

From: [Dan Adams](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: cell network equipment on poles - they should become extinct
Date: Monday, December 17, 2018 8:51:39 AM

Dear City Council Members,

I'm writing again to ask you to eliminate pole-top cell network infrastructure by pushing the telecom companies to bury their installations in underground vaults. Underground installations should be the only option for locating this type of equipment in residential neighborhoods. These systems don't belong next to people's houses and above our neighborhood sidewalks and walking paths.

My primary grievance with the pole-mounted equipment in residential neighborhoods is the noise pollution. Within 50 feet of these poles, constant white noise is noticeable during otherwise quiet times of the day. For people who have houses right next to these poles, they must hear this noise in their yards all the time. Within 20 feet of these poles, the sound is loud enough to be heard inside a houses if the windows are open. It seems wrong to bring this sort of constant noise pollution onto someone's property. On my morning walks, I walk by several of these pole-mounted systems. When walking toward them and as the noise starts to be audible, it sounds like a car is approaching from down the street.

I love the quiet times in our neighborhood and am lucky enough to own a home here. If the city added one of these constant noise sources within earshot of my yard and house, I would be heartbroken at the loss of the quiet we cherish and would be furious someone allowed this kind of infrastructure to alter the environment of my house and yard. Airplane and car noise break the silence periodically but then quiet returns. With these systems, quiet is gone for good.

These systems are also eyesores, especially the big cans sticking up from the top of the pole, usually looking wobbly and sloppy since they rarely seems to be lined up well with the pole. In a community which cares about aesthetics, our great tree canopy and architecture controls and review, why would we possibly tolerate such lousy looking equipment mounted in our neighborhoods? Would you accept one of these things mounted on the corner or side of your lot?

The telecom industry is not hurting for profit these days. Please make them pay to bury all of their infrastructure. Palo Alto must allow the Utilities to bear his cost. The city must not make the residents bear the significant everyday environmental burden just so the Utilities can increase their profitability.

Thanks,

Dan Adams
[REDACTED] Whitsell Ave.

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Don't allow Palo Alto to be a pawn of the FCC
Date: Sunday, December 16, 2018 2:42:27 PM

Dear Mayor Kniss, Vice-Mayor Filseth and Council Members DuBois, Fine, Holman, Kou, Scharff, Tanaka and Wolbach:

I am writing to urge you to do two things.

First, please reject City Staff's advice that Palo Alto incorporate into its ordinances elements of an order issued by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in October. The FCC order is intended to strip cities of important rights with respect to city-owned property, including the right to set the rental fee for space on city-owned poles. There is absolutely no reason for Palo Alto to voluntarily give up these rights. (Please note that the current administration has stacked the FCC with Commissioners who are unequivocal supporters of the telecommunications industry. For example, Ajit Pai, the man appointed by President Trump to chair the FCC, is former Associate General Counsel of Verizon.)

Second, as the Planning and Transportation Commission has recommended, please instead consider joining the League of California Cities and dozens of individual cities, including New York, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle and San Jose, in suing the FCC with respect to its October order.

City Staff's end-of-year rush to change Palo Alto's ordinances to embrace the FCC's blatantly pro-telecom order raises many questions, among them:

1. Why now, when major legal challenges to the FCC's order have not yet been decided?
2. Why now, when the California PUC—and indeed the entire State of California—is rethinking the wisdom of aboveground utilities in the wake of the Camp, Tubbs and Woolsey wildfires, to name but a few?
3. Why now, when our Representative, Anna Eshoo, and her colleague, Senator Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut, are challenging the FCC's current assertion that cell tower installations near people's jobs and homes are safe?
4. Why now, when Palo Alto's Architectural Review Board has directed Crown Castle/Verizon to locate ancillary cell tower equipment underground? and
5. Why now, when serious questions have been raised about the integrity of Palo Alto's cell tower application review process in the wake of Chief Technology Officer Jonathan Reichental's abrupt resignation following the revelation that he had for years been accepting lavish gifts of travel from the telecommunications

industry?

