Commission’s deliberations. Staff will follow up with the Commissioners to confirm the date.

Chair Hechtman emphasized that the project cannot continue to be delayed and he supported having a special meeting.

Commissioner Templeton shared that the beginning of January is tensely demanding, but she is open to having a special meeting.

MOTION

Commissioner Chang moved to continue the item to a date uncertain.

SECOND

Commissioner Summa seconded.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called a roll call vote and announced that the motion passed 6-0 with Vice-Chair Roohparvar absent.

MOTION PASSED 6(Alcheck, Chang, Lauing, Hechtman, Summa, Templeton) -0 -1(Roohparvar absent)

Commission Action: Motion by Chang, seconded by Summa. Motion Passed 6-0 with Vice-Chair Roohparvar absent.

_____

1. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
2. 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 ten (10) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak from five (5) to three (3) minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.
1. **Committee Items**

None.

2. **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Hechtman asked if any Commissioners have any questions, comments, or announcements.

Commissioner Alcheck stated that it has been an honor working with all of the Commissioners and the most important issue that he worked on was housing. He explained that the housing crisis is like carbon monoxide and will silently destroy the region if it is not addressed. He stated that each Commissioner has a choice to either clear barriers and support housing or allow the state to take control of the City. He emphasized that coordination and empathy are key to improving housing. He acknowledged that being a Planning and Transportation Commissioner is hard work and he requested that the Commission and Council continue to fight the housing crisis in a meaningful way.

Commissioner Templeton thanked Commissioner Alcheck for his many years of service to the City and congratulated Commissioner Chang on her reappointment. She was excited to be working again with Mr. Reckdahl.

Chair Hechtman congratulated Commissioner Chang on her reappointment and looked forward to working with Mr. Reckdahl. He expressed his condolences to Ms. Tanner for her recent loss.

3. **Adjournment**

11:05 pm
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