



Planning & Transportation Commission Action Agenda: February 23, 2022

Virtual Meeting
6:00 PM

Call to Order / Roll Call

6:02 pm

Chair Lauing called to order the February 23, 2022 Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) meeting.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted the roll call and announced all Commissioners were present

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

Chair Lauing remarked Item One was to adopt a resolution authorizing the use of teleconferencing.

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved to adopt the resolution.

SECOND and VOTE

Chair Lauing stated Vice-Chair Summa seconded. After seeing no hands for discussion, he requested that Staff conduct a roll call vote.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called the roll and announced that the motion carried 7-0.

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

Commission Action: Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Summa. Motion Passed 7-0

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 Chair Lauing invited members of the public to address the Commission on items, not on the
2 agenda.

3 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, called on the public speaker and invited them to
4 share their comments.

5 Stephen Levy commented he was managing a grant from the Silicon Valley Community
6 Foundation on helping folks engage in the Housing Element Update process. He referenced his
7 report that helped guide folks on how to engage in the process. He stated Palo Alto needed to
8 increase its public outreach and engagement. He suggested PTC allow the public comment to
9 be taken at the beginning of any agenda item that pertained to the Housing Element and to
10 place Housing Element items at the beginning of future agendas. The PTC's tradition of when it
11 holds public comments was a barrier to the California Department of Housing and Community
12 Development's (HCD) goal of public participation and easy access to meetings discussing the
13 Housing Element. He concluded he could not figure out how to receive notices for PTC
14 meetings.

15 Ms. Klicheva stated there were no other speakers for oral communications.

16 **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

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

18 Chair Lauing announced there were no agenda changes, additions or deletions.

19 **City Official Reports**

20 2. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

21 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, announced the Development Center will resume in-person
22 services on February 28, 2022. Services will be available by appointment for folks who cannot
23 come in. Santa Clara County continued to require masks to be worn indoors. Upcoming items
24 the Council would be considering were the Grand Jury Report regarding affordable housing and
25 temporary closures for California Avenue and Romona Street. On March 21, 2022, Staff will be
26 presenting to Council a follow-up on Senate Bill 9 as well as PTC's recommendation regarding
27 the Housing Element site selection. She shared if folks were interested in receiving updates
28 regarding the Housing Element, those could be found on the City's website under Housing
29 Element Working Group.

30 Chair Lauing invited questions or discussion from the Commissioners; seeing none he moved to
31 Action Item Three.

32 **Action Items**

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

3 3. Review and Recommendation on 2023-31 Housing Element Sites and Associated
4 Unit Yield (Item Continued from February 9, 2022)

5 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, stated Mr. Wong would provide a summary of the Planning
6 and Transportation Commission's (PTC) prior discussion.

7 Tim Wong, Senior Planner, reported Staff presented the Working Group recommendations
8 regarding site selections for the Housing Element to the PTC on February 9, 2022. PTC asked
9 questions and had robust discussions. There were no formal recommendations and the item
10 was continued. PTC did reach consensus on the pipeline units, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU),
11 multi-family allowed (MFA) and faith-based institution strategies. He reminded the PTC that the
12 unit yields were dynamic figures and the Working Group strongly encouraged the protection of
13 low-density zoned parcels.

14 Chair Lauing disclosed there would be no public comment on the item because it was a
15 continued hearing with no new information. The process was to review each strategy once and
16 then in the next round of comments begin making motions. He emphasized the item could not
17 be continued due to time constraints.

18 Mr. Wong shared that the first strategy was upzoning and the proposal was to upzone
19 Commercial Neighborhood (CN) Zones from 20-dwelling units (du) to 30-du as well as upzone
20 RM-30, CC and CS Zones from 30-du to 40-du. The total yield for the strategy was 1,6400-du.

21 Commissioner Hechtman announced he supported the Working Group's recommendation for
22 upzoning.

23 Commissioner Roohparvar concurred she also supported the Working Group's
24 recommendation.

25 Vice-Chair Summa mentioned currently RM-40 Zones did not enjoy the same Design Standards
26 in terms of adjacent structure protections that RM-30 Zones had. She conditionally supported
27 the idea as long as the Height Transition Zone was retained and extended to RM-40.

28 Commissioner Chang supported Vice-Chair Summa's comment.

29 Ms. Tanner shared the Council had directed Staff to explore applying the Height Transition Zone
30 to RM-40, but the City would not be taking any action that could be perceived as downzoning.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl wanted to know why there was a difference between RM-30 and RM-
32 40.

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. Tanner explained that RM-40 has a higher density and has structures that were taller to
2 support the higher density.

3 Mr. Wong moved to the next strategy which was to increase density near the fixed rail. Any
4 sites located within a quarter-mile of fixed rail were proposed to be increased to 50-du per acre
5 and any sites located a half-mile from fixed rail were proposed to be increased to 40-du per
6 acre. The strategy produced a total yield of 798-du.

7 Commissioner Hechtman noted the strategy did not include low-density areas within the
8 distances from the station. He disclosed his support of the Working Group's recommendation.

9 Vice-Chair Summa expressed her concerns regarding the Mayfield Neighborhood because the
10 existing neighborhood was already dense.

11 Mr. Wong described the next strategy which was to locate additional residential development
12 along other transit corridors. The strategy would upzone sites along the El Camino Real corridor
13 to 40-du per acre and yielded a total of 274-du.

14 Commissioner Templeton stated she supported the Working Group recommendation but was
15 surprised the total yield was not higher. She mentioned with the addition of more housing, the
16 bus service will be improved.

17 Commissioner Chang generally supported the recommendation but encouraged Staff to pursue
18 improved bus services from Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

19 Vice-Chair Summa greatly appreciated the interactive map on the City's website but inquired
20 what color was the transit corridor strategy on the map.

21 Mr. Wong confessed the transit corridor strategy should be aquamarine and Staff would have
22 to correct the error on the interactive map.

23 Vice-Chair Summa wanted to see an older map that showed where the transit corridor sites
24 were located.

25 Chair Lauing associated his comments with Commissioner Templeton's and Commissioner
26 Chang's.

27 Mr. Wong shared an older map with the Commission.

28 Vice-Chair Summa stated in general she supported the recommendation as long as the height
29 transitions are maintained. She remarked VTA was a troubled agency and was concerned the
30 bus routes would not be improved as housing was being developed.

-
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 asked if Alma Street was considered a transit corridor.

2 Mr. Wong agreed there were sites located along Alma Street but the majority of the sites were
3 located along El Camino Real.

4 Mr. Wong moved to the next strategy which pertained to faith-based institutions. He recalled
5 the PTC had a consensus on the strategy.

6 Chair Lauing believed there was a question about faith-based institutions and how many units
7 could be developed on a parking lot.

8 Mr. Wong mentioned the Working Group used the City's standard of 40-du per acre.

9 Clare Campbell, Planning Manager, clarified for faith-based it was 30-du per acre.

10 Chair Lauing asked how did that translate to how many units could be developed on a parking
11 lot.

12 Mr. Wong shared the range was 11- to 36-du on a site.

13 Vice-Chair Summa pointed out that most of the lot sizes for faith-based institutions were not
14 available on the interactive map. She felt it would be useful information to know how big the
15 surface parking lots are. She wanted to know if all the units would be below-market-rate (BMR)
16 housing.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl confirmed the units would be BMR.