Finally, I hope you will take note that—in advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to recommend that you modify our municipal ordinances so as to codify the FCC’s pro-telecommunications-industry order—City Staff failed to reveal that the order they were advising you endorse is being fought by the League of California Cities, to which Palo Alto belongs. Instead, the Planning and Transportation Commission had to learn from residents that the League, along with dozens of individual cities, has filed a lawsuit to halt the order’s implementation.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [William Ross](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda Item No. 4; Proposed Ordinance Amending Section 18.42.110 (Wireless Communication Facilities) of chapter 18.42 (Standards for Special Uses of Title 18 (Zoning of the Palo Alto Municipal Code ("PAMC") to Update the Code to Reflect recently Adopted F
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 8:11:25 PM
Attachments: [Agenda Item No. 4 12.11.18.pdf](#)

Please see the attached.

William D. Ross, Esq.

Law Offices of William D. Ross

A Professional Corporation

400 Lambert Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306

Tel: (650) 843-8080; Fax: (650) 843-8093

E-Mail: wross@lawross.com

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENTS. THIS MESSAGE MAY BE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION, AND AS SUCH IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT AN INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY REVIEW, USE, DISSEMINATION, FORWARDING OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY REPLY E-MAIL OR TELEPHONE, AND DELETE THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE AND ALL ATTACHMENTS FROM YOUR SYSTEM. THANK YOU

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Melody Song](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell Towers in Palo Alto Neighborhoods
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 9:30:11 PM

Dear Members of City Council,

I recently learned that the Architectural Review Board, considering its first new set of cell tower applications since last December, voted 4-1 to require that ancillary cell tower equipment be located underground. This is the right decision, and it is good for Palo Alto.

I strongly urge the City Council to:

1. Reverse the May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment above ground next to people's homes;
2. Direct city staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise, and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and
3. Direct city staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications industry order into our municipal ordinances.

Sincerely

Melody Song, a concerned Palo Alto resident

From: [Anne Rosenthal](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Reverse Verizon Decision
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 4:20:38 PM

To the Palo Alto City Council:

I urge you to

1. To reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous, especially during earthquakes, equipment aboveground next to people's homes;
2. To direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and, more specifically,;
3. To direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances.

Anne M Rosenthal
Palo Alto Resident and Voter

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Linda Clarke](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell Towers in Residential Areas
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 1:51:26 PM

Dear City Council,

I am writing to implore you to reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its ugly and potentially hazardous equipment above ground next to people's homes. Some of the many reasons I chose to live in Palo Alto are the city's aesthetics, noise ordinances and support of its residents.

It is clear that the FCC's pro-telecommunications industry stance does not adhere to Palo Alto's values, so please stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances.

Thank You,
Linda Clarke
■ Washington Avenue
Palo Alto

From: [Whitney Leeman](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Fwd: 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 4:04:39 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

I am writing to ask that you reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment aboveground next to people's homes and businesses.

I am also requesting that you direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences and businesses.

Thirdly, I ask that you direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into its municipal ordinances.

I realize that Cities get excited about renting their infrastructure to cellular carriers, but by doing so, you are allowing your constituents to be the subjects of human experimentation, without their consent. See the email I sent to Rebecca Atkinson, below.

Sincerely,

Whitney Leeman

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Whitney Leeman** <whitney.r.leeman@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 9:08 AM
Subject: 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto
To: <rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org>

Dear Rebecca, I am writing to voice opposition to the AT&T sponsored small cell project proposed at 250 Hamilton, Avenue, Palo Alto.

Despite industry claims, there are no data proving the safety of microwave/RF radiation at the density needed for "internet of things", self driving cars, augmented reality, etc.

However, there are thousands of published papers in peer-reviewed journals documenting negative effects of microwave/RF radiation. For example, see the following link: <https://ehtrust.org/worlds-largest-animal-study-on-cell-tower-radiation-confirms-cancer-link/>

There is a huge difference between "proven safety" vs. "assumed safety", "lack of data" or "lack of conclusive evidence" on the subject of small cell towers in close proximity to humans, or nonconsensual saturation of public and private space with microwave/RF radiation by cellular providers.

By approving this project, you are subjecting citizens of Palo Alto to nonconsensual human experimentation.

If the project is approved, I for one will avoid the restaurants/businesses near the 250 Hamilton Avenue site, where I was having dinner when I saw the public notice posted. I will also inform the business owners about this project, in case they are unaware of its potential impacts on employees and patrons.

