



Planning & Transportation Commission Action Agenda: April 27, 2022

Virtual Meeting
6:00 PM

Call to Order / Roll Call

Approximately 6:02 pm

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

Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, provided directions on how members of the public can join the hybrid meeting as well as how to provide written and/or spoken public comments.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted the roll call vote and announce all Commissioners were present except Commissioner Roohparvar.

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved adoption of the resolution.

SECOND

Commissioner Chang seconded.

VOTE

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

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

Commission Action: Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Passed 6-0 (Roohparvar absent)

Oral Communications

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

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

1 Chair Lauing invited members of the public to provide comments on any matters not on the
2 agenda.

3 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, reported there were no public speakers.

4 **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

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

6 Chair Lauing asked if there are any agenda changes, additions or deletions.

7 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, stated there are no proposed changes from Staff.

8 **City Official Reports**

9 2. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

10 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, wished Ms. Klicheva a happy Administrative Professional
11 Day and thanked her for her skills and service to the City and Commission. She acknowledged
12 that the Commission has had a busy past few months, but predicted that it would slow down
13 for the remaining 2022 year. She invited the Commissioners to ask questions.

14 Seeing no questions, Chair Lauing moved to Item Three.

15 **Action Items**

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

18 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1033 Amarillo Ave [22PLN00016]:
19 Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Preliminary Parcel Map with
20 Exceptions to Subdivide a 20,787 square foot R-1 zoned property into two (2)
21 lots, where Lot 1 will be 10,668.50 square feet and Lot 2 will be 10,118.77 square
22 feet. Exception is for minimum lot width and maximum lot size. Zoning District:
23 Single Family Residential (R-1). For More Information Contact the Project Planner
24 Emily Foley at emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org

25 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, introduce Amy French who presented the item to the
26 Commission.

27 Amy French, Chief Planning Official, requested the Commissioner to share any disclosures they
28 may have regarding the item. Seeing none, she began the presentation and shared the project
29 site is located in Midtown on a 20,787-square foot on an R-1 parcel. The applicant requested a

-
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 lot split which would result in two lots over 10,000-square feet with 53.2-square foot wide
2 frontages along Amarillo Avenue. The existing neighborhood was single-family residential with
3 lots that varied in size and ranged between 50- to 56-square feet in width. Existing conditions
4 included four 1-story cottages that were arranged in a cottage cluster. Each cottage had
5 approximately 960-square feet of floor area and there were two 20-square foot detached
6 garages on the site. The total existing floor area was 4,240-square feet. The project was pre-
7 screened by City Council in October of 2021. Though there was no development proposal, State
8 legislation required no net loss of housing. When developed, the parcels would contain four
9 new dwelling units. The reason for the lot split was to make the existing parcel more consistent
10 with the other lots in the neighborhood and the proposal met the findings for the Exception.
11 The new lots would be more in compliance with the existing Zoning Code and would facilitate
12 the rebuild of the new units as it was not typical to build four units on one lot under the existing
13 Code. Staff recommended approval of the project to the City Council based on the findings and
14 subject to Conditions of Approval.

15 Chair Lauing invited the applicant to make their presentation.

16 Ted O'Hanlon, the representative of the homeowners, announced there was no formal
17 presentation and the applicants concurred with the findings in the Staff report.

18 Chair Lauing invited members of the public to ask questions.

19 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, announced there are no public speakers.

20 Chair Lauing invited Commissioners to ask questions and provide comments.

21 Commissioner Chang requested Staff explain Senate Bill (SB) 330 and the provision to have no
22 net loss of housing.

23 Ms. French explained SB 330 did not require the housing units to be primary homes. They could
24 be an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) or junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU).

25 Commissioner Chang indicated that the Comprehensive Plan recommended that cottage
26 clusters be retained. She asked if additional ADUs could be built without splitting the lot.

27 Ms. Tanner confirmed State Law allowed additional ADUs on any property. Given the property's
28 current configuration, there was not enough room for an additional ADU unless it was to take
29 space from an existing building. Currently, ADUs must be detached on multi-family properties.

30 Ms. French noted the current structures were a non-compliant, non-conforming use and there
31 was no a right to put additional ADUs on the property because it was zoned for single-family
32 use.

