



Planning & Transportation Commission

Action Agenda: June 8, 2022

Virtual Meeting
6:00 PM

Call to Order / Roll Call

Approximately 6:02 pm

Chair Lauing called to order the Planning & Transportation Commission meeting for June 8th, 2022 and requested Roll Call.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant gave roll call and established there is a quorum.

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

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, provided directions on how members of the public can join the hybrid meeting as well as how to provide written and/or spoken public comments and conducted the roll call vote and announce all Commissioners were present.

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved adoption of the resolution.

SECOND

Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

VOTE

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

1
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

Ms. Klicheva conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 7-0.
MOTION PASSED 6(Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Summa, Roohparvar, Templeton) 7-0-0
Commission Action: Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Summa. Passed 7-0

Oral Communications

The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Three (3) minutes per speaker.^{1,2}
Chair Lauing invited members of the public to provide comments on any matters not on the agenda.
Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, reported there were no public speakers.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

The Chair or Commission majority may modify the agenda order to improve meeting management.
Chair Lauing asked if there are any agenda changes, additions or deletions.
Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director, stated there are no proposed changes from Staff.

City Official Reports

1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Jonathan Lait, Director, provided the Director’s Report to the Commission. On Monday City Council made a resolution on the Castilleja project, the second reading of the ordinance with City Council is scheduled for the 20th of June. Staff is working on changes to the record of land-use action at the request of City Council. In addition, City Council approved the Working Plans for the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC), Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the Historic Review Board (HRB). The City Council adopted the Objective Standards Ordinance. They will be adopting the budget for next fiscal year on June 20th, and they will recess beginning the end of June. Director Lait requested PTC members be sure to let staff know of their vacation

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

1 dates when known so staff can track any lack of quorum for future meetings during the
2 summer.

3 Chair Lauing gave a brief summary of his explanation of the Work Plan to City Council. Most of
4 PTC's work is sourced by Law and City Council and explained the new additions to PTC's Work
5 Plan which includes the importance of robust community engagement in a forum, the traffic
6 study sessions for public response on areas of high concern, and how PTC created a structured
7 framework for planning the future of Palo Alto established and new neighborhoods as the
8 Housing Element goes into effect. Chair mentioned to City Council there is a lot of reference to
9 staffing in the work plan and that falls under City Council's control. Chair Lauing was pleased
10 with the feedback and comments from Councilmembers, and they overall were very pleased
11 about how PTC spelled out the importance of PTC for a public forum. Council comments about
12 the traffic study leaned on the side of they wanted to see it get done, not just talked about.
13 Council would like to see PTC do what they can to get the shuttle started and work on the Bike
14 Plan. The Mayor mentioned PTC could look at helping restaurants and parking relative to the
15 adjustment that is taking place with restaurants. Councilmember Filseth urged that the city
16 needs a quantitative analysis on demand for parking.

17 Commissioner Hechtman inquired when the Parcel Map Lot Split with the four cottages will be
18 heard at City Council.

19 Director Lait responded he believed it would be in August.

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

21

22 **Action Items**

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

25 3. 2023-31 Housing Element Goals, Policies and Programs

26

27 Tim Wong, Senior Planner gave a presentation outlining the Housing Element Goals, Policies
28 and Programs for 2023-31. Mr. Wong explained staff has prepared a 2-meeting session for PTC
29 to review, discuss and provide feedback on Housing Element Program requirements so staff can
30 receive PTC direction for the Housing Element draft programs. The hierarchy of the relationship
31 between goals policies and programs is a goal is an end condition statement. The Housing
32 Element requires goals, policies and programs and the policies are some of those position