18 Vice-Chair Summa supported the strategy and requested Staff include the lot sizes on the
19 interactive map. She wanted to see the height transitions be respected.

20 Commissioner Chang pointed out that the Packet indicated that some of the faith-based
21 institution sites could be developed as low as 6-du.

22 Mr. Wong shared a table that showed the unit yield of each faith-based institution site.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if faith-based institutions operate under a Conditional Use
24 Permit (CUP).

25 Ms. Campbell explained some of the older churches were not required to go through the CUP
26 process but some do have a CUP.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl predicted if the church use was discontinued then the only use for the
28 land would be R-1 housing.

-
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 answered generally speaking yes but there were other uses like daycare facilities.

2 Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, added there were other conditionally permitted uses such
3 as a school or a community center.

4 Commissioner Reckdahl asked what happens to the housing if the church disbands.

5 Ms. Tanner mentioned the City would have to implement a zoning overlay that would allow
6 congregations to build the housing. Often congregations partnered with a non-profit housing
7 developer and the City would have to explore how the ownership of the BMR housing was set
8 up.

9 Mr. Wong stated for City-owned parking lots, the Working Group did not recommend including
10 the strategy in the site inventory. The Council has already directed Staff to explore City-owned
11 parking lots of residential development.

12 Commissioner Hechtman asked will the zoning needs to be changed to allow for residential
13 units to be developed on the parking lots or did the existing zoning allow for residential
14 development.

15 Ms. Campbell confirmed the City would need to modify the zoning to allow for the residential
16 uses.

17 Commissioner Hechtman stated the strategy should be included in the site's inventory list so
18 the sites can be included in the upzone effort. If the sites are upzoned, then barriers would be
19 removed and housing could be developed. He mentioned a member of the public stated HCD
20 requires substantial evidence that housing will be built if more than 50 percent of low-income
21 housing is identified on non-vacant sites. He asked if that was a real requirement.

22 Mr. Yang explained the City has to prove that the sites identified are suitable and available.
23 That work was part of the site selection effort that the Working Group, Staff and the City's
24 consultant have been doing.

25 Commissioner Hechtman inquired if the Working Group discussed what evidence will be shown
26 to prove the sites are suitable and available.

27 Chair Lauing mentioned the Working Group's assignment was not to make sure there were
28 places for 57 percent of the BMR units.

29 Mr. Wong explained Staff presented their methodology on how the sites were identified to the
30 Working Group and one of the main factors used was Improvement to Land Ratio (ILR). If the
31 improvements were ILR was 1 ½ time or less than the land value then the site was appropriate

-
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 for redevelopment. The current Housing Element used the same ratio to identify sites and that
2 methodology was accepted by HCD. Also, the sites identified all housed structures that were
3 older than 20-years and did not have an existing multi-family use.

4 Commissioner Hechtman was concerned HCD would reject a substantial portion of the units if
5 the City does not provide substantial evidence for the non-vacant sites labeled for low-income
6 housing. To protect against that, he recommended having a higher percentage for the buffer
7 and including the City-owner parking lots with a yield of 168-units would increase the buffer.

8 Mr. Wong indicated that the General Manufacturing (GM) Zone strategy was suggested by the
9 Working Group. The strategy was to reintroduce residential use to the GM Zone and yielded a
10 total of 596-units.

11 Commissioner Chang agreed the GM Zone was an appropriate location for housing but the City
12 needed to plan for infrastructure and City services for the new neighborhoods. She preferred
13 the City to change the purpose of the GM Zone to be for housing and not for manufacturing.
14 That type of change would facilitate neighborhoods that are not near or adjacent to
15 manufacturing. Also, to explore allowing higher densities if a certain threshold of affordable
16 housing is met.

17 Commissioner Roohparvar inquired if the proposal was to add residential as an allowable use
18 for the GM Zone.

19 Mr. Wong restated the proposal was to reintroduce housing into the GM Zone.

20 Commissioner Roohparvar asked if the sites would go through the California Environmental
21 Quality Act (CEQA) process. She shared she was concerned about placing housing near or on
22 contaminated sites.

23 Mr. Yang explained the Mass Rezoning Ordinance that PTC will review will include some CEQA
24 review but he predicted it would be at a programmatic level. Also, each project proposed on a
25 GM Zoned parcel would go through the CEQA process.

26 Commissioner Roohparvar wanted to know if CEQA assessed neighboring uses and their
27 impacts on residential uses.

28 Mr. Yang noted that CEQA assesses the new development and its impact on the physical
29 environment. It does not assess the impacts of the environment on residents.

30 Commissioner Roohparvar was concerned about the impacts on residents from the neighboring
31 manufacturing uses.

-
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. Tanner shared if approved, the City could explore additional mitigations that buildings
2 located in the GM Zones would be required to have.

3 Commissioner Roohparvar shared she was more concerned about noise, water and air quality.
4 Many manufacturing facilities were out of compliance with the City and the City does have a
5 Superfund Site.

6 Mr. Wong mentioned the Working Group expressed the same concern. The City requires a 300-
7 foot buffer from businesses that have hazardous materials. Staff explored which businesses
8 those were and any sites within the 300-foot buffer were removed from the sites inventory list.

9 Ms. Campbell added some of the sites were zoned Research, Office, Low-density Manufacturing
10 (ROLM) and the ROLM Zone does allow residential uses with a CUP. A CUP would be an
11 appropriate tool to ensure that there are no hazardous conditions in and around the residential
12 use.

13 Commissioner Roohparvar recommended allowing residential uses to be located in a section of
14 the GM Zone rather than spread out.

15 Commissioner Reckdahl noted there was not a lot of manufacturing happening in the GM
16 Zones. Most of the sites contained offices and other non-manufacturing uses. He aligned his
17 comments with Commissioner Chang's in that the zone should be changed from GM to RM-40
18 or RM-50.

19 Commissioner Chang inquired if the City could completely change the zoning.

20 Ms. Campbell remarked if that was the direction the Council wanted to take. The City could do
21 that through the rezoning process. She noted currently there were very limited areas within the
22 City that allowed general manufacturing uses.

23 Commissioner Chang supported Commissioner Roohparvar's suggestion to preserve a portion
24 of the GM Zones for general manufacturing uses but change the zoning to accommodate
25 housing in the other section.

26 Commissioner Hechtman understood the goal of the site selection process was to prove to HCD
27 that the City can meet its RHNA. He asked if HCD will review the zoning and restrictions the City
28 may impose for particular parcels.

29 Mr. Wong explained that HCD will be doing a 90-day review which included a thorough review
30 of the City's draft Housing Element and then provide any recommendations if needed.

-
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. Tanner answered whether to eliminate the GM Zone or not was relevant to what HCD
2 would be looking at for certification, but it was relevant for rezoning. The rezoning was an
3 essential piece in proving to HCD that the City can meet its RHNA.

4 Commissioner Hechtman suggested the PTC make general motions to recommend the Working
5 Group and Staff's recommendations to Council, then provide subsequent companion motions
6 to express specific concerns PTC Members have for specific strategies.

7 Chair Lauing shared the City's consultant did not express concerns related to a combined
8 residential/general manufacturing zone.

9 Vice-Chair Summa associated her comments with the other Commissioners regarding
10 hazardous materials, air quality and creating a new neighborhood that was not desirable. She
11 concurred that many of the GM sites have transitioned to office. She supported Commissioner
12 Hechtman's suggestion regarding companion motions because it allowed PTC Members to
13 share their concerns with Council without derailing the entire site's inventory list.

