

PARKING REQUIREMENTS ○

- reduce pkg reqs for SROs,
low demand and don't want
to pay \$ for unused spaces

- Increase density & height

- Reduce parking

- Use FAR as metric to determine

how many units are allowed

- prioritize hsg for ppl that
live AND work in PA

PARKING REQUIREMENTS ○

- concern about spillover prkg in neighborhood
- Extremely low income HHS don't have cars/demand
- Provide transit passes
- Residents parking on-street not in their SFR garages reducing pkg supply

PARKING REQUIREMENTS ○

- concern about subsidizing public pkg when residents don't park in garages or projects do ^{not} provide sufficient pkg
- ~~parking~~ - housing people is more important than pkg cars
- need to provide housing AND accommodate pkg
- need realistic regs - don't overpark
- look into incentivize foot traffic residents or individuals who don't use cars to get to work
- Housing for people who don't want to use cars
Example: The President Hotel

PARKING REQUIREMENTS⁰

- Add loading space for Uber/Lyft pick-up for multi-family/disabled housing

PARKING REQUIREMENTS

How to deal with
Rental housing with
more than one or two
renters—where do
5 renters park? ^{by using the 5th floor}

How DID TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS
decide on their Recommendations?
Do they survey current
Residents?

Don't change parking
requirements. I live in a multi-
residential complex at Cal Avenue—
we need more parking—not less!
We need at the very least one parking
space for every unit.

Please Don't pretend
Four people won't own
cars
— or won't have visitors

We need to bid more for people not
for cars. People's habits are and will
continue to change. Traditional parking
requirements are no longer applicable and
society and mobility affect living
opportunities. Policy needs to be relaxed
in the right location, near transit.

The city should care more about
housing humans than cars.
The city should make walkable
communities that have higher
density housing near transit.
Residents use LA car-sharing law
legislated for parking free parking
app to traffic as local
policy.

Yes to using surveyed parking
demand rate rather than
old numbers!!

For instance, DD only use .3 (including
study & permit)

Do not ~~use~~ ^{increase} parking requirements
for residential by
requiring ground-level retail
(e.g. keep shops in retail)
business centers such as Cal Ave
& University/terminal/Lytton.

Understanding impacts on on street
parking is fundamentally important

- If impact from situated sites is
low now, how will that change
w/ cumulative additional demand
created by new developments?
- How does "unbundling" impact
uptake of an on-street parking lot?
Does it incentivize driverless Pkgs?

NO! Have you been
to LOS ROBES AVENUE
ACROSS GARDEN VISTA
PARK REQUIREMENT ON
RESIDENT AVENUE?
THE STREET IS FULL OF CARS
FOR BLOCKS IN OTHER
DIRECTIONS

Parking study should also account
for overlap of parking claims?

Can a tenant reject unwanted
Pkg cost in favor of a PEP
Permit?
Do they claim both?

Parking requirements keep T&B
Alive from making its housing
goals

Allow more car share
cars (Zip Car) around
denser areas of town
so families can get rid
of their second car.

Parking permit programs for
new development areas:

- 1) People parking for their job
will take less spaces that
belong to residents
- 2) Residents will have to think
about owning 2-3 cars because
they need to pay \$X per year
for each car. This is especially
true for developments near public transport.

How is it possible
to expand Comm.
& retail & not provide
an abundance of private
transport from choke
points:
• Provide an abundance
of Uber/Lyft/pickup
transitional transit
• On call services
• Reducing lanes
does not work, but
continuous traffic
management

Full package for
all developments.
Residents should not have
to pay for new unimproved
projects.

Don't provide less
parking than needed

HOUSING AND RETAIL



Less constraints on 100% afford. residential ✓

- no requirement for retail ✓✓

Need to be cautious when near SF neigh.

- no parking reductions ✓

- underparked currently ✓

- utilize RFP in appropriate places

~ it would be preferable to have people live and work in PA if not then you can't even do PA

- STRICT
- more ton of concessions
- Encourage Bldg oburgity instead of in lieu

→

Protect retail

Displacement concern of people w/ disabilities

Housing and Retail

- Exempt parking reqs for comm users in mixed use

- Encouraging mixed use

→ " 100 residential

→ Disincentive exclusive 100% com
→ restrictive ben jobs/housing
Balance ✓

Explore disincentivizing driving.

→ mixed use small well out
page mil + Charleston

Don't let parking limit housing. Should not be driver ✓

Increase height max.

Don't support retail that isn't supported by market

Housing and Retail

7 Consider allowing Dances
Res. Dev't. in R1 Zoning near
Transit

HOUSING AND RETAIL

SAVE PRESIDENT HOUSING!