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

1 statements of how the city will move towards implementing or enacting those goal. The actual
2 implementing items that will be used to achieve that goal are the programs, which go to
3 Housing and Community Development (HCD) review from the state to then be certified. The
4 Housing Element goals are the required program categories that must be touched upon in the
5 Housing Element for preservation of existing housing stock. Affordable housing development
6 provides adequate sites for all types of housing, removal of constraints and/or how to increase
7 housing production, specifically housing for persons with special needs. Fair Housing is a new
8 State requirement. The first goal addresses the category of conservation and preservation of
9 existing housing stock, the second goal assists affordable housing development. The third goal
10 provides adequate sites for a variety of housing types which supports, holistic and strategic
11 Housing Development with a variety of housing prices, types, tenures to meet the diverse
12 needs of all current, and future residents. The comments from the Housing Element Working
13 Group were incorporated into these goals. The fourth goal addresses the removal of constraints
14 for increasing opportunities for housing, this is more to the goal of increasing housing
15 production in the city. The fifth goal matches the fifth category which is housing for persons
16 with special needs which includes seniors, female-headed households, persons with... both
17 intellectual or developmental disabilities, both physical and intellectual, large families. The sixth
18 goal for the city is to proactively affirmatively further fair housing, which is a proactive stance
19 required by the State to promote equal opportunity for all housing types and for all residents.
20 Housing Element programs is an actual government statute which mandates jurisdictions must
21 have programs in their Housing Element to incorporate or implement their stated goals and
22 must include specific actions needed to implement the goals, policies and objectives listed in
23 the Housing Element and each program must have a definitive time frame. All of our programs
24 must meet legislation, but also considers community input and feedback. Some of the programs
25 that will be discussed in this meeting are not complete with data, the document is a work in
26 progress, however staff is looking for PTC feedback for what staff has proposed up to this point.
27 While reviewing Attachment A, there are programs that identify adequate sites when
28 appropriate, with appropriate zoning that directly addresses a State requirement that we have
29 to have adequate sites to meet our RHNA for all income levels, under that specific State
30 requirement, staff included all those proposed programs which touch on that particular
31 requirement. The program number, language, implementing criteria in there, the time frame,
32 who's going to do the rezoning for adequate sites, and the funding source is listed below. The
33 target population and the implementing objective, rezone information to be able to provide
34 adequate sites to meet the City's to meet the City's RHNA and a reference to show what this
35 program is addressing is included.

36 Chair Lauing explained the format for reviewing the information would start with Commission
37 questions for staff, public comments, and a report from the ad-hoc committee. From that point
38 the Commission will decide what is reviewed and discussed at this meeting versus the 2nd
39 meeting and then shift into discussing the objectives and programs.

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

1 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if the special needs category was defined by the City or State.

2 Mr. Wong answered the State. Each city can define beyond the state requirements but the core
3 category and requirements for the Special Needs category is State defined.

4 Commissioner Hechtman asked Mr. Wong to explain the penalty for not meeting the May 2023
5 deadline for HCD certification of the Housing Element, and inquired if Palo Alto is conferring
6 with other Cities in the area.

7 Mr. Wong explained the city could not apply for any state housing funds, not having a certified
8 Housing Element could leave the City open to potential lawsuits by the HCD, some low-income
9 housing groups, or the community at large. Additionally, the Housing Element is one of the
10 mandated parts of the Comp Plan so it could potentially invalidate the Comprehensive Plan
11 also. Jurisdictions in Santa Clara County meet on a regular basis to discuss Housing Element
12 strategy and staff are reviewing certified Housing Elements from Southern California,
13 understanding that those programs have been approved by the State and could potentially be
14 appropriate for Palo Alto.

15
16 Vice-Chair Summa asked the reason for the 90-day and the 60-day review, does anything
17 change between the 90-day review period and the HCD comments.

18
19 Mr. Wong explained the 90 and the 60 days are our statutory, and HCD has two review periods
20 as part of the entire Housing Element update. The 90-day is their initial review and will provide
21 a number of comments, typically on the Housing Element. The 60-day review is to make sure
22 the jurisdiction has addressed those comments provided during the 90-day, and any other
23 programs or discussions the City has with the State during that time to make sure those are
24 addressed during that 60-day review.

25
26 Chair Lauing stated there were no other Commission comments and moved on to public
27 comments.

28
29 Steve, resident, thanked staff and the Commission for their work on the Bay Shore project and
30 suggested staff begin conversations with Stanford for potential lots for the site inventory and
31 parking lots should be used for mixed use and not just affordable housing. Some of the projects
32 being heavily debated due to height requirements need to be considered due to the amount of
33 RHNA expectations have tripled and thus far the site inventory didn't fulfill the fifth cycle, let
34 alone the new requirements as set by the State.