14 Mr. Wong explained the next strategy identified existing ROLM Zones that allow residential
15 uses. Using this strategy, the total housing units it yielded was 902 units.

16 Commissioner Chang proclaimed she broadly supported the strategy but did not have enough
17 information to know whether all the ROLM sites should be changed. She suggested changing a
18 portion of the ROLM sites to residential and leaving the remaining as-is. She asked what is the
19 Stanford Research Park zoned.

20 Ms. Campbell answered zoned Research Park (RP).

21 Commissioner Chang emphasized Stanford University needed to begin making moves to
22 encourage more housing on their lands.

23 Ms. Tanner mentioned four Stanford-owned properties are proposed to have housing. One of
24 the major hurdles for Stanford was their land was not suitable or readily available but may
25 become available for the next Housing Element Cycle.

26 Commissioner Chang understood many of Stanford-owned land would not be available for the
27 6th Cycle Housing Element. She strongly encouraged Staff and Council to begin the discussions
28 with Stanford University now for the next Housing Element.

29 Ms. Tanner agreed that a discussion could take place during the Housing Element policy and
30 program discussion.

-
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 supported Commissioner Chang’s recommendation to begin the
2 discussion with Council as soon as possible. Regarding the ROLM strategy, they felt both the
3 GM and ROLM strategies were great opportunities but wanted to see neighborhoods be built.
4 That included bus routes, schools, parks, retail and other neighborhood amenities.

5 Commissioner Roohparvar echoed Commissioner Reckdahl’s comment about building desirable
6 neighborhoods.

7 Chair Lauing mentioned at the PTC retreat, that the Commission will discuss adding an item to
8 the Workplan about creating what is needed to design a new neighborhood.

9 Vice-Chair Summa agreed with the other Commissioners about making the area a
10 neighborhood with the right infrastructure. She appreciated Commissioner Chang’s comments
11 regarding Stanford University and engaging them in the process now for the next Housing
12 Element.

13 Mr. Wong reported the next strategy was to develop housing on three Stanford-owned sites.
14 The sites were located on Pasteur Drive which yielded 420-du, Palo Alto Transit Center which
15 yielded 180-du and 3128 El Camino Real which yielded 244-du.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl recalled the Working Group supported having higher density for 3128
17 El Camino Real, but recommended 144 to allow Council flexibility to approve more density. The
18 Palo Alto Transit Center was a zoned Public Facility (PF). The Working Group did not discuss
19 whether to constrain the Palo Alto Transit Center to be only 100 percent affordable housing. He
20 encouraged PTC to recommend to Council to have the Palo Alto Transit Center be only 100
21 percent affordable housing.

22 Commissioner Hechtman recalled Co-Chair of the Working Group strongly encouraged PTC to
23 increase the density of the Palo Alto Transit Center. He inquired what was the highest density
24 that Stanford University proposed for the Palo Alto Transit Center.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl remarked the recommended yield corresponded with Stanford’s 85-
26 foot height proposal. The Council Ad Hoc Committee had concerns about having a tall structure
27 that loomed over downtown Palo Alto. He mentioned there are several properties nearby that
28 have tall existing structures.

29 Chair Lauing added one concept was to rebuild the bus station and place housing above it. Also,
30 parts of the structure would be facing El Camino Real and El Camino Park.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl proclaimed Director Jonathan Lait of Planning and Development
32 Services recommended not to include Palo Alto Transit Center in the Housing Element due to

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 upgrades coming to the rail crossing near the site. Director Lait agreed the site was a great
2 housing opportunity but suggested it be used for the next Housing Element.

3 Commissioner Hechtman was concerned about leaving the site for the next Housing Element
4 because the site may redevelop with a low density.

5 Sheryl Klein shared that Stanford University proposed a 130-foot structure with 560-units.

6 Commissioner Hechtman stated the Palo Alto Transit Center was a site the City should have as
7 much density as possible to provide a bigger buffer for the Housing Element.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if the by-right provision applied to the buffer sites or only the
9 RHNA sites.

10 Ms. Tanner restated that the by-right provision only applied to the carry-over sites from the
11 previous Housing Element.

12 Mr. Yang believed the by-right provision was for sites that had been identified in two previous
13 Housing Element.

14 Mr. Wong confirmed the provision applied to vacant sites that were listed in the past two
15 Housing Element cycles and the current Housing Element cycle for non-vacant sites.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl restated sites that are located in the buffer and then carried over to
17 the next Housing Element would have the by-right provision.

18 Mr. Yang noted the City was not identifying which sites are part of the buffer and which are
19 part of the RHNA.

20 Ms. Tanner explained Director Lait expressed concern that the Palo Alto Transit Center may not
21 be developed within the next 8-years due to grade separation and other factors. The City can
22 move forward with a housing proposal for the site regardless if it is identified in the Housing
23 Element or not.

24 Vice-Chair Summa agreed with Director Lait's concern. She mentioned there are historic
25 structures on the site and she wanted to see those structures retained and included in any
26 planning efforts. Also, recently there was a proposal for a tall structure on the site but was
27 considered not desirable. She asked if the reservoir was under the park or the Palo Alto Transit
28 Center.

29 Ms. Campbell confirmed it is located under the park.

-
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 shared there was an Olmstead landscape design that was never completed
2 along El Camino Real where Stanford University connected with Palo Alto. She suggested that
3 the design be incorporated into the site.

4 Commissioner Chang agreed with Director Lait's comments as well as Commissioner Reckdahl's
5 comment regarding the site being 100 percent affordable housing. If the City needed to use the
6 site to reach its RHNA, then she supported it being included in the Housing Element as a 100
7 percent affordable housing site.

8 Mr. Wong shared two other properties not directly under Stanford University's control but on
9 Stanford-owned land 3300 El Camino Real and Palo Alto Square. Though Palo Alto Square was
10 not part of the proposed strategies. If the discussions are successful with the leaseholder the
11 site had a potential yield of 300 to 400-du. 3300 El Camino Real was included in the Housing
12 Element and had a total potential yield of 92-du.

13 Commissioner Reckdahl mentioned the Staff report stated the proposal for 3300 El Camino Real
14 included a mixed-use of office and 187 residential units. The capacity of 92-du was a
15 conservative number.

16 Vice-Chair Summa inquired if the 3300 El Camino Real is the CPI site.

17 Chair Lauing answered yes.

18 Vice-Chair Summa understood Staff was in discussions with the leaseholder of Palo Alto Square
19 to understand if they were interested in adding more housing to the site.

20 Mr. Wong confirmed that is correct. He announced the last strategy was Staff suggested sites
21 that were additional suitable and available sites. The strategy had a total yield of 91-du.

22 Chair Lauing suggested the Commission take a break and then resume the discussion with
23 round two of comments and motions.

24 [The Commission took a 10-minute break]

25 Chair Lauing suggested the PTC begin with the pipeline strategy.

26 MOTION #1

27 Commissioner Chang moved that PTC recommend that the Council approve the pipeline units.

28 SECOND

29 Chair Lauing announced Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

-
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 Hechtman recommended including in the motion the number of unit yields for
2 each strategy.

3 Commissioner Chang understood the total yield for the pipeline strategy was still in flux but
4 agreed to include it in the motion. She confirmed the motion was to recommend that the
5 Council approve the pipeline strategy with 565-units.

