

# Planning & Transportation Commission Action Agenda: August 28, 2019

Council Chambers 250 Hamilton Avenue 6:00 PM

5 6

1

2

4

# Call to Order / Roll Call

6:12 pm

8 9

7

- 10 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright I'll call us to order. It is 6:09. Welcome to the August 28<sup>th</sup> version of the
- 11 Planning and Transportation Commission City of Palo Alto. Let's do a roll call?

#### **Oral Communications**

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

14

12

- 15 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright any oral communications? Any individual in the public want to speak to
- things that are not on the agenda? Ok, I have no cards and seeing none. Seeing none? Ok.

## Agenda Changes, Additions, and Deletions

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

18 19

17

20 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Mr. Planning Director, any additions chances, announcements before we get started?

22

24

23 Mr. Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services: No changes.

# **City Official Reports**

1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

26 27

25

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so our first item is Director's report with kind of a schedule and assignments I believe. Anything to report?

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services: So just a couple of announcements. One just to let the Commission know that we went to the City Council I think it was last week, maybe the week before, and got some direction on the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan. So, we had some good dialog and feedback and general support to move forward with some slight changes to the schedule and adjustments to the scope of work with our consultant. We'll be returning to the Council at their next meeting or the one

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

thereafter with a scope of work to study the possible options for naturalizing the Matadero Creek within this discreet study area. And then thereafter we'd have another scope of work change for Perkins Wheeler [note-phonetics], our prime consultant so that's coming forthcoming.

The last meeting, I introduced Assistant Director Rachael Tanner and Rachael will be transitioning into the role that I've been serving with the Commission for the past several years. She will now serve as the Planning and Transportation Commissioner liaison so you will see her bright face here on Wednesdays and at a website blasting live across the universe. Don't be nervous about that.

And then I want to also introduce Vinhloc Nguyen who has joined us and he was the one who pronounced the roll call this evening. Vinhloc is a new employee and he will have the responsibility of not only serving the Planning and Transportation Commission but also the Architectural Review Board, the Historic Resources Board, and our Director's Hearings. And so, with that, he has the responsibility of our public noticing, preparing the Packets for the Commissions and the Boards, making sure that the meetings have been set up and the teardown, follow through with the minutes and a whole variety of other work. And he still comes to work with a big smile on his face and so we're totally excited about that but this is his first meeting so we'll see. Once we run him through the gauntlet of all those meetings we'll see if he's still smiling. Alright so that's the end of the Director's report.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Riveting. Yeah, sorry, I just... no, thank you very much, that's great.

## **Study Session**

Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.1,3

2. Introduction of New Chief Transportation Official and Overview of Transportation Priorities.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> So, I guess we should move onto our second item which is a study session. Public comment is permitted, 3-minutes per speaker, but I believe before we do that, we have an introduction of the new Transportation Director... new Chief Transportation Official.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services: Great so yeah, Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Planning Official, right? No.

[note – many Staff members started speaking at once off mic]

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Mr. Lait: Transportation Official, sorry. I tried too... see how I tried to bring you into the Planning side again? You just... we just separated you guys now you're... ok... alright. Philip, take it away.

Mr. Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official: Actually, Chantal will kick us off.

 Ms. Chantal Cotton-Gaines, Assistant to the City Manager: Sure. Good evening Chair Riggs and Commission. My name is Chantel Cotton-Gaines, I'm an Assistant to the City Manager here for the City of Palo Alto, and up until Mr. Kamhi arrived last week, I've been filling in leading the Transportation Office upstairs. So, we thought it would be fitting for the two of us to give this presentation today, just an overview of where transportation is, and the future of transportation in Palo Alto with Philip and items that we'll be bringing forward to the PTC over the coming months. So, it's really an introduction item today.

So, I wanted to give... which some of this may be redundant to some of you if you're following the details of transportation but I think it helps to bring everyone to the same place. I wanted to give an overview of where the Office of Transportation is right now. As you are aware, we previously had them within the Planning Department so Planning and Community Environment and transportation was a division. And the City Council has prioritized transportation in form or another over the past 6-years as one of their Council's stated priorities each year and this year they really want to put more emphasis on transportation. And in the response to that, the City Manager pulled transportation out of Planning to make it its own office to really match the level of attention that the Council has been putting on transportation over the years. And in the Budget adoption for... in June this year for the FY-2020 Budget, the City Council official made the Office of Transportation. And so, the Chief Transportation Official was leading a team of about 14 others Staff members now and reporting directly to the City Manager.

So, I just wanted to give a little more context there. In the Budget we... the shift to moving it out we set a purpose, mission, and goals for the Office of Transportation. In previous Budgets, transportation had one performance metric in the community or Planning and Community Environment Department's Budget Pages. So, this was our opportunity to really just describe but transportation does and to set some metrics. So, it was 12-pages now focused on transportation in the Budget and I wanted to read the mission and purpose if I could to you guys right now? So, the mission for the Office of Transportation: Office of Transportation's mission is to preserve and enhance the quality of the Palo Alto residents, visitors, and businesses by providing efficient and cost-efficient transportation services for all modes of transportation. And our purpose: The purpose of the Office of Transportation is to improve the safety of the users of all modes of transportation, reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, address congestion, and reduce through traffic and non-resident parking in Palo Alto

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

neighborhoods, leading to an integrated transportation system that serves local, regional, and intercity travel.

In the Budget as well as we set a goal to focus on Staff retention. As you know we've had quite a bit of turnover in our Transportation Team over the past couple of years and so we really wanted to emphasize that the people really make the office work. And we have requested in the Budget some additional management positions and the City Council did approve those. So, we have a Parking and Shuttle Manager that was added as well as a Senior Engineer. The idea is we need more people to help really meet some of the priorities set by the City Council. So those were included in the Budget as well with focus on developing our Staff.

And then just two more quick points before we get into some of the things that will be coming to the PTC. So, we have... actually one more quick point. The City Council approved those managers positions and we are actually actively recruiting for them. So, the two critical positions we have just filled are the Chief Transportation Official who you will hear from in a second as well as a Senior Transportation Planner. And the two new positions we are actively working on getting the recruitments actually out on the ground so that we can get those people in. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Philip to talk about some items that will be coming to you guys soon.

Mr. Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official: Alright thank you, Chantal. So, I'm Philip Kamhi, I'm the new Chief Transportation Official here. I'm very pleased to be here before the Planning and Transportation Commission.

So, I'm working to get a better understanding of all of the projects that are ongoing. This is really... this is the start of my second week here but... and also working on prioritization of projects within the Office of Transportation. But I'm going to give you a list of some of the items that we really anticipate will be coming to PTC over the next coming months. One of those if Parking Management which is something that I worked on in my previous role at the City and we've complied a Parking Work Plan. And that Work Plan came from the work of Wayne Tanda who was a consultant with the City and it says that there are about nine recommendations that we'll be working on with the PTC coming from that Work Plan. Also, the RPP which is also something that I worked on in my previous roll here with the City. And going back to the purpose I thought about underlining this as Chantal said it but the Office of Transportation, one of our purposes is to reduce through traffic and non-residential parking in Palo Alto neighborhoods. So RPPs are a program that do work to address that and tonight you'll be hearing from our Parking Operations Lead, Mark Hur, on the RPP for Old Palo Alto. Traffic calming measures, as projects come up and I do anticipate we'll have some projects coming up similar to the Middlefield North Project which came here in the past. We'll have policy changes regarding Level of Service to Vehicle Miles Traveled as required by state law as it relates to

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

CEQA. And also, policy changes regarding to Transportation Demand Management and with that, I'd believe we'd be happy to take any questions.

**Chair Riggs:** Commissioner Lauing.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Congrats. I hope you know what you're getting in for. We're happy to have bodies and seats to move things along. That's really good to hear. One of the questions that I was going to ask is how many openings are left because I know you've been doing some backfill?

Mr. Kamhi: We currently have two openings that we'll be filling.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok so just the two she mentioned. That's great. And the Council sent the Work Plan to you with 35 recommendations on parking. So, did I hear that right that you've narrowed it down to nine that we're going to be working with you on and the other 20 something we won't?

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, I believe that nine of them are items that should come to the PTC. Some of them relate to Staffing, etc. And I'm sorry, to go back, correct... the correct positions that we need to fill is 2.5. Sorry.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok so what you finished discussing the recommendations that nine need to come to PTC and then the others won't?

Mr. Kamhi: Yes, I believe so.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: So, the 35 recommendations from Mr. Tanda's report include some things that are administrative changes. So just in terms of... I have the report with me as well but in terms of things that have to do with house Staff rolls out different pieces of the program. So those are less of bigger discussion and more of things that just need to happen. So of the 35 recommendations there are nine of them that are what Mr. Tanda recommended as things where we know we need it more enhanced community and conversation around them because it's things like setting up parking occupancy percentage for threshold; where we see like this is a parking issue versus its not if it's less than that threshold. So that's the example of one of the nine that will come to PTC.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok, yeah, I think I would speak for more than myself if I say that if more nine you'd like to have help with, that they don't have to come here, we'd be delighted to jump in and help on behalf of the community and have hearing time for them as well.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: Much appreciated.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> The next question is how is this going to work in terms of liaison? Will you also have a transportation liaison in addition to the planning liaison to this Commission?

Mr. Kamhi: That's a good question. I'll have to get back to you on that.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> In the past in my 3-years almost to service on this Commission now, there was sometimes a gap because there just wasn't somebody that... and this is not a reflection on Planning Staff what so ever. But it would be more communicative to us and perhaps we could give you earlier feedback on some issues if there was a separate person. I understand that's more workload. Jonathan will tell you it's really fun. That's all.

[note - male speaker]: Thank you.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Templeton.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> I also wanted to say thank you to Chantal and welcome to Phil in this new role. We're really excited to have you here. As Commissioner Lauing noted, we would love to see even more transportation projects. It's been lite on that front so we're eager to help and I think there's also a community interest that we have another opportunity input on several types of projects around the City. So hopefully we'll be seeing more of your smiling faces and excited to have you on board. Thank you.

Mr. Kamhi: Thank you.

Chair Riggs: Well, I'll chime... I'm actually still disappointed. I have to say I was expecting more out of this even based on the conversation that we had before. The priorities that were mentioned, didn't mention any... we've asked for data initiatives, we've asked to actually see Mr. Tanda's recommendations before they were finalized. None of that has been provided to us so I feel like my fellow Commissioners are being kinder. I provided a warning from the dais that I thought this was a bad idea to pull transportation out of planning. I believe that was a year and a half ago. The liaison suggestion is not only important, it's essential. I thought we would get a little more update of what's happening with a lot of the rail crossings issues. I didn't hear reference to the Circulation Element once. So, I think there's some really deep-rooted issues here where we're in pulling planning away from transportation initiatives. We're actually setting ourselves up for conflict with our General Plan. So, I would... I think there's a lot of work to be done. I was expecting a little more and I think I even said this in the pre-meeting. I was a little caught off guard that we weren't having a more robust discussion today. So, I guess I'm encouraged we have a warm body in the position now, not that... Mr. Gaines, you've been

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

amazing to work with but I guess you have a lot on your plate doing basically two jobs but we have to up our game in transportation. And I'm not sure that... I think you have seven people here that have been asking for stuff and we haven't been... we're underutilized in terms of our expertise and our willingness to work on this issue. <u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I'll make a brief comment. <u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Commissioner Summa. Commissioner Summa: Well, thank you for coming and talking to us today. And thank you for the update and I'm looking forward to us getting into these issues. And thank you very much Mr. Kamhi for coming back to Palo Alto so let's just take it from here, I think. Thanks. Chair Riggs: Alright seeing no other lights and comments from... I think we're done with this

15 item.

**Commission Action:** No action was taken by the Commission.

**Action Items** 

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

3. Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to implement the Old Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program as a one-year pilot

 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Moving on to our two action items for this evening. Our first Item, Item Three, is a recommendation to the City Council... and thank you both. I'm assuming you're sticking around but we have a recommendation to City Council to adopt a Resolution for Old Palo Alto Residential Preferred Parking Program as a 1-year pilot. I believe we have a presentation from Staff and then we'll open it up for comments. I do have two comment cards for this agenda item. If there's any more if you could get them in with... if you can just hand them to me that'd be great.

<u>Commissioner Waldfogel:</u> I'm going to step out for this because I'm within 500-feet of the district.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> That sounds good, Commissioner Waldfogel is recusing himself based on his residential location.

Mr. Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official: Ok, once again I'm Philip Kamhi, the Chief Transportation Official, and tonight I'm going to be introducing to you Mark Hur who is our Parking Operations Lead. I believe I mentioned him in the last item. Mark was here previously when I was here in my former role working on parking behind the scenes and doing a lot of the good work in order to make sure that the RPP's have timely implementation. As such tonight he's here to assist the Old Palo Alto with their own RPP District.

Mr. Mark Hur, Parking Operations Lead: Good evening Commissioners. Tonight, we have a short presentation on the proposed all Old Palo Alto RPP with the goal of reviewing the programing and hopefully formalizing an item to bring before Council on September 16<sup>th</sup>.

We will start with providing some background on the program and how we got to this particular date in the program development. The City-wide RPP Ordinance requires neighborhoods meet a certain level of steps to initiate the development of an RPP Program. Examples outlined in the ordinance include that non-residential vehicles substantially interfere with the use of on-street parking spaces by neighborhood residents. That resident — at the interference by non-resident vehicles occurs at a regular interval, that non-resident parked in an area of the proposed district create traffic congestion or other disruptions that disrupt neighborhood life. Residents of Old Palo Alto also submitted a petition which met most if not all the requirements of the ordinance.

There's a brief timeline of the Old Palo Alto RPP. Back in August of 2018 City Staff received a formal petition from residents in Old Palo Alto. On March 27<sup>th</sup> of this year, we brought three petitions to PTC to prioritize the districts that have requested RPP with the Commission prioritizing Old Palo Alto as the first and the highest priority. In the month of April, City Staff collected initial data regarding parking occupancy and parking simple in Old Palo Alto. In May City directed... the City directed Staff to initiate program development. In June and July, the Office of Transportation began program design, modifying the perimeters to meet... while meeting with the residents in community workshops. In the month of August residents were surveyed and based on the supporting feedback we are presenting for your review and recommendation to adopt a Resolution for a 1-year RPP pilot program in Old Palo Alto. And with that recommendation Staff presents an Action Item to Council on September 16<sup>th</sup>. With Council's approval our anticipation program start date is 11... on November 1<sup>st</sup>.

City Staff participated in a number of community engagement exercises. Once receiving the petition in August of 2018 up until the PTC meeting earlier this year we had been in regular communication with the residents defining processes and possible solutions to their parking intrusion. On July 31st City Staff hosted a community workshop by Jerry Bowden Park to discuss

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

the proposed program boundaries and other items related to the program. And City Staff mailed individual surveys to residents on August 6<sup>th</sup>.