35
36 Gene Snyder, a Stanford University representative, requested the City adopt a more holistic
37 planning approach to the current housing sites proposed in the Stanford Research Park and
38 pause on stipulating very specific design standards and inclusionary housing levels until

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

1 feasibility studies can be completed. Stanford appreciated City staff consolidating the Stanford
2 housing sites in one aggregated program which made it easier to see all of those perspective
3 sites in one place. They request that in lieu of individualized, parcel by parcel development
4 standards, that the City staff consider an overlay with consistent parameters that can
5 collaborate on introducing housing in the research park in a much more holistic and connected
6 way. Stanford's interest is ensuring housing is not just planned, but built and realized, and
7 concerned about prematurely stipulating specific design requirements at this stage of the
8 Housing Element that unwittingly render housing unfeasible to build at the numbers that are
9 identified for these sites. Another area of concern is with the inclusionary housing percentages
10 stipulated for the Stanford sites. Prescribing affordability percentages now seems premature
11 when the City has identified a Housing Element program to study feasible, inclusionary housing
12 percentages for rental communities. A request was made to delay stipulating an inclusionary
13 housing on any Housing Element sites, including Stanford's, until after the city completes its
14 planned feasibility analysis and adopts a citywide inclusionary ordinance for rental housing.

15
16 Hamilton Hitchings, member of the Housing Element Working Group, recommended develop
17 affordable housing over the transit center, and public parking lots to address below market
18 shortfalls and tie more up-zoning and developer bonuses to affordable housing. In addition,
19 properties on 300 and 3128 El Camino should require a higher percentage of affordable housing
20 in exchange for the 75-foot height limit. For housing above City-owned parking lots, the City
21 should require 75% of those units to be affordable with a focus on very low- and low-income
22 categories. Because the city is providing the land and should do so in conjunction with State
23 grants, this is one of the few opportunities to provide very heavily subsidized housing, since
24 land is so expensive in the City of Palo Alto. Mr. Hitchings also recommended only exempting
25 development impact fees for BMR housing that is 80% of AMI and below. Due to time
26 constraints, some of the programs in the Housing Element packet were never shown or
27 discussed with an HEWG. This included the renaming of the R-1 designation to something more
28 permissive, increasing the height by an unspecified amount for mixed-use projects, and the
29 housing, the HIP removal of transition heights and removal of retail requirements for HIP. City
30 Mayor Pat Burke said he is concerned Stanford is getting off easy. Even proposed renegotiating
31 the development agreement that allows Stanford to build more office building in SRP. Instead,
32 it was suggested Palo Alto put some teeth into the program to guarantee Stanford commit to
33 build its fair share of housing for the next RHNA cycle on Stanford lands under CERT City
34 jurisdiction.

35
36 Chair Lauing closed public comments and requested a report out from the ad-hoc committee.

37
38 Commissioner Reckdahl stated the ad-hoc just scratched the surface and have had some good
39 discussions. They've learned a lot but haven't got any specifics about sites or programs and
40 there's a significant amount of additional material that they need to cover.

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

1
2 Commissioner Chang commented the ad-hoc met twice, the first time was much more of a
3 process overview and the second time they began the review of programs through 2.2. The
4 Meeting Packet seen here is a little different from what the ad-hoc was shown and, there's
5 been additional work by staff that has been put in to the 1.X programs. The ad-hoc did not go
6 through the goals and policies in great detail and focused most of their time and effort on the
7 program specifically because that's likely where HCD is going to be having the most scrutiny.

8
9 Director Lait commented in the pre-meeting they reviewed through program 3 and staff has
10 made revisions since the ad-hoc meeting to include incorporating the ad-hoc comments
11 through program 1.6.

12
13 Commissioner Hechtman provided comments on typo and format changes of the document
14 and stated the way Staff tied in the information together in the slide presentation would be
15 helpful in the document, make it more linear with the information from the policies, goals and
16 objectives listed as they pertain to each other.