-
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 shared that the Packet states that the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for
2 the property of the original lot size was 7,672-square feet but the maximum house size allowed
3 was 6,000-square feet. She asked what the Code says about the ability to take advantage of the
4 additional FAR and was that allowed without a subdivision.

5 Ms. French explained maximum house size was for primary residential units and that was
6 different from the gross floor area (GFA).

7 Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, agreed the application was more complicated because the
8 multi-family use was non-conforming. The applicant is not allowed to expand the non-
9 conformity. In general, without a subdivision and rezone, the applicant would only be able to
10 replace the buildings in their current locations within the existing building envelope.

11 Commissioner Hechtman announced in general he agreed the findings were sufficient and
12 supportable. One issue was the proposed lot line would run down the middle of the parcel and
13 dissect the existing driveway. He asked if Staff had investigated the private utilities for the
14 property to see if any of those crossed the proposed lot line.

15 Ms. French confessed she did not know the answer to the question.

16 Commissioner Hechtman requested the applicant provide an answer.

17 Mr. O'Hanlon answered the Public Works and Utilities Department reviewed the application
18 and did not find any crossing utilities.

19 Commissioner Hechtman highlighted Condition #2 and requested that Staff confirm that none
20 of the existing cottages' utilities cross the proposed lot line. If it is discovered they do cross the
21 line, those should be included in the easement arrangement outlined in Condition #2. He
22 mentioned the application may need a Covenant of Easement, and if used, it could include
23 provisions to inform the property owners on how to maintain the shared improvements. He
24 asked if the City has ever used a Covenant of Easement and would the applicant accept that
25 rather than the easement on the Parcel Map.

26 Mr. Yang confirmed the City does use the Covenant of Easement and agreed that made the
27 most sense for the application. Staff can clarify that approach before the item goes to Council.

28 Vice-Chair Summa commented that cottage clusters provide a range of housing options and
29 they were naturally affordable. She referenced several policies in the Comprehensive Plan that
30 supported retaining cottage clusters and smaller units. She expressed concern that the lot split
31 would lead to the displacement of residents and that it would be a loss of affordable housing.
32 She mentioned current legislation allowed one ADU and one JADU on the existing R-1 parcel.
33 She asked if SB 330 protected each divided lot and require them to have two units each.

-
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. Yang answered that is correct. He mentioned it was not clear that an ADU and a JADU could
2 be added to the current property since the current use was a non-conforming multi-family use.
3 He predicted the existing lot would be permitted to build two detached ADUs but there was an
4 issue with finding space on the lot for those units.

5 Vice-Chair Summa responded she thought the law was written more about the zone. If the
6 owner built two units on each lot, the use would still be non-conforming and they would not be
7 allowed to build an ADU or JADU.

8 Mr. Yang concurred that the new structures would be allowed to be built outside of the
9 previous envelope under SB 330.

10 Vice-Chair Summa was concerned about losing naturally affordable housing and displacing
11 residents. She shared she found Exception Finding #2 confusing and did not see how the finding
12 explained the necessary preservation and enjoyment of the substantiation property right of the
13 petitioner. In conclusion, she did not see any reason to do the lot split. It wouldn't add housing
14 units, it did not solve the issue of the back two units not having access to the street and she
15 could not make the findings for both the Exception and the lot split.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired what the process was if the landowner wanted to redevelop
17 without a lot split.

18 Ms. Tanner clarified Staff did not have a development proposal and did not know what will
19 happen to the parcels after the lot split. If the application is denied, the landowner could
20 rebuild the same non-conforming structures but not clear the site and do an arrangement
21 completely different.

22 Commissioner Reckdahl understood the City could approve a project with a Variance.

23 Ms. Tanner concurred and stated the landowner would have to apply for a rezoning of the
24 parcel. If the lot was split, then redevelopment could take place under SB 9.

25 Mr. Yang confirmed in the lot split, two units could be on a lot and would not be required to be
26 in the same location, or same size, as the existing structure.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl concurred with Vice-Chair Summa about Finding #2 and Exception
28 Finding #2 and #4 because the application was not supported by the Comprehensive Plan. He
29 believed a lot split would result in the landowner not retaining the cottage cluster. He could not
30 approve the project because the Comprehensive Plan protected cottage clusters.