Sincerely,

Whitney Leeman, Ph.D.
Portola Valley, CA

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Lily Huang Liao](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Fwd: Update: Cell Towers in Residential Neighborhoods
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 3:21:44 PM

Dear Sir/Madam,

I totally agree with the following position. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Lily Huang

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Date: Tue, Dec 11, 2018 at 2:33 PM
Subject: Update: Cell Towers in Residential Neighborhoods
To: <JFLEMING@metricus.net>
Cc: Jerry Fan <jerry.fan@gmail.com>, Jyotsna Nimkar <jnimkar@gmail.com>

Dear Neighbors:

We have great news: The Architectural Review Board, considering its first new set of cell tower applications since last December, voted 4-0-1 to require that ancillary cell tower equipment be located underground. (There were no votes in opposition. One Board member abstained.) The all-volunteer ARB is working hard to protect the interests of the residents of Palo Alto in the face of relentless pressure to do otherwise. We thank them.

On another front, Jeanne has sent a formal demand letter to City Attorney Molly Stump, asking that City Council—in light of what we now know about Jonathan Reichental and the pro-telecommunications-industry bias at City Hall—reconsider its May 21st, 2018 decision upholding the installation of the Vinculums/Verizon Cluster 1 cell towers in the Midtown, South of Midtown, St. Claire Gardens, and Palo Verde neighborhoods. She has also asked Ms. Stump and City Clerk Beth Minor to conduct their own investigation of Dr Reichental and to require him to amend his six years of Statements of Economic Interest so that they are complete, correct and unambiguous.

Finally, as welcome as Jonathan Reichental's hasty resignation was, he leaves behind a legacy of favoritism toward the telecommunications industry that must be dismantled.

Right now, City Staff are advising the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) to incorporate into Palo Alto's municipal ordinances

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

the current administration FCC's October order establishing, among other things, \$270 per year as the maximum pole rental fee for cell tower equipment. The PTC will be considering this recommendation at its meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, December 12th, 2018.

It is impossible to imagine that what City Staff is advising the PTC to do could be of benefit to Palo Alto's residents. New York, Seattle, Portland, Denver, San Jose and dozens of other cities are resisting the order and suing the FCC over it. Moreover, to reduce fire hazards, the California PUC recently initiated the process of establishing rules that ultimately will require the undergrounding of many utility poles.

In this context, how can City Staff honestly recommend to the PTC that they codify allowing these poles to be loaded up with heavy cell tower equipment, let alone codify renting space on the poles for the pittance of \$270 a year?

We hope you will take a moment today to send a brief email to City Council (City.Council@CityofPaloAlto.org) urging them:

To reverse their May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment aboveground next to people's homes;

To direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and, more specifically,

To direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances.

Please CC your email to the PTC (Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org), to the PTC's Staff liaison Jonathan Lait (Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org), and to the City Clerk (City.Clerk@CityofPaloAlto.org).

We are, as always, most appreciative of your concern about locating cell towers near residents' homes and of your continuing support for

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18
reining in the telecommunications industry's ambitions in Palo Alto.

Jeanne, Jerry & Jyo

For United Neighbors

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Barbara Kelly](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell Towers in Residential Neighborhoods
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:58:05 PM

My husband and I urge you:

To reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment aboveground next to people's homes;

To direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and, more specifically,

To direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances.

Sincerely,

George and Barbara Kelly

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Leo Povolotsky](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Jeanne Fleming](#)
Subject: Update: Cell Towers in Residential Neighborhoods TIME SENSITIVE
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 3:51:32 AM

Dear City Council,

We are concerned about the situation with installation of the new cell towers in our neighborhood and are asking you please:

1. To reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment aboveground next to people's homes;
2. To direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and, more specifically,
3. To direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances.

Sincerely,

Leo Povolotsky,
Palo Alto resident of 27 years,
HOA Board Member

From: [Tina Chow](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: please take action
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 6:18:11 PM

Dear City Council members,

Recent developments regarding cell towers in residential neighborhoods and the actions of city staff are alarming and I urge you to stand up for Palo Alto residents!