This will cover the data collection that City Staff had accumulated over the past couple months. Parking Occupancy Data was collected by City Staff on April 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and the 24<sup>th</sup> at various hours of the day listed on this slide; which includes 9:00 am, 12:00 pm, 3:00 pm, and 6:00 pm. On this slide, you will find the results of our collections. The blocks included are street segments outlined in the original RPP petition. The streets included, shaded in blue, had a parking occupancy between 0 to 50 percent, orange blocks 51 percent to 74 percent, and finally red with a parking occupancy of 75 percent or higher. And as you can see the areas with the highest parking intrusion are those closest to the California Avenue underpass.

Shortly after the community workshop Staff surveyed residents in the areas where the parking... with the highest parking intrusion; those streets that are red and orange from the previous slide. Information on the survey includes the number of permits per household, permit fees and proposed boundaries of the RPP district. Residents were given 14-days to respond with their support or opposition to RPP restrictions. Here you will find the results of the survey, as of August 19<sup>th</sup> Staff received 55 out of 93 surveys with a return rate of 59 percent. Out of the 55 returned surveys, 49 residents supported RPP restrictions while 6 residents opposed; 98 percent of the returned surveys support of the program was well above the 70 percent requirement outlined in our guidelines.

This is our recommended program design. The boundaries of the pilot or core of the district is highlighted in Red. Street segments in blue may petition the Office of Transportation to be annexed into the program after the initial rollout of the program. Residents who reside outside of the proposed district are not eligible for parking permits.

The Old Palo Alto program will release resident permits available to those who live within the district. Annual hang tag permits will be issued for this particular district at \$50.00 per permit, with five permits per household. Residents may also purchase visitor or daily hang tag permits at \$5.00 a permit, and they are limited to 50 per year which expires at the end of the program year, and we are proposing employee permits for this district.

Next steps, we hope to bring a program before Council on September 16<sup>th</sup> and receive direction on whether to move forward with the RPP Program. With Council's approval Staff will move forward with permit sales and signed installation in October and out anticipated launch date is early November. And then during the pilot year, the program Staff will monitor parking patterns and continue working with the residents to refine the program. This concludes our presentation; we're welcome to any questions or comments from the Commission.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Chair Riggs: Thank you. Any questions or comments from our Commissioners? Commissioner 1 2 Templeton. 3 4 Commissioner Templeton: Hi. Thank you for this presentation. I really appreciated your clear 5 charts and maps about the areas that will be affected by the permit. One technical question I have is under survey you indicate that you didn't do any surveys past... I'm sorry, I'm looking at 6 7 this slide. Not that survey, the audit of parking. 8 9 Mr. Hur: Yes. 10 11 Commissioner Templeton: That you didn't do any surveys past 6:00 pm but in the Findings on 12 Section 1A which is on Page 3A or Packet Page 17, you say that the parking patterns indicated 13 that the evening was so lightly parked that it was clear that there was a difference. How did you 14 find the difference if you didn't survey it in the evening? 15 16 Mr. Hur: We saw a significant drop in occupancy (interrupted) 17 18 Commissioner Templeton: Even by 6:00? 19 20 Mr. Hur: Essentially after 5:00 pm in which most of the vehicles have been leaving the area. 21 22 Commissioner Templeton: Can you quantify that? 23 24 Mr. Hur: Oh, this was done by manual counts by City Staff during those times. 25 26 Commissioner Templeton: Did you have a number of like it went from this at noon to this at 27 6:00? 28 29 Mr. Hur: We have those in multiple documents so we'd need some time to review those 30 numbers. 31 32 Commissioner Templeton: Oh, that's ok. I just wondered if you had it handy, it would be helpful 33 to make that Finding. Thank you. 34 35 Chair Riggs: Commissioner Lauing. 36 37 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I just want to note that the PTC made this in our referral the

number one priority and we actually asked for a pilot to accelerate this and then Council

approved that. So, I think we're right on track and consistent with where we had been before.

38

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

So, we can continue the discussion but I'd just like to get a motion on a table to support the 1 2 recommendation as [unintelligible](interrupted) 3 4 Chair Riggs: Sorry, we're not ready for that yet. 5 6 Commissioner Lauing: Oh ok, sorry, sorry, ok. My only question is if there was a hard stop... 7 how do I ask this question? For example, one block of Washington in that circular block wasn't 8 included and another one was. Was there hard data there or was that more of a judgment call? 9 10 Mr. Hur: There is data that supports the drop-in parking occupancy. 11 12 <u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok. That's all. 13 14 Chair Riggs: Sorry, the microphones are tricky, if you leave them on it's actually hard to hear. I 15 don't know if you guys have actually noticed that. I had a couple of questions. The... in the 16 Occupancy Survey are you specifying the data based on block-face? I... it's not clear how you're 17 specifying this data in your visualization. 18 19 Mr. Hur: So, the occupancy counts include both sides of (interrupted) 20 21 Chair Riggs: No, no, no but this is by in individual block face? Clearly, a percentage requires a 22 calculation so it is by individual block that you're doing the calculation? 23 24 Mr. Hur: It's a combination of both sides of the block. 25 26 Chair Riggs: So, the... both sides of the block are not decoupled from one another? 27 28 Mr. Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services: It's by block. 29 30 Mr. Hur: It's by block, yes. 31 32 Chair Riggs: Alright so if the north, south, or east side were any different we wouldn't know? 33 34 Mr. Hur: Yes, that's correct. 35 36 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Is there a way to segregate that data or are they just (interrupted) 37 38 Mr. Hur: We would need additional time to review that collection. 39

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so in... I guess the second question because that visualization is poor. Why three cohorts? I mean there's 74 percent to 100 percent is a big range as is 51 percent to 74 percent. Can you unpack that at all? Can you tell me based... in a histogram what that means in terms of is there... are we... the average... is the mid-point around 60 percent? I can't affirm much from this data.

Mr. Kamhi: Do you know what the average was?

Mr. Hur: Not off the [unintelligible]

Mr. Kamhi: I think... you know I can take this question. I can't really provide you with the answer that you're looking for but I think what I can say is in the future we can bring back a lot more data charts for the RPPs; different times as was requested and an average occupancy by the zone. I think that's a reasonable thing to provide.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> But can you anecdotally say which block is 74 percent and which block is for example 95 percent?

Mr. Hur: Yes, we can, we do have the data that represents those [unintelligible].

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok, can you provide that for us maybe at some point this evening? That would be great.

Mr. Kamhi: We can see if we can pull that together but I guess to give you the basic assumption we would have is that the closer that you get to Caltrain tunnel the higher the occupancy is.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Yeah, we just don't see that here and if there's (interrupted)

29 Mr. Kamhi: I completely (interrupted)

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> You know, you've worked in parking before, you know if you're operating 85 to 95 percent you can still squeeze more occupancy out of your inventory. Clearly, 95 percent is effectively full so we... if you tell me that most of these blocks are 74 percent, I think there's not an acute issue. So, I just... I can't say anything... I can't infer anything from this data.

Mr. Kamhi: Your point's taken.

38 <u>Ms. Cotton-Gaines:</u> And while he's pulling it up I will make a plug back to the recommendations 39 as well that one of them, this is kind of that conversation about having a set Parking Occupancy

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

threshold as well because then it's something to link back too; which is a discussion we'll have in the future.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so I have one more question that I'm just going to put out there. What's the rubric for the policy proposal? Number of cars? I don't see any connection back to the Circulation Element or back to other policies. It just seems random.

Mr. Kamhi: Well so this is resident requested.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Right but the City is approving it so how's it connects to our Circulation Element? How's it connects to our City goals? You just stated the City goals, is it consistent? I think we have to make that judgment. I see no rubric in terms of assessing that number. You can just say no, there wasn't a rubric. Is that the answer?

 Mr. Kamhi: So, I guess... I'm not exactly sure what you're asking to... but that said I also will say that I'm not sure I'm best equipped to answer this at this time because I'm reviewing this item after it's already somewhat published. So yeah, I'm not sure that... at this time I'm not sure that I can fully answer your question but I'm not really sure what your question is.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Sounds good. Any other questions? Seeing no lights, I will enter the public hearing piece so I have four speaker cards. If anyone else would like to speak please give me a card. First, we'll have Barbara Carlitz, you have 3-minutes. Don't worry Barbara, we won't start you until you get up here and behind Barbara, Elizabeth Shepard.

Ms. Barbara Carlitz: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity. Really, I'd like to thank both the City and our neighborhood for setting a quick time schedule and more amazing sticking to it. I've been very impressed with the Staff and the way it's proceeded in a fairly rapid fashion and that the fact that our neighborhood received our survey requests on a Monday and they needed to be back the next Monday. And we managed to get that many people to return them in August was a very good sign of the enthusiasm. I encourage us to keep up this pace and send the 1-year pilot to the City Council in 2-weeks and implement it in November as suggested by the Staff report. I've lived in this corner of Palo Alto for nearly 50-years and I can certainly attest to that fact that the problem has grown steadily worse during that time. I'd add that since the Mayfield/Evergreen RPP began and computer... not computers, excuse me, commuters, employees, and customers can no longer park in that neighborhood on the other side of Alma and Caltrain from us. Our situation has become much more dire and the comments about the closer you get to the underpass, the more dense the parking is certainly true. I'm happy that we have a chance to discuss, evaluate, and tweak this pilot program in a years' time after we have had some real-time experience with it; which I think should make all of us more confident as we

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

go forward. That we are not setting into absolute concrete something which we would prefer to be able to change. So, with that, onward. Thank you.

Chair Riggs: Thank you, Barbara. Elizabeth Shepard followed by Rod Miller.

Ms. Elizabeth Shepard: Hi, Elizabeth Shepard, I'm a homeowner in the affected area in Old Palo Alto. We are continuing to see day parkers and it is having a big effect on the quality of life. I've lived there for 9-years and I've seen a huge change in the last 2-years. Just this evening before coming over here I was trying to unload my elderly dog in front of my house because I have to carry him in and out of the car. There was a car parked just in such a way it was difficult for me to pull up in front of the sidewalk. I'm very happy with the program that the transportation division has come up with. I think they did a really nice job. I'm willing to pay for it so I'd ask you to please support that and allow it to go forward to the Council for implementation. Thank you.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Thank you Elizabeth. Rod Miller followed by Chris Robell [note -phonetics]

Mr. Rod Miller: Could we go back to the criteria slide, please? I have a problem with the bottom item. To me, that sounds like we're giving up on alternatives in the RPP and making the RPP a permanent program which in my mind is only going to expand. Anything that's permanent just gets bigger so maybe that's poor wording on the slide but it sure gives me some heartburn. Any response? Are we letting the RPP be permanent and not... giving up on trying to find alternatives?

Mr. Lait: So just as a (interrupted)

Chair Riggs: Point of order.

Mr. Lait: In terms of just the process, this is your public... your opportunity to speak and it's not really a time for questions but the Chair could refer those questions to Staff.

Mr. Miller: I'm sorry, ok, I didn't understand the process.

Mr. Lait: So yeah, you'll want to complete your public comments and then we're going to continue with the public meeting and the Chair (interrupted)

36 Mr. Miller: Alright, ok (interrupted)

38 <u>Mr. Lait:</u> Thank you.

Mr. Miller: I made my comment so I'm done. Thank you.

\_

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Mr. Lait: Thank you.

3 4

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Mr. Robell [note-phonetics]

5 6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

Mr. Chris Robell [note -phonetics]: Thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to speak and I've been working very closely with the City; Chantal and Mark and team on this getting setup. And I appreciate the partnership and the effort to move this along. I did want to first of all just underscore that this has been happening for... I mean I have emails from 2017. So, this is something that we've been working a long time, it's not something that's a new initiative from 2018. And I secondly want to say that so the point is we really need to get parking relief. This is something that I know many of you have said that we want to get a pilot sooner and I want to underscore that. There was extremely strong consistent desire to have this done so I think we have among the highest participation rate and favorable rate of any of the RPPs. Just to give you an example the Evergreen/Mayfield was only a 20 percent participation rate whereas we're at a 59 percent and we were at 72 with the survey. And they had a 68 percent support and we have an 89 percent according to this but it's even higher because we've had people that have, after the 19<sup>th</sup>, said that they wanted to do this. There's only... we really only had 1-week in the middle of August and we didn't know when exactly when we'd get the survey and we had 1week from the time it showed up in our mailboxes on Saturday prior to the 19<sup>th</sup>. So, it was really a 1-week and 2-day turnaround. So bottom line is I'm really asking for this to please just pass. Please, please just pass this as it is. This is a pilot, let's get it off the ground. I don't want to do anything to disturb or jeopardize the November 1st date. I know that they're short on resources and I really want to again thank the team that we've gotten this far. We have a... like I said I think it's something that we just ask that you prioritize and not make perfect the enemy of good. Thank you.

262728

29

30

31 32 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright any other comments? Any other public... speakers from the public? Ok, nobody? Seeing none the hearing for that item is closed. We'll bring it back to the Commission so maybe we can give... I'm going to take questions as they come and I'll let you know. I have two... alright, I'm going to take comments from the Commissioners as they come, but maybe we can get... if Staff wanted to provide an answer to Mr. Miller in terms of where the last bullet comes from and the exact meaning of that bullet. That would be helpful.

333435

Mr. Kamhi: That bullet I believe comes directly from the Code.

36 37

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Right so that is directly from the ordinance?

38 39

Mr. Kamhi: Yes.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright and so nothing else to add Director Lait in terms of... ok. So, I have two lights on, if... I'll have Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair] and Commissioner Templeton. I'll take them as they come. Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair]

4 5

6

7

8

9

1

2

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Good evening. Allow me to lighten the mood. Welcome, we are excited to have somebody in your position at the top that is going to be available to us and accountable to the City and we're eager to work with you. I think this is a tough night to sit in the seat and just so you know, that if... I suggest that there's some opportunities here to sort of address issues. Those are just those opportunities I think rather than from my perspective disappointments or anything.

10 11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

I appreciate Commissioner Lauing's eagerness to move on this item. I want to take a step back though and have a little bit of a dialog. It is true on March 27<sup>th</sup> this year we did formally recommend that the Council direct Staff to begin. I want to suggest to you that my perspective is we directed Staff... we recommended that Council direct Staff to begin the process of evaluating the merit of an RPP Program in this neighborhood. One of the themes of those meetings that we've had in the past with respect to RPP, whether it was this specific one or the one that we did before, I think we even did one... I can remember once having a sincere debate with Eric... Commissioner Rosenblum at the time, a prior Commissioner, about what is the vision for the City's off-street or on-street parking utilization? What is the goal? Is it 50 percent, is it 85 percent, is it 95 percent? I would suggest to you that one of the themes of the evening on March 27<sup>th</sup> is that we need to understand that. That we need... it's not so much that every RPP has to have the same execution but RPPs should be approached with some level of consistency in terms of how we evaluate it. It is entirely clear and very Palo Alto by the way that the process to engage the protocol has been very well thought out. If you look at the report and you kind of take a look at Page 9, Packet Page 9, the steps a neighborhood has to go through are very clear. Someone has clearly walked this process through; E is problematic; E is the crux, right? So, after they do this step and then this step and then you do this and you do this and you do this. We get to E and we have to make a recommendation. We don't have criteria. That's in my opinion highly problematic to continuing... to making a motion tonight and the reason why I've struggled with the other RPs is for the same reason. And every time we get into this situation with RPPs we suggest we need the logic and the responses. Well listen, we're going to try it as a pilot and then we're going to come back with logic and we need more time or we're under Staffed. I feel like that's not working anymore from my perspective and it would be a bad idea to start like that again. I think there's a lot of neighborhoods wondering how this evaluation takes place. I'll ask a few questions. We did the analysis on April 18th, right, the Parking Survey? Do I have that right?