31 Commissioner Templeton invited Staff to respond to the Comprehensive Plan protecting
32 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 Ms. French agreed the Comprehensive Plan protected cottage clusters but believed the policy
2 was intended for historic cottage clusters. The subject property was not historic and retention
3 of the buildings was not a concern with respect to historic preservation.

4 Commissioner Templeton pointed out that the properties appeared to have asbestos siding on
5 them.

6 Mr. O'Hanlon could not verify the material of the siding.

7 Commissioner Templeton asked when the structures were built.

8 Mr. O'Hanlon predicted in the 1940s.

9 Commissioner Templeton stated it was a high likelihood they had asbestos siding. She
10 mentioned the photo from Google Street view from February 2022 noted there was a project
11 application but Staff indicated there was no application.

12 Ms. Tanner explained the sign was to indicate that the City was not considering the future of
13 the project and believed that was part of the challenge for the Commission.

14 Commissioner Templeton agreed and commented that if the parcel remained at approximately
15 20,000-square feet. The property would be out of reach for many folks moving into Palo Alto
16 and splitting the lot may make it more affordable. She mentioned the neighbors were being
17 redeveloped and many of the structures needed renovations or replaced. Redeveloping but
18 having four structures that share the same driveway would provide better quality housing for
19 the folks living in the units.

20 Chair Lauing echoed Commissioner Hechtman's comments about the easement and
21 maintenance of the easement. Also, he echoed Vice-Chair Summa's remark that the existing
22 units are more affordable and that would change with redevelopment.

23 Commissioner Hechtman stated that the application was not to demolish the existing structures
24 and the Commissioners should not base their decision based on a concept that was not before
25 them. He pointed out cottage clusters were mentioned in Finding #2. Also, the existing lot was
26 too large for an R-1 Zone and the application was to bring the parcel closer to conformity with
27 the Municipal Code. He was unclear if a single-family parcel with four units could qualify for an
28 additional unit for an ADU or JADU and was unsure if that concept was addressed in State Law.
29 In the Staff report, it indicated it was possible to add one ADU to each new lot based on the
30 existing configuration. Through the lot split, there was a potential to add more affordable units
31 and that would increase the City's housing inventory.

-
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 how subdividing the lot makes it so that more housing units can be
2 built.

3 Mr. Yang explained once the property is divided, there will be two units on each lot. SB 9
4 allowed 2-units on each lot and that would no longer be considered non-conforming. Once
5 redeveloped there was the potential to have four units on each parcel.

6 Ms. Tanner added another option to develop the lots with three housing units on each parcel.

7 Commissioner Reckdahl was troubled that the City was not sure what the redevelopment
8 would be once the lot split is approved. He recommended denying the application and allowing
9 the City to relax standards when a project comes forward for the parcel.

10 Vice-Chair Summa agreed with Commissioner Reckdahl. She asked if denied, could the
11 landowner rebuild the structures in the same footprint but add a second story and a basement.

12 Mr. Yang answered no, under the Municipal Code a non-conforming use has to be rebuilt in the
13 same building envelope.

14 Vice-Chair Summa asked why the applicant wants the lot split in the absence of a project.

15 Mr. O'Hanlon explained the landowner wants to conform to R-1 standards. In October 2022,
16 the application presented options to Council with the potential to have smaller units but
17 Council was not interested in that type of development.

18 Vice-Chair Summa restated that the properties would remain non-conforming after the split.

19 Mr. O'Hanlon believed the lots would be conforming with Exceptions under the R-1 guidelines.

20 Chair Lauing understood from Mr. Yang that the uses would be non-conforming.

21 Mr. Yang clarified if the lot is split and two units are built. Those units would be considered
22 conforming as a result of SB 9.

23 Commissioner Hechtman asked if Palo Alto has a maximum size for a detached ADU.

24 Ms. Tanner believed the maximum size was 1,000-square feet for a 2-bedroom ADU.

25 Commissioner Hechtman agreed that the Commission was considering a lot split in the absence
26 of a project. It was clear from the Staff report that the minimum that the City will receive after
27 the lot split and redevelopment was four approximately 940-square foot cottages. Under SB
28 330, the landowner was not allowed to have less than four dwelling 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 Commissioner Templeton could not see a downside to approving the split because the
2 minimum number of dwelling units allowed would be four. She objected to the large existing
3 property size and doing a subdivision to have two smaller lots was an improvement. She
4 summarized a lot split would provide two appropriately sized lots, with no net loss of housing
5 and had the potential to include two additional housing units that would be more affordable
6 than the existing use.