6 VOTE

7 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion
8 carried 7-0.

9 MOTION #1 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton)-0

10 Chair Lauing moved to the ADU strategy.

11 Commissioner Chang asked if the ADU total yield could be increased if the City receives more
12 applications.

13 Mr. Wong stated it was possible if Staff reviewed the total average for the end of the year 2022.
14 To clarify, the ADUs were permitted, not submitted applications.

15 MOTION #2

16 Commissioner Chang moved the PTC to recommend to Council that they include 512-du for the
17 ADU strategy in the Housing Element and change the total yield if the City receives more
18 permitted ADUs.

19 SECOND

20 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

21 VOTE

22 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

23 MOTION #2 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0

24 Chair Lauing moved to the MFA strategy.

25 MOTION #3

26 Vice-Chair Summa moved the MFA strategy of 457-du to be included in the site strategy.

-
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 SECOND

2 Commissioner Reckdahl seconded.

3 VOTE

4 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

5 MOTION #3 PASSED 7(Chang, Lauing, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0

6 Chair Lauing moved to the upzone strategy with 1,640-du.

7 MOTION #4

8 Commissioner Hechtman moved the Working Group recommendation as modified by Staff for
9 1,640-du in the upzone category to be recommended to the Council for inclusion in the site
10 inventory.

11 SECOND

12 Commissioner Reckdahl seconded.

13 Vice-Chair Summa generally supported the strategy but wanted to include conditions in a
14 companion motion. She stated concerns about height transitions and other Design Standards.

15 Commissioner Hechtman clarified the main motion would approve the information that must
16 be submitted to HCD. Then the companion motions will speak to the concerns PTC has for the
17 strategy.

18 Commissioner Chang preferred to have one motion that incorporated the strategy and PTC's
19 concerns.

20 Chair Lauing confirmed that would be an amendment and that was acceptable to do as well.

21 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1

22 Vice-Chair Summa suggested a friendly amendment to add to the motion general support of
23 the strategy but to add a condition to maintain and extend the height transition to RM-40 sites.
24 Also, to maintain parking as well as private and shared open space standards.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl suggested specifying in the friendly amendment to extend the changes
26 from RM-30 to RM-40 and apply those to the new property.

-
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 clarified the intention was to maintain the current standards but to extend
2 the height transition protections to RM-40.

3 Chair Lauing remarked Council would be determining parking standards for RM-30 and RM-40.
4 He believed it was not the right time to make those distinguishing constraints.

5 Mr. Wong added the Housing Element process was to remove barriers to encourage housing
6 development. Adding height transition to a zone district that does not already have that
7 constraint may be perceived as a barrier to HCD.

8 Vice-Chair Summa recalled the Council already directed Staff to explore extending the height
9 protection to RM-40.

10 Chair Lauing stated in general, yes.

11 Ms. Tanner confirmed the Council did direct Staff to explore that. She restated the friendly
12 amendment was to carry over the existing Design Standards and that the height transition zone
13 for RM-30 to the new RM-40 was feasible.

14 Commissioner Chang concurred with Ms. Tanner's restatement.

15 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT DECLINED

16 Commissioner Hechtman stated PTC's charge was to make a recommendation to the Council
17 for Housing Element sites and their associated unit yields. The proposed amendment was not
18 part of PTC's current charge but rather part of the next step in the Housing Element process. He
19 encouraged Vice-Chair Summa to make a companion motion after the main motion is voted on
20 and declined the friendly amendment.

21 Chair Lauing stated the original motion was to approve the 1,640-du for the upzone strategy to
22 Council for adoption.

23 Mr. Yang noted Commissioner Chang can second Vice-Chair Summa's friendly amendment
24 which then the Commission must vote on the unfriendly amendment and then the main
25 motion.

26 Vice-Chair Summa understood that if she votes yes for any of the motions as a general idea.
27 When the item comes back to PTC with the programs and zoning changes. She does not have to
28 support them.

29 Ms. Tanner answered that is correct.

30 UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT 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 Vice-Chair Summa proposed her amendment as an unfriendly amendment.

2 Commissioner Chang seconded the unfriendly amendment.

3 Vice-Chair Summa wanted the Council to know Commissioner's concerns related to the site
4 selection decisions.

5 Commissioner Chang added the amendment was a more accurate statement of her support.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl understood the reasoning for the amendment but could not support it.
7 He agreed with Commissioner Hechtman that every strategy could include amendments. The
8 Council will have to determine the zoning and come to conclusions. He supported having more
9 motions for each strategy than one main motion.

10 Chair Lauing restated the item was a site inventory discussion and the amendment included
11 components that will come with the policy and program discussion.

12 Commissioner Hechtman asked if Vice-Chair Summa's motion was a substitute motion.

13 Mr. Yang stated no, it was an amendment and substitute motions were not allowed under
14 PTC's rules.

15 Commissioner Hechtman understood the Commission will first vote on the amendment and
16 then vote on the main motion.

17 Mr. Yang answered yes.

18 Commissioner Hechtman announced he could not support the amendment but hoped it would
19 be expressed again as a companion motion.

20 Commissioner Templeton inquired if zoning was agendized.

21 Mr. Yang confirmed PTC was not considering zoning but the discussion was appropriate.

22 UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1 RESTATED

23 Ms. Campbell stated the unfriendly amendment was to carry over the RM-30 Design Standards
24 to the new RM-40. Including height transitions, parking and open space.

25 VOTE ON UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1

26 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 2-5.

-
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 UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED 2(Chang, Summa) – 5(Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl,
2 Roohparvar, Templeton)

3 VOTE ON MOTION #4

4 Chair Lauing requested a roll call vote on approving the 1,640-du yield under the upzone
5 strategy.

6 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

7 MOTION #4 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0

8 Commissioner Reckdahl suggested making companion motions after the capacity motion is
9 voted on.

10 COMPANION MOTION

11 Vice-Chair Summa moved to carry on the existing RM-30 Design Standards and extend them to
12 RM-40. Including height transition protections, parking standards and onsite open space
13 requirements.

14 SECOND

15 Commissioner Chang seconded.

16 Commissioner Hechtman was concerned the language in the motion recommended changes to
17 zoning without Staff analysis. He suggested the language be PTC recommends Staff investigate
18 rather than recommend it be done.

19 COMPANION MOTION AMENDED

20 Vice-Chair Summa agreed to change the language to not be declarative but rather to
21 investigate.

22 Commissioner Chang supported the language change.

23 Chair Lauing found the motion redundant and assumed the Council would direct Staff to
24 investigate the changes anyways.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl agreed but was concerned about taking Vice-Chair Summa and
26 Commissioner Chang's initial approval out of context. The companion motion was not binding
27 and made clear where the concerns were.

-
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 wanted to know if there was another format the Commission could use to
2 express concerns without making a companion motion.

3 Commissioner Hechtman announced he could support the motion but disclosed that after Staff
4 investigates the concepts further, based on their findings, he may not be able to support the
5 concepts. He felt having unanimity on the capacities was a good message to send to Council but
6 acknowledged that Commissioner's concerns also needed to be shared with Council.

7 Commissioner Templeton supported the companion motion concept. She noted Council reads
8 the minutes, Staff highlights any concerns in the Staff report and so the Council fully
9 understands where PTC's concerns are.

10 VOTE

11 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 6-1.