37 38 39

Mr. Hur: Correct, four days in April.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Do you know what date the City parking lot off of Paige was closed and construction began there?

Mr. Hur: I do not.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Are you aware that there's a parking lot that's no longer accessible? Do you know how many spaces are in that parking lot?

Mr. Hur: Approximately there's 300 spaces, yes.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Here's a big problem. You did an analysis in April; we don't understand or appreciate how the problem has maybe gotten worse. Especially considering that you did the surveys in August which for sure we know that the... am I right? You did the surveys in August? 93 surveys? I know the lot was worked on then so too what extent is the neighborhood's response to this issue affected by the influx of having to share that street as a result 300 spaces being taken from Cal. Ave? That may... my sense is that you appreciate that that's kind of a big deal. Maybe you don't. I feel like it's a huge deal. I'm not opposed to us instituting RPPs in this City but without a logical framework where I can understand what is the City's goal and I'm not suggesting that I need to align my own views with that goal. I need to understand if the City's view here is that these blocks are for the exclusive use of the residents and that's what this purpose is. Is the purpose of RPP to make this asset, this parking asset, exclusive to the residential neighborhood or is our purpose to make it easier for the residential parcels to enjoy that public parking asset in conjunction with their neighboring business's employees?

 There's sort of a different issue here which is Caltrain. I understand that there are a lot of Caltrain users that may park in this neighborhood. I am also under the impression, and this is not something in your report, that the Caltrans lot is often not full which is shocking that it's not discussed in this report because that deficiency should be apart of the analysis. If you were to say to me that on a daily basis in your survey you found that the Caltrans lot was 75 percent full and you told me that there where... I don't know, do you know how many spaces there are in the Caltrans lot? I mean I'm just being hypothetical here just so I can keep my hype up. If it's 75 percent full and there's 300 spaces then we've got a lot of spaces there. Then the question becomes how do we make it... I'm familiar in Redwood City, for example, they were considering a development of a new parking structure. And in lieu of doing that they created some digital street signage that identified how many... just how many spaces were actually available in the parking structures that they already had as a way to see if they could address the problem because they had so much space. And then they decided ultimately not to build the garage because they woke up to the underutilization of their garages. So, the question is, number one, from my perspective I can't move... I cannot support a recommendation at this time. If I were to support a motion tonight it would be to continue this item so that we could number one

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

understand what is the purpose of our RPP. Are we... I think I made that one clear. You got that? And then the second would be we really need to understand number one, how is the problem impacted by the 300-parking space taken off of Page? Number two, to what extent are we underutilizing what we already have there for Caltrans?

And then I would suggest to you that the third issue that I struggled a lot with was the determination that every household is entitled to five hanging permits. Our Downtown RPP I believe allows for two. Our Crescent Park RPP allows for two. What is the logic that an Old Palo Alto resident... what was the logic that went into the determination that Old Palo Alto residents should have five cars parked on their...? I mean I'm assuming you have a street with 10 houses. If the ten houses all park 50 cars on their street, I mean where did we come up with that number? How does that even seem rational?

Mr. Hur: The number of permits per household was discussed at the community workshop on July 31<sup>st</sup> and we had originally proposed two permits per household, but based on the feedback that we received from the majority of the residents they had asked for additional permits. Similar to Downtown and then Evergreen Park/Mayfield which was five permits per household.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Mayfield has five permits per household?

21 Mr. Hur: Correct.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: Ok and Downtown?

Mr. Hur: Downtown is five as well. College Terrace RPP and Crescent Park and OP only allow two permits per household.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Two, ok. Look, if you were to tell me that I can't park on my street for more than 2-hours at a time without a hang permit, I would tell you I'll take 20 permits. I'll take as many as you can give because if I'm going to... why... they're transferable.

Mr. Hur: Correct.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> It's not a fair question to ask a resident how much do you want to be impacted by this highly restrictive policy. The answer is going to be zero, I'd like to have no impact. So again, we have to fall back, what approach to parking and transportation do we want to encourage in this City? What's in our Comp. Plan suggests that we want residents in Palo Alto to park five cars on the street? That just doesn't make sense. I think a much more appropriate... one data point would be, from my perspective, how many cars are in this neighborhood? How many cars are owned by the residents in this neighborhood? If most of the

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

residents own cars are, they anticipating utilization of these parking permits by Staff members of their household that come during the day and that's why they need five each? Maybe neighbors could share them since they're transferable and each neighbor can get two and if you know you're going to need some, you go next door and we encourage some sort of community engagement. I'm a little uncomfortable with... I guess what this boils down to is it's another component of the execution of a policy that doesn't have a logic. So, it's simply because the feedback suggested that they wanted five. I think if you were to poll the Crescent Park community, what they thought, they'll tell you they want five too.

Those are my comments. If... I'll summarize again in conclusion that I think we have to stop moving things forward without the foundational approach that gives the whole City an idea of how we accomplish this process. Not just what you have to do by March 1st and November 1st but how we make this assessment because it seems to me like it's catching in every neighborhood and I anticipate every year we'll have another one. This is the third or fourth one that we've done now and I'm worried that if we continue to approach this with approval of ok, start another pilot program. The next one will be just as complex and sort of without the right level of strategy. So, my... I would support a... I'm not going to make a motion but I would support a motion that we continue this item, come back in a month, understand how the construction has affected the issues, understand what... maybe develop a strategy that articulates how we feel about the street so that we can begin applying that uniformly everywhere, and third maybe we have a logic about how we evaluate which neighborhoods get five permits per household and which neighborhoods get two. Ok that's it.

Chair Riggs: Ms. Gaines.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: Yes, thank you so much.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Cotton-Gaines, sorry.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: It's ok. Both of them are technically my name. I did want to point out one of the things related to the recommendations that came from the MRG report from Mr. Tanda is really hitting at the emphasis that we need uniformity and consistency amongst RPPs. So that when that report went to Council, the direction they provided to Staff was continue moving forward on the RPPs that had been prioritized based off the work that came from PTC, but then also start working on these bigger recommendations; which really are asking those base question. What's the purpose of our (interrupted)

 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> You know, I'll suggest that you've had that information from Mr. Tanda for a while and just been sitting on it. So, I respect that and yet I can quite easily dismiss it so thank you (interrupted)

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Thank you. I am wondering... well, first I should say that I'm inclined to take some action either now or when we decide this to support the request from the neighbors. So that you guys understand that I think you... we've heard a lot of support this time and last time for the neighbors. I think there's a slight process issue that we need to make sure that whatever decision we make is solid so that's where some of these questions are coming from.

Chair Riggs: I appreciate you bringing it up but it... I think it underscores Commissioner

Alcheck's [note – Vice-Chair] point. Commissioner Templeton and Commissioner Roohparvar.

For me, my questions where around the transition. We've described this as a temporary set up. I've seen no information about what the transition would be like, how it would be decided, if it's going to be continued or if we're going to end it? So, understanding the scope of the commitment would help I think many of us come to a decision. You even heard members of the community question about what... how do we know this won't go on forever and that's because the report doesn't describe any transition or decision-making process whether to extend or terminate it. So, can you speak to that?

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, the pilot does not continue past the... whatever it is. The... I can't remember if it's... October 31<sup>st</sup> date without approval.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> But what does that... how does that approval work? Is there a trigger? Are we going to have another survey? Are we going to have another assessment analysis?

Mr. Kamhi: Well yes, first of all, we will do another Occupancy Study during the year to determine what the occupancy levels are. Second it does... I can't remember what occurred in the past, if it goes to Council or if it comes to PTC but somebody needs to... one of the Boards needs to approve it. Sandy, do you remember if its (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> But it's not included in the Resolution I guess is my concern. None of that description.

Ms. Sandra Lee, Assistant City Attorney: Yes, so the Code does say that the pilot period can be up to 2-years and what we have historically done is have a 1-year pilot period. And then after that pilot period, the item does go back to Council for a determination on whether to adopt a new Resolution continuing the RPP Program.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

decision?

6 7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28 29 30

31 32 33

34

35 36 37

38 39

40

1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.

2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Mr. Kamhi: Well I will say that historically we have. Yeah, we provide all the occupancy data, members of the public typically come speak on it, it's... so yes.

Commissioner Templeton: So, it's just agendized but there's no... is there any commitment

from the Staff to provide more information to Council at that time so that they can make a

Commissioner Templeton: But it's not going to be written down or some... it's not part of what you want us to weigh in on tonight?

Mr. Kamhi: I believe that's part of the ordinance so you're talking about what item we would bring back or are you talking about the process?

Commissioner Templeton: How do you know... yeah, so I'm suggesting that if you... it might be better to add a line in here that says what the criteria are, they'll be revisited when it goes before Council, and just be very explicit about it because then we know that it's not arbitrary or cryptic. It would be great if you can also include that when it comes back to us, to Planning Commission before going to Council. Thank you.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Roohparvar... sorry, are you done?

Commissioner Templeton: Yes.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Roohparvar and Commissioner Summa.

Commissioner Roohparvar: Thank you. I have a few questions so I want to better understand in terms of each resident getting five permits. On top of that, they own... they have their own parking spots in their own driveways so we're talking about between seven to nine parking spaces per household. That kind of doesn't make sense. What... why did you choose five and what do other RPP Programs have and what was the process between five for this area, two for

another area, three for another area or is it arbitrary?

Mr. Kamhi: So, I think all the RPPs, if I can speak for Mark and he'll kick me if I'm saying this incorrectly but all of the RPPs that have been recently initiated have been five. So, this is to keep some consistency with all the recent RPP Programs it's been five. So, it's a resident elected thing so there was community engagement with the residents that determine that they wished to have five. That said, historically in most areas, the residents do not purchase all five permits that they're allowed. It's just what we've evidenced from the other RPP districts we've established that do allow five per residences.

Mr. Hur: Three.

Mr. Kamhi: Evergreen Park/Mayfield, South Gate, and Downtown.

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> So, four and then how many totals do you have RPP Programs that don't have five; all in?

Mr. Kamhi: Just Crescent (interrupted)

Mr. Hur: Two. College Terrace and Crescent Park are only allowed two permits per household.

Commissioner Roohparvar: Another issue that I just wanted to reiterate. I'm left a little bit concerned as to the data and the results presented because of the issues raised about the garage and whether that was taken into consideration. And the point Commissioner... the garage on... the parking lot that Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair] raised and was that taken into consideration. And also, the fact that what Chair Riggs raised about the 75 percent to 100 percent. Where exactly on the street there's more traffic or less traffic and the issue about the Caltrain lot being not full because at first blush you would think well it's all that overflow Caltrain parkers that are parking on these streets and causing traffic, but then you're telling me the lots not full. I don't know if you want to comment on that, that was just a point of (interrupted)

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah so if I can (interrupted)

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> It's paid parking.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah that's exactly what I was going to say.

Chair Riggs: It's \$5 a day.

Mr. Kamhi: If I can in my prior role here and Mark has actually worked with them more recently. We've tried to work with Caltrain to get them to fully utilize that parking lot. We're actually even leasing a portion of that parking lot right now to mitigate some of the impacts of the parking garage being closed in California Avenue. So that is a paid lot, we actually expect that if this is enacted that during this pilot period, we'll probably see a jump in parking in that area. That's one of the things we'll want to measure... we'll want to monitor is whether more people start parking in that Caltrain lot. And in addition to that, the California Avenue garage is

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

being constructed and losing parking there. We believe that it probably is having an impact in that neighborhood, we think that that's likely, and we think that will probably be something that resolves once the garage opens. Although... do you know the opening date?

Chair Riggs: [unintelligible – off mic]

Mr. Kamhi: We should, yeah.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: The other thing is I wanted to look it up to make sure I was accurate. The garage broke ground on April 22<sup>nd</sup> so it was after the Occupancy Studies were conducted.

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> Ok thank you.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: (off mic) Do you know if it's closed?

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok so, hold on, hold on, just hold your question Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair], Commissioner Roohparvar isn't done.

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> Yeah, I had two more questions. What about... I understand that there was some businesses that are located in this area. I think a dental, medical office. Do they also get hangtags or are they just... even though they are in the area and they're residents are they just kind of out of luck?

Mr. Kamhi: So, because they... the... I think it's two businesses that are in the district, they actually have their own parking, and they did not have desire to purchase or become enrolled in this. So, it makes the program a lot easier to implement not having to deal with the employees that are within the district.

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> And then one final question, I think it was public comment by Mr. Miller and I thought I understood him as asking at to Point D [note – E]. We're required to find the other alternative of parking strategies that are not feasible or practical. Can you tell me what alternative parking strategies were considered and why they were found infeasible and impractical?

Mr. Hur: Oh, we're just following Council's direction when we brought that item to them in May but we did not provide any additional alternative options for Old Palo Alto.

Commissioner Roohparvar: Ok, thank you. That's it.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Summer followed by Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair].

\_

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Commissioner Summa: So, thank you, everyone, who came out to speak. Thank you for Staff. I'm not as concerned about any potential effects from construction on the Cal. Ave parking garage. Everybody who spoke and even more people spoke at our last meeting indicated that this has been a growing problem for some time. And in addition to leasing part of the Caltrain parking lot so part of that is not available to anyone but the rather large apartment building there. They use that parking too. And also, the City restriped the other parking lot where the police stations isn't going to go... is going to go eventually to hold many more cars so I'm not worried that's going to be a big problem. And being in College... living in College Terrace I can tell you that not everybody does have adequate off-street parking, especially older houses. I don't know anybody ever who has bought all five permits in my neighborhood. People don't want to spend more than they have too and most people do not have cars. I worry a little bit that a future tenant of the office building in that area, which I believe is one building but two business uses, that they might want to participate in the future and how we've handled that in other neighborhoods like South Gate is different. So, I appreciate five permits and your explanation that that's for consistency sake. I am ready to and I think the neighbors in this 

motion after everyone has talked tonight.