I am writing to ask you:

1. To reverse your May 21st decision allowing Verizon to install its cheap and potentially hazardous equipment aboveground next to people's homes; *[what about fire hazards?]*
2. To direct City Staff to vigorously enforce Palo Alto's aesthetics, noise and other ordinances with respect to the siting and installation of cell towers near residences; and, more specifically,
3. To direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate the FCC's aggressively pro-telecommunications-industry October order into our municipal ordinances. *[How for example is \$270/year rent in the best interest of Palo Alto residents?]*

Dozens of other cities are standing up for their neighborhoods on this issue. Palo Alto can and should be a leader in creating a community that is respectful of residents' needs and concerns.

Sincerely,
Tina Chow, Ph.D.
Barron Park

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: City Staff pressing PTC to get with the telecom industry's program
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 2:54:31 PM

Dear Mayor Kniss, Vice-Mayor Filseth and Council Members DuBois, Fine, Holman, Kou, Scharff, Tanaka and Wolbach,

I am writing to urge you to direct City Staff to stop advising the Planning and Transportation Commission to incorporate into Palo Alto's municipal ordinances the current administration FCC's October order establishing, among other things, \$270 per year as the maximum pole rental fee for neighborhood cell tower equipment.

The PTC will be considering this recommendation at its meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, December 12th, 2018.

It is impossible to imagine that what City Staff is advising the PTC to do could be of benefit to Palo Alto's residents.

New York, Seattle, Portland, Denver, San Jose and dozens of other cities are resisting the order and suing the FCC over it.

Moreover, to reduce fire hazards, the California PUC just initiated the process of establishing rules that ultimately will require the undergrounding of many utility poles.

In this context, how can it make sense for City Staff to recommend to the PTC that they codify allowing these poles to be loaded up with heavy cell tower equipment, let alone codify renting space on the poles for the pittance of \$270 a year?

Please consider what is best for residents and direct City Staff to stop advising the PTC to needlessly lock Palo Alto into a bad policy that aggressively favors the telecommunications industry at the expense of the people who live here.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net


Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Hur, Mark](#)
To: [Neilson Buchanan](#); [De Geus, Robert](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sallyann Rudd](#); [Malcolm Roy Beasley](#); [Ronjon Nag](#); [Marion Odell](#); [Neeraj Pendse](#); [John Guislin](#); [Norman H. Beamer](#); [Fred Kohler](#); [Kuo-Jung Chang](#); [Gabrielle Layton](#); [Becky Sanders](#); [Furman, Sheri](#); [Allen Akin](#); [Michael Hodos](#); [Mary Gallagher](#); [Mary Dimit](#)
Subject: RE: Downtown RPP data for Non-Resident Parking Permits
Date: Monday, December 3, 2018 9:50:11 AM

Hello Neilson,

Please review the table below for a breakdown of Downtown RPP non-resident permits sold as of 12/3/18. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Zone	Employee Decals Sold	Employer Hang- Tags Sold	Total Permits Sold	Total Permit Inventory	Permits Available
1	46	22	68	69	1
2	71	37	108	111	3
3	57	69	126	208	82
4	64	52	116	176	60
5	98	49	147	162	15
6	59	33	92	92	0
7	73	41	114	125	11
8	38	19	57	57	0
9	-	-	-	-	0
10	-	-	-	-	0
Total	506	322	828	1000	172
Reserve				100	

Thank you,



Mark Hur | Operations Lead
 Office of Transportation | City of Palo Alto
 250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
T: 650.329.2520 | **E:** Mark.hur@cityofpaloalto.org

Please think of the environment before printing this email – Thank you!

Use Palo Alto 311 to report items you'd like the City to fix!! Download the [app](#) or click [here](#) to make a service request.

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 1, 2018 9:14 AM
To: Hur, Mark <Mark.Hur@CityofPaloAlto.org>; De Geus, Robert <Robert.DeGeus@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Sallyann Rudd <sallyannr03@gmail.com>; Malcolm Roy

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

Beasley <beasley@stanford.edu>; Ronjon Nag <ronjonn@yahoo.com>; Marion Odell <marionodell7@gmail.com>; Neeraj Pendse <pendse.neeraj@gmail.com>; John Guislin <jguislin@gmail.com>; Norman H. Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>; Fred Kohler <fkohler@sbcglobal.net>; Kuo-Jung Chang <kuojungchang@gmail.com>; Gabrielle Layton <strop@redjuice.com>; Becky Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>; Furman, Sheri <sheri11@earthlink.net>; Allen Akin <akin@arden.org>; Michael Hodos <mehodos@mac.com>; Mary Gallagher <marygallagher88@gmail.com>; Mary Dimit <marydimit@sonic.net>

Subject: Downtown RPP data for Non-Resident Parking Permits

Good Morning, Rob and Mark

Would you please compile fresh Downtown RPP data on non-resident permits sales by zone as of Dec 1, 2018? Include any data you have for show-rates. Thank you.