17
18 Commissioner Chang stated she doesn't believe it's linear because some of the programs cross
19 over into multiple goals and objectives.

20
21 Vice-Chair Summa stated she agreed with Commissioner Hechtman suggestion because it is
22 consistent with the way the Comprehensive Plan reads.

23
24 Director Lait stated the headings for the programs we done to be consistent with the State
25 requirements to make it easier for HCD to go down the list for compliance compatibility during
26 their review.

27
28 Commissioner Hechtman suggested if the headings can't be added, possibly renumber the
29 programs to make it easier for HCD for cross-referencing the goals and policies.

30
31 Director Lait agreed, and commented staff will incorporate the renumbering for cross-
32 referencing.

33
34 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired how Palo Alto balances giving firm commitments to the State
35 with actually being responsible and doing due diligence in investigating potential issues with
36 some of the programs.

37
38 Director Lait replied there are areas that will need feasibility studies in order to get all the
39 information needed to move forward with a program.

40

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

1 Mr. Wong stated they can craft the language and programs to study and explore options when
2 it comes to development standards, continue with the feasibility study, yet explore and develop
3 options to bring back to PTC and Council for consideration.
4
5 Commissioner Chang began a discussion of Commissioner Hechtman’s suggestion of using “in-
6 kind” and “compact infill” and the liabilities with being that specific.
7
8 Albert Yang, City Attorney, suggested the use of compact without infill development would
9 likely be efficient.
10
11 Commissioner Hechtman agreed the use of “in-kind” could possibly be misinterpreted and
12 suggested staff consider other ways of making that clearer without using “in-kind”.
13
14 Vice-Chair Summa commented there is a lot of crossovers in the first three goals. They state a
15 lot of the same things and it's good because staff is trying to cover lower-income housing,
16 however, the program suffers from redundancy as well.
17
18 Commissioner Chang and Commissioner Reckdahl both stated program 1.1 was not
19 particularly controversial.
20
21 Commissioner Reckdahl requested Director Lait explain the State penalties for not meeting
22 below market rates.
23
24 Director Lait explained that applies to State Bill 35 and there are penalties for missing your
25 affordable targets and we are subject to that today because the RHNA expectations are so high.
26 If Palo Alto doesn’t meet their target rates, the City will be in jeopardy of losing density bonus
27 inclusions which would ensure the City doesn’t meet their RHNA requirements. Staff has
28 worked into the inventory site a higher percentage required as a buffer in case a project that is
29 expected for example for lower-income housing falls through, which is brought up in Program
30 1.2 for no net loss. Program 1.2 deals with the City planning for more RHNA than was assigned.
31 This is the 10% increase beyond the regional housing needs. If a housing opportunity site gets
32 developed with something other than housing or with few housing units, over time, over the
33 planning horizon of the eight years, staff would make sure Palo Alto has a surplus planned for
34 that, so the City doesn’t fall below what is expected for RHNA.
35
36 Commissioner Chang explained Program 1.3 is modifying the code to be consistent with State
37 Law.
38
39 Mr. Wong added there are 16 carryover sites so the By Right provision will apply to 16 sites on
40 the housing inventory.

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

1
2 Chair Lauing commented he didn't believe the Housing Element Working Group (HEWG) or City
3 Council discussed transitional on parking lots.
4
5 Director Lait agreed and replied staff will revisit that and make the necessary corrections.
6
7 Vice-Chair Summa commented it would be more appropriate to use public property for lower
8 income housing.
9
10 Director Lait added The reason you might want to include private enterprise in that
11 development is so that you can actually build more structured parking to support downtown
12 too.
13
14 Commissioner Reckdahl commented using public property for 100% affordable could be
15 construed as segregational.
16
17 Commissioner Templeton commented that if it were written into the program that the City
18 retains the right to the property, they could develop the land how they would like.
19
20 Director Lait stated that Program 1.5 pertains to developing housing on church parking lots,
21 however the problem with that is there hasn't been any resolution on how to replace the
22 parking spaces for the churches.
23
24 Commissioner Hechtman suggested sweetening the deal for developers that if they were to
25 retain the parking spaces they would get more bonuses from the City than what the State
26 requires.
27
28 Commissioner Chang and Commissioner Templeton provided ad-hoc comments regarding
29 Program 1.6. There was substantial discussion however, nothing was resolved. Commissioner
30 Chang pointed out differences in numbers and requested explanation from staff.
31
32 Director Lait explained staff did make some changes, on Item A there seems to be support
33 conceptionally for that, which is 3000 El Camino Real, this is Palo Alto Square, this is not a
34 housing opportunity site. With respect to B) and C) and the 20%, 20% is a big change from 15%,
35 and a significant impact... it doesn't preclude that from being something that staff implements
36 as zoning is changed. The inclusionary standard may be 20%, but even at 15% Palo Alto is still
37 yielding a fair number of units. For item C), the McDonald's site, staff did have 20% on that one
38 originally because it was modeled in part after a planned home zoning application that was filed
39 next door at the fish market and that application came in at about 50 or 55 feet, and
40 approximately 130 units, and that one would have necessarily needed to meet the 20%

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

1 inclusionary requirement to qualify for a PHC and so in the first draft presented to the ad-hoc,
2 staff include that 20%, however after the conversation with the ad-hoc, they weren't confident.
3 That's not the case for letter D) where staff does have the 20% and that's because Item D does
4 reflect the planned home zoning application that was filed with the City and reviewed. After
5 having conversations with that lease holder, that project is still one that still has some potential,
6 but they are pursuing their office project at this time. The two projects are not exclusive of each
7 other. There was a change from what the working group had seen and what the ad-hoc had
8 seen which mostly reflects staff's attempt to balance the issues that they are trying to balance.

9
10 Vice-Chair Summa commented it is difficult to differentiate between the requirements because
11 the descriptors are not consistent as they relate to height, densities and Floor Area (FAR) and
12 this section should be rewritten to be clearer.

13
14 Commissioner Hechtman suggested keeping B, C and D and adding an item F which recognizes
15 the potential to be more flexible with zoning parameters.

16
17 Chair Lauing agreed with Commissioner Hechtman and commented he felt the discussion was
18 moving in a specific design direction which is was not the goal of the this review.

19
20 Director Lait stated the percentages used were based on the projects that are currently being
21 built and a feasibility study would definitely be necessary for property that has not yet been
22 considered for zoning changed for residential use.

23
24 Mr. Wong explained Program 2.1 is about affordable housing program, as opposed to the BMR
25 program, which is where the City collects fees for the housing trust fund to fund to provide
26 financial assistance to 100% affordable housing projects.

27
28 Chair Lauing inquired if this was for 100% affordable housing.

29
30 Director Lait stated it does not have to be.

31
32 Mr. Wong commented it should be 100% affordable. It's very difficult to fund a project that
33 could be 75%, or primarily affordable housing, staff had some of those discussions with the
34 Working Group, and yes, it's 100% and he can clarify that.

35
36 Commissioner Roohparvar commented this program could use more specificity regarding the
37 source funding and the Gap funding of 100% affordability.

38
39 Commissioner Reckdahl asked if staff could clarify where the funding comes from.

40

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

1 Mr. Wong commented no, with any commercial development, any net new commercial square
2 footage gets charged a commercial housing impact fee and the City takes those funds to
3 provide the gap financing, in addition currently, yes Palo Alto has a 15% inclusionary but that's
4 only for ownership developments right now, if you propose a multifamily rental development,
5 you also pay a fee.

6
7 Chair Lauing questioned the clarity of item B under 2.2 and suggested whether that's by
8 geographical area in town or by neighborhood, staff should be clearer to show what they mean.

9
10 Mr. Wong advised Program 3.1 speaks about fee waivers and adjustments, and staff are looking
11 at in support of affordable housing to waive certain fees for those directly related consultants
12 trying to reduce some of those carrying costs or construction costs, development costs for
13 affordable housing for implementing Objective A and to encourage ADU production to exempt
14 ADU's from development impact fees if they have an affordable period for low income.

15
16 Commissioner Roohparvar commented State Law exempted all ADUs from development
17 impact fees, and questioned in what scenario would State Law not apply to the ADU.

18
19 Director Lait replied not all ADU's were exempted from development impact fees, I think
20 there's a square foot threshold.

21
22 Mr. Wong added only ADU's that are only 750 square feet or below that are exempted from
23 impact fees.

24
25 Commissioner Chang expressed concern of funding sources and adding a sentence to
26 incorporate making up for lost revenue.

27
28 Vice-Chair Summa would like to see more clarity surrounding the 10-year limit for 80% AMI.

29
30 Commissioner Reckdahl is concerned that concerned that 10 years for the City looking for
31 affordable housing is really short. And possibly consider an exit fee.

32
33 Mr. Wong commented staff could look into that and possibly make that a requirement in the
34 deed restriction that it would need to be occupied. The City could guarantee that residence is a
35 low income and that it's being rented at a 80% AMI rent level, those type of things.

36
37 Commissioner Chang reminded the Commission that prior conversation regarding who would
38 manage the ADU's was a bit of a sticky conversation and suggest a feasibility study be done.

39

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

1 Mr. Wong explained Program 3.2 pledges to HCD that Palo Alto will look at their development
2 standards on a consistent basis to see how those new standards are working and adjust
3 accordingly if that development standard doesn't produce the desired result.

4

5 Director Lait explained Program 3.3 the city has already met items A, B and C and D fine tunes
6 the requirements for A, B and C.

7

8 Programs 3.4 and 3.5 were skipped due to lack of data acquired.

9

10 Commissioner Hechtman requested clarity be provided under Program 3.4 on Packet page 32,
11 objective E.

12

13 Mr. Wong explained Program 3.6 looks at limiting certain number of Public Hearings, also
14 looking at what potential permit applications can be done at the administrative level, and in
15 addition to formalize a procedure to provide some free technical services prior to submittal of
16 the application. Director Lait answered questions about the current processes and how this
17 changes those processes.

18

19 Mr. Wong explained 4.1 just requires replacement of low-income units and also add
20 commercial development would have to replace housing in expansion of the SB330
21 requirements. Currently SB330 does not require replacing those units for commercial, future
22 commercial development.

23

24 Program 4.2 provides renters with more information that empowers them to take actions
25 against landlords who do not keep the building up to code.

26

27 In response to Commissioner Chang's question about Program 4.3, Mr. Wong explained the City
28 only dedicate CDBG funds to the City's rehab program, but this is something that staff could
29 supplement with, for example, the State has come out with a few additional sources through
30 the parcel tax programs.

31

32 Commissioner Chang requested the language be more concise regarding State Grants.

33

34 Director Lait explained Program 4.4 is a broader program requiring seismic upgrades of
35 vulnerable housing stock and staff has a budget request in this budget cycle for funding for that
36 program. If this is something that is supported by the City Council later this month, staff might
37 be able to advance starting next year.

38

39 Commissioner Hechtman requested the ad-hoc go through Program 6.10 regarding rent
40 stabilizations because that is something he will want to discuss at the meeting on the 29th.

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Approval of Minutes

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

6. March 9, 2022 Draft Summary Meeting Minutes

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the March 9, 2022 draft summary minutes as revised.

SECOND

Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

VOTE

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

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

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

7. March 30, 2022 Draft Verbatim Meeting Minutes

MOTION

Commissioner Hechtman moved approval of the March 30, 2022 draft verbatim meeting minutes as revised.

SECOND

Commissioner Chang seconded.

VOTE

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

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

1 MOTION PASSED 5 (Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Reckdahl, Templeton) – 1 - 1 (Roohparvar
2 Absent/Summa Abstained)

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

4 8. May 11, 2022 Draft Verbatim and Summary Meeting Minutes

5 MOTION

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

8 SECOND

9 Vice-Chair Summa seconded.

10 VOTE

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

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

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

17 **Committee Items**

18 None.

19 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

20 Chair Lauing announced there is only one meeting in July on the 13th and the ADU Ordinance
21 revisions will likely take place in August, if it still happens.

22 Chair Lauing adjourned the meeting.

23 **Adjournment**

24 10:13 pm

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