I did have one question for Staff on Packet Page 10 which is Page 3 of the Staff report at the bottom. It says College Terrace is the only other resident-only parking program and right before that it says that the Staff received a petition from the Old Palo Alto neighborhood for a Resident Only Parking Program. Is it possible for a neighborhood to request a Resident Only Parking Program because I think other neighborhoods might have done that before? So, I appreciate that we're being more consistent in some ways but in other ways we're being less consistent. And the stated goals in the Comprehensive Plan and the Findings all mention protection of neighborhood character and residential streets and those sorts of values; which I don't know how we apply those unequally across different Palo Alto neighborhoods. That being said I'm delighted to wholeheartedly support Staff's recommendation for Old Palo Alto but I think we might want to think about the problem of protecting certain neighborhoods differently than other neighborhoods and just think about that more. So, I'd be happy to make a motion but I want to hear from all my colleagues first.

location are ready to move this forward and I would be happy to do that after... make that

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Yeah so, I have Alcheck and Templeton but I want to hear from Commissioner Lauing before we do that. And I'd also like to see if you have an answer to my question from earlier if you are able to provide that but Commissioner Lauing.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Yeah, excuse me, yes can I first address a question to Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair]? I just want to get the Chair's permission.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> You discussed the questions around... I don't know if this is the correct word but sort of the purpose, the strategy of an RPP. Can you articulate on what it is because I think from a laymen's perspective it's to relieve a parking crisis but if you could just articulate for my ears at least what would be different than just that's laymen's definition?

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah so, I... look, this kind of goes back to one of the themes of then Commissioner Rosenblum's which was when you don't price street parking... if you make street parking free it will always win the competition against a paid lot. And so, we have this underutilized lot that costs \$5 a day for example and individuals are not surprisingly parking on the other sides of the tracks and walking under it. And so, there's sort of two questions... there's two answers to your questions. The first is I'm... I don't have a vision; I don't have the... I can't articulate to you what the City should be doing. My question is what is the City's idea of its goal? And what I mean by that is, is the goal of an RPP Program to take what is typically viewed as a public asset, the on-street parking and essentially make it exclusive to residential homeowners regardless how close they live to business districts or is the goal... or should the goal of an RPP be to elevate some of the difficulty associated with living within close proximity to a business district?

You know we're talking about 75 percent; should the goal of the RPP be... here's why. They said they're going to do a study at the end of the period. What's it going to tell you? How will you evaluate your survey at the conclusion of the pilot? There is no answer to that question because there's no rubric that says if we've achieved 45 percent we've succeeded. We don't have a way of saying 45 percent is our goal because that's not... the City hasn't articulated its goal. So, is our goal that during the day the street is empty? If that's the case just put up a sign that says no parking on the side of the street. If the goal is that the street be half parked so that residents can get some access then maybe we should allow businesses to buy street specific parking like I think we do... I don't know if we do that in the Downtown RPP but it was something we discussed. You know is the idea exclusive, not exclusive so that's sort of what I meant by what is the strategy? I don't... I can't articulate that strategy on behalf of the City. My point was because it hasn't been articulated on behalf of the City, we are left sort of floundering. That was my point.

Commissioner Lauing: Ok but that's the case with all the current RPPs.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: (off mic) That has been the case with RPPs that we've reviewed.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Right.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> We keep saying how do we continue to do this and we keep pushing it down the road.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

11 12

10

24 25 26

27

28

22

23

29 30

32 33

31

34 35 36

38 39

37

40

in mind so I totally understand that. I'm also quite sympathetic to the issue which has a lot of precedents we just heard that a resident can buy five passes. In general, I don't think that's the ideal so that's something that we should just look at across the board as being changed. I'm not sure that we should try to be baking that into this one right now. And as also I'm very supportive of comments that ask for more data so that we can make better decisions as Commissioner Riggs [note -Chair Riggs] just outlined. It was a much more detailed question than the one I asked which is, is their data to support why there's no spot here but we're kind of on the same point. And that's been frankly a chronic problem in the issues that we've gotten on parking. That there's just not enough data there nor is there a valid goal.

Commissioner Lauing: Ok so I get that because it's hard to evaluate if you don't have the goal

The issue, however, is that at least some of us asked last time for a pilot and by definition, a pilot is or a prototype incorporation or whatever you want to say. Is it is a way to get data in a real live setting as opposed to speculating what might happen? So, the question also that was raised about... excuse me... about when we get to the pilot which is set up here in the recommendation to be 1-year which is frankly a short amount of time in Palo Alto but I actually agree with that 1-year. By definition there has to be an evaluation period before that so I guess it would be helpful for us to know when is that? After 9-months or 8-months or 6-months because you have to get data and process it like you've had to do to get here. So, it may be that after 6-months you have to start doing another analysis to get to a recommendation on changes to be made in the pilot so it doesn't just automatically go away at the end of October of 2020. So, I'm not sure if it's again something that we should wait on or that we should demand that goes into this particular pilot but I do agree it's debatable.

The other thing... the common thread here is that this has been a years ongoing problem. It's getting worse because the Caltrans situation and to me the risk of having the 1-year pilot not perfect is a lower risk than not doing anything for 6 or 12-months while we continue to study this.

Chair Riggs: Alright so I have the second... no, I get the floor.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> [unintelligible – off mic]

Chair Riggs: I have some questions. I've been polite the first time around. So, I have Alcheck, Templeton, Summa. Alright, I have a couple questions. I wanted to see... if you feel uncertain just kind of going off with data, I'm totally happy to say we don't want to do that but if you do have a little more finesse data you can share (interrupted)

Mr. Kamhi: Yes, we do [unintelligible] (interrupted)

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, we do have some data available to share with you.

<u>Mr. Hur:</u> Yeah so if there's any particular block that you were interested in and we have information available on the occupancy for the particular day and time but nothing as a comprehensive report at the moment.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> But so, as you're looking at it, I mean so... I mean are we saying that some of these... I mean I'm sorry, I'm not looking at anything but some of these streets near your orange 54 to 74 percent are closer to 74 percent to 100 percent.

Mr. Kamhi: So, if I can (interrupted)

16 Chair Riggs: I'm assuming there's a bigger map here.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah so, I'll just give you some numbers. North California on the northside, Alma and High (interrupted)

<u>Chair Riggs: [unintelligible</u>] slower.

Mr. Kamhi: We're at 100 percent occupancy. I'm not sure what this time... this is at noon on the 24<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Riggs: Just keep them all consistent.

Mr. Kamhi: North California, High and Emerson we're 100 percent. Nevada at High and Emerson we're at 80 percent. Nevada at High... wait Nevada at Emerson and Ramona 67 percent. Nevada, High, and Emerson on the south side... sorry I should be saying sides... that's 100 percent. Nevada on the southside at Emerson and Ramona 75 percent. Maybe I'll just give you the 100 percent if that's alright. This is going to be a long list.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> No, no, so I have enough. I have enough information. That's fantastic, that would have been really helpful (interrupted)

Mr. Kamhi: I concur.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> And I think in the future, yeah, we need more tranches in that or just give us a histogram or something that actually shows where... what the spread is. So, I guess I have a

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

comment that I see... I definitely see a couple blocks where there is a queue problem but what I don't see is creativity in the solving the queue problem and I think this gets at kind of the Findings we had to make. That we didn't have data to make when we heard this the first time so the fact that we've exhausted all possible solutions and all possible tactical deployment solutions that we could actually go out and do tomorrow. We have not and that's my... from a practitioner standpoint we could create paper hang tags and give them to people on the block and do that tomorrow. And I don't know why we aren't exploring potential solutions that actually would deal with the acute issue as opposed to this cumbersome policy where the issue of occupancy degrades pretty quickly. We have 75, 60, 67 percent within two blocks of the Caltrain Station. There are... we ran a program at UC Berkeley when I was a Transportation Program Manager there and we basically allowed for employees... it was employee paid parking with a block face allocation. So basically, you can sell the... you can sell a certain number of permits to employers per block face and still preserve a certain amount of that block face to be protected for residents. And so, I don't know why... I guess if we're coupling something that with enforcement, I don't know why we wouldn't explore other creative solutions as opposed to something that's not rubric-based. And so, I guess I'm really struggling with this because what I see is, from based on data, is actually not as cute... as acute of an issue as we thought it was except for basically a two or three-block radius. And I don't think people will overflow into Caltrain, I think they'll park further out. That's really just the way it works. Unless you do RPP everywhere, you get spill over into the parts of Old Palo Alto. So, I think that people are rational, they're not going to pay \$5. If they did, we'd price all parking everywhere because it would just like this wonderful world where we'd make money off of parking in residential neighborhoods. It just doesn't work like that so I just don't by it. And I think that... I worry that we've not explored like really tactical, creative opportunities here that would not only benefit neighbors but wouldn't... would not follow this antiquated and I think Ad Hoc process. So, I think that's... I don't need a response. It's just I... but if you could provide data... maybe more data next time around that would be very appreciative.

272829

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Mr. Kamhi: Will do.

30 31

Chair Riggs: Alcheck, Templeton, Summa.

32 33

34 35 <u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> I generally accept the premise that perfect is the enemy of good and I support recommendations that may not be perfect in an effort to sort of achieve some objective and hopefully tweak it as we move forward. That's not really how I feel about this one. I feel like this one is not just imperfect, it's like good (interrupted)

363738

Chair Riggs: Vice-Chair Alcheck, just speak into your mic, please.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah, that's... I feel like we're not at good yet and that's my concern. There's a part of me that feels like you have 300 spaces that are off the street right now under construction. So, are we choosing one of the most inopportune times to create an RPP because where are those people suppose to go if 300 spaces aren't...? I mean we've always known Cal Ave "congested". So, if there are 300 spaces not available now, where are these people going to go?

I'm really surprised that not a single business sent us a letter and it makes me wonder whether resident... whether parcels on the other side of Alma really understood what we're doing here tonight to be perfectly frank. I don't know, maybe they were noticed, maybe did 500-feet, maybe businesses and commercial parcel owners are two different things.

## <u>Chair Riggs: [unintelligible – off mic]</u>

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> So, there's a concern there because they may wake up in a month and go whoa. That's a different calculus for the Caltrans user. I guess I would be a little bit... let's say it costs you \$5 a day to park in the Caltrans lot and you suggested that you would allow non-residents to buy permits for the equivalent of \$30 a week. When we talk about alternative, would a bunch of day-long parking meters work around this park? Would that have encouraged those people to maybe drive to the other side and pay \$5 instead of \$8? I think we don't have a strategy that bifurcates the Caltrans rider and potentially an employee of a business that creates a benefit for all residents in Palo Alto to some extent by operating.

And we've been on this Commission together now long enough and I think as a group we feel pretty strongly that Cal Ave's retail charm is pretty important. And the number one thing we heard from businesses typically is that they can't find people who are willing to make the commute and that parking is a very big challenge. And so there... I am a little worried that because our strategy doesn't really identify... because of the strategy, the non-existent strategy doesn't really identify those two parkers separately. We don't have a good way of alleviating the challenge we're creating by the lack of parking spaces on... taken away from... by the garage construction.

 So, I... let me put it to you this way, often times when we have a decision that may have impacts that are complicated like this one, we take a little more time. And I'm not suggesting that we take this off the table. What I'm suggesting is that we create an incentive for Staff to come back to the table in 30-days or maybe it's 60, I don't know how long this should take, with answers to these questions so that we can say one of two things. Number one we found the answers adequate and we support this parking RPP and we recommend that Council do so or two, we don't necessarily find these answers antiquate, we don't support the RPP, and that's our recommendation to Council and Council can do what they see fit. I just think a recommendation

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

based on our current information is not good. It's not perfect, it's not good and I really think we can create an opportunity here to make it better if we just take a little more time.

Chair Riggs: Thank you. Commissioner Templeton and then Commissioner Summa.

Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. I just have a process clarification based on some of the comments I've heard today. On Packet Page 10 there's the Municipal Code is sited, Section E refers to the process for the RPP, that it needs to be seen by the PTC no later than September and then forwarded to the Council no later than September 30<sup>th</sup>. If we were to continue this so that you would have time to prepare responses to the questions that have come tonight, would it be possible to have it back on the PTC agenda in September and still meet this timeline or is that off the table? How does the timing work? Sorry guys, I know that's kind of a technical question but I want to make sure that we all understand as we make this recommendation what the implications are if we don't act tonight.

Commissioner Lauing: Was it Section D on Page 10?

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> E on Packet Page 10.

Commissioner Lauing: Oh, E.

Commissioner Summa: That's a good one.

Ms. Rachael Turner, Assistant Director: Maybe I'll ask if Philip wants to speak to the possibility of bringing it back. I think we have the time to possibly agendize it. I don't know if we'd be able to answer the questions. I'd ask Philip to respond to that. And I don't know if Sandy, you know the impact of if it somehow did not come back by September if that evaporates the work or if it can continue and go to Council at a later date? I'm not sure about that.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> I think there were two questions that you were asking so maybe we can take the legal question first or the evaporation question first.

 <u>Ms. Lee:</u> So first let me take the non-evaporation question which will need transportation to weigh in on more specifically but from a Code and legal perspective you can certainly continue it for 30-days. It's just the matter of whether or not administratively and logistically that's a sufficient time for Staff to provide some sufficient additional work to satisfy the Commission's desires.

So, it doesn't evaporate the work if the Commission does not act by 30... by September 30<sup>th</sup>. I think then there is a question of whether or not... what the Commission might want to do is

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

forward a recommendation to Council not to adopt or deny the RPP but instead to further study and get some additional information. So, because the Code does say the Commission shall forward a recommendation to Council by September 30<sup>th</sup>, I would suggest that the Council... that the Commission take some action but that recommendation could be do some additional study and come back later in the year.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Ok and as long Council has it in their hands by September 30<sup>th</sup> are you still able to make your November 1<sup>st</sup> timeline or is the timeline impacted?

Mr. Kamhi: No, the timeline... I think any action other than approval tonight would probably impact the timeline for implementation. I'm not sure about the... how the ordinance plays into that but it would certainly hold... because we would need to begin ordering signs and developing contracts for enforcement and all that. Stepping back, the other question that I would have is what things the PTC would like to see if they saw this revisited because I will say that 30-days could be reasonable for us to provide more data, such as Chair Riggs requested, that we have. We just would need to comply and organize better. Potentially to go out and redo surveys in order to understand better what the impacts of the garage at this current date are or this current time, but things like developing a Parking Occupancy Standard which is something that I'd love to have in association is a trigger for when these RPPs and all that. That's a great policy discussion that needs to occur.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Thank you. I appreciate anything that helps clarify the decision and recommendation we'll be making.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Summa followed by Commissioner Lauing.

### MOTION #1

Commissioner Summa: So, a couple things, we already established that since one of the parking lots is not available that Staff has found other parking spaces so it's not like we're out 300. And the public had come... there may be no one in the room that thinks our RPP Ordinance is perfect but the public has a right to come forward and request this. They have met all the conditions and continuing it in a way that makes it impossible for them to get this program this year seem frankly punitive. I think there's a misconception that the goal is empty streets. I can tell you as someone living in the first RPPP in Palo Alto on a street which is... the other side of my street is a mixed-use zone; it's zoned CN. There is no expectation of empty streets ever because I live quite close into the business community, it was a chose I made, I'm always going to have more 2-hour parking. Every single RPPP allows 2-hour parking and if you underestimate the need for both residential and businesses to have short term parking and circulation of that short-term parking it's a grave mistake. Businesses will go out of business near me if they

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

couldn't park on my street, especially restaurants and dental offices and medical offices. There are times when I come home and I still have no parking on my street and that's after 8-years of what I consider a very successful RPP. So, it is never the goal to not have the closed streets provide the same kinds of services that they did to help businesses and the residents with short term parking. Residents need it too, businesses need plumbers to come, businesses need shredding services to come. It's... the expectation of empty streets is not what this is about. So, I am ready to make a motion to move Staff's recommendation.