12 COMPANION MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa) -
13 1(Templeton)

14 Chair Lauing moved to the Caltrain station strategy.

15 MOTION #5

16 Commissioner Hechtman moved the Working Group and Staff recommendation of
17 recommending to Council the capacity of 798-du be accepted for the Caltrain station strategy.

18 SECOND

19 Commissioner Reckdahl seconded.

20 VOTE

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

22 MOTION #5 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0

23 COMPANION MOTION

24 Vice-Chair Summa moved a companion motion that Staff investigates the appropriateness of
25 50-du per acre, especially for the Mayfield Neighborhood.

26 COMPANION MOTION DIED DUE TO LACK OF A 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 Templeton suggested having one motion that Staff highlight PTC's concerns in
2 the Staff report that is presented to Council.

3 Ms. Tanner agreed Staff can highlight the concerns but the companion motion would allow
4 Council to know if there was a majority of PTC Members concerned about a specific item or if it
5 was a minority concern.

6 Commissioner Templeton stated all concerns should be highlighted to Council even if the
7 motion does not pass.

8 Ms. Tanner confirmed that was typical practice for Staff.

9 Chair Lauing moved to the transit corridor strategy.

10 MOTION #6

11 Commissioner Reckdahl moved that PTC recommend the 274-units for the transit corridor
12 strategy.

13 SECOND

14 Commissioner Hechtman seconded.

15 VOTE

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

17 MOTION #6 PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Templeton) -1(Summa)

18 Chair Lauing invited Vice-Chair Summa to speak to her no vote.

19 Vice-Chair Summa stated she has always been uncomfortable with relying on the unstable bus
20 line run by VTA. She found the sites particularly difficult to maintain the impacts for neighbors
21 regarding the height transitions and other Design Standards. She supported housing in the
22 proposed area but felt the City did not need to make any changes at this time.

23 Chair Lauing moved to the faith-based institution strategy.

24 MOTION #7

25 Commissioner Reckdahl moved that PTC accept Staff's 148-units for the faith-based institution
26 strategy provided the units are all BMR.

27 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 Chang seconded.

2 Commissioner Hechtman wanted to know if PTC could make the motion in the outlined format.

3 Mr. Yang answered yes.

4 Chair Lauing shared that HCD does not care if the City labels the sites affordable or not. He
5 noted one of the sites proposed 36-du per acre and that was very dense for an R-1
6 neighborhood. He inquired if Commissioners wanted to place a cap on how many units can be
7 developed.

8 VOTE

9 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

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

11 Chair Lauing moved to the City-owned parking lot strategy.

12 MOTION #8

13 Commissioner Hechtman moved the inclusion of 168-units on City-owned parking lots to be
14 recommended to the City Council for inclusion in the inventory.

15 SECOND

16 Commissioner Templeton seconded.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl supported the strategy but felt six developments in 8-years was a far
18 stretch. He wanted to know if Commissioners were interested in reducing the number of
19 developments.

20 Vice-Chair Summa pointed out the strategy was not stating that six projects will happen. The
21 strategy was stating that six sites are available. She noted she wanted to investigate all of the
22 sites but was not necessarily in favor of all of them.

23 Chair Lauing completely supported the motion and agreed all the sites may not be developed.

24 Commissioner Chang asked if the units will be affordable.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl answered yes, and the Working Group recommended the sites as
26 affordable.

27 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

-
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 wanted that to be specified in the motion that the units be BMR units.

2 Commissioner Hechtman accepted the friendly amendment.

3 Commissioner Reckdahl agreed.

4 VOTE

5 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

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

7 Chair Lauing moved to the GM Zone strategy.

8 MOTION #9

9 Commissioner Reckdahl moved to accept the GM Zoned 596-du sites that Staff recommended.
10 He noted he will have a companion motion for the item after the capacity motion has been
11 voted on.

12 SECOND

13 Commissioner Hechtman seconded.

14 Vice-Chair Summa suggested Commissioner Reckdahl incorporate his companion motion into
15 the main motion.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl stated it was cleaner to have two motions.

17 VOTE

18 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

19 MOTION #9 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton)-0

20 COMPANION MOTION

21 Commissioner Reckdahl moved that PTC encourage Council to perform early planning to
22 identify transit, school and retails to support the new neighborhoods.

23 SECOND

24 Commissioner Chang seconded.

-
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 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

2 Vice-Chair Summa requested the motion include parks and bicycle lanes.

3 Commissioner Reckdahl accepted the friendly amendment.

4 Commissioner Chang accepted.

5 Commissioner Hechtman remarked the companion motion was encouraging Council to do
6 something they would already be doing. He supported the companion motion to highlight
7 Commissioner Reckdahl's concerns.

8 VOTE

9 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

10 COMPANION MOTION PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa,
11 Templeton) -0

12 Commissioner Chang strongly encouraged carving out sections for just housing and not having
13 just the addition of housing to the GM Zone.

14 COMPANION MOTION

15 Commissioner Roohparvar moved to have Council consider rezoning sections of the GM Zones
16 for multi-family use rather than interspersing or adding residential use to the GM Zones.

17 SECOND

18 Commissioner Chang seconded.

19 Commissioner Hechtman supported the companion motion but felt Council will naturally take
20 that approach.

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

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

24 Chair Lauing moved to the ROLM strategy.

25 MOTION #10

-
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 Hechtman moved the Working Group and Staff recommendation the Council
2 includes 902-units in this category for the site inventory.

3 SECOND

4 Commissioner Roohparvar seconded.

5 VOTE

6 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

7 MOTION #10 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -
8 0

9 COMPANION MOTION

10 Vice-Chair Summa moved to have Council consider rezoning sections of the ROLM Zones for
11 multi-family use rather than interspersing or adding residential use to the ROLM Zone.

12 SECOND

13 Commissioner Chang seconded.

14 VOTE

15 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

16 COMPANION MOITON PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa,
17 Templeton) -0

18 Chair Lauing moved to Stanford University's proposed site located at Pasteur Drive.

19 MOTION #11

20 Commissioner Reckdahl moved that PTC accept the Working Group recommendation for 425-
21 units on Pasteur Drive.

22 SECOND

23 Commissioner Chang seconded.

24 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

25 Commissioner Hechtman suggested making the recommendation to the City Council.

-
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 accepted.

2 Commissioner Chang agreed.

3 VOTE

4 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

5 MOTION #11 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -
6 0

7 Chair Lauing

8 MOTION #12

9 Commissioner Reckdahl moved that PTC recommend to the Council to accept the Working
10 Group's recommendation for 144-units at the 3128 El Camino site.

11 SECOND

12 Commissioner Hechtman seconded.

13 Vice-Chair Summa understood the proposal was for all housing and no office.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl confirmed its 100 percent housing.

15 VOTE

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

17 MOTION #12 PASSED 6(Chang, Lauing, Hechtman, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa) -
18 1(Templeton)

19 Commissioner Templeton shared she voted no because she believed the site could
20 accommodate more density.

21 Chair Lauing moved to the Stanford University Palo Alto Transit Center site.

22 Commissioner Hechtman asked if Staff had the three scenarios that Stanford University had
23 presented to the Working Group.

24 Mr. Wong confirmed 180-du was the lowest density at 75-to 85-feet and the highest density
25 was 530-du at the height of 137-feet.

-
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 Hechtman understood the Working Group took a conservative approach and
2 often recommended the lowest range.