Compact/dense housing is needed when office expands
• EXISTING HOUSING NEEDS TO BE PROTECTED BECAUSE IT ALREADY HOUSES THE MIX WHICH IS NEEDED FOR EFFECTIVE BALANCE OF SKILLS
• DOES CITY HAVE INT. IN RETAINING EXISTING OR ONLY PROPOSE NEW ONES.

I support the Retail Preservation Ordinance. We need to support retail - small business in town. In North Ventura there might be places for 100% residential but not along major roads Park Blvd.

Allow more mixed-use developments - people living over retail or commercial.

Maintain the apartments at the President Hotel

Retail requirements only make sense if the market will support. They required a grocery at College Terrace, no one shopped there, it closed. Lack of housing much more important than forcing unsupported retail.

Do not require retail for housing other than in commercial/transit served centers such as Cal Ave, Univ/Hamilton/Lytton. Do not spread up & down El Camino where retail will increase parking requirements that will escalate cost of housing.

Be more creative w/ mix use dev't

Require developers to provide housing for a significant % of new development.

Limit ground floor retail exceptions to narrowly defined housing - affordability @ up to 80% AMI is our most-needed supply. Save incentives (subsidy) for most-needed housing.

Strongly support Idea #1 ^(Retail) ID where retail is viable. Consider both affordable and market rate housing in entirety on mixed use sites.

Housing & Retail. It is my opinion that structures in the city of Lab Atto that fit with the concept and vision of H and R should be focused on and guided towards the cities stated goals and visions. Example: President ->

As we incentivize ↑ housing (at any price) via our zoning code, do we have any mechanism to reign it back in if necessary? We went "big" on office last decade + now we've created a new crisis for housing. How do we avoid carrying from crisis to crisis?

Keep the apartments at President Hotel as residential units! They provide retail below housing for 80+ people, and have historic character! YES!!!

If require ground floor retail for affordable housing, must allow more height/area/units & permit parking & all funding gaps lost because retail & other parking. Eliminate eligibility for tax credits. ~~Save on ground floor office~~ Eliminate retail/office ~~minimum~~ parking req for affordable.

Do not force retail for retail sake. The market will dictate what works and what will die. Forcing grocery stores as a requirement is not a good idea - College Terrace Market was a prime example. Put retail in the right places!!!

Housing and Retail

Hotel @ 488 University Ave.

- It has retail
- It has residential (affordable)
- It could have a few floors of

Hotel. That's seems like
multi use w/out compromise!
Scott Keith

PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS ①

- Combine roles of ARB AND ~~PTC~~ AND ^{YES} ~~PTC~~ AND ^{YES} ensure no loss of oversight
- YES, DO THINGS TO HELP HOUSING TO MOVE THROUGH THE PROCESS FASTER
- YES, BUT MAKE SURE THAT ~~THERE ARE~~ ^{IT IS FOR PROJECTS} ~~THAT ARE~~ ^{THAT ARE} INCREASING HOUSING SUPPLY (MORE UNITS THAN ANY LIST) ^{ON SITE}
- PLEASE CONSIDER WAYS OF NOT PROMOTING displacement of existing residents (e.g. project hotel)

- stronger tenant laws
- city needs to stand behind tenants

- rent control + stabilization
- rental units affordable
- housing preservation

PTOD projects can be helpful to individuals with developmental disabilities who are extremely low-income and rely on public transportation

Think about those w/ disabilities who may benefit from PTOD housing

Send notices on new housing projects to people on the affordable housing waiting list

PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS ②

PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS 2

PLEASE In-laws for ~~ADU's~~ and ADU's lowering the cost of putting in sewer lines, etc, that can be actually add-ons to existing. \$20,000 many years ago stopped my mother from completing an ADU, which a family member could be using now. \$20k is too high!
PLEASE In-laws for ADU's lowering the cost of putting in sewer lines, etc, that can be actually add-ons to existing. \$20,000 many years ago stopped my mother from completing an ADU, which a family member could be using now. \$20k is too high!

IP ADUs are actually a priority, reduce fees and process so that average homeowners can feasibly build them.

Allow 4 families to purchase a tear down single-family + build a 4-unit condo together
 Change zoning near train stations to allow these
 \$3M tear down
 \$2M to build 4 units
 \$5M / 4 families = \$1.25M/fam
*train station housing!

Streamline + Speed up review of single-family housing.

Give developer the option for one-stop or multi-step process

4 years is too long! just PERM is good bc they get into site + design too!
 most projects have many hearings anyway!

- Streamlining approval of housing is important to meeting goals of adding to PLS housing stock while maintaining affordability
 - Providing incentives for affordable development (incl 100% affordable) to streamline or increase density is important

Yes to PTOD bonus for affordable housing.
 Consider allowing for also allow for project with, say, 50% MLI or ELI.