Chair Riggs: So are you making a motion or (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Yes, I am making a motion to move Staff's recommendation.

Chair Riggs: Do I have a second?

SECOND

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Yes, I'll second it and I have some comments.

Chair Riggs: Ok, motion and a second. You're up Commissioner Lauing anyway.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> So just trying to figure out a way to split the baby and still keep them all alive. One option would be to have you give us a hard date that you could come back with some of these things that we talked about that are I'll call it incomplete. One of which is sort of the goals for this RPP. We couldn't be solving that for all RPPs, it would have to be (interrupted)

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Lauing, I just want to make sure that you understand. I don't believe that was the motion that was made so the motion on the floor is not that. So, if you could just make sure in your comments that you're clear.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> No, I'm trying to consider if there should be any amendments to this.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Yeah so, I just want to make sure that you're understanding because I'm looking over here and seeing Commissioner Summa... I'm sensing that... she's not. So, I... please, proceed.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> So, what I'm saying is I think that this is valid and as we always say the minutes are going to record some of the concerns we have. We make the recommendation and note the concerns and go straight to Council. And I see the main concerns as being goals, a specific... I mean by definition there has to be an evaluation but you haven't told us what it is which is a quite valid comment. And so we would need to know when that timeline was to be

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

started or Council at least needs to know when that timeline would start, how you would make the decision that we should move forward after the pilot or not, and the third thing, the impact to this garage and the fourth thing, consideration of reduction from five to three on the hang tags. So, we could either ask you to come back with that or we could add those comments in our recommendation.

So, I just wanted to follow up on Commissioner Templeton's question because I wasn't sure that I heard exactly how soon you could come back with answers to those questions.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> So, I think that's just a question for Staff and Philip if you could get those items that were mentioned. I think... I'm going to go out on a limb, I think that you included all those in your comments to us with the exception of the what I call the rubric for the number of hang tags provided or the number of spaces provided, but you could respond to that one. Alright, Staff, do we need... can we continue our dialog while you guys are doing that? Ok so I have... Commissioner Lauing do you have anything else whether dialog on this?

Commissioner Lauing: Not till I hear the answer to that question.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so any other comments pertinent to the motion on the floor? I have a light from Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair]. Is this pertinent to the motion on the floor?

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> I mean it's pertinent to you comment which I think is in support of the motion on the floor which is that maybe it's just that I'm skeptical of the idea that local government will take an action. And then after that action takes place, they're going to tell you by what rubric you should evaluate its success. So, we're talking about this review that will take place in 9-months or at the conclusion of the pilot. And that review will tell you how the street is parked and because no one has ever articulated what our goal is for how much parking should be on the street, there... let's say in 7-months they come back and say our goal is exactly what we achieved. Kudos. The question is... and he mentioned it, it's a policy idea, we have to figure out this idea.

My big concern is the justification for five parking spots is that we've done it two times. By the way, those two times happened at the same time and so essentially the reliance here is that the precedent we are setting is the reason for we continue to do what we're doing. And that is a little self-serving because I would argue to you why don't we try two permits? And the logic there would be we don't have a logic so why continue to set a precedent if none of us feel comfortable with it? There's a lot... I think making the recommendation that we come back on September 30<sup>th</sup> with as much as you possibly can and then at that point making the call whether or not we want to make a recommendation to Council would be a wiser choice. It's just 30-days. It gives them an opportunity to do some of the work.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30 31

32 33

35 36

34

37 38

39 40

3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Chair Riggs: Alright thank you Commissioner Alcheck [note - Vice-Chair]. I think Chief Transportation Official, do you want to weigh in?

Chair Riggs: Philip, did you have something you wanted to get a word in?

Commissioner Summa: He's been here 2-weeks.

Mr. Kamhi: (off mic) I... yeah, probably. Sorry but I'm struggling to remember what... I think that anything that the PTC does, as long as it's forward to the Council by September 30th, I think we're ok. Sorry, am I not catching the mic enough? I think as long as it's forward to the City Council before September 30th, we're ok. As far as implementing the program it will, however, delay the start of this program likely till March. Is that right, March?

Chair Riggs: Ok I see no lights. Commissioner Lauing did you have additional comments based on your questions to Staff?

Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, I mean I'm quite disturbed at that answer because I don't knowhow if they came back within 30-days we would be postponing the implementation by 4months. I still haven't had my question answered. Could you be back here in 30-days with addressing the four items that I noted which is the goal and your judgment for the Palo Alto... I'm sorry, for the Old Palo Alto RPP, the timeline and criteria for evaluation, and any impacts on the garage being down, and why it's five instead of two hang tags? It's really when can you be back with that information is the question.

Mr. Kamhi: I'm sorry can you clarify the evaluation criteria and timeline? Are you talking about for the pilot what the (interrupted)

Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

Mr. Kamhi: Ok.

Commissioner Lauing: And we can't do an evaluation if it was successful until we know what the goal was.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, understood so that would not be a problem. None of those items are things that we could not bring back in 30-days. The reason for the delay until March is because we order our permits at set times during the year. There's economies of scale, there's a large process in actually processing and preparing all the permits. So, we do all of our RPPs at the same time in order to be consistent, same time every part of the year.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok we have a motion on the floor. I... can I... I think... Commissioner Summa, it's fine but let's try to keep to the motion and I think I'd like to (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I am speaking to my motion (interrupted)

Chair Riggs: Call the question.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Which I haven't done yet. So, if you look at the Findings that are set forth in 10.50.3.0 of the Municipal Code for Designating a Residential Preferential Permit Zone and the Policy implications from the Comp Plan that were quoted. The goal lies in there. We don't need a specific goal for this neighborhood that is any different. I mean legally they are allowed to ask to be included in this, they have done so, and they have fulfilled the requirements to do so. I don't understand what further goal we need other than the policy implications from the Comp Plan and the Findings from the ordinance itself. I think we should just call the vote.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> So, Chair? I'd like to suggest to the maker a friendly amendment and she can accept or not.

Commissioner Summa: Ok.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> So, the amendment would be that we would approve this but upon presentation to the Council Staff would have to identify the evaluation criteria to continue the pilot and they would have to comment on the garage being down.

Commissioner Summa: So, in the interest of (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Wait, wait and the third one is that and they should justify five instead of two hang tags.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I will not accept five instead of two. I will accept the other amendments.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok then I withdraw number three in the interest of moving this along, but you'll accept A and B?

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I will accept moving Staff recommendation and with a suggestion that you provide... Staff provides more information to the Council when they consider our recommendation and this item. And as I understand it it's implications of the parking garage (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> No, the... we need to be really clear about this so we have it in the record. The number one thing is that they have to tell us how they're going to evaluate the success or failure of the Old Palo Alto RPP to decide whether or not the pilot should be continued because by definitions of the pilot which means it may not be continued.

Commissioner Summa: Ok.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> And the second thing is implications of the parking garage issue there.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I will accept those two in the interest of moving this along. Although I think the construction of the garage is temporary and I believe it has been alleviated, but that's fine. And I'm assuming Staff would have a set of criteria to evaluate the success of the program would largely be informed by how the residents feel it has worked but we can leave it in there just so we can go ahead a vote.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> I believe Commissioner Templeton has a comment and then I think we're going to call the question.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Yes, I don't know if it's in order for me to try and make one more amendment. Is that allowed?

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Yeah.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Ok so I appreciate the inclusion of success criteria for the pilot when presented to Council so thank you for suggesting that. The other suggestion I would include is a commitment by Staff to investigate the creative alternatives in the intervening year before the presentation for renewal request. Would you be willing to (interrupted)

Commissioner Summa: Can you say it again?

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> For Staff to agree to investigate the creative alternatives that Commissioner or Chair Riggs suggested in the intervening year during the pilot. So that when we are looking at renewal 1-year from now, that those creative alternatives are included.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

3 none of the other neighbors that have RPPs were held to that standard. I just... I don't know 4 legally how we can provide something to one neighborhood and not another. And I think that 5 the Staff has made some strides forward in doing that tonight by allowing them to request five 6 the other neighborhoods have theirs still. Some things that I don't find equally applied across 7 the City but I don't... I mean I'm assuming we're going to have more broad policy discussions 8 about TDM and other creative parking policies. I don't think that needs to be a condition of the 9 approval of a well-established ordinance that other neighborhoods across the City have used.

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

VOTE

27 28 29

30 31 32

33 34

35 36

37

40

38 our... the meeting after our next meeting to give Staff an opportunity to come back and answer 39 some of... as many of the questions as you possibly can. And I think the ones that Commissioner Lauing had suggested are at the heart of this but as many... you took a bunch of notes.

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.

Commissioner Templeton: One quick response. Just respectfully, Commissioner Summa, it's part of the ordinance to investigate other alternative parking strategies.

Commissioner Summa: I'm a little uncomfortable with that and the reason is because nobody...

Chair Riggs: I'd like to move us to a vote. We have a motion on the floor, we have a second, we've had plenty of dialog. (interrupted)

Commissioner Summa: I haven't finished. Since it is part of the ordinance and you pointed that out to me, I will accept it.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Thank you.

So, I would prefer not to include that one, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

Chair Riggs: Alright so ready for a vote? So, all in favor say aye? All opposed? So, I'm assuming the motion does not carry? Ok, so motion fails. I'll entertain another motion.

MOTION #1 FAILED WITH A VOTE OF 3(Lauing, Summa, Templeton) - 3(Riggs, Alcheck, Roohparvar) WITH COMMISSIONER WALDFOGEL RECUSED.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: Ok I move that we continue this item to our next meeting or I should say

Commissioner Lauing: Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair].

1	Everything that you could possibly so I would move that we continue the item to September
2	25 <sup>th</sup> to give us an opportunity to approach this process with a strategy, with a goal in mind. And
3	at that time this Commission can once again determine whether or not we want to recommend
4	the RPPs what do you call it? Approval to the Council.
5	
6	Chair Riggs: Motion on the floor, do I have a second?
7	
8	MOTION #2 FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND
9	
10	Chair Riggs: No second. Is there a second? Ok. So, I don't think that motion goes anywhere. Do
11	have another motion? Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair]
12	
13	<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> No, I didn't, sorry. [ <mark>unintelligible – off mic</mark> ]
14	
15	Commissioner Roohparvar: I'll make a motion.
16	
17	Chair Riggs: Commissioner Roohparvar.
18	
19	MOTION #3
20	
21	Commissioner Roohparvar: Yeah although I don't know if I can articulate this well but my
22	motion would be to approve the RPP Program but with all of the points raised by Commissione
23	Lauing and all the points raised by Commissioner Templeton.
24	
25	[note – a Commissioner spoke off mic]
26	
27	Commissioner Roohparvar: But you just said no to the five to three hang tags. You said no to
28	that, I want all (interrupted)
29	
30	Chair Riggs: Ok, no table that's not our protocol.
31	
32	Commissioner Roohparvar: Yeah, that's why.
33	
34	Chair Riggs: I think it's clear what Commissioner Lauing has said. Are you done with you
35	motion?
36	
37	SECOND
38	
39	Commissioner Templeton: (off mic) I'll second it.
40	

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Commissioner Roohparvar: If I don't need to reiterate what Commissioner Lauing has said and 1 2 Commissioner Templeton, I'm done. 3 4 Chair Riggs: So, motion from Commissioner Roohparvar, seconded by Commissioner 5 Templeton. Any dialog on that motion? 6 7 Ms. Tanner: We just want to clarify it so we can capture the motion accurately. That it is 8 everything that Commissioner Lauing and Commissioner Templeton added which included the 9 three to five... three hang tags instead of five, is that correct? Two instead of five. 10 11 Commissioner Roohparvar: Do you want to reiterate? 12 13 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah two instead of five. 14 15 Chair Riggs: If I can maybe... I think that there was no specificity in what he was saying. It goes back to my original question and if I'm mistaking what you're saying I'm saying show us a rubric 16 17 for whatever that number should be because we've been using anecdote for far too long. 18 Commissioner Lauing: That's fine. I was just [unintelligible] to the maker of the motion. I don't 19 20 think that one is material so I'm agreeing with you but she wanted that in the motion. So, if she 21 drops that (interrupted) 22 23 Ms. Tanner: I'm sorry, Commissioner (interrupted) 24 25 <u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> No, I want all the issues considered. 26 27 Ms. Tanner: Commissioner Roohparvar, can you clarify if you are recommending... your motion 28 is to recommend moving this forward to the Council with the additional comments by the 29 Commissioners. Is that correct? 30 31 Commissioner Roohparvar: Yes, with all of the comments accepted in because again I think and 32 I'll explain my reasoning. I think we shouldn't just rely on precedent; this is how it's always 33 been. We really do need to think through things and (interrupted) 34 35 Ms. Tanner: Right. 36 37 Commissioner Roohparvar: Understand why we're making certain decisions. 38 39 Ms. Tanner: Right so I'm going to ask if Ms. Gaines can restate what we believe is the motion on

40

the floor. So that we can capture that, if that does pass and be sure to enact it properly.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

10 11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26 27

28 29

30 31

32 33 34

35 36

37 38

38 39 40 Ok, then I'll stop.

Ms. Lee: [unintelligible – off mic] need to clarify this. Ok, alright, so actually the motion is to move the Staff recommendation, not to approve the RPP because the Commission doesn't

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: Oh yes, yeah.

Commissioner Lauing: Ok great.

Commissioner Lauing: For evaluation.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: That's my understanding.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> But (interrupted)

Commissioner Roohparvar: And Ms. (interrupted)

move the Staff recommendation, not to approve the RPP because the Commission doesn't approve the RPP. It just recommends approval and are you asking that the Staff come back during the pilot period or determine in the pilot period what the success criteria are or are you

Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at

provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.

The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

reduction of hang tags from five to two [unintelligible] (interrupted)

which was that there be a defined goal and timeline (interrupted)

alternatives needed to be looked at by Staff during this pilot year.

Commissioner Templeton: (off mic) To satisfy this (interrupted)

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: I mentioned the evaluation criteria and timeline for the pilot.

Commissioner Lauing: Right but I think you missed... at least I didn't hear the primary one

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: And I'm sorry, and Ms. Templeton mentioned also looking at creative

Commissioner Lauing: Wait so I think I'm the seconder to this, is that... oh sorry, Templeton.

Ms. Cotton-Gaines: To satisfy that bullet point to say what you said off your microphone.