3 Mr. Wong answered yes.

4 MOTION #13

5 Commissioner Hechtman moved that PTC recommend to Council inclusion of 360-unit yield for
6 the Transit Center as part of the site inventory.

7 Vice-Chair Summa asked what height was associated with 360-du.

8 Mr. Wong stated it would be 105-feet.

9 SECOND

10 Commissioner Templeton seconded the motion.

11 Commissioner Hechtman was hoping to remove an obstacle to increasing the dwelling units.

12 Commissioner Templeton found the area to be a high potential site with the least amount of
13 disruption to the community and supported having a higher density.

14 Commissioner Chang asked if the units would be all BMR housing.

15 Chair Lauing answered no, that was not the proposal.

16 Commissioner Chang inquired why the Working Group chose 180-du instead of 270-du.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl could not recall the discussion and rationale behind choosing 180-du
18 over 270-du. Regarding height, the Working Group felt they were overstepping its bounds to
19 ask Council to double the height from 85-feet to 105-feet. The current height limit for the site
20 was 50-feet and the Council Ad Hoc Committee showed no support for 105-feet or higher
21 structures.

22 Commissioner Chang stated the number of units was completed determined by the height of
23 the structure. While the location was prime for housing, she could not decide on density
24 because she did not have enough information. She acknowledged Director Lait's concerns
25 regarding grade separations and announced she could not support the motion.

26 Commissioner Reckdahl was about potentially allowing 360-units to be allowed to use the by-
27 right provision. He wanted to change the zoning after seeing what proposals come forward.

-
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 agreed with Commissioner Reckdahl regarding the by-right provision. She
2 did not find the height of the Hoover Pavilion to be relevant and there was no information
3 about the future of the historic resources. She concluded she could not support the motion.

4 Commissioner Templeton highlighted there was plenty of high-rise building in the area, the site
5 was not adjacent to low-density residential and the site was the most practical site for high-
6 density housing. She acknowledged that there was no plan but PTC was not being asked to
7 evaluate a plan. PTC was being asked to assess the potential of the property and encouraged
8 the Commission to do that.

9 Mr. Yang clarified the number of units assigned to the site will not have an impact on what is
10 permitted by right.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl understood that if the zoning is changed then that affected the by-right
12 provision.

13 Mr. Yang answered no. If the site does not develop, the City will have to amend the zoning to
14 allow a lower density by right.

15 Ms. Tanner noted the State has a specified density in the by-right provision and that was less
16 than what was being proposed.

17 Mr. Yang added the State required 20-units per acre for the by-right provision.

18 Commissioner Hechtman asked if the City loses its design controls for by-right sites.

19 Mr. Yang answered there was some potential for limited input but it was not the amount of
20 input normally practiced in Palo Alto.

21 Ms. Campbell added the City's Objective Standards will apply to by-right projects.

22 Commissioner Hechtman felt there was no negative to having 360-du built through the by-right
23 provision because the project has to comply with the Objective Standards and the housing gets
24 built. He agreed that the site is remote and does not have any of the concerns associated with
25 abutting low-density sites.

26 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

27 Chair Laung mentioned the scenarios are not specific projects and as projects come forward.
28 The height and densities can change as the project moves through the City's process. The train
29 station will be retained, mitigations will be made for the historic structures and Council will
30 have to decide on what height is best for the community. He proposed the density be 270-du
31 instead of 360-du.

-
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 Hechtman wanted the Council to know PTC supported higher densities on the
2 site but not the max density. He declined the friendly amendment.

3 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT DIES DUE TO LACK OF SUPPORT FROM THE MAKER

4 Commissioner Roohparvar supported Commissioner Hechtman's motion.

5 Vice-Chair Summa asked how many units per acre was 360-du.

6 Ms. Campbell commented the site is 4.5 acres.

7 Ms. Tanner suggested the Commission continue the discussion to allow Staff to determine how
8 many dwelling units per acre it would be.

9 Commissioner Templeton did not understand the pushback on the height. The parcel was near
10 other tall structures and was not near any low-density residential parcels.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl mentioned the proposed height and dwelling unit count were not
12 binding.

13 Commissioner Templeton agreed with Commissioner Hechtman that Council will adjust the
14 heights and unit counts. It was better to recommend a larger number and then Council could
15 adjust down from there.

16 Chair Lauing stated Director Lait's comments are material and he did not know Stanford's
17 reaction to his comments.

18 Mr. Wong shared at 360-du, which equated to 80-du per acre.

19 VOTE

20 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion failed 3-4.

21 MOTION #13 FAILED 3(Hechtman, Roohparvar, Templeton) -4(Chang, Lauing, Reckdahl,
22 Summa)

23 MOTION #14

24 Commissioner Hechtman moved PTC to recommend to the Council 270-units of additional
25 capacity identified with the Palo Alto Transit Center.

26 SECOND

27 Chair Lauing seconded.

-
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 asked if the units are not built, what are the implications of allocating
2 some of the units for affordable housing for the next Housing Element cycle.

3 Ms. Tanner did not believe the affordability component would change.

4 Commissioner Chang was concerned about Director Lait's comments regarding grade
5 separation. If the site is included in the site inventory, she suggested assigning a specified
6 percentage of affordable housing to the site. With that said, she agreed with Director Lait that it
7 may be best to hold the site over to the next Housing Element Cycle.

8 Mr. Wong reminded the Commission that the City does have BMR requirements and those
9 requirements would apply to any project. Those BMR units will be counted towards the City's
10 RHNA.

11 Commissioner Chang agreed the Palo Alto Transit Center was a prime location for affordable
12 housing.

13 Vice-Chair Summa asked how many units per acre was 270-du.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl answered it would be 60-du per acre.

15 Vice-Chair Summa was also concerned about Director Lait's comment as well as the history of
16 the 27 University site. She mentioned the City currently had 60-du on half an acre and the
17 structures were not as tall as the proposal. Also, the site was a PF Zone that is large, close to
18 jobs and transit and is a perfect site for affordable housing. Once the site's zone changes, the
19 City will have lost a huge opportunity to build affordable housing. At this time, she could not
20 support the motion and felt the site was not the best housing solution for the City.

21 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

22 Commissioner Reckdahl proposed a friendly amendment that the 270-units be affordable units
23 to be consistent with the current zoning.

24 Commissioner Hechtman declined the friendly amendment and suggested Commissioner
25 Reckdahl propose his amendment as a companion motion instead.

26 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT DIES DUE TO LACK OF SUPPORT FROM THE MAKER

27 UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT

28 Commissioner Reckdahl argued the current zoning was PF and should be used as a public
29 benefit. Putting market-rate housing on the site would not create a public benefit. He posed an
30 unfriendly amendment that the 270-units be all affordable units.

-
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 SECOND

2 Commissioner Chang seconded

3 Commissioner Chang agreed if the units are not 100 percent affordable then that would be a
4 huge loss to the City.

5 Vice-Chair Summa suggested the maker and seconder of the unfriendly amendment specify
6 what area of medium income (AMI) the units should be set at.

7 Commissioner Reckdahl did not want to restrict the Council and wanted to keep the unfriendly
8 amendment at BMR units with no set AMI.

9 Commissioner Templeton did not understand why the unfriendly amendment could not be a
10 companion motion. The current approach was sending mixed messages to the Council. She
11 could not support the unfriendly amendment but she could support it if it were a companion
12 motion.