This information is essential for resident leaders to confer with City Council members and our neighbors.

If it necessary, please consider this email as a request for public information. Please see attached example of data format compiled on June 25, 2018. This data is now obsolete because new permit sales commenced Oct 1, 2018.

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Hur, Mark](#); [De Geus, Robert](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sallyann Rudd](#); [Malcolm Roy Beasley](#); [Ronjon Nag](#); [Marion Odell](#); [Neeraj Pendse](#); [John Guislin](#); [Norman H. Beamer](#); [Fred Kohler](#); [Kuo-Jung Chang](#); [Gabrielle Layton](#); [Becky Sanders](#); [Furman, Sheri](#); [Allen Akin](#); [Michael Hodos](#); [Mary Gallagher](#); [Mary Dimit](#)
Subject: Downtown RPP data for Non-Resident Parking Permits
Date: Saturday, December 1, 2018 9:14:44 AM
Attachments: [180625 Downtown RPP Non-Resident Permit Sales by Zone June 25 2018.pdf](#)

Good Morning, Rob and Mark

Would you please compile fresh Downtown RPP data on non-resident permits sales by zone as of Dec 1, 2018? Include any data you have for show-rates. Thank you.

This information is essential for resident leaders to confer with City Council members and our neighbors.

If it necessary, please consider this email as a request for public information. Please see attached example of data format compiled on June 25, 2018. This data is now obsolete because new permit sales commenced Oct 1, 2018.

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [De Geus, Robert](#); [Hur, Mark](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Laura D. Beaton](#)
Subject: Urgent! Your action is needed
Date: Sunday, December 2, 2018 3:38:04 PM
Attachments: [Downtown RPP Zones 1 to 10 Map Jan 2018.pdf](#)
[Buchanan attorney response to Housing Ordinance Nov 29 2019.PDF](#)

Dear Neighbors who live in Downtown RPP! Especially Zones 1, 4 and 5. Please open and read the two attachments

Background

Our City council will probably approve a new housing ordinance on Dec 3 and Dec 10. This ordinance creates economic incentives for denser housing developments and less parking. In my opinion there is very little possibility to change the direction of the council. The housing ordinance will be approved more or less as proposed by staff and the Planning Commission. I feel that the housing ordinance will not significantly increase housing supply nor reduce housing costs per square foot. Housing units may be smaller but still be expensive relative to other adjacent towns. Supply of housing will be increased slightly but much less that the ongoing increase in worker density and jobs.

The housing ordinance does not materially address housing for Palo Alto citizens who need truly affordable housing.e.g. teachers, healthcare workers, service workers, retail workers, etc.

The housing ordinance is in direct conflict with the RPP ordinance which shields our neighborhoods from commercial parking and traffic spillover. Unfortunately the Council seems ready to approve the housing ordinance without addressing this conflict. The issue is that housing within the commercial core is likely to push its parking from the core to the adjacent neighborhoods. More housing in the commercial core will inevitably mean more commercial traffic and parking in our neighborhoods, The major impact will be concentrated on RPP Zones, 1, 4 and 5.

There are two solutions. The first solution is that the commercial core area must obligated to provide all parking needed for commercial core housing. The solution is outlined in the attached letter from legal firm Shute, Mihaly. The second solution is for RPP stakeholder and Council to adopt a quality standard prescribing the amount of non-resident parked vehicles in neighborhoods. City Council thus far has refused to take a position on quality standards for neighborhoods.

Call to Action

1. Send an email to city council at city.council@cityofpaloalto.org. Ask for the following support:

- Do not approve the housing ordinance without full understanding of how

vehicles owned by tenants in under-parked new commercial core housing will spillover onto RPP Zones 1, 4 and 5 adjacent to University Avenue.