3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair,

1 2	suggesting they provide some success criteria when they forward the item to Council for the approval of this Resolution? The maker of the motion.
3 4	Commissioner Roohparvar: When it goes to Council. When it goes to Council.
5 6 7	Ms. Lee: Ok.
, 8 9	Commissioner Roohparvar: Not after, yeah.
10 11	Ms. Lee: Ok but then during the pilot period that they would Staff would look into alternative creative alternative methods to address the parking issues in that area?
12 13 14	<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Correct, what I'm suggesting is when it goes to Council that it will include a commitment written in the Resolution that Staff will (interrupted)
15 16	Commissioner Roohparvar: Yes.
17 18	Commissioner Templeton: Before it's renewed have something for us to consider that meets
19 20 21	that ordinance criterion.  Ms. Lee: Ok, yes, yes, I understand. And then with respect to the number of hang tags, are you
22 23 24	suggesting that they include a justification for the number of hang tags when this item is presented to Council for the pilot period? Is that correct?
25 26 27	<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> That's up to the maker. I just think it should be looked at but it depends on what she wants in the motion. If you just say review the number of hang tags in the context of our prior discussion tonight.
28 29 30	Ms. Lee: Ok, a review at some point during the pilot period the number of hang tags.
31 32	[note – many people started talking at once]
33 34 35	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> I think I'm misunderstanding now too. I understood her motion to be and maybe (interrupted)
36 37	Commissioner Roohparvar: Go ahead, go ahead.
38 39 40	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> That all of this all of those fives' things would be completed and presented to Council.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 2	Commissioner Roohparvar: Yes.
2 3 4	Chair Riggs: If I misstating you (interrupted)
5 6	Commissioner Roohparvar: No, that's exactly (interrupted)
7 8	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Then please (interrupted)
9 10	Commissioner Roohparvar: Yes, that's exactly right.
11 12	[note – unknown female:] No, no.
13 14	Chair Riggs: I think you should make that excruciating clear.
15 16 17	<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> Clear. That was the whole point. Everything needs to be evaluated before (interrupted)
18 19	Ms. Lee: No, no but what (interrupted)
20 21	Commissioner Roohparvar: We can't recommend it.
22 23 24	Ms. Lee: Commissioner Templeton clarified was that the it will be presented to Council but not at the time that the this Resolution for the pilot is it goes to Council.
25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Commissioner Templeton: I'm sorry, clearly there's a misunderstanding, let me try again. I want what is presented to Council in September to include writing that describes how the roll-off will happen. That will reflect be reflected in success criteria, there it will be included in the presentation, the Resolution presented to Council. It will also be the Resolution will also include text that says part of that roll off criteria will be to provide data that we don't currently have. In other words, if we're going to do a provisional approval of the RPP request from this neighborhood without information that we need, we want to ensure that we have it a year
32 33 34	from now.  Ms. Lee: Ok.
35 36 37	Commissioner Templeton: Does that make sense?
38 39	Ms. Lee: Yes.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Commissioner Templeton: So, the text will be included to go to Council, the research will be done before the renewal.
 Ms. Lee: Right, ok, that's what I understood.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Ok sorry, thank you, sorry about that.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok I think we're done with clarification. I have Commissioner Summa followed by Commissioner Alcheck [note - Vice-Chair].

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> (off mic) Should we speak to our motions?

13 <u>Chair Riggs: Oh.</u>

Commissioner Summa: To be clear I'm still confused. Are we recommend... do you want to recommend only two hangtags or do you want to recommend that Council look at the number of hangtags...permits?

- <u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> I want to recommend that Council look at the number of permits but understand why we're going with five as opposed to what we would... maybe two or three.
- 21 Does that make sense?

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Does the ordinance provide a legal right for them to have up to five permits per household?

Ms. Lee: No, it doesn't.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Ok.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Alcheck [note - Vice-Chair] and then I believe I didn't give Commissioner Templeton a chance to speak to her second.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: I just... I'm struggling with this and I think in the same way you might be and I need you to help me understand this. But I think there's a presumption here that we can ask... that we can make a recommendation that somehow conditions... like we recommend that this RPP be approved but that Staff has to present to the City Council this criterion before City Council makes their determination. For example, the goal criteria and it is my understanding that there is no power for us to dictate what Staff does. Staff can simply put a paragraph in the report that says this was their motion and Staff doesn't have to do any leg work with respect to the criteria or the goal. And so with all due respect, the notion that they're going to come back

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

in September to City Council with this information is... this is... City Council is basically going to get this recommendation and say the Commission asked for this and presumably they're going to say well did you get a chance to do that? I mean how does this work? Does the... can you help me understand? Do we have any authority to dictate how this gets presented to City Council? Could we, for example, say we recommend approval but you have to explain the criteria by which you will evaluate this?

<u>Ms. Lee:</u> The Commission cannot direct Staff but the Commission can certainly make a recommendation to Staff and it's likely that the Council will ask why they did not follow through with those recommendations if Staff does not.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> So, the premise of this recommendation is that in 30-days whenever this goes to Council, Council will then put the squeeze on Staff and then maybe in its high esteem send it back to us in another month this the direction that Staff do the things that we're asking. That's the best-case scenario here (interrupted)

Ms. Lee: No, I... that's not what I heard from Staff.

Commissioner Lauing: No, no.

Ms. Lee: I mean it sounded like Staff said that they could come back with some of this information even to the Commission. And so, it wouldn't be my assumption... this isn't a legal opinion but it wouldn't be my assumption that they are going to ignore the Commission's recommendation and not provide the desired information to Council if they can obtain it.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> But Staff doesn't have to agree with the Commission's perspective and they can present their own opinion.

Ms. Lee: Sure.

 <u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Ok so my biggest concern here is that the feedback that we get is that we're understaffed and not enough time. And we're under the gun and there's always an opportunity to save money on some economies of scale. There's too many opportunities... I'm a little more skeptical that... of this which is why continuation buys more time but I just wanted to understand. I wanted to [unintelligible – shut mic off]

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Lord have mercy. Commissioner Summa followed by... oh sorry, Commissioner Templeton. Thank you so much, I'm off my game tonight.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Commissioner Templeton: That's alright, we're having fun. I wanted to speak to the second because I think it's really important based on the feedback we got from Staff tonight that we make a recommendation to Council and keep with up with our timeline because the community members have expressed that they have been suffering and we need to address it. This is an opportunity for us to take a risk, yes, it's a risk, but it's a small risk. It's only a 1-year pilot and if we can have good faith in our new team members that they will include justification for some of their recommendations so that Council can pick where we have identified gaps. I think then we can move forward and try this out. So, I hope that that good faith is well placed and I trust you guys to come up with reasonable, short, specific, measurable success criteria. And to... and take the year to investigate how we could do something better as some of the Commissioners have suggested. So, in the meantime, we do need to provide some relief for our community members.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Summa followed by Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner Roohparvar.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I have a suggestion and that is just because it's the maker's intention to move Staff's recommendation to keep it simple and leave it at that and in the minutes, they will see all of the things that we were concerned about and read about them. I just think it keeps it simpler and better but.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner Roohparvar.

Commissioner Lauing: I mean just commenting on that last comment relative to the motion. The idea here is to get something very specific in terms of the core recommendations after our deliberation given the lack of stuff... lack of data etc. that we got. And to focus on that and we're requesting as was articulated by counsel that Staff just have this prepared for Council instead of us because we're trying to stay on target for the benefits of the residents and for the benefit of Council. The default position is essentially that we already have acted and we sent the 3-3 motion with one recusal and then they do have to read 40-pages of minutes. So, I think the focus on these four key things and our asking a request for Staff and staying on point here with the target is... makes the motion supportive... supportable.

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> I don't have a comment. You know (interrupted)

VOTE

 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> I think we're getting close to being able... I also struggle with this similar to Vice-Chair Alcheck. I can't find the Findings; I can't make one of them. I felt differently when this was here before but now that I have data in front of me, given the data that I have, I would have

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

preferred to see us continue this and I would... I think that we're making a decision in a vacuum. And I'm surprised no one was willing to second Commissioner Alcheck's [note-Vice-Chair] motion and I would have been willing to bet that that's usually the role of the Chair. So, I'm going to ask if there's any more comments. Ok seeing none I'd like to get us to take a vote. All in favor? All opposed?

5 6 7

1 2

3

4

MOTION PASSED 4(Roohparvar, Templeton, Summa, Lauing) – 2(Alcheck, Riggs) WITH COMMISSIONER WALDFOGEL RECUSED.

8 9 10

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Motion carries 4-2. I think Commissioner Alcheck [note - Vice-Chair] would like to speak to his descent.

111213

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Vice-Chair Alcheck: Look I'll just say this. We're an unelected body, we're an appointed body, and when we put the City Council in a position to have to sort of weigh in on an issue that privatizes what is otherwise a public asset, we're setting them up for failure if we don't do the work. Of course, I think we have to address the RPP issue in this neighborhood, but we need a system that doesn't simply benefit 50-residents at a time at an expense that we cannot measure. We have no way of addressing whether this will create an immediate problem because of all the construction that's happening on California Avenue. We don't even have a date for when that garage is going to be complete. Wouldn't it be nice if it was completed before this happened in March but it probably won't be because they haven't really made that much progress. So and I think it's a missed opportunity if we don't utilize our apolitical natural... our appointed apolitical nature to be insulated from the public in some regards and as the tough question about what is it that we want our streets to look like before we dictate what they're going to look like which is private. Does it matter for example that there's a park in this little area? Do most residents use parks for 2-hours at a time in the middle of the day? I don't know. It just seems to me like without a vision we're not doing the City Council any favors. We're just putting them in a position to make a political vote and I can tell you how it's going to go. Old Palo Alto is going to get an RPP before the end of the month and the reason why is because there's nobody in this room to argue otherwise. And they'll probably get five permits because that's what we've done the last two times and I really wonder what encouraging five permits does for our vision of discouraging single-occupancy vehicles in Palo Alto. There's just... none of it makes sense in putting them... putting a political body in a position to make this sort of... have this sort of... we're... what we should be doing is forcing Staff to make this Commission the epicenter of the conversation about what the streets should look like. Of course, I have faith in you guys to be good partners. You are not insulated from the politics of the community. When residents complain about the Transportation Official, which they have done relentlessly in the past, that is a heavy burden. You shouldn't be the bad guy. We should have a debate on this dais about what it should look like. We should get input from everybody in the community. It should be driven by our Comp plan and then and only then should we then

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

establish RPP. And the question is how many more of these are we going to set up before we force Staff to have that debate? And by the way, you can't force the City Council to tell them to do that for us because they get to make their own decisions and again, political bodies are unlikely to make those tough decisions; especially in anticipation of an election year.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

Chair Riggs: I want to speak to my descent. Streets are real estate, they are public real estate, but they're not for storing cars. They are to a certain extent but they can be so much more. We even had a robust policy dialog that's consistent with our Circulation Element about this. We have these climate goals and the decisions we make about RPP have induced demand implications. I question whether or not this type of decision as it continues whether or not it's in conformance with our Climate Element. So, we have these climate goals that... do these types of decisions are they consistent with them? We're seeing the gradual assetization of public real estate and the transition over the private real estate. I think Commissioner Alcheck note-Vice-Chair made a very compelling case that this a policy discussion that's not being had. It ought to be had. I mean maybe we should eliminate all the parking; they should all be parklets. Why are we not talking about those types of solutions? Maybe we should... I mean there are any number of creative opportunities that could have mitigated some of the neighborhood concerns a long time ago without even going down the path of RPP because I am sympathetic to many of the people that have talked about some the acute issues within the 2blocks. But beyond that, this is not... the data and the data issue and what we're shown here doesn't illustrate in my mind and interestingly this is my research area. It doesn't... it does not illustrate an endemic need to have policy action. It basically needs a creative and tactical solution to an acute issue for a couple blocks. So, I think that we're taking a kind of what... not thought out process-based band-aid and putting it on something that could have a lot more elegant and sophisticated solution.

252627

28

29

30

31 32 And with that said I'll... I have one recommendation because I am concerned about one comment that was not addressed by Staff and was brought up on the dais is the noticing for this project. My back of the envelop calculations shows that 500-feet does not include the bulk of California Avenue. I think this should be a 1,000, if not 1,500-feet. I'm assuming... I'm not sure if you've done a buffer-based math but I'm pretty sure 500-feet barely makes it to over the top of the Caltrain parking lot. So, I think you just need to take a look at that going into the Council hearing. I think that concludes this item.

333435

Chair Riggs: You know what? Can we take a 10-minute break? Is that ok?

36 37

[note – unknown Staff member:] [unintelligible – off mic]

38 39

Chair Riggs: What's that?

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

#### [note – unknown Staff member:] [unintelligible – off mic]

Chair Riggs: Can we take a 10-minute break for us to use the restroom and (interrupted)

Mr. Lait: You're the Chair.

Chair Riggs: I think we're going to take a 10-minute break.

- 1. <u>Commission Action:</u> Motion to Move the Staff recommendation and include all of the following in the report to City Council made by Commissioner Roohparvar and Seconded by Commissioner Templeton. Motion Passed 4-2:
  - a. Include the RPP Pilot evaluation criteria and timeline for the evaluation of this RPP in the report to Council; this needs to be included in the pilot program.
  - b. What is the impact of the garage construction and garage on this (needs to be included in report to Council)?
  - c. Number of hangtags: need to include a justification for the number of hangtags during this pilot period; wants Council to decide number of permits but they need a justification of why.
  - d. Staff needs to review creative alternatives to this RPP; Text will be included in what goes to Council and the evaluation will be done within the pilot year.

#### [The Commission took a 10-minute break]

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 874 Boyce [18PLN-00030]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of An Ordinance to Amend Title 21, Chapter 20 to Allow for Creation of a Flag Lot Where the Residence on the Subject Lot to Be Subdivided Would be Protected Under a Historic Covenant as Well as Recommendation for Approval of a Preliminary Parcel Map With Exceptions to Subdivide One Lot to Create Two Lots. The Exceptions Are to Allow for A Narrower Front Lot Than Is Allowed Within the R-1 Zone District and To Allow for the Easements Serving the Rear Lot to be Greater Than 100 Feet. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15308 (Protection of the Environment) and 15332 (Infill Development). Zoning District: R-1 (Single-Family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> So, if you guys want to... you all ready? I think we're ready to let our... let... give Claire some relief.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Great. Good evening Commissioners. I'm Claire Hodgkins and I'm the project planner for this project. The project before you today is 874 Boyce Avenue. So, this is a property located within the R-1 Zone District near the 3-way intersection of Homer, Seneca, and Boyce Avenue.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

1 2

3

The purpose of the proposed project would be to create a flag lot in order to allow for an additional housing unit will also preserving the existing historic structure at the front of the property. The project includes multiple components including a request for a Code Text Amendment which would amend Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 21.20 which is our Subdivision Ordinance. It also includes a subdivision of a single parcel into two parcels. The existing parcel is oversized for this zone district and exceeds the R-1 requirements. The two new parcels would each meet the minimum code requirement for parcel size of 6,000-square feet or exceed it. And the project would require two Exception to the Preliminary Parcel Map. One would be allowed for a lot width that does not meet the 60-foot Minimum Lot Width requirements in the R-1 District and the second one would be for two Access Easements that exceed 100-feet in length. Under Title 21 typically it's the Easement needs to be 100-feet in length and the applicant is requesting one that's approximately 120-square feet [note - just feet] and one that's approximately 128-square feet or sorry feet. I do want to note that the proposed Map Exception for these easements was reviewed by our Fire Division and then they confirmed that they would allow for up to 150-feet for the Easements while still meeting fire safety requirements if each Easement is only surveying one parcel at the rear.