13 Chair Lauing agreed with Commissioner Templeton's comments that a companion motion
14 would be a better approach.

15 Commissioner Chang restated she strongly supported housing on the site. Having the site in the
16 Housing Element inventory or not did preclude the City from developing the site. She remarked
17 her first choice would be to hold the site over to the next Housing Element to allow for the
18 grade separation project to be completed. If PTC recommends the site be included, then she
19 wanted to see all the units be 100 percent affordable.

20 Vice-Chair Summa concurred that all PTC Members want housing on the site. The site should
21 not be included in the site inventory list because it removed it from being developed as an
22 affordable site. PF Zoned sites were not as valuable as other zoned sites because PF Zones have
23 restricted uses. She commented she could support the unfriendly amendment because there is
24 a great benefit in building more affordable housing.

25 VOTE

26 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote on the unfriendly amendment and announced the
27 motion failed 3-4.

28 UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED 3(Chang, Reckdahl, Summa) -4(Hechtman, Lauing,
29 Roohparvar, Templeton)

30 VOTE

-
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. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote on the original motion and announced the motion
2 carried 4-3.

3 MOTION #14 PASSED 4(Hechtman, Lauing, Roohparvar, Templeton) -3(Chang, Reckdahl,
4 Summa)

5 COMPANION MOTION

6 Commissioner Reckdahl proposed a companion motion that the Palo Alto Transit Center be 100
7 percent BMR.

8 SECOND

9 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

10 Chair Lauing inquired if the maker wanted to highlight that this had to be considered during the
11 negotiations with the owner of the property.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl understood the property owner cannot build any structures without
13 the City changing the zoning.

14 Commissioner Templeton expressed concern that a requirement of 100 percent affordable
15 housing may appear as though the City was trying to block other types of housing projects on
16 the site. She preferred the companion motion use words such as “maximize” or include a high
17 percentage of BMR housing.

18 Vice-Chair Summa restated PF Zoned sites are generally not as valuable because of their limited
19 uses. She understood one of the uses could be workforce housing.

20 Ms. Tanner stated in any case, the site would have to be rezoned to allow for housing.

21 Ms. Campbell answered yes, workforce housing is an allowed use.

22 Mr. Yang added the City would have to apply the workforce housing overlay.

23 Vice-Chair Summa remarked her other concern was that the site would be developed as
24 workforce housing and that type of housing does not provide affordability.

25 Commissioner Chang commented to build more affordable housing, heights have to be
26 increased. The site does not abut any low-density structures and was one of the most attractive
27 locations to allow for increased heights and affordable housing.

-
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 could not support the companion motion. She did not think the City
2 has the upper hand in the negotiations with Stanford University and 100 percent affordable
3 housing was not viable or realistic. She supported Commissioner Templeton's suggestion using
4 words such as maximum or high percentage.

5 Commissioner Hechtman also could not support the companion motion. There was a false
6 assumption that if 100 affordable housing is required, then it will be built and this was
7 inaccurate.

8 Chair Lauing concurred with Commissioner Hechtman and the discussion of what was realistic
9 for the site would be determined through private negotiations. It would be a huge loss to the
10 City if no housing is built as well.

11 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

12 Vice-Chair Summa suggested the maker rephrase the companion motion to investigate or
13 consider 100 affordable housing instead of demanding 100 percent affordable housing.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl accepted the amendment.

15 Commissioner Templeton suggested the companion motion be PTC recommend Staff work with
16 the parcel owners to identify and encourage the maximum affordable housing on the site.

17 COMPANION MOTION RESTATED

18 Commissioner Reckdahl could not support Commissioner Templeton's suggestion. He noted
19 good intentions do not produce affordable housing in the City. He restated the motion which
20 was to recommend that City Council make the development primarily BMR housing.

21 Commissioner Chang supported the amended companion motion.

22 Vice-Chair Summa suggested the motion be more specific.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl stated he was comfortable using the word primarily.

24 Commissioner Chang agreed.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl stated the zoning is for public benefit and the location was a prime
26 location for BMR housing.

27 Chair Lauing felt the changes to the language were better but it did not address the
28 negotiations between the two parties.

-
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 agreed the City and Stanford University will have to work together to
2 subsidize the housing. There was no illusion the housing will magically get built.

3 Commissioner Templeton agreed housing will not magically get built and adding additional
4 barriers would diminish the likelihood the housing will be built. She supported affordable
5 housing being built on the site but was concerned about the phrasing of the companion motion.

6 Commissioner Hechtman encouraged the maker of the motion to withdraw the motion. He was
7 concerned that the wrong message will be sent to Council if the motion loses. Also, if the
8 motion passes, then the City will be placing a constraint on development.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl stated this was a chance to show HCD that the City is serious about
10 developing more affordable housing.

11 Ms. Tanner noted the next agenda item is a time-sensitive item and had to be taken up. She
12 encouraged the Commissioners to make their comments brief due to the late hour.

13 VOTE

14 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 4-3.

15 COMPANION MOTION PASSED 4(Chang, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa) -3(Hechtman, Roohparvar,
16 Templeton)

17 Chair Lauing moved to the 3300 El Camino Real site and Staff suggested site strategies.

18 MOTION #15

19 Commissioner Hechtman moved the Working Group recommendation that 92-units be included
20 in the inventory for the 3300 ECR site.

21 SECOND

22 Commissioner Chang seconded.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl wanted to see more density for the 3300 El Camino Real site and
24 encouraged Council to explore that further.

25 VOTE

26 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

-
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 MOTION #15 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -
2 0

3 MOTION #16

4 Commissioner Chang moved that PTC recommend to City Council that we include the Staff
5 suggested sites at 91-du in the housing inventory.

6 SECOND

7 Commissioner Hechtman seconded.

8 VOTE

9 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

10 MOTION #16 PASSED 7(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -
11 0

12 Commissioner Hechtman requested Staff display the map showing the quarter-mile and half-
13 mile radiuses around the California Avenue transit station.

14 MOTION #17

15 Commissioner Hechtman acknowledged that the Working Group decided to avoid all low-
16 density residential sites for the upcoming Housing Element. He stated in the future the City will
17 have to densify near transit hubs and that included the low-density residential nearby. He
18 wanted to avoid having the City be unprepared to densify low-density residential for the next
19 Housing Element. He moved to recommend that City Council consider starting a study to
20 investigate increasing density for low-density residentially zoned properties within a quarter-
21 mile of the California Avenue Caltrain station to be completed by 2029, so its findings can be
22 considered in site selection for the 7th RHNA Cycle.

23 Chair Lauing remarked that was not agendized and did not correlate with approving the
24 Housing Element that came from the Working Group. He suggested the concern be agendized
25 and taken up at a future PTC meeting.

26 Mr. Yang agreed with Chair Lauing and felt the same process applied to the Research Park. He
27 recommended PTC discuss the two items when the Housing Element policies and programs
28 item is brought forward for consideration.

-
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 Hechtman pointed out that two companion motions that passed for the GM and
2 ROLM sites encouraged the start of a process. He did not see the difference between his
3 proposed motion and the motions that were approved earlier in the meeting.

4 Chair Lauing clarified the companion motion for the ROLM sites was approving the total unit
5 yield and then suggested there be some changes as well. That was in context with the current
6 site, not a process that should be started in 8-years.