7 Chair Lauing understood Commissioner Reckdahl was concerned the landowner may build two
8 high market units and that resulted in the City losing two affordable housing units if the lot split
9 were approved. He believed it was not relevant to focus on the size of the existing parcel
10 because a lot split would result in two 10,000-square foot lots with two units on them.

11 Commissioner Templeton noticed that Chair Lauing mentioned that the existing units were
12 affordable.

13 Chair Lauing clarified that cottage clusters were presumed to be more affordable because of
14 their size.

15 Commissioner Templeton remarked less expensive but not affordable in the terms of
16 restrictions.

17 Chair Lauing answered not required to be restricted.

18 Commissioner Templeton found the application to be a huge opportunity for the City to gain
19 more housing by allowing the parcel to be split. She emphasized if the lot split is not approved
20 then there was no way for the landowner to build six units.

21 Vice-Chair Summa provided several different scenarios on how the two new lots could be
22 developed and could not support the application because of the unknowns.

23 Commissioner Chang indicated that the Staff report stated that the application was consistent
24 with the Comprehensive Plan because there was no proposed project and the existing cottage
25 cluster will be retained. However, approving the subdivision enabled the loss of a cottage
26 cluster which the Comprehensive Plan did not favor.

27 Commissioner Templeton invited Staff to address Commissioner Chang's concern about the
28 Staff report stating that the application was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Per SB
29 330, the applicant was required to build four units on the parcels and thereby following the
30 Comprehensive Plan by retaining the cottage cluster but in a different configuration.

31 Ms. Tanner noted that not all the Comprehensive Plan policies were incorporated into the City's
32 Municipal Code. Staff believed that Policy L-1.3 and L-3.1 were ways that the potential

-
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 subdivision did conform to the Comprehensive Plan. Staff also believed that the intention was
2 to retain historic cottage clusters and the cluster in question was not historic.

3 Ms. French found that the split would encourage new cottage clusters and there may be ways
4 to modify the Zoning Code as part of the Housing Element to encourage new cottage clusters.

5 Chair Lauing restated his concern was two market-rate dwelling units will be built with two
6 smaller dwelling units and that scenario would not retain the cottage cluster concept.

7 Commissioner Templeton was not concerned about having two market-rate dwelling units with
8 two smaller units because it would still retain the cottage cluster environment.

9 Vice-Chair Summa shared that if the lot split is approved, the applicant could do another lot
10 split under SB 9 which would result in 26 units per acre. That exceeded the allowable density of
11 20-units per acre as highlighted in the Comprehensive Plan under village residential.

12 Ms. Tanner stated that the parcel was not zoned for that scenario and would have to be
13 rezoned.

14 Vice-Chair Summa clarified the scenario could exist if the applicant did another lot split under
15 SB 9.

16 Ms. Tanner agreed that the applicant could perform a lot under SB 9 and potentially have four
17 lots. Those lots would be eligible for a primary home, ADU and JADU which would result in 12
18 dwelling units on four lots.

19 Mr. Yang cautioned the Commission in discussing hypothetical scenarios.

20 Commission Hechtman noted that an owner could not use SB 9 to split two adjacent lots. The
21 scenario described by Vice-Chair Summa would not be allowed. Also, under SB 9, the owner of
22 the lot split had to live on one of the lots for a period of 3-years.

23 Commissioner Chang asked if a Convent of Easement was done could there be two driveways?

24 Mr. Yang explained that an easement would not exist until the properties were owned by two
25 different owners. The lots could also be redeveloped to have separate driveways. The City did
26 have standards on how far apart driveways have to be and it was unclear if divided if the
27 parcels could each have a driveway due to the space constraints.

28 Commissioner Reckdahl restated his concern that the lot split will allow a cottage cluster to be
29 redeveloped into a mansion cluster.

30 Commissioner Templeton encouraged the Commission to find consensus.

-
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 believed that in order to gain support from all Commissioners. The motion would
2 have to be to recommend approval but with the promise that more housing will be built and
3 remain affordable.

4 Commissioner Hechtman did not agree with Commissioner Reckdahl that four mansions would
5 be built on the properties if the lot split was approved.