212223

24

25

26

27

28

So, in terms of process, a Preliminary Parcel Map is required for any subdivision creating less than 5-parcels or units but creating more than one or two new parcels. Exception... it also includes an Exception for the lot design which may be requested in accordance with Chapter 21.32 of our Code. It requires PTC review and Council decision for the Preliminary Parcel Map with Exceptions and Code text amendments, other than Zoning Code amendments, typically only require Council review. However, because the map is being reviewed by the PTC, the Code Text Amendment is also included in this request.

293031

32

33

So just some Comprehensive Plan policy considerations, so encourage historic... this project encourages Historic Preservation which is consistent with Policy L-7.1 of our Comprehensive Plan. It also encourages additional housing units which is consistent with Program H-2.1.2 of our Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

343536

37 38

39

40

And Staff recommends that the Planning and Transportation Commission take the following actions. Find the project exempted from CEQA, recommend approval of the proposed ordinance to Council, and recommend approval of the proposed Preliminary Parcel Map with Exceptions to Council based on Findings and subject to Conditions of Approval as outlines in the Staff report.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

have any.

that is Commissioner Templeton? Yeah.

as an exception tonight is for that purpose?

Commissioner Templeton: Ok thank you.

(spoke from the audience off mic) He had to leave.

paragraph under Easements if other people are trying to find it.

Ms. Hodgkins: Can you repeat your question really quickly?

6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32 33 34

35 36

> 37 38

39

40

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> He had to leave, ok.

is he still here?

Mr. Leopold Vandeneynde: [unintelligible – spoke off-mic from the audience]

And with that, I'll turn it back to you. I wanted to let you know that the applicant is here today.

They're not planning on giving a presentation but they're available to answer questions if you

Chair Riggs: Alright thank you. Any Commission... questions from Commissioners and I think

Commissioner Templeton: Hi. Thank you for this great report and presentation, Claire. I have a question on Page 4, Packet Page 26 about the Easements. Can you clarify what... how much of

these exceptions and changes are being requested in order to avoid the private street? Second

Commissioner Templeton: Sure, sure. It... the report states that some of these exceptions are

being requested in order to avoid having a private street. How much of what's being requested

Ms. Hodgkins: So, the Exceptions tonight for both the lot width and the Easement length would

not be required if you were to create a private street. The issue that if you... if you don't do an

Easement serving one lot at the rear and it becomes private street then it deducts from the lot

area which would be detrimental to the adjacent property owner's property and would not be

supported obviously by them. So that was one of the issues that came up and in reviewing the

project we determined that the definition of the private street was actually a voter initiative so

Chair Riggs: Great so any other questions and I do have some speaker cards. So, if you have...

withhold your deliberations we want to hear from the public on this too. Any other questions?

Summa? Ok. Alright with that said we will open the hearing; I have two cards. I have Rod Miller,

it's not something that could be amended without going to a vote of the people.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok wait, would you like to come up and I just will need a card and maybe you can provide some context.

Mr. Vandeneynde: I was just going to say he's the neighbor at 876 behind the neighboring home and he was just here just to give his approval. We've had multiple conversations with him. I know you can't take my word for it but as far as why he was here.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> And just for the record I'm assuming you are the app... you are representing the applicant?

Mr. Vandeneynde: I'm actually... I'm the architect. My name is Leopold.

13 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Nice to meet you.

15 Mr. Vandeneynde: Yes.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Thank you, thank you for that clarification. So, Mr. Miller is not here but thank you for providing some clarification. Herb Borock.

 Mr. Herb Borock: Thank you and good evening Chair, Riggs and Commissioners. I urge you to reject the recommendation. This is being brought to you by a family, Loops' family, Chris Loops is in a construction business with HRB long term member David Bower and he took over the business. And a lot of... they did most of the Roger Kohler's work, another HRB long term member. Mr. Bower at 860 Boyce and Roger Kohler bringing through an application on 850 Boyce just last year. And the history is, is that the rejection that you can't have the flag lot in an R-1 district has been in the law since January/February 1989 and that it was amended specifically for flag lots regarding historic property on the front parcel in 2009; December. And then the family came in and divided the property with full knowledge of the law creating this separate lot that could not have a flat lot. And they did that in 2012 so they're fully aware of what the law was when they did that division to get the advantage of building on the adjacent lot by having the front parcel, 876, meet that historic criteria to enable to do flag lots behind it. So notionally they just want to change the law that they already created a parcel that they knew the law applied to them and this project is also being segmented.

That is, they've indicated in two study sessions before the HRB last year that they want to increase the size of the house in front and to be able to do that. They want to make sure that even with the Covenant they can do that. So really that should be apart of the application at the same time.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

In regard to the Easement, I don't have a copy of the plans in front of me but I suspect the two Easements are side by side and unless you permanently put a fence that nobody can take away and that you'll always know that it's there and check every day. You essentially got the width of a private Easement street... a private street that serves four lots. It's silly to think that the properties on one side are only going to be using a one-lane driveway on the one side and the properties on the other side are going to be using the other one-lane. So, for that reason... for all those reasons I believe you should reject this proposal. Thank you.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright I don't have any other cards so... seeing no other takers we'll close the hearing. So first up it looks like we have Commissioner Alcheck [note – Vice-Chair].

#### MOTION

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Claire, thanks for your report. I found all of your analysis compelling. It occurred to me while I was working on this item that in Minneapolis you wouldn't need flag lots anymore because they have eliminated R-1. I thought this is quite innovated way to create a new parcel and a new residential unit. And I think it's no surprise that we have to make these adjustments in our Code to accommodate this because this is a unique situation that no one anticipated probably when they wrote these Code sections.

So, I am interested in hearing what everyone has to say but with my time I'm going to move the Staff recommendation and recommendation that City Council make the Finding and approve the changes.

**SECOND** 

Commissioner Roohparvar: I'll second.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so we have a motion, a second. Let... I... ok so there's a motion on the floor. I... then I'm going to be kind of structured than with this and I'm going to... what I'm going to ask is we go in a structured way. If you want to speak to the motion but if you have other things that you want to... questions that you want to ask or comments you want to make please do so. So, Commissioner Waldfogel can I start with you, if that's ok?

<u>Commissioner Waldfogel:</u> I'll support the motion. I walked the block, looked at the conditions on the block, this seems to be consistent with prevailing conditions. I also checked with several previous City Council Members to see if there was any reason why we had a preference on the historic unit being front lot versus backlot in a flag lot division. Nobody could recall any reasons so apparently; we were just capturing the request at the time that that Code was written. So just given those things I would... I'd support the motion.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> I think we can all echo that your presentation was great. Commissioner Summa.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I'm inclined to support this as well but I do have some questions and is in the ordinance itself. Section 1 is about... it's a definition of private streets. I was really curious why this was included in the ordinance and there's... because nothing is... there's no strikeouts or underlines. It's exactly the same except for one word. Is that why you put it in, to add the word homes in the first sentence?

Ms. Hodgkins: I honestly just included everything that was under this section, 21.23.0.1.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> So, I mean I was just kind of confused but also it does add the word homes in which I'm sure was intended to be there.

Ms. Hodgkins: Oh, I sorry, sorry, I see what you mean.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> It just says... in the Code it says traffic to or from two or more, it doesn't have the word homes. So, I thought maybe that's why you changed it.

Ms. Hodgkins: So, homes should be underlined then. Maybe our attorney did add that just because as he was reading, he probably was thinking it was really clear.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> I think that's right. It's kind of hard to compare two things like that. And then I have a question on the City's Planning Website it refers to Code 18.10.130 which is the Historic Preservation Incentives and which does include R-1. Although when you got to the Code (interrupted)

Ms. Hodgkins: Say that one more time, sorry.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> So, on the City's Planning Website there is a page about historic incentives and it has as one of its bullets Section 18.10.130 of the Code which is about the historic incentives.

Ms. Hodgkins: Oh yeah.

38 <u>Commissioner Summa:</u> And it is about subdividing a lot to save a Historic Resource with the 39 same kinds of provisions to guarantee that same kind of Covenant but it does include R-1. So, but in the Code R-1... so was R-1 left out, take out of that at some point?

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Commissioner Summa: The flag lot section.

Ms. Hodgkins: Under the flag lot section, yeah because we (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Ok so that seemed a little confusing to me and I didn't know if it was a mistake actually when the Code was... I mean I would look into, if you haven't already, whether that was inadvertently dropped from the actual historic code. Because also in what the flag lot changes that you're recommending do most of the same thing but there's actually a minimum in the Historic Preservation Section and there is no minimum lot here recommended. So, I think its kind of inconsistent between... is that making sense kind of?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, yeah, the 4,000-square foot minimum or something.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> Yeah so, I don't know if you want to add a minimum in or if you want to research whether R-1 was left out of 18.10.130 by accident basically.

Ms. Hodgkins: Ok we can look into those issues.

<u>Commissioner Summa:</u> And then look at having them not contradict each other because I think that's always bad when the Code does that. So also, I know there's been two fairly recent R-1 Zone sites that subdivided for Historic Preservation reasons. One at 381 Lincoln and 1050 Waverley. It might be... you might be able... depending on what law allowed that, it was in the last few years I think, it might help determining whether that other one dropped R-1 by accident. So that is my only... that's my main concern is that those two areas that address Historic Preservation Covenant and subdivision be consistent. That's all for now.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> That's greats so we will continue. I will encourage if you don't really have anything to add don't do that, but before we get to you Commissioner Templeton I... we do... I forgot one thing. We... this is a quasi-judicial action so we need to actually do disclosures. So, in the spirit of fairness, I'm just going to go down the list and people say if they have anything to disclose.

Commissioner Lauing: No disclosures.

39 <u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> No disclosures.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1	Chair Riggs: You got to say it, Mike.
2 3 4	<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Actually, I only have to announce if I have a disclosure so silence is presumed (interrupted)
5 6 7	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok, no.
, 8 9	<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> No really.
10 11	Commissioner Templeton: No.
12 13	Vice-Chair Alcheck: It's not an obligation to announce (interrupted)
14 15	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> You're right, you're right.
16 17	Commissioner Summa: No.
18 19	Commissioner Waldfogel: No disclosure.
20 21	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Commissioner Templeton.
22 23 24	<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Hi. It looks like on this picture that they've already constructed a fence and kind of done an informal subdivision of the property already, is that right?
25 26	Ms. Hodgkins: I think there is a fence there or was a fence there. Is there a fence?
27 28	Mr. Vandeneynde: (off mic) There is currently a fence [unintelligible].
29 30	Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, it's just an empty lot at the rear though.
31 32 33	<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Oh ok, ok. So, I'm also inclined to support this. I'm a little uncomfortable with the lengths to which we're going to work around the private street and I don't really understand the implications. And especially it would be especially valuable to me
34 35 36	for you to explain why it won't have any long-term implications for other projects if we allow this workaround to really literally change the Code. So, can you clarify why that's the recommendation?
37 38 39 40	Ms. Hodgkins: So, as I mentioned if it becomes a private street then it gets deducted from the lot area. So, the current Easement runs down (interrupted)

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> So sorry, sorry to interrupt. I understand why the applicant wants what they want. I'm trying to understand why we want to change the Code for everyone based on this one application.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah so, I think the reasons why the City is willing or Staff is willing to support this application is to support policies under our Comprehensive Plan that encourage Historic Preservation and encourage the addition of more units. So, it doesn't... it's... the way that we are changing this Code is in a way that would not change private streets and that also minimizes the application of future Easements so that on future parcels and how that ends up getting implemented. So that if somebody were to come back in the future and we start getting a lot of lots that want to do this similar thing it gives the PTC and then Council another shot at looking at those on an individual bases and seeing if they're appropriate.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Ok thank you, that's very helpful. Also, what... another question that came to mind, I think this has an obvious answer but I want to ask it just for completeness. Could the same building goals be accomplished with an ADU in that spot or do we need to...? I guess the goal is to subdivide and sell off the property or how does that work?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, so we did encourage an ADU as an alternative to exploring these options and the applicant wasn't interested in that option. That would do the same thing in terms of adding an additional unit in terms of our inventory, but it would not necessarily preserve the historic property at the front. They could still... so under our Historic Preservation as a Category Four structure, if they're looking to do any Discretionary Application then CEQA would apply. And therefore, we could protect the resource but under our current Codes, if they were looking to do just a single-story residence, they could actually demo the home even though it's a Category Four structure and could rebuild with a single-story residence.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> Ok so these changes will, as part of a trade-off as a benefit for the City, will protect the Historic Resource in exchange for the... ok, thank you.

Ms. Hodgkins: Correct.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Alcheck [note -Vice-Chair] anything to add?

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah so, a couple quick questions. We have a number of 6,000-square foot and under lots in the City. Is there any, in your mind, policy discouraging subdivision of 12,000-square foot lots?

Ms. Hodgkins: Not that I'm aware of, I mean other than the minimum... well, minimum lot size ensuring that we're meeting the minimum lot size which anything over 12,000 presumably you

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

could subdivide. And I guess the only ordinance that would affect that right now is the one that Commissioner Summa mentioned that specifically leaves out the R-1 but for reasons unknown.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> I think it's safe... I wonder how you feel about this but or Staff... Staff feels about but I think it's safe to say that our Comprehensive Plan actually looks favorably on the concept of subdividing lots that are in excessive 10,000-square feet because to do so would inherently increase the number of residential parcels which increases the number of residential units.

And the interesting thing about your question about ADUs that I think is compelling is that there are restrictions embedded in our ADUs that limit who can occupy the unit. So, for example, if you rent your ADU out to a family, let's say you're a Stanford Professor and you rent your ADU out to a family. And then you go on some teaching program in another University in another state, you can't actually rent your house. It has to remain vacant because both units can't... one unit must be... one of the two residences have to be occupied by an owner. So, to some extent our ADU doesn't necessarily always encourage the greatest occupancy of residences. So, I think to some extent this isn't... like I said when I made my motion... a really innovative way to work around a Historic Resource and also create an opportunity to create a new parcel that meets our minimum qualifications. So, I just wanted to add that.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Roohparvar, anything to add?

<u>Commissioner Roohparvar:</u> I don't have comments.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Lauing, anything to add?

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Yes, thank you. It... have you done an inventory or to see if there's any other situations like this? I mean we're changing this law. Is it just going to fit one case or are there other situations/scenarios in the City where this might apply?