7 MOTION #17 WITHDRAWN

8 Commissioner Hechtman withdrew his motion.

9 Chair Lauing closed the item and moved to Agenda Item Number Four.

10 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Summa. Motion Passed 7-0.

11 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Summa. Motion Passed 7-0.

12 **Commission Action:** Motion by Summa, seconded by Reckdahl. Motion Passed 7-0.

13 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Reckdahl. Motion Passed 7-0.

14 **Commission Action:** Motion by Summa, seconded by Chang. Motion Failed 2- 5(Hechtman,
15 Lauing, Reckdahl, Roohparvar, Templeton no)

16 **Commission Action:** Motion by Summa, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 6-1 (Templeton no)

17 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Reckdahl. Motion Passed 7-0.

18 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Hechtman. Motion Passed 6-1 (Summa
19 no).

20 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

21 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by **Templeton/Reckdahl**. Motion Passed 7-
22 0.

23 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Hechtman. Motion Passed 7-0.

24 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

25 **Commission Action:** Motion by Roohparvar, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

26 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Roohparvar. Motion Passed 7-0.

27 **Commission Action:** Motion by Summa, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

28 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

29 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Hechtman. Motion Passed 6-1
30 (Templeton no)

31 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Templeton. Motion Failed 3 -4 (Chang,
32 Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa no)

33 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Chang. Motion Failed 3-4 (Hechtman,
34 Lauing, Roohparvar, Templeton no)

35 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Lauing. Motion Passed 4-3 (Chang,
36 Reckdahl, Summa no)

-
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 **Commission Action:** Motion by Reckdahl, seconded by Summa. Motion Passed 4-3 (Hechtman,
2 Roohparvar, Templeton no)

3 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Motion Passed 7-0.

4 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Hechtman. Motion Passed 7-0.

5 4. Review and Authorize Transmittal of the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Annual Progress
6 Report to the Office of Planning and Research and the 2021 Housing Element Annual
7 Progress Report to the Department of Housing and Community Development

8 Chair Lauing noted the item was a continued hearing but members of the public are allowed to
9 share comments with the Commission.

10 Chitra Moitra, Planner, stated Staff recommends the Planning and Transportation Commission
11 (PTC) recommend the Council authorize the transmission of bot the Comprehensive Plan
12 Annual Progress Report and the Housing Element Annual Progress Report. On December 8,
13 2021, PTC reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Progress Report and requested additional
14 information be brought back. The Implementation Chapter contained 410 programs and each
15 element of the Comprehensive Plan has to follow the number of programs. The implementation
16 table highlighted the lead department, the timing, the anticipated level of effort and the status
17 of each program. The implementation status for 2021 included the completion of 10 programs,
18 28 partially completed programs, 277 ongoing programs and 95 pending programs. Of the 410
19 programs, 74 the programs have been completed in the past 4-years but many of the programs
20 have transitioned to a status of ongoing.

21 Tim Wong, Planner, presented the Annual Progress Report for the Housing Element. The City
22 was in year 7 or the 8-year cycle. The City's current RHNA was 1,988-units. Of the 1988-units,
23 212 new units were added in the year 2021 and the City was able to count 117-units from
24 Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. The City has achieved 47.5 percent of its total RHNA with a
25 completion of 32 percent for very-low-income, 15 percent for low income, 9 percent for
26 moderate and 108 percent for above moderate-income. The Housing Element contained 72
27 programs and the City has implemented 77 percent of those programs.

28 Commissioner Chang appreciated the additional information Staff was able to provide since the
29 last meeting. She wanted to know what the consequences are for not meeting the City's RHNA
30 goals.

31 Mr. Wong answered there are no consequences.

32 Commissioner Chang pressed what about the implementation of the programs.

33 Mr. Wong confirmed there are no consequences for not implementing all the programs.

-
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 noticed the Pedestrian and Transit Overlay was never completed. She
2 explained in the last agenda item it was important to highlight the planning process because
3 without direction from the Council. Some of the planning components become lost and the City
4 must provide the resources to Staff to be able to have successful planning.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if other jurisdictions were struggling to meet their below-market
6 RHNA numbers.

7 Mr. Wong was not aware of any jurisdictions that fulfilled their below-market RHNA goals.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl understood that the Business Registry was put on pause.

9 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, confirmed the Business Registry exists and was still in
10 operation.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl pressed if the City was using the data housed in the Business Registry.

12 Ms. Tanner answered it is used from time to time.

13 Commissioner Reckdahl wanted to know if was there a central location where the results of all
14 the programs were tabulated.

15 Clare Campbell, Planning Manager, explained that individual departments are contacted.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired how many programs would be accomplished if they were not
17 in the Comprehensive Plan.

18 Ms. Campbell predicted there would be some programs the City would be doing anyway but
19 having the program listed in the Comprehensive Plan was a way to track its progress.

20 Commissioner Hechtman asked what has changed to make Buena Vista Mobile Park eligible to
21 be listed in the City's current RHNA.

22 Mr. Wong answered housing legislation has changed.

23 Commissioner Hechtman appreciated Staff's additional information and tables that were
24 included in the Packet. He encouraged Staff to continue to provide those data points in future
25 annual progress reports. He recommended Staff develop clearer and more consistent
26 terminology and use the word "underway" instead of "pending".

27 Vice-Chair Summa recalled there was a provision in the Comprehensive Plan to retain cottage
28 clusters and now there was a new State Law that provided more protection for cottage clusters.

-
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 Senate Bill (SB) 330 required there be no net loss of units.
2 Vice-Chair Summa wanted to see more awareness brought to bird-safe buildings and to pursue
3 a Transfer Development Right for downtown for residential uses.

4 MOTION

5 Commissioner Templeton moved that PTC recommend that City Council authorize the
6 transmittal of the reports to the Office of Planning and Research and Department of Housing
7 and Community Development by April 1st.

8 SECOND

9 Commissioner Roohparvar seconded.

10 VOTE

11 Chair Lauing echoed his colleague's comments regarding Staff's fast response to PTC's feedback
12 and questions.

13 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 7-0.

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

15 Chair Lauing closed the item.

16 **Commission Action:** Motion by Templeton, seconded by Roohparvar. Motion Passed 7-0.

17 **Approval of Minutes**

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

19 5. December 15, 2021 Draft Summary Meeting Minutes

20 MOTION

21 Commissioner Hechtman moved the approval of the summary minutes as revised by himself
22 and Commissioner Chang.

23 SECOND

24 Commissioner Chang seconded.

25 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

-
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 Chair Lauing pointed out on Page 20, line 15, there was no language that Director Lait
2 appreciated Commissioner Lauing's idea or suggestion.

3 Commissioner Hechtman accepted the amendment.

4 VOTE

5 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion carried 6-0 with
6 Commissioner Reckdahl abstaining.

7 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0-1 (Reckdahl
8 abstain)

9 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Lauing. Motion Passed 6-0-1 (Reckdahl
10 Abstain)

11 **Committee Items**

12 Chair Lauing announced there are no Committee items.

13 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

14 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, remarked the Planning and Transportation Commission's
15 (PTC) retreat will be on March 9, 2022, in the Council Chambers. She encouraged
16 Commissioners to watch Council's hybrid meeting to understand the process of how hybrid
17 meetings are run. She requested that Commissioners submit their preferred discussion topics
18 to Staff.

19 Chair Lauing adjourned the meeting.

20 **Adjournment**

21 11:00 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.