6 MOTION #1

7 Commissioner Templeton moved Staff's recommendation.

8 SECOND

9 Commissioner Hechtman seconded. He asked if the motion included Staff exploring a Convent
10 of Easement and exploring the utilities.

11 Commissioner Templeton answered yes.

12 Chair Lauing restated there was a downside risk that the City will lose affordable housing if the
13 motion is approved. He inquired if the motion can include that Council considers requiring the
14 applicant to provide a certain number of units.

15 Mr. Yang did not believe there was a mechanism that would allow the Council to require a
16 certain number of units as part of the Preliminary Parcel Map.

17 Commissioner Templeton asked if the PTC could require that any project be brought forward to
18 the PTC for review.

19 Chair Lauing believed no.

20 VOTE

21 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion failed 2-4.

22 MOTION FAILED 2(Hechtman, Templeton) -4(Chang, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa) -1 (Roohparvar
23 absent)

24 Ms. Tanner reported that an alternative motion was needed.

25 MOTION #2

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

1 Vice-Chair Summa moved to deny the applicant's request to divide the lot because of the
2 uncertainty of the outcome and because not all of the findings could be made. Specifically
3 Finding #2 of the Parcel Map findings and Findings #2 and #4 of the Exception findings.

4 SECOND

5 Commissioner Reckdahl seconded.

6 VOTE

7 Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 4-2.

8 MOTION PASSED 4(Chang, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa)- 2(Hechtman, Templeton) -1 (Roohparvar
9 absent)

10 Mr. O'Hanlon asked in what manner would the Commission see the project again? He restated
11 that Council showed no interest in the applicant deviating from the R-1 standard that
12 supported more units.

13 Ms. Tanner remarked the dialog has ended unless the Chair allows further comment from the
14 applicant.

15 Chair Lauing answered the vote has been taken and now Council will have to make a decision.

16 Mr. O'Hanlon stated he did not agree with the findings of the denial and felt the motion
17 violated the owner's rights.

18 Commissioner Hechtman expressed frustration with the result. If the understanding from the
19 Commissioners who voted yes was that the structures will become less affordable if they are
20 upgraded, then using that logic the City should not allow anyone to renovate their homes.

21 Commissioner Templeton was surprised as well by the result and that the Commission would
22 allow a large non-conforming lot to remain when the City was facing a substantial increase in its
23 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). She encouraged less rigid dialog and was more
24 oriented toward finding a solution together.

25 **Commission Action:** Motion by Templeton, seconded by S. Failed 2-4 (Roohparvar absent)

26 **Commission Action:** Motion by Summa, seconded by Reckdahl. Passed 4-2 (Roohparvar absent)

27 4. PUBLIC HEARING: Recommendation for City Council adoption of an Ordinance
28 Amending Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 18.52.070 (Parking Regulations for CD
29 Assessment District) to Continue a Temporary Ban the Eligibility of Commercial
30 Office Uses Above the Ground Floor to Participate in the Downtown Parking In-

-
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 Lieu Program and Making Clerical Amendments to PAMC Section 16.57.010
2 (Applicability) in Chapter 16.57 (In-Lieu Parking Fee for New Nonresidential
3 Development in the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zoning District).

4 Rebecca Atkinson, Planner, stated the topic was to discuss an existing policy regarding the
5 temporary ban on the eligibility of new, above-ground, office floor area to be able to participate
6 in the downtown parking in lieu program. The temporary ban was established in 2018 and
7 approved in 2019. The ban was extended in the years 2020 and 2022 and was to expire on
8 August 1, 2022. PTC's purpose was to review the results of the Staff study on the temporary
9 ban, hear public feedback, and provide direction to Council for consideration. The temporary
10 ban did not affect the Downtown Parking Assessment District boundaries, basic site eligibility
11 criteria, downtown parking requirements, or commercial and services use could still use the in-
12 lieu parking program. Before the temporary ban, there was infrequent parking in-lieu
13 participation and few housing applications. Since the ban, there have been no parking in-lieu
14 participation and no housing units proposed. Staff conducted community outreach efforts in
15 February and March of 2022. Feedback from the community ranged from support to letting the
16 ban lapse to allowing the ban to be permanent. After receiving direction from PTC, Staff will
17 present the item to Council at their June 6, 2022 meeting with the second reading on June 20,
18 2022. Staff recommended PTC recommend to Council extending the ban for 3-years which
19 allowed for significant progress to happen on the other City initiatives happening in the
20 downtown area.