- Direct city staff to convene an emergency city-wide RPP stakeholder process to refine the city's RPP ordinance and assure equitable distribution of non-resident vehicles in all RPP zones. This process must start in mid-January and forward recommendations to City Council within 60 days.
- Demand that Mayor Kniss report on actions that Council will take after the Special Traffic Town Hall she convened in October.

2. If you have a personal relationship with any city councilperson, contact her/him directly as soon as possible and state your concerns.

If you have any questions about this Call to Action, email John Guislin [jguislin@gmail.com] or call/email Neilson Buchanan [cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com 650 537-6911]. PAN and PASZ have positions on the housing ordinance and you may find information on their websites.

Here is the link to the Housing Ordinance and Dec 3 City Council Agenda

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/67968>

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 12-12-18

From: [Shannon Rose McEntee](#)
To: citycouncil@cityofpaloalto.org; [City Mgr](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Proposed Zoning Requirements for Home Developers
Date: Friday, November 23, 2018 12:59:40 PM

Dear Palo Alto City Council,

Your proposed revisions in our zoning codes are a huge mistake. We must NOT reduce the parking requirements for any new residential developments. Because the cost of living is so high for both owners and renters in Palo Alto, MORE people are cramming into both rental and owner-occupied homes and condos. My 55-unit condo building (16 2-bdr units, 39 1-bdr units and 1 studio) has seen an enormous shift in demographics. In the 25 years I've lived here, the number of residents in a 1-bedroom condo has increased dramatically. We now have families of three and four crammed into one-bedroom condos, including adults with teenage children! Head of households are technocrats, attorneys and other professionals. Their need for parking isn't going to decrease and we will never be able to build enough new housing to stop or even slow down this trend.

Yes, we need meaningful housing reform, but it needs to include more, not less, parking per unit! And we don't want tenements in Palo Alto -- we need sufficient setback and green space for any new housing.

Sincerely,

Shannon Rose McEntee
■ Sheridan Avenue

From: [Cervantes, Yolanda](#)
To: [Cervantes, Yolanda](#)
Cc: [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Message regarding 3200 El Camino Real
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 9:33:13 AM

Good morning Commissioners,

I am forwarding the message below on behalf of Dominic Dutra of Architectural Dimensions. This project is scheduled to be heard by the PTC on 12/12/18.

Dear Planning Commissioner,

I write you on behalf of the owners of the Parmani Hotel at 3200 El Camino Real (18PLN-00045). Our proposed project is a 99-room, 4-story hotel which will replace the existing 2-story, 36-room hotel. Our project has been in the Planning review process for more than 3 years now, and we are finally approaching a PTC hearing date to present the project. We have been to the ARB several times and to the City Council for pre-screening reviews, and we have worked closely with staff to refine design issues to yield a new hotel design that completely respects all zoning and development regulations, except for the 50' setback that makes redevelopment of the site impossible. Our entitlement application includes a request to delete the 50' special setback that traverses through this project site in the east/west direction, splitting the site in half as the site is only 100' wide. The 50' special setback was established in the zoning code around 1956 presumably to set the tone for future development (at that time) for the Stanford Business Park. The setback would, and did, set buildings (developed over the years) 50' back from property lines along Hansen. While a deep "parklike" setback was appropriate for business parks, the setback specifically did not consider its impacts on our site that is only 100' x 275' and really fronts El Camino, not Hansen. The existing hotel on the site was developed in 1948 before the setback was crafted thus making the site now "non-conforming". We believe that we have a design that addresses many development constraints and will provide many benefits to the community. We request a meeting with you to present the project and answer any questions you may have.

Thank you and best regards,

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further information.

Thank you!

Dominic Dutra, Senior Agency Manager



30 Years of Success!

www.archdim.com

S.F. BAY AREA

300 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Ste. 375

Oakland, CA 94612

TEL. [510.463.8300](tel:510.463.8300)

FAX. [510.463.8395](tel:510.463.8395)

Yolanda M. Cervantes

Administrative Assistant

Planning & Community Environment

City of Palo Alto

250 Hamilton Ave
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Main Line: 650.329.2441 | Direct Line: 650.329.2404
Yolanda.cervantes@cityofpaloalto.org