



Planning & Transportation Commission

Action Agenda: June 28, 2023

Council Chambers & Virtual
6:00 PM

6 Call to Order / Roll Call

7 6:01 pm

8 Chair Summa called the meeting to order.

9 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, conducted the roll and announced all
10 Commissioners were present with the exception of Vice-Chair Chang and Commissioner
11 Reckdahl.

12 Oral Communications

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

14 Chair Summa invited members of the public to provide any comments to the Commission that
15 pertained to items not on the Agenda.

16 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, reported there were no public speakers for oral
17 communications.

18 Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

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

20 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, announced there were not changes from Staff.

21 City Official Reports

22 2. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

23 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, reported in the upcoming July meetings, PTC would be
24 reviewing a project at 3200 Park Boulevard, several items related to legislative modifications to
25 the Municipal Code and the Noise Ordinance regarding electrification equipment. PTC had
26 discussed canceling the August 9, 2023 meeting to allow for a summer break. There were no
27 City Council items for July due to their summer break. Before their summer break, Council
28 approved several planning items via the Consent Calendar.

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

1 Chair Summa inquired if the Office of Transportation Staff had a report.

2 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, replied there was no transportation Staff present.

3 **Action Items**

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

6 2. 2901 Middlefield Road and 702 Ellsworth Place: Request for Rezoning to Amend
7 Planned Community 2343 (PC 2343) and to apply the R-1 Zoning to 702 Ellsworth
8 Place to Enable the Development of a Single-Story, Single-Family Residence

9 Chair Summa requested that the Commissioners share disclosures they had.

10 Commissioner Hechtman shared he had a conversation with the applicant's attorney and
11 discussed the content of the attorney's June 8, 2023 letter and associated plan set.

12 Commissioner Lu announced he had an email exchange with the applicant's architect to discuss
13 having a meeting but that meeting was never scheduled.

14 Commissioner Akin shared he had an email exchange with the applicant, Richard Dewey, but
15 determined it was best practice not to hold an in-person meeting.

16 Chair Summa reported she declined an invitation to meet with the applicant's attorney, but did
17 do several site visits where she met a resident. The resident showed her San Carlos Street,
18 which is a private street, and pointed out how differently that street was signed compared to
19 Ellsworth Place. The resident also shared she was not made aware when her family purchased
20 the home, that Ellsworth Place is a private street. Chair Summa observed that Ellsworth Place
21 had regular City Street signs, not the private street signs visible at San Carlos Street. Also, Mr.
22 Dewey invited her to do a site visit of his property but no meeting was scheduled. She did not
23 hold any discussions with members of the community who had raised the matter with her.

24 Commissioner Templeton shared she had no disclosures.

25 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, introduced Garrett Sauls who was helping with the
26 project. She reported that the project went before the City Council for a pre-screening on
27 March 13, 2023. There would be no Architectural Review (AR) of the project because the
28 project was not a new development and was a single-family, one-story home. The parcel
29 located at 702 Ellsworth included an easement that required 2,000-square feet (sf) to be
30 subtracted for the easement to determine Gross Floor Area (GFA). Staff was seeking a
31 recommendation from the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) to City Council on
32 the project. The rezone request was to remove 702 Ellsworth Place, Mr. Handa's property, from

-
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 the three parcels of Residential Planned Community (PC) 2343, Mr. Dewey's property, and
2 rezone 702 Ellsworth to R-1. 702 Ellsworth then would be bordered by Middlefield at the front,
3 706 Ellsworth Place at the rear, Matadero Creek on one side and 2901-2905 Middlefield on the
4 other side. The City's Comprehensive Plan indicated that 702 Ellsworth Place was zoned R-1 and
5 the other three parcels were zoned multi-family. At one point in history, a one-story home was
6 located at 702 Ellsworth Place and then later the apartment building on Mr. Dewey's property
7 was constructed. City records showed the lot width of 55-feet which included the 20-foot wide
8 street and a lot of depth of 100-feet, but Santa Clara County records indicated the lot was
9 4,447-sf. Based on City records and existing conditions, a multi-family dwelling was located on
10 PC 2343 and guest parking for that development was located on 702 Ellsworth Place. The
11 proposal was to remove the guest parking on 702 Ellsworth Place and reconfigure the parking
12 on PC 2343 to include two tandem parking spaces to accommodate four cars and a separate
13 delivery parking space. Garbage and recycling pickup for PC 2343 was to be moved to Sutter
14 Avenue. A zoning comparison table was included in the Packet that showed the original PC
15 2343, the proposed amended PC 2343 and the proposed one-story home.

16 Mr. Garrett Sauls, Planner, mentioned in 2018 a tree was removed from 702 Ellsworth Place. At
17 the time of that removal, the applicant discussed the removal with the City's Urban Forester
18 who approved the removal without an AR process. To rectify that error, the applicant proposed
19 to plant six additional trees. Per the City's current Code, the amount of trees needed to be
20 planted to replace the canopy of the tree removed was four and the applicant was proposing
21 two trees beyond the replacement requirement. All six trees were proposed to be native trees.
22 The applicant, Mr. Handa, submitted plans to the City for the one-story home his family wished
23 to build at 702 Ellsworth Place. The applicant proposed to have a wider driveway along
24 Ellsworth Place to create a visual space of 30-feet with the additional wider driveway and
25 private street easement. Mr. Handa proposed to have a 3-foot high fence along Middlefield
26 Road to retain the City's required visibility triangle. The proposal also included pavers long the
27 frontage between the home and Ellsworth Place as well as pavers along Mr. Dewey's property.
28 Staff requested feedback on whether the pavers would be adequate for folks in terms of
29 drivability and visibility.

30 Ms. French shared the majority of the existing lots on Ellsworth Place were considered
31 substandard lots. Even though the Ellsworth Place Street easement reduced the GFA, the 702
32 Ellsworth Place parcel was not considered substandard because the width of the lot did not
33 subtract the private street easement. She mentioned a Class 2 bicycle lane was planned from
34 Moreno Avenue to Loma Verde Avenue and that raised safety concerns for Middlefield Road
35 and the entrance to Ellsworth Place. The City owned a utility easement within the private street
36 easement for maintenance of the sewer drains.

37 Chair Summa invited the applicant to share their presentation.

-
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. Ken Hayes, applicant’s architect, summarized the purpose of the hearing was to amend an
2 uncodified, unrecorded PC Ordinance that involved two parcels of land, rectify a Zoning Map
3 upon which two property owners relied upon for a real estate transaction, create an
4 opportunity for a new single-family home, consolidate apartment parking onto one parcel,
5 modify ingress and egress access to the other properties on Ellsworth Place, increase
6 pedestrian and bicycle safety for Ellsworth Place and provide delivery truck parking. RLD Land
7 bought parcels PC 2343 in 2017 and the Zoning Map showed one parcel as Multi-family
8 Residential (RM)-15 and the other as Single-Family Residential (R-1). In 2019, the RM-15 was
9 changed to RM-20 but the other parcel remained R-1. In 2022, RDL Land sold 702 Ellsworth to
10 Mr. Handa with the impression that he could build a 1,695-square foot single-family home.
11 When Mr. Handa submitted plans to the City for a Building Permit, he was informed by the City
12 that the zone was not zoned R-1 and could not be built on. He shared photos of the existing
13 conditions on 702 Ellsworth and Mr. Dewey’s apartment building. With respect to parking for
14 Mr. Dewey’s apartment building, the Code required 16 spaces with 12 of them covered. Those
15 would be retained and four spaces would be incorporated via tandem parking in the side and
16 rear yard of the property. That configuration eliminated five cars from parking on Ellsworth
17 Place and increased safety. Mr. Dewey had also included a temporary parking space on his
18 property for delivery vehicles. Mr. Handa was also allowing a 4-foot strip across the street to
19 create a total of 42-feet for delivery trucks. Mr. Dewey also proposed to dedicate a 2 ½-foot
20 strip of land near the driveway apron to be paved to match Mr. Handa’s 1 ½-foot strip of paved
21 land to allow for a 24-foot drive entrance to Ellsworth Place. To retain the required sight
22 distance triangle coming out of Ellsworth Place onto Middlefield Road, Mr. Handa’s proposed a
23 3-foot high fence which included horizontal slots to allow for visibility through the fence and
24 low bushes. With the requested zoning change and proposed improvements, many safety
25 benefits would be granted to the residents of Ellsworth Place.

26 Mr. Nitin Handa, an applicant, shared he purchased the lot in November of 2022 intending to
27 build a home before his son’s first year of high school in the fall of 2023. His home plans were
28 submitted to the City in January of 2023 to have the home completed by the fall of 2023.
29 Before he purchased the lot from Mr. Dewey, multiple meetings with the City confirmed the lot
30 was zoned R-1 and a single-family home could be built. During the pre-screening meeting with
31 City Council, the Director of Planning and Development Services admitted that there was no
32 way Mr. Handa could have discovered the lot was not R-1 because all the documents that were
33 checked indicated it was an R-1 lot. He explained he held multiple conversations with the
34 neighbors and agreed to amend the plans to accommodate some of their concerns. The first
35 was to add 4-feet of pavers to the front of the home to allow more vehicular movability. The
36 second was to widen the driveway, the third was to cut the bushes along Middlefield Road and
37 Ellsworth to allow increased visibility and build a 3-foot tall fence. Also, to eliminate the
38 basement and give the right to access to the City for the 24-foot private street easement that
39 was located on the property. Due to safety concerns raised by the neighbors regarding
40 transportation, he hired Hexagon Transportation to do an analysis and their analysis showed

-
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 that the existing street was safe. The City also did a peer review of that analysis and confirmed
2 its conclusions were correct. Even with the analysis, he agreed to have horizontal gaps between
3 the fence planks to increase visibility and to widen Ellsworth Place with pavers to increase
4 vehicular movability.

5 Chair Summa invited Commissioners to ask clarifying questions of Staff.

6 Commissioner Hechtman inquired if the distribution of the 20 parking spaces per the PC was as
7 stated in the Staff Report.

8 Ms. French confirmed that was correct.

9 Commissioner Hechtman stated based on the drawing, there were 18-inch pavers in the first
10 35-feet, a gap in the pavers and then pavers that connected the front entry walkway to the
11 driveway. In a different rendition, there was no gap and he requested that be clarified by Staff.

12 Ms. French confessed the drawing shown in the Staff report was a representation of what the
13 applicant had verbally described.

14 Mr. Handa confirmed there would be no gap between the pavers and they would be a
15 continuous strip.

16 Mr. Hayes confirmed the 18-inch pavers were proposed for the first 35-feet from the curb and
17 Mr. Handa just confirmed that would be extended to his entry walk.

18 Commissioner Akin asked if a two-story was allowed on the Ellsworth parcel.

19 Ms. French restated single-family homes are not permitted in the PC Zone. If the parcel were
20 rezoned to R-1, the applicant could apply for a two-story home.

21 Commissioner Akin inquired if it was possible to move a detached garage to the front and if so,
22 would that structure be subject to the 24-foot special setback.

23 Ms. French answered structures are not allowed in the 24-foot setback except for a low fence.

24 Commissioner Akin wanted to know more details about the objections to the basement.

25 Mr. Handa explained during a discussion with the neighbors, they suggested not to include a
26 basement due to the soil and other conditions. Based on that discussion, his family decided not
27 to include a basement.

28 Commissioner Akin mentioned the parcel was located outside of the 100-year floor plane.

-
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. Handa noted a basement was allowed per the City's Municipal Code.

2 Commissioner Akin confirmed it may be feasible to build a basement. He noticed the new
3 tandem parking spaces, 15 and 16, blocked the passageway from Sutter Avenue to Ellsworth
4 Place. He asked if that was acceptable to the residents.

5 Mr. Hayes clarified the spaces did not block the access from Sutter Avenue.

6 Commissioner Akin explained in current conditions, it was possible to drive from Sutter Avenue
7 to Ellsworth Place but with the new parking spaces that passage would be blocked.

8 Mr. Hayes stated Mr. Dewey did not want vehicles traveling across the site. The trash and
9 recycling use to block that passage but that had been relocated to Sutter Avenue.

10 Commissioner Akin requested Staff or the applicant to explain the path of travel for a delivery
11 vehicle and the new parking space.

12 Mr. Gary Black, Hexagon Transportation, explained trucks may park 90 degrees to the new
13 delivery space. With the new proposal, the combined width would be 42-feet to allow trucks to
14 maneuver around. Also, trucks could park in the space and use Mr. Handa's driveway to turn
15 around.

16 Commissioner Akin stated during his site visit, he predicted delivery trucks would turn around
17 in Mr. Handa's driveway. He expressed his appreciation that the analysis did consider the trucks
18 parking horizontally as well as vertically.

19 Mr. Black noted it would not be desirable if the truck parked horizontally for a long period
20 because that would block a portion of the street.

21 Chair Summa understood the new delivery space would block the four required covered
22 parking spaces and asked if that was legal.

23 Ms. French commented a PC Zone allowed for other parking configurations to be considered
24 and it was not illegal to offer a temporary delivery space.

25 Chair Summa recalled the Municipal Code required tandem spots to be used by the same unit
26 for vehicle coordination.

27 Ms. French explained an apartment is required to have one covered, one uncovered parking
28 space and those could be in tandem arrangement. Delivery spaces were not required for
29 apartment buildings.

30 Chair Summa asked if the tandem space is required to be used by the same unit.

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

1 Ms. French could not recall if it was stated in the Code that way.

2 Chair Summa understood it was not a requirement of the Municipal Code that tandem spaces
3 be used by the same unit.

4 Mr. Sauls stated he would check the Zoning Code quickly to confirm.

5 Chair Summa said with respect to 2901 Middlefield Road, there are special requirements for PC
6 Zones and they were listed in 18.38.150 (a) through (e). She asked if the zoning were modified
7 again, would 2901 Middlefield Road be required to comply with those special requirements
8 and/or the special setback along Middlefield Road?

9 Mr. Sauls noted that special setbacks are specific about having structures in the setback. With
10 respect to the tandem parking spaces, the Zoning Code required tandem parking to be used by
11 the same residential unit in multi-family.

12 Chair Summa asked if one of the larger units would be allowed two parking spaces.

13 Mr. Sauls clarified whichever unit was assigned to the tandem spaces.

14 Chair Summa inquired if one unit received two spaces, and was the totality of the site correctly
15 parked.

16 Mr. Sauls confirmed that was correct.

17 Chair Summa wanted to understand if the parking spaces on 702 Ellsworth Place were being
18 used.

19 Mr. Sauls answered the City did not manage those spaces.

20 Mr. Hayes noted per the manager of the apartment building there was no demand for the guest
21 parking. The guests had been parking on Sutter Avenue.

22 Chair Summa shared that in one of the public's letters, it was mentioned the parking was used
23 frequently and full overnight. She expressed concern about who was using the parking and for
24 how long. She found it difficult to understand why 702 Ellsworth was labeled as a corner lot
25 when it abutted 2901 Middlefield Road.

26 Ms. French explained Staff considered the lot to be an interior lot because it did not abut the
27 street, it included the street and functionally was a corner lot.

28 Mr. Albert Yang, City Attorney, stated it was a corner lot because a corner lot was defined as a
29 lot at the intersection of two streets and that included a private street.

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

1 Ms. French added the property lines did not coincide with the boundary of the street on one
2 side, it was on the other side.

3 Chair Summa requested that someone explain where the proposed fence was to be located.

4 Mr. Sauls mentioned the City rule for the sight distance triangle was any fence within the
5 triangle could not exceed 3-feet in height.

6 Chair Summa re-asked where the fence started on Ellsworth Place and where it ended on
7 Middlefield Road.

8 Ms. French showed a diagram that highlighted where the fence was to be located in yellow. The
9 fence was to be behind the paved area on the front of the house.

10 Chair Summa mentioned the fence color in the key was a rusty brown/orange color and the
11 diagram had the fence in yellow. She shared she recently drove in and out of Ellsworth Place
12 and agreed it was hard to see coming out of Ellsworth Place. She inquired if the fence impacted
13 the sight triangle because of the slope of Ellsworth Place and the curve in the road.

14 Mr. Sauls understood having a low fence along the street did not impact the sight line triangle.

15 Chair Summa asked if the Council approved the project, what control did the City have on what
16 the applicant, or any future owners, could build on the site if the parcel were changed to R-1.

17 Ms. French mentioned if it were changed to R-1, a single-family home submission was a
18 ministerial process. However, there could be agreements on specific conditions that had to
19 remain such as fence height, etc.

20 Chair Summa understood the City would lose control of being able to craft any development if
21 it became R-1. She invited Commissioners to ask any remaining clarifying questions they had;
22 seeing none she opened public comment.

23 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, announced there were six speakers and two
24 groups.

25 Ms. Gala Beykin mentioned currently cars could not go out of Ellsworth Place and enter
26 Ellsworth Place from Middlefield Road at the same time. Car on Ellsworth Place was required to
27 back up to allow for the car coming off of Middlefield Road to enter and the parking area on
28 702 Ellsworth allowed that circulation. She asked whether the sight triangles took into account
29 the speeds driven on Middlefield Road because high speeds required larger triangles. She
30 agreed it was difficult exiting Ellsworth Place and often had to drive onto the sidewalk to see,
31 which posed a safety risk for pedestrians and bicyclists. With respect to the trees that were

-
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 removed in 2017, tree number five was a protected Valley Oak tree and no removal permits
2 were provided to the neighbors. Based on a report conducted by Canopy, the Valley Oak had a
3 diameter of a tree at a standard height (DSH) of 17 which marked the tree as protected per the
4 City's Municipal Code. This was confirmed by another analysis conducted by the previous
5 apartment owner. No notice was placed on the tree that informed residents that it was being
6 removed. Also, when the apartments were built, a landscape plan was approved which required
7 the plants to be permanently maintained and replaced as necessary. That landscape plan and
8 commitment had been violated. All the information was sent to the City and was received by
9 Planning Director Lait.

10 Mr. Jeff Levinsky spoke on behalf of Andie Reed, Kanaka Juvva, Pamela Van Fleet and Caroline
11 Garbarino. With respect to the designation of a corner lot, the Code indicates that a corner lot
12 must have two abutting streets, but Ellsworth Place was within the 702 Ellsworth parcel.
13 Therefore, the parcel did not abut Ellsworth Place and 702 Ellsworth place was not a corner lot.
14 With respect to setbacks, the Staff Report stated the side setback on the north side should start
15 on the north property line adjoining the apartments and that the private street easement
16 counted toward the required setback. The City's Code did not require R-1 properties to have a
17 side setback but a side yard and based on the Staff Report, part of the side yard would be
18 located in the street. If approved, he believed it would set a precedent. With respect rezoning,
19 the proposal required massive upzoning of the existing apartments on the PC parcels. With the
20 removal of 702 Ellsworth Place and Ellsworth Place Street, what remained was half an acre and
21 that only allowed nine units under the current RM-20 zoning, not the current 12 units. The
22 applicant's attorney mentioned the City of Palo Alto was looking to upzone other RM-20 parcels
23 to RM-30 but that only applied to 19 parcels out of 900 RM-20 parcels in the City and none
24 were located near the project site. The applicant's benefit of that upzoning, and other requests
25 if granted, largely outweighed the public's benefit. He acknowledged that this was not the first
26 time the City had a problem with the PC Zoning and the City only allowed new PCs if it provided
27 substantially more affordable housing than a normal project. He strongly requested PTC
28 recommend Staff return with an evaluation of the upzoning and an evaluation of the pluses and
29 minuses to the benefit of the public.

30 Ms. Kristen Van Fleet spoke on behalf of Jake Margolis, Venkata Kurra, Andrea Alberson and
31 Chuck Effinger. She shared that Ellsworth Street Place was established in 1937, was annexed by
32 Palo Alto in 1947 and the apartments were built in 1967. The Ellsworth Place homeowners did
33 not want PC 2343 lifted from 702 Ellsworth Place because it did not provide a public benefit, it
34 impacted the quality of life on the street, there was no control over what could be built on the
35 parcel, it impacted circulation on the street and increased an already dangerous situation. The
36 letter from the applicant's attorney mentioned that Ellsworth Place had a cul-de-sac but in fact,
37 the street was a dead end and so the residents relied on the parking area for circulation. In
38 1967, the parcels were joined together to construct the apartment building and many of the
39 residents had no complaints about it. She invited the Commission to come to the site and view

-
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 the current situation to understand the concerns raised by the residents. With respect to the
2 existing parking at the apartment building, the far left parking space on Ellsworth Place was
3 only 98-inches wide. This caused the resident to park on the line in order to go in and out of
4 their car. Thus, causing the adjoining space unusable and the resident to park overnight in the
5 guest parking spaces. The existing temporary chain link fence on 702 Ellsworth Place was placed
6 4-feet back from the proposed pavers. A delivery truck had hit the fence several times trying to
7 turn around and pushed it back by so much as 2-feet. Ellsworth Place Street was only 20-feet
8 wide and removing the guest parking would reduce the width even further. With respect to the
9 proposed deliver space, a long-time delivery driver mentioned they could not use the space as
10 proposed because they could not legally block cars. She shared many of the homes had 7-feet
11 of pavers along the front. The proposed 4-feet of pavers would only allow two tires off the road
12 and that placed a car halfway into the street. The residents found the traffic analysis to be
13 biased and incomplete. It insufficiently calculated the site triangle and gave false, misleading
14 and missed information. Before any development could be considered, the City must solve the
15 problem of is Ellsworth Place a road and consider what happens to Ellsworth Place if traffic
16 were increased on Middlefield Road. There had been many accidents at the entrance to
17 Ellsworth Place and near Ellsworth Place. She noted Ordinance 1810 was supposed to widen
18 the entrance of Ellsworth Place. PC 2343 referenced the ordinance and required all other
19 requirements that were not amended to be followed. Ordinance 1810 was not included in the
20 Packet for consideration. With respect to who owns Ellsworth Place, two residents had claims
21 written into their Title and that was being investigated by a private title company. She
22 emphasized no development should take place until ownership of the road was decided. She
23 agreed Santa Clara County identified that the City of Palo Alto has owned Ellsworth Place Street
24 since 1968.

25 Ms. Bhanu Iyer echoed many of the comments raised by the previous speakers regarding the
26 inadequate traffic study, the upzoning of the apartment complex, there being no public benefit
27 and safety concerns. Now was the time for the City to own up to the mistake of saying the
28 parcel was R-1 but that did not mean the residents had to be impacted by the proposed
29 development.

30 Mr. Paul Bigbee, a homeowner on Ellsworth Place, mentioned bicycle and pedestrian safety
31 was already a major concern when leaving and entering Ellsworth Place. The proposed
32 development would exacerbate that issue more. There was no evidence presented that the
33 new public good had reached a threshold that was deemed objectively positive. Lastly, Civil
34 Codes and local norms must be applied and setting a precedent of allowing developments to
35 violate many of those regulations was wrong. He supported Alternative One to deny the
36 project.

37 Ms. Robyn Ziegler, a 35-year homeowner of Ellsworth Place, emphasized there were huge
38 safety concerns when entering and existing Ellsworth Place onto Middlefield Road. During

-
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 school hours, the school across the street caused traffic congestion on Middlefield Road and
2 that impacted the egress and ingress of Ellsworth Place. Lastly, she was concerned about a
3 future bike lane on Middlefield Road and how that would impact egress and ingress to
4 Ellsworth Place as well.

5 Mr. Robert Chen, a longtime resident of Ellsworth Place, wished the street was as wide as
6 shown on the architect's plans but it wasn't. He shared there were two accidents his family
7 experienced while exiting Ellsworth Place. One morning his son was almost struck by a car that
8 was backing out of the apartment parking spaces. Another accident occurred when he was
9 exiting Ellsworth Place at night and he could not see the pedestrian walking along the sidewalk.
10 As he pulled onto the side walk to look down Middlefield Road for oncoming cars, he almost hit
11 the pedestrian. With that said, he strongly opposed the proposed amendment and
12 development of a new home. He did not support the City encouraging the removal of trees
13 without proper notification and permitting and the existing parking spaces provided a safety
14 traffic buffer between Middlefield Road and the neighborhood.

15 Ms. Susan Light, a resident of Ellsworth Place, expressed concerns about the accuracy of the
16 traffic report. The report ignored the fact that two cars could not exit and enter Ellsworth Place
17 at the same time.

18 Ms. Karen Mangum shared she visits a resident on Ellsworth Place during the day and on many
19 occasions the guest parking had at least two cars parked in it, if not more. She observed when
20 the chain link fence was installed, it had been backed into several times and apartment dwellers
21 had parked parallel to the fence. She echoed the safety concerns about entering and exiting
22 Ellsworth Place. With respect to PC 2343 and Ordinance 1810, all the provisions not amended
23 by PC 2343 were still active in Ordinance 1810 and it did not make sense why 702 Ellsworth
24 Place was being proposed to be rezoned to R-1. Also, she did not understand who owned the
25 road and how a piece of the road could be attached to one parcel. Those questions must be
26 answered before approving the amendment.

27 Ms. Mariah Slattery echoed the concerns raised regarding the safety of exiting and entering
28 Ellsworth Place and how narrow the street is.

29 Ms. MJ Wolf agreed that removing the parking lot, 702 Ellsworth Place, from PC 2343
30 essentially upzoned the apartment complex. This approval would set a precedent for other
31 multi-family owners to sell portions of their parking lot to increase their density and she did not
32 support that. The guest parking spaces had always been used by the postal service and delivery
33 trucks because there was no other available space for them to park. With respect to the tree
34 that was removed, she asked if the six newly proposed trees included oak trees and would
35 there be enforcement for the proposed landscape. She invited all of the Commissioners to visit

-
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 the site to witness how the vehicular circulation worked on the street and how unsafe it was for
2 bicyclists and pedestrians to leave Ellsworth Place.

3 Mr. Yevgeny Khasin, a resident of Ellsworth Place, shared he recently had a piano delivered to
4 his home. The delivery truck was a full-size truck, much larger than a standard delivery truck
5 and the driver had to back up to the guest parking to turn around and exit. If a home were
6 constructed on 702 Ellsworth Place, he wondered how large trucks will exit Ellsworth place
7 without having to back out onto Middlefield Road.

8 Mr. Ardan Michael Blum stated when thinking of Palo Alto as a whole, there were many
9 dangerous avenues and streets along Alma Street that had the same safety issues as Ellsworth
10 Place. One way to mitigate those safety concerns was to use mirrors and cameras. Until proven,
11 Ellsworth Place was a public road and any cost for the instillation of mirrors and cameras fell on
12 the City.

13 [The Commission took a short break]

14 Chair Summa invited the applicant team to provide their conclusionary comments.

15 Mr. Hayes stated the City had not recognized the PC for over 56-years, even when the zoning
16 was changed from RM-15 to RM-20 in 2019. A mistake was made by the City and folks now
17 were suffering financial hardship because of it. It was a normal exercise for drivers to slow
18 down when entering and exiting any of the roads along Middlefield Road. With respect to
19 density, the reason to do a PC was to allow for a deviation from the standards. With respect to
20 the existing parking and the site triangle, the back of the eight cars parked in the guest parking
21 was roughly where Mr. Handa proposed to have pavers. If approved, the project would improve
22 safety because the home would be pushed back from the road and everything would be lower
23 than 3-feet.

24 Mr. Handa announced his commitment to building the single-family, one-story home that was
25 drawn in the plans and submitted to the City. He clarified that the fence would be 3-feet high,
26 not 4-feet and there would be a 3-inch gap between the planks.

27 Chair Summa brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

28 Commissioner Hechtman thanked the applicant team and the members of the public who
29 shared their comments with the Commission. He explained the PC 2343 would apply to the
30 Middlefield Road property and that the R-1 would only apply to 702 Ellsworth Place. He asked if
31 the PC 2343 zoning could be retained for 702 Ellsworth but allow 702 Ellsworth to build a
32 single-family with limitations. Those limitations could be no basement, 35-foot site triangle
33 space, pavers at the front and widening to the sidewalk.

-
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. Sauls answered yes, that was an option and a new PC number would be assigned with the
2 limitations listed in the documents.

3 Commissioner Hechtman encouraged the applicant and Staff to consider that. He referenced
4 Packet Page 42 and noticed established landscaping along the sidewalk that framed Ellsworth
5 Place. He asked if there was landscaping on both sides of Ellsworth Place or just on 702
6 Ellsworth Place.

7 Ms. French confirmed there was vegetation on 702 Ellsworth that was taller than 3-feet and
8 there was one tree on the other side near the apartment complex that was in the site triangle.

9 Commissioner Hechtman commented normally there was a flared apron at the entrance/exit of
10 a driveway and he asked if that option had been discussed at the entrance/exit of Ellsworth
11 Place.

12 Ms. French answered that was discussed with the applicant.

13 Commissioner Hechtman said he was interested in understanding from the applicant if they
14 were amenable to adding a flared apron after the other Commissioners shared their comments.
15 He acknowledged it may reduce the square footage of the house and he wanted to understand
16 that more as well.

17 Commissioner Akin wanted to see the project moved forward because it provided more
18 housing for the City. However, based on the comments, the residents would be receiving
19 insufficient benefits to offset the public cost. During his site visit, he noticed the space to the
20 south of 2905 Middlefield Road could be used to widen Ellsworth Place to Middlefield Road, but
21 a rear yard would have to be eliminated. He asked if there was a way to reduce the foot print of
22 the house by utilizing a basement or a second story to allow for Ellsworth Place to be widened,
23 provide better access, etc. That design was beyond PTC's scope but he asked if the applicant
24 was amenable to considering other options and coming back to the City with other proposals.

25 Commissioner Templeton agreed it would be helpful to understand the scope and based on the
26 Staff Report, PTC was not being asked to approve a project, a housing design, or a driveway
27 expansion. PTC was being asked to consider whether Mr. Handa could build a house on 702
28 Ellsworth Place as the City stated he could when he purchased the property. This was a risk to
29 the City and the Commission did not fully understand that risk and what it meant if the
30 application was denied. Many of the comments made were outside of the scope of what PTC
31 was being asked to do. She stated she was not comfortable with delivering most of the
32 understanding of the requests because the City already said a home could be built because it
33 was an R-1 property. The Staff Report was insufficient in answering the many unanswered
34 questions. With respect to traffic safety, the City was aware that Middlefield Road was
35 dangerous, but the City was not able to deliver safety improvements because it was focused on

-
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 other things. She expressed frustration that there was no Office of Transportation Staff present
2 to address the traffic safety concerns. She sympathized with the applicant and his family having
3 a conflict with his potentially new neighbors. That was not the type of welcoming the City
4 should be giving to new residents and she wished to see a process that allowed a new home to
5 be built and a safer street at the same time.

6 Commissioner Lu agreed with Commissioner Templeton but was receptive to some of the
7 compromised proposed by Commissioner Hechtman. He invited Staff to provide more
8 comments on visibility and safety.

9 Ms. French noted the applicant's traffic consultant's report was shared with the Office of
10 Transportation Staff and they agreed with the findings.

11 Commissioner Templeton interjected and asked why no Office of Transportation Staff was
12 present when many of the concerns raised were related to traffic safety.

13 Ms. French commented transportation Staff was made aware that the item was agendaized.

14 Commissioner Templeton recommended planning and transportation Staff be present for these
15 types of items.

16 Commissioner Lu agreed the safety improvements and negative aspects are not clear. He asked
17 if residents in the apartments had a perspective on the matter and would they receive any
18 compensation if the project were approved.

19 Ms. French answered Staff had not interviewed the apartment tenants but had conversations
20 with the apartment's manager.

21 Mr. Hayes assumed if the residents of the apartment building had concerns they would voice
22 them via email or during public comment. They would not receive any compensation and the
23 guest parking was more convenient on Sutter Avenue than the spaces on 702 Ellsworth Place.

24 Ms. Van Fleet answered having friends at the apartments, many of them were afraid their rent
25 would be raised if they spoke out on the project. She encouraged the Commission to read the
26 book Evicted to understand better a tenant's perspective.

27 Mr. Richard Dewey, an applicant, stated he was offended by that comment and the reaction
28 that somehow there would be retribution against the tenants if they shared their comments.
29 He understood some of the tenants submitted positive comments for the project.

30 Chair Summa thanked everyone for their comments and she understood this was a difficult
31 situation. Ellsworth Place had existing issues because of the nature and physicality of the street.

-
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 She did not feel the issue as delivering a result in that regard to the property owner but rather
2 the PC process was flawed. She doubted that PC properties were checked every 3-years as was
3 written in the Municipal Code. One troubling item was the applicant wanted to open the PC to
4 improve existing conditions and the neighbors felt those improvements would be a detriment.
5 She agreed with Commissioner Templeton that the Staff Report was insufficient and left many
6 questions unanswered. One glaring issue was the status of Ellsworth Place and Santa Clara
7 County recognized it as a City-owned street. It was very important to understand the facts
8 about the easements and that needed to be determined before the design of the property
9 went underway. Another troubling aspect was one of the streets that determined 702 Ellsworth
10 Place as a corner lot that ran through the parcel. That drastically impacted setbacks and the use
11 of the land. If the amendment was granted, the decision would be made without considering all
12 of the details. She found the zoning comparison table to be incomplete and if the site triangle
13 was correct then a 3-foot tall fence should not be erected. The City and applicant should think
14 more creatively about the frontage for both properties but cautioned the City to go slowly. In
15 general, the Commission did not have all the information needed to make the decision. Also,
16 every City Zoning Map had a disclaimer that folks should not use them to make financial
17 decisions because there could be mistakes.

18 Commissioner Templeton agreed with Chair Summa that the best decision was to have Staff
19 come back with a more complete Staff Report and answers to the open questions. The
20 Commission needed the ability to interact with Staff on the questions that have been raised
21 and not all the Staff were present. She proposed that if there was an impasse, then the
22 neighbors should consider purchasing 702 Ellsworth Place.

23 Commissioner Hechtman was supportive of a path that yielded a new single-family home on
24 702 Ellsworth, but that may not be with R-1 zoning. He believed there would be community
25 benefit if the project was approved. Community benefit did not encompass just the local
26 community, but the entire community of Palo Alto. One of the biggest benefits to the City was
27 to provide more housing and the applicant before the Commission sought to do that.
28 Additionally, the proposed applicant was seeking to improve a bad situation with respect to
29 traffic safety at the beginning of Ellsworth Place. He was also satisfied that the first leg of
30 Ellsworth located on parcel 702 was not a public street. The two ways to make a public street
31 were to offer it for dedication and the offer was accepted, or over time the local agency
32 maintains and repairs it and treats it like a City street. Based on the Staff Report, neither of
33 those scenarios applied to Ellsworth Place. He believed the determination of the street should
34 not hinder the Commission in finding a path to achieve the requests in the application. The sole
35 function of 702 Ellsworth Place as envisioned by the City Council in its adoption of PC 2343 was
36 to provide guest parking. It was not provided for vehicular circulation for the residents of
37 Ellsworth Place, nor overflow overnight parking for the apartment residents. With that said the
38 removal of that guest parking should not be considered as taking away something that anyone
39 was entitled to. With respect to the comments regarding two-story versus one-story, he

-
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 explained square footage would be lost in the stairwell for a two-story home and that loss of
2 square footage could make a big difference. Also, it was not the responsibility of 702 Ellsworth
3 Place to fix the access issues that had already existed with a 20-foot wide road. He
4 acknowledged the comments about the removal of the trees but that was not agendized.
5 Lastly, the thrust of State Law and local ordinances was about the promotion of housing at the
6 expense of parking and the application was following that trend. He invited the applicants to
7 answer if they were open to leaving 702 Ellsworth as a PC and if they were amendable to having
8 a flared apron where their property met Middlefield Road.

9 Ms. Handa wanted to understand the time consequences of leaving 702 Ellsworth Place as a PC.
10 Also, he didn't understand the technicality of a flared apron and how it would work out. He
11 requested it be shown in a drawing that he could consider.

12 Ms. Cara Silver, Mr. Dewey's attorney, stated folding 702 Ellsworth into an amended PC was an
13 alternative in the Staff Report and it could be feasible if Mr. Handa's time concerns could be
14 addressed. She stated it was difficult to have two property owners with different issues in a
15 single PC. With respect to enforcement, she recommended that be handled through the
16 dedication of the easement to the public and attaching the requirements to Mr. Handa's
17 property to that dedication. Any obligations to Mr. Dewey's property could be codified in the
18 PC amendment. With respect to the flared apron, she understood it would be located on public
19 right of way and the City would have to approve it, but there was an existing flare.

20 Commissioner Hechtman understood both property owners wanted to understand the timing if
21 the item were continued to allow for Staff and the applicants to explore a PC amendment
22 instead of an R-1 amendment.

23 Ms. French mentioned the next PTC meeting had a very meaty item and recommended the
24 item not come back to the Commission before July 26, 2023.

25 Commissioner Hechtman summarized it could be a month before the item comes back to the
26 Commission.

27 Chair Summa asked if Commissioner Hechtman wanted to know how the residents felt about
28 his proposal of having a PC with a single-family home added to it.

29 Commissioner Hechtman answered no because he understood the resident's perspective.

30 Commissioner Lu restated the question was whether housing should be allowed on 702
31 Ellsworth Place and similar lots. The questions around safety and public benefit should be left
32 up to Council to consider. He answered yes, housing should be allowed on lots like 702
33 Ellsworth Place and it was important to build on top of surface parking. Also, in-fill single-family

-
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 homes were rare and important to have. Also, he believed the lot was underutilized, even if one
2 or two cars used it at a given time.

3 Chair Summa stated Council expected the Commission to consider the safety and public
4 benefits issues. The question in her mind was not whether a home should be built on 702
5 Ellsworth Place but rather was opening up the PC was the right approach. Typically, PTC did not
6 review single-family homes unless there was an appeal and doing it on the fly was difficult. If
7 approved as proposed, the City would lose control over what is built on 702 Ellsworth Place
8 now and in the future. She agreed the safety concerns and the configuration of the street were
9 not created by the applicants, but that did not mean the City should not use this opportunity to
10 improve them. She was still concerned that Santa Clara County considered Ellsworth Place as a
11 City-owned street. She asked if 2901 Middlefield Road would then be subject to 18.38.150 (c).
12 She restated she did not see any public benefit if the amendment were approved and the City
13 would not receive any affordability in the housing that was to be created. Also, she expressed
14 concern about setting a precedent for corner lots that contained their own side street in their
15 lot and if approved, that precedent would allow larger PC properties to request to eliminate
16 their parking.

17 Mr. Yang addressed the question about the status of Ellsworth Place and based on the records,
18 Staff could not find any evidence that the City had accepted a dedication or was maintaining
19 the street. There were several documents that Staff was trying to make legible but so far no
20 evidence was found.

21 Chair Summa stated Mr. Yang's comment reinforced that the Commission was working in the
22 dark and noted that one of the applicants had shared a document that showed the City had
23 adopted the Street. She acknowledged that the applicants were under a time constraint but she
24 found value in Commissioner Templeton's suggestion to continue the item.

25 Commissioner Templeton did not believe affordable housing was an issue in this case.

26 Mr. Sauls understood the Chair was trying to distinguish the current PC process.

27 Chair Summa answered yes, but added in opening the PC there was a certain amount of liability
28 that came with that because the Council may say that Mr. Dewey's parcel now has to include a
29 percentage of affordable units.

30 Commissioner Templeton remarked that was a really good point that there was a risk to Mr.
31 Dewey.

32 Chair Summa commented she was very sorry the maps were wrong and the parcel reports were
33 wrong. Typically, though, those documents usually had many mistakes.

-
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 Lu was unsure a precedent would be set given how much of an edge case the
2 application was. Though the question regarding the status of the private street was tricky, it did
3 not change his analysis of should housing be allowed to be built on parcels like 702 Ellsworth
4 Place. He stated there was inherit value in having single-family housing that was more modest
5 and not costing many millions of dollars. That should be encouraged to the extent it was
6 reasonable. He asked if other mechanisms could be used for enforceability.

7 Mr. Sauls recalled for one project the conditions were listed on a Parcel Map, but that was a
8 one-time incidence.

9 Commissioner Lu agreed he did not want to create more edge cases.

10 Ms. French added there have been covenants placed in Development Agreements.

11 Mr. Yang commented with respect to the street ownership comments, the 1949 document
12 referred to a dedication of Middlefield Road, but that document was not found for Ellsworth
13 Place.

14 Chair Summa encouraged the Commission to move to motions. She mentioned Alternative Two
15 in the Staff Report was similar to what Commissioner Hechtman had recommended.

16 Commissioner Hechtman asked if Staff had enough information based on the discussion to
17 work with the applicant on the way to Council to refine the application to follow Alternative
18 Two with conditions.

19 Ms. French explained Staff included that option and had already done a lot of research on the
20 application. She was supportive of having more conversations with the applications if the
21 Commission approved Alternative Two.

22 Commissioner Hechtman clarified he was interested in a motion to recommend Alternative Two
23 to Council which moved forward the development proposal but not as an R-1. With that said,
24 he did not expect the item to come back to the Commission and on the way to Council, Staff
25 would work with the applicants and include prohibitions such as no basements, flared aprons,
26 etc. in the new modified PC zoning for 702 Ellsworth Place.

27 Ms. French believed Staff had sufficient direction to move forward with those conversations.

28 Mr. Yang clarified a typical plan set attached to a PC showed exactly what would be built. If
29 there was an element the Commission wished to see that was not included in the plan, that
30 should be highlighted now for Staff to pursue with the applicant.

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

1 Commissioner Templeton was concerned the PTC was considering a motion without knowing
2 what the applicant wanted.

3 Commissioner Hechtman answered he was not concerned because it was listed as an option in
4 the Staff Report on Packet Page 17. He noted he asked the applicants and understood they
5 were in support of moving forward with that option as long as some problems were worked out
6 in the dialog with Staff.

7 Chair Summa believed the item should come back to the Commission before it went to Council
8 because it was important to know what was being recommended to Council. She understood
9 that Staff needed more specificity on Commissioner Hechtman's apron flare idea. She
10 suggested the motion include broader language such as address visibility issues at Middlefield
11 Road.

12 Commissioner Lu agreed with Commissioner Hechtman that the item did not need to come
13 back to the Commission.

14 Commissioner Akin stated he was not opposed to the idea of moving Alternative Two and
15 believed the item did not need to come back to the Commission. However, he emphasized the
16 concerns expressed by the residents needed to be incorporated as part of the discussion for
17 the version that is presented to Council.

18 Ms. French answered if the motion is approved, Staff would forward diagrams, lists, the
19 minutes and a summarization of the neighbor's concerns to Council and what possible solutions
20 that are available to mitigate those concerns.

21 Commissioner Akin confirmed those ideas should be forwarded to Council. He mentioned a
22 basement does not count toward FAR and that was a way to get a lot of space in a small
23 footprint. Though many of the considerations were placed on Mr. Handa, Mr. Dewey may have
24 valuable contributions as well and those should be negotiated as a part of the amendment to
25 the PC. That would not be included unless Staff or other folks initiate that discussion.

26 Chair Summa found Commissioner Akin's comment very compelling and stated one advantage
27 to keep 702 Ellsworth a PC was it eliminated the concern about the corner lot precedent.

28 Commissioner Templeton was not supportive of many of the restrictions the other
29 Commissioners were discussing. The discussion about a basement had not been though
30 through and the Commission must understand exactly what it was requiring the homeowner to
31 do. In addition, she was concerned about passing to Council a half-baked proposal and she
32 could not support a motion that did not bring the item back to the Commission.

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

1 Chair Summa agreed it would be nice to see the proposal again but understood a majority of
2 the Commission wanted to forward the project to Council. She understood the intention was
3 not to tell Mr. Handa to install a basement, but rather he should not be restricted from putting
4 in a basement. She believed having smaller setbacks on what was a substandard property
5 because the road was going through it was a great benefit to the folks living on Ellsworth Place.

6 MOTION #1

7 Commissioner Hechtman moved that the PTC recommend to the City Council what was
8 described as Alternative Two in the Staff Report on Packet Page 17. An amendment of PC 2343
9 to add single-family residential use to the list of permitted or conditionally permitted uses of
10 the PC Zone, and the single-family residence would then be added to the development plan for
11 the PC. In the development plan, as part of the motion, to state the items the PTC would expect
12 to see in the development plan. Pavers as shown on the plans that PTC received in various
13 locations on both sides of Ellsworth Place and in particular, on the 702 side, that 18-inch width
14 extending from the Middlefield to the point it connected with the widened part. Four new
15 tenant parking spaces on the Middlefield parcel, and two tandems as shown in the plans. A
16 delivery parking spot on the Middlefield parcel as shown in the plans. The Ellsworth home
17 would be indicated in the development plan as a single-story with no basement. The 35-foot
18 sight triangles that were shown in the Staff Report. Six new trees on the Middlefield parcel and
19 then an additional item that Staff investigates with transportation Staff and the applicant to
20 include the apron flares on Ellsworth where it meets Middlefield on both parcels.

21 Commissioner Templeton understood the Commission agreed not to restrict the homeowner
22 from building a basement.

23 Mr. Sauls restated that development plans are very specific with a PC to what was shown in the
24 drawings. Any deviations or changes to those drawings required a new PC process and/or a
25 Minor Architectural Review process. If the current proposal did not include a basement, that
26 may or may not require an additional PC amendment to include that.

27 Mr. Yang confirmed that was correct. Unless the direction was for the PC to say no basement
28 was permitted, then if a future owner wanted a basement they could come back for an
29 amendment.

30 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

31 Chair Summa suggested the motion say not with these Development Standards currently being
32 proposed but with those items in mind such as addressing visibility and setbacks. She
33 understood the intent was to allow the owner of 702 Ellsworth some flexibility to have a project
34 with less impact in terms of setbacks. The Commission wanted to see a project come back that

-
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 was approved by the applicants and the neighbors and having restrictions may limit what could
2 be proposed.

3 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT DECLINED

4 Commissioner Hechtman understood Mr. Handa submitted full Oplans for a house in January
5 2023 and that was the house he wanted to build. The understanding was he wanted to build a
6 single-family home with a specific size and dimensions and it did not include a basement.

7 Commissioner Templeton inquired why it had to be restricted to those specific plans and what
8 about future homeowners.

9 Commissioner Hechtman explained the house plan Mr. Handa already submitted was going to
10 be part of the Development Plan. Mr. Yang explained that if the approval of the amendment
11 was pursuant to the plan of a single-family home with no basement, the PC would allow that
12 particular house and a future homeowner could go through a process of changing that PC if
13 they so wished to install a basement.

14 Chair Summa remarked she had not reviewed the house plans. If the plan was to pursue those
15 specific plans then the item should return to the Commission.

16 Commissioner Hechtman argued that single-family homes never come before the PTC.

17 Commissioner Templeton noted that only if the zoning was changed to R-1.

18 Chair Summa clarified if a single-family was proposed in a PC Zone, then the home would be
19 reviewed by PTC.

20 MOTION AMENDED

21 Commissioner Hechtman believed PTC was not equipped to review architectural plans and that
22 was the job of the Architectural Review Board (ARB). He modified the motion to refer to the
23 plan set that Mr. Handa had submitted on the date they were submitted to Staff and that the
24 plans he submitted were a one-story home with no basement.

25 SECOND

26 Commissioner Lue seconded.

27 Commissioner Akin was concerned that the objections raised by the neighborhood had not
28 been addressed, nor had the PTC identified a mechanism in which they would be addressed.

29 Commissioner Hechtman asked if Commissioner Akin had an amendment to the motion.

-
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 Akin wanted the concerns worked out with Staff before the item was presented
2 to PTC or Council. That would ensure majority agreement on the plans that were submitted to
3 PTC and Council.

4 Chair Summa agreed with Commissioner Akin in that there needed to be more flexibility
5 moving forward and the motion was very restrictive.

6 Commissioner Templeton agreed with Commissioner Akin as well. She added she was very
7 concerned about the approach and it potentially backfiring when the item is presented to
8 Council.

9 Commissioner Lu asked if Staff should go through the safety and convince concerns and supply
10 a clear perspective on the ultimate conclusion.

11 Chair Summa stated that was too much specificity for the motion. She suggested a vote be held
12 and then move forward if the motion fails.

13 VOTE

14 Ms. Dao conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion failed 2-3 with Vice-Chair Chang
15 and Commissioner Reckdahl absent.

16 MOTION #1 FAILED 2(Hechtman, Lu) – 3(Akin, Summa, Templeton) -2(Chang, Reckdahl absent)

17 Chair Summa invited Commissioners to speak to their no votes; seeing none she asked if the
18 project could be moved forward with a concept of allowing a single-family home on that
19 portion of PC 2343 and leave the precise Development Standards open. Then have the item
20 return to PTC before going to Council.

21 Mr. Yang confirmed that was a possible motion. Another option was to have the plans reviewed
22 by the ARB and then move the project to Council.

23 MOTION #2

24 Commissioner Templeton moved that PTC continue the item till the next PTC meeting, July 12,
25 2023, at which time Staff would be prepared to respond to the open items brought up by
26 Commissioners.

27 Ms. French clarified Staff would not prepare a new Staff Report and have transportation Staff
28 present.

29 Commissioner Templeton confirmed that was correct.

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

1 Ms. French added Staff would share any documents they discovered between now and the next
2 meeting as well as the house plans that were submitted. Staff had analyzed the plans as if they
3 were in an R-1 Zone and that would not longer be the case if the zone was a PC.

4 Commissioner Templeton remarked PTC would need both.

5 Chair Summa believed what was being discussed was new information and thus would not be a
6 continuation of the meeting.

7 Ms. French confirmed the analysis of the home would be new information but the pictures that
8 had already been seen by the Commissioners were what was being requested.

9 Commissioner Akin asked if public comment would be allowed at the continued meeting.

10 Commissioner Templeton answered it depended on what information Staff presented. If new
11 information was presented then public comment would have to be opened.

12 Ms. French answered the Commission could close the public portion of the hearing but it was
13 the pleasure of the Commission to determine that.

14 Commissioner Templeton stated the motion intended to minimize the follow-up only to what
15 Staff was answering that they weren't able to answer during discussion.

16 Chair Summa recommended the public hearing be kept open for new public speakers.

17 SECOND

18 Commissioner Akin seconded.

19 Commissioner Hechtman confessed he did not know what the open items were that were
20 brought up by the Commission and concerned parties. Many public speakers raised issues and if
21 Staff returned with a response then those who raised the issue should have time to respond to
22 Staff's response.

23 Commissioner Templeton expressed she was not concerned if public comment was opened or
24 not. She wanted the unanswered questions to be answered adequately. Many concerns were
25 raised that were out of scope and she wanted Staff to answer those questions with respect to
26 the removed tree, using the guest parking for circulation, etc.

27 Commissioner Hechtman commented if he did not know what the open items where, then Staff
28 may not know what they are.

29 Commissioner Templeton recited the fence and the site triangle were examples.

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

1 Chair Summa asked if it would be helpful to list the open items in the motion.
2 Commissioner Hechtman wondered if that would provide the best direction to Staff. He
3 recommended that each Commissioner share what items were unanswered and Staff would
4 know exactly what to address at the next meeting.
5 Commissioner Templeton suggested Commissioner Hechtman and Staff refer to the transcript
6 of the meeting.
7 Chair Summa inquired if Staff was confused about the wording “open items”.
8 Ms. French stated a transcript of the meeting would not be available before the next meeting.
9 Commissioner Templeton recommended Staff refer to the transcript posted on YouTube.
10 Chair Summa directed Staff to call the vote.

11 VOTE

12 Ms. Dao conducted a roll call vote and announced the motion passed 3-2 with Vice-Chair Chang
13 and Commissioner Reckdahl absent.

14 MOTION PASSED 3(Akin, Summa, Templeton) -2 (Hechtman, Lu) – 2 (Chang, Reckdahl absent)

15 **Commission Action:** Motion by Hechtman, seconded by Lu. Fail 2-3-0-2 (Chang, Reckdahl
16 absent)

17 **Commission Action:** Motion by Templeton, seconded by Akin. Passed 3-2-0-2 (Chang, Reckdahl
18 absent)

19 3. Amendment to Title 18 Chapters 18.04, 18.16, 18.18, 18.42, 18.52, 18.76 and Title 16
20 Chapter 16.20 to Waive Parklets from Certain Planning and Zoning Requirements.

21 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, stated the City has an existing Interim Parklet Program
22 in place and it had been in effect since 2020. Staff had been working on a Permanent Parklet
23 Program per Council direction that included an implementing ordinance and technical
24 regulations. The Interim Ordinance was to sunset on March 31, 2024, and the related resolution
25 pertaining to the commercial use of private and public parking lots would sunset at the end of
26 2023. Staff presented several Municipal Code amendments that would allow for an over-the-
27 counter process for permanent Parklets. The changes to Title 16 and Tile 18 provided a new
28 definition for Parklet, adjusted or added language regarding outdoor sales and storage,
29 alcoholic beverages, off-street parking, Conditional Use Permits (CUP), architectural review and
30 parklet standards for signs.

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

1 Chair Summa invited Commissioners to ask clarifying questions of Staff.

2 Commissioner Akin referenced Packet Page 104 and asked if Council directed Staff to address
3 the parklet effect of off-street parking requirements.

4 Ms. French recalled it was discussed with Council.

5 Commissioner Akin understood that restaurants that had parklets, it expanded their Floor Area
6 and that City was not requiring them to add additional off-street parking.

7 Ms. French confirmed that was correct.

8 Commissioner Akin asked if Staff suggested that or was that Council's direction.

9 Mr. Tim Shimizu, Assistant City Attorney, stated what was proposed to become permanent was
10 existing practice under the Interim Ordinance. Parklets that had been approved under the
11 Interim Ordinance did not have their square footage counted towards their parking
12 requirement for the main structure. Having to provide additional parking for the parklet would
13 bring a significant cost increase to the owner.

14 Commissioner Akin stated the reason he raised it was because if parklets were to expand
15 significantly then they would add to parking constraints in the core areas.

16 Chair Summa added the parklets were for California Avenue and the downtown area. Currently,
17 the restaurants on California Avenue would have less outdoor seating with a parklet
18 requirement than they would have currently with the street closed.

19 Ms. French agreed a closed street versus an open street was a different matter. If a closed
20 street were to become permanent then parklets would not be a factor on those streets.

21 Chair Summa confirmed it was best to have City-wide standards and that concern would best
22 be resolved when Council made its determination about California Avenue.

23 Commissioner Lu asked what Staff was seeking from PTC. He understood that there were little
24 to no changes in practice between the Interim Ordinance and the Permanent Ordinance.

25 Ms. French restated that the Interim Ordinance would sunset and then the Permanent
26 Ordinance would take over. Council must adopt another ordinance that was not subject to PTC
27 review because it was not Title 18. What PTC was approving was a piece of the ordinance that
28 would go into the full Permanent Ordinance.

29 Commissioner Lu inquired to what extent was the proposed ordinance an alternative to just
30 passing an Interim Ordinance until the final ordinance was ready.

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

1 Ms. French clarified City Council would consider the full totality of the Permanent Ordinance.

2 Commissioner Lu understood currently to apply for parklet there was no difference between
3 the Interim Ordinance and the proposed Permanent Ordinance. None of the changes proposed
4 required an existing parklet to physically modify the parklet.

5 Ms. French restated the standards that were shared with Council that were being finalized in
6 the Permanent Ordinance would require existing parklets to change if did not meet the new
7 standards.

8 Mr. Shimizu noted the proposed amendments intended to enact them as a part of the
9 Permanent Parklet Program which would come after the Interim Ordinance sunsets. What Staff
10 proposed was to codify the Title 16 and Title 18 exemptions that were currently in the Interim
11 Ordinance. In terms of the specific amendments proposed for PTC to consider, they did not
12 change the status quo.

13 Commissioner Hechtman understood two ordinances were going to Council to create the
14 Permanent Parklet Program and one of those ordinances was in front of the PTC because it
15 involved items within the PTC's purview. He asked if and when the Permanent Parklet Program
16 is adopted, it would go into effect 30 days after adopted, even if the Permanent Parklet Program
17 was adopted before March 2024.

18 Mr. Shimizu confirmed that was correct but Staff would discuss how they wished to transition
19 between the Interim Ordinance and the Permanent Ordinance.

20 Chair Summa asked if there was a maximum number of parklets allowed per block.

21 Mr. Shimizu answered there was no maximum in any given area.

22 Chair Summa understood parklets were restricted by the permitting process and other location
23 criteria. Seeing no other questions from the Commissioners she opened public comment.

24 Mr. Ardan Michael Blum asked what was the purpose of a parklet related to Covid-19. He
25 recommended the Commission discussion parklet equal Covid restaurant space during their
26 discussion.

27 Chair Summa brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

28 Commissioner Hechtman referenced the proposed definition of Parklet and asked if the
29 language proposed was existing language or new language.

30 Mr. Shimizu answered the language was new and could be adjusted as needed.

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

1 Commissioner Hechtman commented that the definition did not make any reference to what a
2 parklet could be used for. He understood the intention of a parklet was not to be used for office
3 space or bicycle storage, but rather for retail sales and displays, and eating and drinking
4 establishment/dining.

5 Mr. Shimizu stated the intention of the definition was not to define the program through the
6 definition but to reference the operative chapter Title 10.

7 Commissioner Hechtman suggested Staff consider if it was appropriate in the definition to refer
8 to the approved uses for parklets as described in Chapter 10.

9 Chair Summa agreed with Commissioner Hechtman and mentioned the uses were highlighted
10 on Packet Page 103 (ii).

11 Commissioner Hechtman said outdoor uses were listed on Packet Page 103 but the reference in
12 that section was to Chapter 12.11 which was the definition but neither of those was Chapter
13 10.

14 Mr. Shimizu clarified Staff was creating a new Chapter 12.11 and that was to be the operative
15 section, not Chapter 10 as he said earlier.

16 Commissioner Lu disagreed with adding extremely ridged requirements on how parklets could
17 be used. He shared that some parklets in the City of San Francisco had bike parking or seating
18 areas with art displays.

19 MOTION

20 Commissioner Akin moved that PTC accept the Staff recommendation.

21 SECOND

22 Commissioner Templeton seconded.

23 Chair Summa asked if the motion was sufficient.

24 Mr. Shimizu answered yes.

25 VOTE

26 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the
27 motion passed 5-0 with Vice-Chair Chang and Commissioner Reckdahl absent.

28 MOTION PASSED 5(Akin, Hechtman, Lu, Summa, Templeton) -0 -2(Chang, Reckdahl absent)

-
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 **Commission Action:** Motion by Akin, seconded by Templeton. Pass 5-0-0-2 (Chang, Reckdahl
2 absent)

3 **Study Session**

4 Public Comment is Permitted. Three (3) minutes per speaker.

5 4. Discuss Work Plan to Amend the Palo Alto Zoning Code to Implement Housing
6 Element Programs 1.1 and 3.4.

7 Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official, introduced Jean Eisberg, a consultant with the City,
8 who was managing the project.

9 Ms. Jean Eisberg, Lexington Planning, reported the PTC recommended in May of 2023 that City
10 Council adopt the 2023-2021 Housing Element. In June of 2023, the City sent the adopted
11 Housing Element to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
12 for review. HCD had 60-days to review the Housing Element and any comments from them
13 were expected in August of 2023. The Housing Element included 20 Programs and many of
14 those Programs required changes to the Zoning Code. The proposed Work Plan addressed two
15 key programs to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and encourage housing
16 production. Program 1.1A, the Adequate Sites Inventory, required several sites to be rezoned
17 and the program had a statutory deadline of January 31, 2024. Program 1.1B, General
18 Manufacturing (GM) and Office, Research and Limited Manufacturing (ROLM), included the
19 rezoning of those sites and those were proposed to be adopted, as required by the Housing
20 Element, by January of 2024. Program 3.4, Housing Incentive Program (HIP), was an expansion
21 of incentives to facilitate housing. The Housing Element determined an implementation date of
22 December 31, 2024, but Staff was aiming to make those changes by January 2024. The key
23 elements of Program 1.1A was to rezone to allow housing as a permitted use, upzone to
24 increase density/Floor Area Ratio (FAR), modify development standards to reduce constraints,
25 ensure development was feasible and complete other statutory requirements. The Housing
26 Element Chapter 3 identified strategies for rezoning opportunity sites and that was shared in
27 detail in the Staff Report. Key elements of Program 1.1B were to upzone to 90 dwelling units
28 per acre (du/ac), increase building height while decreasing the parking ratio to accommodate
29 increased density and have the program only apply to properties near Bayshore Freeway. The
30 zoning amendments required changes to the Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive Plan
31 amendments must be internally consistent among the various Elements. The HIP was an
32 existing program that was enacted in 2019 as an alternative to State Density Bonus Law and it
33 was applicable to select commercial mixed-use districts. Program 3.4 proposed to extend the
34 HIP to Multi-family Residential (RM) districts and portions of ROLM/GM districts. It also
35 proposed to expand the HIP to be more attractive to potential developers and proposed to
36 revise the Retail Preservation Ordinance. Changes in response to Program 1.1 were more
37 specified in the Housing Element and were more straight forward. The HIP changes were based

-
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 on a feasibility study and that feasibility would come before the Commission at a future date.
2 The approach was to prepare two separate ordinances. The standards for Housing Element
3 sites would modify existing base district standards and be included in a new chapter in the
4 Municipal Code. Staff predicted they would return in late August or September of 2023 with the
5 proposed ordinance for Program 1.1 and then present it to Council in October or November of
6 2023. In September and November of 2023, Staff would return to PTC with the ordinance for
7 Program 3.4 and then move it to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 2023. Then forward it
8 to City Council in December 2023 or January 2024.

9 Chair Summa invited Commissioners to ask clarifying questions of Staff. She understood once
10 the feasibility studies were completed, Program 3.4 would return to the Commission for review.

11 Ms. Eisberg clarified Program 1.1 would come back first and then Program 3.4 in a separate
12 study session.

13 Chair Summa asked if Staff still wanted PTC's comments in advance of the feasibility studies.

14 Ms. Eisberg answered no because PTC had not received the full feasibility study and what was
15 released were preliminary results.

16 Chair Summa opened the item up for public comment.

17 Mr. Ardan Michael Blum stated there was a large population of Palo Alto residents who were
18 renters and who were experiencing rent increases. That indicated that the City was not taking
19 steps to enact rent control measures to protect renters.

20 Mr. Albert Lustre was excited to see zoning being changed to allow for new projects to come to
21 Palo Alto. He encouraged the City to adopt provisions that protected construction workers and
22 the protections include apprenticeship programs, local hire, health care and a livable wage.
23 Adopting those provisions would allow construction workers a better quality of life for
24 themselves and their families. He encouraged the City to follow in the footsteps of the City of
25 Menlo Park, Redwood City and other local cities who had adopted such provision into their
26 local codes.

27 Chair Summa closed public comment and brought the item back to the Commission for
28 discussion.

29 Commissioner Lu addressed Program 1.1B which stated that housing continued to be approved
30 in the City, but the City had no infrastructure, parks and other public amenities for those new
31 housing sites. He asked if the Work Plan included discussions with land owners to see if they
32 were receptive to donating land for those amenities.

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

1 Ms. Eisberg explained the program was specific to zoning ordinance changes but elsewhere in
2 the Housing Element it did address specifically the public amenities issues.

3 Commissioner Hechtman recalled PTC adopted its own Work Plan and asked if the proposed
4 Housing Element Work Plan was included in PTC's Work Plan.

5 Ms. French confirmed PTC's Work Plan was adopted and it included the adoption and
6 implementation of the Housing Element.

7 Commissioner Hechtman shared he had no feedback and appreciated Staff's progress toward
8 creating more housing opportunities in Palo Alto.

9 Commissioner Akin stated he was impressed by Staff's aggressive schedule and he appreciated
10 Staff's hard work to implement the Housing Element so quickly.

11 Commissioner Lu noticed the implementation of Program 3.4 was predicted to go past the
12 deadline.

13 Ms. Eisberg clarified the only statutory requirement was for Program 1.1. The Housing Element
14 proposed Program 3.4 be completed by December of 2024 and Staff was trying to complete it
15 by January of 2024.

16 Chair Summa thanked Staff for their work and an organized Staff Report. She shared
17 Commissioner Lu's concern that the City was not doing enough in providing public amenities to
18 new residents. Also, with respect to Program 1.1A (2) and (3), there were some places within a
19 half mile of a Caltrain station where it may not be appropriate to upzone. She wanted to see
20 acknowledgment of that concern. She continued to believe that high-frequency bus transit
21 corridors were somewhat femoral to base zoning changes on.

22 Commissioner Lu encouraged more work to be done for the neighborhood in Southeast Palo
23 Alto with respect to parks, schools, etc.

24 Chair Summa wanted to see a policy established for San Antonio Road and other arterial streets
25 to use special setbacks for safe bike lanes as well as aggressive requirements for trees. With
26 that said she closed the item.

27 **Approval of Minutes**

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

29 5. Approval of Planning & Transportation Commission Draft Verbatim & Summary
30 Minutes of May 31, 2023.

31 [note – Commissioners spoke off mic, couldn't hear who moved and seconded]

-
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 VOTE

2 Ms. Veronica Dao, Administrative Assistant, conducted a roll call vote and announced the
3 motion passed 5-0 with Vice-Chair Chang and Commissioner Reckdahl absent.

4 **Commission Action:** Motion by [?] seconded by [?] Pass 5-0-0-1 (Chang, Reckdahl absent)

5 **Committee Items**

6 None

7 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

8 Chair Summa opened it up for Commissioner questions, comments and announcements; seeing
9 none she adjourned the meeting.

10 **Adjournment**

11 10:57 pm

12

-
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.