21 Chair Lauing summarized Staff's recommendation was to extend the ban for 3-years but PTC
22 could also recommend that the ban become permanent or remove altogether.

23 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, announced there are no public speakers for the
24 item.

25 Commissioner Templeton reiterated that Staff collected data during a unique and unusual time.
26 She supported the Staff's recommendation.

27 Commissioner Chang agreed with Commissioner Templeton. She asked how many sites
28 downtown need seismic or historic rehabilitation.

29 Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, noted that the City's Building Department was conducting
30 a seismic survey.

31 Vice-Chair Summa appreciated the letters from the public and found them well informed. She
32 mentioned she was not supportive of the in-lieu program overall but supported extending the
33 ban for 3-years. Extending the program would allow Staff to collect sufficient data and see how
34 the ban worked with the other initiatives.

-
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 noted residential uses cannot use the in-lieu program and non-
2 residential uses must follow one or more of the criteria outlined in the Municipal Code. He
3 believed the ban played a role in limiting building development in Palo Alto. He agreed with
4 Staff that the removal of the ban could encourage redevelopment downtown with multi-story
5 office. He supported the Staff recommendation but wanted to understand why Staff suggested
6 3-years instead of 2-years. He supported Staff's recommendation to exempt from the ban the
7 use of existing Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) for seismic and historic rehabilitation.

8 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, answered the reason for the 3-year suggestion was to be
9 able to collect data outside of the COVID-19 Pandemic. She acknowledged that 2-years was
10 reasonable in terms of understanding does the ban negatively or positively impacts office or
11 housing development.

12 Ms. Atkinson mentioned Council recently directed Staff to explore adjustments to FAR for
13 commercial and residential uses downtown. That direction will influence the financial penciling
14 of future projects.

15 Chair Lauing agreed that PTC needs more data before making a final recommendation.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl supported extending the ban for 3-year. He echoed Commissioner
17 Hechtman's comment about moving the initiative forward quickly. He expressed concern about
18 the lack of housing in the downtown area and asked why residential uses could not use the in-
19 lieu project.

20 Ms. Tanner answered the Municipal Code did not allow it but PTC could recommend that
21 Council consider allowing residential uses to use the program. She mentioned in Palo Alto it
22 was not common for folks to have a parking space that was not near their home.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired where folks park who have in-lieu parking.

24 Ms. Tanner explained proposals do not build the parking but instead give funds to the City. The
25 City then uses the fund to build a parking structure to accommodate the parking.

26 Commissioner Reckdahl summarized the in-lieu spots are in publicly owned garages.

27 Ms. Tanner answered yes.

28 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if a proposal has extra space for parking. Can the proposal
29 convert those spots to in-lieu parking?

30 Ms. Tanner explained the program was currently designed like that but could be changed.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired how much money was in the in-lieu parking fund.

-
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 confessed she did not know.

2 Chair Lauing wanted to know how many folks Staff was able to reach out to during public
3 engagement.

4 Ms. Atkinson answered three people attended the virtual meeting and Staff conducted
5 interviews with five people.

6 Ms. Tanner added several of the participants owned multiple properties.

7 Sheldon Ah Sing, Planner, noted Staff distributed an email blast to the downtown businesses.

8 Chair Lauing believed the TDRs needed to be evaluated but agreed that should not be
9 happening now.

10 MOTION #1

11 Commissioner Templeton moved the Staff recommendation.

12 SECOND

13 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

14 Commissioner Hechtman asked if he could make a motion regarding TDRs afterward.

15 Chair Lauing proclaimed Commissioner Hechtman can make a supplementary motion.

16 VOTE

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

18 Commissioner Templeton noted the Staff recommendation does not specify the extension was
19 for 3-years.

20 Ms. Tanner confirmed the ordinance has the language regarding 3-years.

21 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa, Templeton) – 0 -1(Roohparvar
22 absent)

23 MOTION #2

24 Commissioner Hechtman moved that the PTC recommend to the Council exemption from the 3-
25 years extension of the ban recommended by the PTC for existing TDRs and for all downtown

-
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 applications that proposed generations of TDRs to be sold so that projects proposing seismic
2 rehabilitation and/or historic rehabilitation downtown could remain incentivized.

3 Chair Lauing understood the motion was to make the change now as opposed to PTC
4 considering that at a later time.

5 Commissioner Hechtman confirmed that is correct.

6 Chair Lauing reported the motion dies due to the lack of a second.

7 MOTION #2 DIED DUE TO A LACK OF A SECOND.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl commented he supported Commissioner Hechtman's concept but
9 wanted to have more dialog about it at a future meeting.

10 Commissioner Chang echoed Commissioner Reckdahl's comment and requested that Staff
11 provide more information regarding the magnitude of the issue at a later date.

12 Ms. Tanner mentioned Staff could include in the Staff report for Council that PTC is interested
13 in exploring the topic further.

14 **Commission Action:** Motion by Templeton, seconded by Summa. Passed 6-0 (Roohparvar
15 absent)

16 5. Staff Recommend the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) adopts the
17 2022-2023 Work Plan and Forward the Plan to Council for Consideration and
18 Approval.

19 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, specified that the Work Plan now captured Commissioner
20 Hechtman's revisions. The Work Plan will be presented to Council on June 1, 2022.

21 Chair Lauing pointed out that in the prior year's accomplishments, in the second sentence, the
22 word "providing" was not spelled correctly. With respect to Project Goal #7, he met with the
23 Mayor and Planning Direction to discuss the goal and it will be continued.

24 MOTION

25 Commissioner Hechtman thanked Staff for making the clarifications to the Mission Statement
26 and providing language for the blank boxes. He moved to forward the Work Plan to Council for
27 consideration.

28 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 Chair Lauing seconded.

2 VOTE

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

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

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

8 **Approval of Minutes**

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

10 6. February 9, 2022 Draft PTC Meeting Minutes

11 MOTION

12 Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the February 9, 2022 draft summary minutes as
13 revised.

14 SECOND

15 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

16 VOTE

17 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion
18 passed 6-0.

19 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa, Templeton) – 0 -1(Roohparvar
20 absent)

21 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Summa. Passed 6-0 (Roohparvar
22 absent)

23 7. February 23, 2022 Draft Verbatim and Summary Meeting Minutes

24 MOTION

25 Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the February 23, 2022 draft verbatim and
26 summary meeting minutes as revised.

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

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

8 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Reckdahl. Passed 6-0 (Roohparvar
9 absent)

10 8. March 9, 2022 Draft Verbatim Meeting Minutes

11 MOTION

12 Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the March 9, 2022 draft verbatim meeting
13 minutes as revised.

14 SECOND

15 Commissioner Chang seconded.

16 VOTE

17 Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion
18 passed 6-0.

19 MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa, Templeton) – 0 -1(Roohparvar
20 absent)

21 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Chang. Passed 6-0 (Roohparvar absent)

22 **Committee Items**

23 None.

-
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 Questions, Comments or Announcements**

2 Chair Lauing announced the July 27, 2022 meeting will be canceled. He recommended not to
3 take action on canceling another meeting until PTC concludes the Housing Element item.

4 Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, stated at the next meeting, that PTC will have one time-
5 sensitive item and then the following meeting PTC will be reviewing the Accessory Dwelling
6 Unit (ADU) Ordinance.

7 Chair Lauing asked when the ADU Ordinance was coming.

8 Ms. Tanner answered on May 25, 2022.

9 Chair Lauing reminded Commissioner Templeton she will be the Council's liaison for May.

10 Commissioner Templeton asked if Staff knew of PTC items that will be coming to Council in
11 May. She asked if Vice-Chair Summa would be available as a backup.

12 Vice-Chair Summa answered yes.

13 Ms. Tanner articulated Council will consider the second reading of an ordinance on May 9th,
14 2022. Then on May 16th, 2022, Council will consider Objective Standards and then on May 23rd,
15 2022 Council will be hearing the Castilleja Expansion Project.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl stated Commissioner Chang always leads off in the roll call votes and
17 suggested the order be rotated.

18 Commissioner Chang strongly supported that recommendation.

19 Commissioner Hechtman supported rotating the voting order. He shared that the May Fete
20 Parade will be held on May 7th, 2022. He asked if Planning Commissioner normally participated
21 in the parade.

22 Vice-Chair Summa announced she's participated every year.

23 Chair Lauing adjourned the meeting.

24 **Adjournment**

25 8:40 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.