Ms. Hodgkins: I don't have a full list but I know that there is... it wouldn't be a one-off. There are definitely other cases where there are lots. It's hard to tell exactly because it would depend exactly on whether they could meet some of the Easement or private street requirements that would be needed to allow for that subdivision; as well as on each individual lot. But there are a number of lots that have a historic property that are in excess of 12,000-square feet.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Ok so partly because of that, that is why you think that this is a better way to go than a Variance or insisting on an ADU?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, I mean... yeah.

\_

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

11 12 <u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> And the comment there about the possibility of raising the Historic Resource as it's currently in the Code, ineffectively not protecting that is very sad and a discussion for a different day. This is not the agenda tonight so it just seems like we're going through a lot of hoops for one applicant and one situation.

not end up preserving the resource and that is a tradeoff.

131415

Two Commissioners already covered very important questions that I was going to ask about somethings so I won't repeat that so I think that's it.

16 17

18 VOTE

19 20

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Sorry, I missed the it. I was... ok so any other comments? If not, I think we should... we have a motion, we have a second, I think we should vote. Seeing none, all in favor? All opposed? Any opposed? Ok motion carries 7-0. Thank you for being here.

222324

21

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0.

25 26

<u>Commission Action</u>: Motion to move Staff's recommendation made by Vice-Chair Alcheck, seconded by Commissioner Lauing; motion passed 7-0.

27 28

29

#### **Approval of Minutes**

- Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,3</sup>
- Chair Riggs: Ok so 2-minutes till 9 o'clock. Approval of the minutes, can I have a motion to approve the minutes.

33

MOTION

34 35

36 <u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Motion to approve the minutes.

37 38

Chair Riggs: Do I have a second?

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 2	SECOND
3	Commissioner Roohparvar: I'll second.
4 5 6	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright, thank you all. Any questions, comments, announcements, and future agenda items?
7 8	Vice-Chair Alcheck: We have to vote on the motion.
9 10	VOTE
11	
12 13	<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Oh, do we have to vote on the motion? Do we have to vote on that, really? Motion second? Ok, all in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? No, movement is approved.
14 15	MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0.
16 17	[note- no minutes to approve]
18	Committee Items
19 20 21	Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements  Chair Riggs: Take it away. You got nothing. Any announcements from look ahead for our next meeting.
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>	Vice-Chair Alcheck: I got a quick question. Do we know when the (interrupted)
25 26	Chair Riggs: 40 20-seconds.
27 28	Vice-Chair Alcheck: Draft EIR that we reviewed, do we have a date for that follow-up?
29 30 31	Mr. Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services: Are you referring to the Castilleja project?
32 33	Commissioner Summa: For Castilleja.
34 35	Vice-Chair Alcheck: Yeah, the item from last time.
36 37	Mr. Lait: No.
38	Vice-Chair Alcheck: Do we know is there a timeline?

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Mr. Lait: We're still in the public comment period. We've received probably hundreds of comments. It's going to take us quite some time to respond to those.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Ok so the timeline closes (interrupted)

Mr. Lait: We do not have a timeline right now.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: Ok just checking.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Alright so we do have a discussion item but you haven't gotten there yet and I was wondering if there's any other... so there's no look ahead in terms of agenda items we have...

Mr. Lait: So, one question that came out (interrupted)

16 Chair Riggs: Yeah, we'll get there.

Mr. Lait: That's the one we're going to get too, alright.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> So, we do have a... thank you Commissioner Lauing for bringing up the Yom Kippur is on October 9<sup>th</sup>. I think we need to decide as a group if we're going to hold a meeting. I'm seeing from two people that they would prefer not to hold a meeting on October 9<sup>th</sup>.

Vice-Chair Alcheck: Why don't we do this a little easier? Is any... how many people are not
 intending on attending on a meeting on Yom Kippur and then you can see if you have a
 quorum.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> How many people are not intending to come on the 9<sup>th</sup> of October? Alright, so we have four.

31 Mr. Lait: It's questionable.

33 <u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Four max.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Yeah, I think we'll cancel October 9<sup>th</sup>.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Could we push it so we could be productive? Push it to the next week.

Chair Riggs: I don't know that we have enough... we... ok, so should we do... before I cancel do,
 we have an agenda that we can fill a meeting before you recommend, we just cancel.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

Ms. Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director: I think if you were to cancel it that would be fine. The pending item can be adjusted to a different date. We already confirmed that with the Staff which at the time is not present.

Chair Riggs: Commissioner Templeton.

<u>Commissioner Templeton:</u> I believe October is a month with 5-weeks in there so just letting you know you have the ability to have different timing if you want.

Mr. Lait: I think we're going to be ok. I mean it would be one thing if we had three items on each of our Commission meetings that we needed to navigate that, but the only item that is presently scheduled was a discussion having to do with the intersection of Charleston and San Antonio or something. But that can... another transportation item but I'm not sure if that's an action or an update and it could move to the next meeting.

<u>Commissioner Waldfogel:</u> [unintelligible – off mic]

Mr. Lait: Yes.

Chair Riggs: Is that a part of the Charleston Corridor Plan?

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, I'm just [unintelligible] (interrupted)

Chair Riggs: Yeah you just a messenger. Commissioner Lauing, you still have your light.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> I just wanted to ask in terms of looking at the future agenda at the last meeting you said that you would try to put together one for the whole year.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, thank you. Thanks, Commissioner.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry for cutting you off. We still need to get together and hammer that out but we are optimistic that there's going to be some more meaty items for the Commission to weigh in on and from a policy perspective just a couple of items to put out there. One is the Inclusionary Housing component. We have a draft consultant's report that we're expecting in about 4 to 6-weeks' time. And so, once we get that report our typical process might be to use that report and then frame some kind of an ordinance based on that and other guidance that we have from Council and our own perspective. But one thing that we're thinking about is maybe sharing the

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

report with you before we prepare those recommendations and learn from the Commission your perspective or areas of the report that maybe need to be refined before we come up with an ordinance. So that's one thing that we're looking at. We earlier in the year talked about EV chargers and how they need to address our parking standards so that is one that we want to come back to and address. And there's a conversation that we'd like to have hopefully before the end of the year having to deal with TDRs and how might be able to use them to incentives housing projects.

So those are just a couple things that we're working on and I think there's probably a couple other ones.

Commissioner Lauing: Ok that segues to a related question and it's a transportation question that we've raised but I wanted to get it on the record to find out when and what kind of policies were coming to us? My understanding from the Council, I haven't reread the motion, but they directed that Staff and PTC. And someone has edited out three-quarters of the recommendations and saying that we don't need to comment on those. I'd rather have 35 come to us and have us give an opinion on which ones we'd like to comment on and then have transportation or whoever go ahead make that decision. But to look at nine 6-months or whatever it was after it was recommended, I just don't find that acceptable. And I understand I'm talking to a planning guy now, not a transportation guy but it would apply to any other things that come up that we could be helpful on.

Mr. Lait: Yeah absolutely and I recall that the Council did have the full list but there's only a subset of that list that they had differed to the Planning and Transportation Commission.

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> Yeah, I can't remember the wording. I agree I can't remember the wording.

 Mr. Lait: Yeah so, I just don't know if it was nine or some other number. I imagine if they referred... whatever the number is that they referred to the PTC we're going to come back to the PTC and have that conversation. You know Philips been on the job for 4-days I think so there's been a number of deficiencies in Staff... vacancies, I should not say deficiencies but vacancies in our Staffing. We're getting up to speed and we want to have those conversations with the Commission but we just need a little bit more patience.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> You know (interrupted)

[note- many people started talking at once off mic]

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Yeah but I think in Commissioner Lauing's defense, we're been asking for this all year and we canceled a lot of meetings over the summer. And I have... I really like Ms. Gaines but like we... as Chair I have talked to her numerous times about bringing these priorities to us. So, I candidly agree and I think it's important to put it on the record.

Mr. Lait: Understood.

<u>Commissioner Waldfogel:</u> On a different topic, last year we passed the Housing Incentive Program and I believe that not a whole lot has happened. Although I believe that there's also some impetus to bring... to extend that into a different district which is something that we may see some time in the future. And I just wonder will there be any other thinking or just any other analysis on what's going on with that? What... is there anything else that we need to do relative to that to make that successful?

Mr. Lait: So, the application that you're... the project that you're referring to is actually an application that was filed by a private property owner to redevelop a property on San Antonio. And part of that request was an extension of the HIP, Housing Incentive Program, to that specific property. We had a pre-screening before the City Council where Staff had recommended instead of just focusing on one property that it be extended between; I think it's Charleston and Middlefield. And so ordinarily, again this an opportunity for us to get the Commission's early involvement on this. Ordinarily we would do our analysis, come to you with a recommendation of the... on the project and the ordinance as applicable. What we want to do is come to you with the policy conversation first before we even drafted anything to hear if there's any early feedback about applying those standards to this stretch of properties.

Commissioner Waldfogel: I think that's great. I think that's (interrupted)

Mr. Lait: And that's in the near future.

 <u>Commissioner Waldfogel:</u> I think that's fantastic and I think that if you also have any observations about just how to make the program successful in general. That would be or maybe that's a different... maybe that's a different topic but just we put a lot of work into that last year and if there's tweaks that we need to do, let's tee up that conversation.

Mr. Lait: Ok we'll get some thoughts to that. I think it might be a little bit early for us to have a response to that but you're right. There has not been any activity following the adoption of that. Again, it was April 1<sup>st</sup> so it does take time for private property owners to develop plans and submit them so we may be in that window. In fact, I do know of a couple of properties, one in Downtown and one on El Camino where we've received contact from folks that are interested in exploring that a HIP development.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

<u>Chair Riggs:</u> Ok I have Commissioner Templeton but before I... oh ok, you're good. So, Commissioner Lauing, I just wanted to make sure you were done. [unintelligible] (interrupted)

<u>Commissioner Lauing:</u> I was just going to ask if we could also schedule an ADU update at the appropriate time. Just sometime this year. Statues on ADUs in terms of the numbers and how many are actually starting construction. Sorry? By memo, that's ok.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, we do a report to the Council. I thought I sent an email with a link to it but let me send you what I have again and if there's interest in a study session discussion we can have that.

<u>Chair Riggs: Commissioner Alcheck</u> [note- Vice-Chair].

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> The local press suggested that there had been movement on the promise of housing on the Ventura area. And I'm not to suggest that that's like a credible source for information, but do you as Staff has any sort of idea about if... what... we haven't ever really discussed that area. And I know that there's a community group and I'm just wondering if you could shed some light on what happened at City Council that changed the way the City's looking at it?

Ms. Tanner: Are you referring to the (interrupted)

Vice-Chair Alcheck: The Fry's site.

Ms. Tanner: The Fry's site, yeah. So that last Monday we did take to City Council a report on the

NV Cap in the effort to have a Coordinated Area Plan there. The new information I think is two-fold. One is a little bit not as new which is around the historic nature of the Fry's building, kind of what that might mean for those who want to see if preserved in whole or in part. And then the second piece of information was that we have learned from the representatives of The Sobrato Organization that they are at present at least not interested in demolishing the building. They would like to retain it on-site and we don't have details of would it be the entire thing or the historic portion. There are different phases of that building. They weren't built at all the same time, the building wasn't, and so the question became well with the retention of the building what is possible.... in the NV Cap area what is possible on that site in terms of realizing the City's housing projections? And would we be able to realize the assumed number of units that could be on that site at least as it's currently zoned? So, without trying to predict the future which is dangerous, our position and what we've talked about with the Work Group is that while that... the retention of the building could present some challenge to a scenario where the entire site is housing in the way that people might have envisioned. It doesn't

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

necessarily mean that there can't be housing on that site that is significant or that in the NV Cap are, which does include other parcels that have development capacity, that we couldn't see housing and that we should continue to pursue the development of the Coordinated Area Plan with that in mind. So that we can think about how we might need to leverage the polices to incentives and realize the housing there. Hopefully that answers your question.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah, no, that's a phenomenal answer. A follow-up question is does that... is there any change to the Work Group's... so is that continuing or is that on pause?

Ms. Tanner: Yes, it is continuing. We are hopeful that we'll return to Council in the last meeting in September to bring forward the contract to expand our work... scope of work with Perkins Will who's the consultant who's working with us on the NV Cap proposal. We're hopeful that Council will support that and we'll continue that work. Again, don't want to predict what they will do but they were favorable in moving the motion to bring back that contract to them.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Not that it's not publicly available but would you consider just coping us on when that presentation is created to Council just so that we can (interrupted)

Ms. Tanner: You know that it's happening and what's going forward, yeah.

<u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah, I'd love to read it. It sounds like we're outside of the discussion which is fine but I'd love to see what gets presented to them when you are guys are presenting to them. I'm sure I could have found it but it would be nice to be copied (interrupted)

Ms. Tanner: It's nice to have something in your email box pinging that it's going forward.

27 <u>Vice-Chair Alcheck:</u> Yeah that would be awesome.

29 Ms. Tanner: Yeah, that's great, certainly can do that.

- 31 <u>Chair Riggs:</u> Any other questions, comments? I don't see any. Alright seeing none, yep, I'll do it.
- 32 It is... what time is it? 9:11, there we go. Finito.

### Adjournment

34 9:40pm

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

# Palo Alto Planning & Transportation Commission

Commissioner Biographies, Present and Archived Agendas and Reports are available online: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/boards/ptc/default.asp. The PTC Commission members are:

Vice-Chair Michael Alcheck
Commissioner Ed Lauing
Chair William Riggs
Commissioner Giselle Roohparvar
Commissioner Doria Summa
Commissioner Carolyn Templeton
Commissioner Asher Waldfogel

Get Informed and Be Engaged!

13 V

View online: http://midpenmedia.org/category/government/city-of-palo-alto or on Channel 26.

Show up and speak. Public comment is encouraged. Please complete a speaker request card located on the table at the entrance to the Council Chambers and deliver it to the Commission Secretary prior to discussion of the item.

Write to us. Email the PTC at: <a href="Planning.commission@CityofPaloAlto.org">Planning.commission@CityofPaloAlto.org</a>. Letters can be delivered to the Planning & Community Environment Department, 5<sup>th</sup> floor, City Hall, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301. Comments received by 2:00 PM two Tuesdays preceding the meeting date will be included in the agenda packet. Comments received afterward through 2:00 PM the day of the meeting will be presented to the Commission at the dais.

Material related to an item on this agenda submitted to the PTC after distribution of the agenda packet is available for public inspection at the address above.

## Americans with Disability Act (ADA)

It is the policy of the City of Palo Alto to offer its public programs, services and meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to all. Persons with disabilities who require materials in an appropriate alternative format or who require auxiliary aids to access City meetings, programs, or services may contact the City's ADA Coordinator at (650) 329-2550 (voice) or by emailing <a href="mailto:ada@cityofpaloalto.org">ada@cityofpaloalto.org</a>. Requests for assistance or accommodations must be submitted at least

33 24 hours in advance of the meeting, program, or service.

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>2.</sup> The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.

<sup>3.</sup> The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.