Streamlining should be incentivized not to hurt neighbors
 => quality

PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS ③

Streamline even more -
Still a hard process for
projects to get through!

process is intimidating -
not incentivizing!
need constructive, focused
criticism process.

#1

NO !!

PROCESS SHOULD NOT BE ELIM.

• sped up the review process
for residential developments
that increase supply
• Increase money for developers
that increases or decreases
housing supply

Does City concern
itself with existing
dense housing
which could be
changed for
Comm/Hotel/Office
• If 2nd story gets
a Special Review
Why does city
Architect gets to
dictate only his ideas
shouldn't he be a
local Architect?

NO, ABSOLUTELY NOT!

THIS ATTEMPT TO SUGGEST
FEEDBACK & REVIEW AT THE
EXPENSE OF DEVELOPER
EXPERIENCE.

WHAT PROJECTS WOULD
ACTUALLY BENEFIT?

Do reduce process
requirements. If
project meets zoning,
facilitate speed.

ELIMINATE PROCESS!

Good authoritarian IDEA.
Trump would agree.

developers want
New process -
better process

Streamlining the review
process strictly for the benefit
of developers is bad. The City
should be serving its residents first.
Citizen input is vital on projects that
affect their neighborhood.

Look at bigger
picture - 3 boards
is a lot - but
we do good things!

NO on #2.

important for ppl
to have input on
PTOD projects - not
be risky.

Support streamlining so
long as no big
obstacle to quality
of development. Still
needs to meet zoning

DENSITY AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

- Support ^{higher} density near public transportation
- Consider more multi-generational housing and consider more floor area for that type of housing
- require housing w/ commercial development
- increase floor area, height, density; especially for below market rate housing but maintain high quality of architecture
- need more senior housing options
- Supportive of higher density but not at the expense of higher parking needs that can't be met or higher open space ratios that can't be met w/out rooftop open space (note: rooftop open space not great in small lot areas)
- modify R-1 zoning to have flexibility to construct MF project that's walkable to commercial/amenities
- on large residential lots, have incentives to build smaller residential units (i.e. ADU)

DENSITY AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARD

- Supportive of height increases → especially for projects w/ ground floor retail preservation or affordable. President's hotel a great example of high density, ~~just~~ taller building that works
- Rooftop open space
- London → uppermost floor has to be available to general public as open space
- Supportive of eliminating density and increasing FAR to allow for more floors

DENSITY AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Zone for multi-family & reduced unit sizes per new demographics; fewer 4 or more person families & more 2 or even 1 person households.

Support the idea here, goal to offer incentives + bonuses in support of affordable development or bonus in principle, part of affordability.

Rezone office to housing
Keep 50' height limit and sufficient parking

Map affordable housing, combining district overlay onto candidate areas of city NW.

↑ density in "transit rich" areas sounds good, but very few Palo Altoans would brag that any part of our city (w/ possible exception of Univ station) is transit rich.

Housing in Stanford Research Park and Shopping Center

Raise height Limit!
Allow 5 or 6 stories on El Camino, at least 4 stories on corridors, Cal Ave, Bryant, Hamilton, Lyman, Alma.
allow more mass up to 500 100 yards in from corridors.

People with intellectual + developmental disabilities would benefit from an incentive to build affordable units for extremely low income individuals, but would need open floor plans to navigate their space.

allow more resid FAR to retain retail component

Zone a lot of areas in city to support multi-family. ~~zone~~ Allow duplexes & triplexes on previously R1 lots to help "missing middle".

Strong housing overlay to incentivize housing development over office keep 50' height limit parking

Wish there was an opportunity for gen public to get a primer on what the impacts of reduced standards are. How can they assess whether certain incentives are worthwhile when they only hear the benefits and not the costs/impacts?

Allow higher FAR for multi-family and main + ADU.

Stanford GUP updated DEIR shows that residential uses require much more diverse access to other parts of town (school, childcare, grocery, etc) for which our transit options are meager. How will ↑ densities be tied to more appropriate transportation options for residential projects?
DEIR also concluded that TDM is not very effective for those residential transp. needs. ~~How~~ Solving the transp problem must either precede or go in tandem w/ ^{dense} housing development.

Why aren't ALL development/density standard reductions tied to PRIORITY projects/types?
Impacts are born by neighbors. Why are zoning "subsidies" offered evenly to all project types, regardless of connection to community needs?

I would support offering bonus for affordable projects especially to meet the needs of ~~Disability~~ Disabled.

To encourage housing, don't use 2 standard, FAR + unit/acre. Too restrictive. Allow FAR to be the constraint not units/acre. But really need more FAR + height to accommodate more units + affordable units.

Against raising 50' height limit in City. Maintain this throughout City. Adding density without adding the proper infrastructure (road improvements, water systems, etc) - and schools - is bad for everyone.

DENSITY AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS