

From: [Fred Balin](#)
To: [Margaret Heath](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#)
Subject: #8: Late Area Plan Submissions
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 9:28:12 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I agree that the item should be postponed.

It is bad form to bypass the NVCAP as well to leave the larger public with little time to examine major changes. Staff also acknowledges that "(their) review is limited by the short amount of time available."

The relevant section in the council's policy and procedures (below and enacted after major subversions of transparency over a decade ago) relates to the submission of "planing applications," which technically this not. Rather it is part of a path to a Comp Plan Amendment via an Area Plan. But the logic still holds and should be followed: If neither the advisory committee, the staff, or the public has sufficient time to absorb late changes related to a land use proposal, especially if the changes are significant, the item should be postponed.

Thank you for writing, Margaret

From City Council Procedures and Protocols Handbooks
<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/from-archive/agendas-minutes-reports/reports/city-manager-reports-cmrs/2011/final-council-protocols-and-procedures-manual.pdf>

In Council Procedures
Section 2.4D (Page 8)

and repeated

in City Council Protocols
Section 3.5 (Page 35)

Late Submittal of Correspondence or Other Information Related to Planning Applications

In order to allow for adequate Staff review and analysis, and to ensure public access to information, all plans, correspondence, and other documents supporting planning applications being heard by the City Council must be submitted to staff not later than noon five working days prior to the release of the Council Agenda Packet. If any correspondence or other information is submitted after this deadline to Council Members or staff, and Staff determines additional review is needed Staff will reschedule the item for a future Council meeting. If a Council member receives planning application materials from a project applicant he or she shall notify the City Clerk and the City Manager as soon as possible. There are no restrictions on the rights of applicants or others to comment or respond to information contained within the Staff Report. At the meeting the City Council may determine whether to continue or refer the item to the appropriate Board and/or Commission if significant changes to a project or significant new information become known. Nothing in this statement is intended to restrict

the rights of applicants or other interested parties to respond to information contained in or attached to a Staff Report.

-Fred Balin
9/19/21

On Sep 19, 2021, at 5:49 PM, Margaret Heath <maggi650@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor DuBois and City Council Members:

Please postpone discussion of the two proposals being offered in the At Places Memo for City Council's discussion about NVCAP at the 9/20/21 meeting.

I am particularly disappointed that staff continues to present council members with late-breaking "at places memos" containing substantive new information. A practice completely contrary to council policy that such documents must be made available to the public at large a specific number of days ahead of any council action. Substantive late information should automatically trigger postponement of any council discussion until this requirement is met.

Not only do "at places memos" do a major disservice to council members who are not given the courtesy of sufficient advance notice to fully consider any ramifications, this practice contributes to the appearance of secrecy and collusion to subvert council policy for the benefit of specific individuals or companies. Which continues to severely undermine public trust.

In this particular case, the applicant's proposals offer major departures away from the intent of the NVCAP working group's findings. These are major not minor concerns. Consideration of any development on this property should be postponed until the issue of how much, if any, commercial development vs housing is resolved.

This proposal is particularly galling to our friends and neighbors who gave thousands of hours in service to crafting a new vision for North Ventura. I am particularly disappointed that staff presented this late-breaking information instead of pulling the item from the agenda. Unfortunately, this gives all the appearance of a thinly disguised attempt to undermine NVCAP's work and manipulate the outcome in favor of the applicant.

Thank you for your attention,

margaret heath
2140 cornell street.

From: gmahany@aol.com
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: 395 Page Mill site and NVCAP
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 5:20:09 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor DuBois and City Council Members:

So the Jay Paul Company after pondering considerable financial requirements that redevelopment of 395 Page Mill decided that considerably more office space is needed. The same song that is sung by all developers. Palo Alto already has an imbalance of office space to residential space. I point out that the California state government is pushing residential developments not office space.

Why not hold the Jay Paul Company and Sobrato to the state requirements for Palo Alto's residential development.

Why is 389 Page Mill not included with the rest of the NVCAP area.

Prudence requires the postponement of discussions of the two proposals being offered in the At Places Memo for City Council's discussion about NVCAP at the 9/20/21 meeting until the concept designs are more complete.

The public as well as the Council has not had enough time to study these proposals.

The proposals offer major departures away from the intent of the working group's findings, so these are major not minor concerns

As such, they require more study and review.

Also this end-run around the NVCAP process is particularly galling to our friends and neighbors who gave thousands of hours in service to crafting a new vision for North Ventura. Please don't subvert all their work.

Thank you.

Gary Mahany
Ventura neighborhood

From: [Palo Alto Forward](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Burt, Patrick](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Gail Price](#)
Cc: [North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda Item: 8 Preferred Alternative for NVCAP
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 12:53:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Re: Agenda Item: 8 Preferred Alternative for NVCAP
Support for Alternative 3B with Clear Incentivizes for Affordable Housing

Dear Mayor DuBois and Palo Alto City Council Members:

Palo Alto Forward is a non-profit organization focused on innovating and expanding housing choices and transportation mobility for a vibrant, welcoming, and sustainable Palo Alto. We are a broad coalition with a multi-generational membership, including new and longtime residents.

We strongly support, at a minimum, staff and the Planning and Transportation Commission's recommendation: Alternative 3B. [As we have said during previous public comment periods](#) over the last 2.5 years, Alternative 3B is the only financially feasible alternative that demonstrates a commitment to meeting our regional housing needs. Leaning on an aspirational vision without concrete and substantial funding sources and political support will **not** result in the construction of new, affordable homes.

The combination of density and incentives are the only viable means to promote needed housing while also helping to fund parks and numerous creative community benefits. By demonstrating our commitment to a denser, walkable, transit-adjacent neighborhood in NVCAP, we can prioritize our climate change goals (while increasing a green canopy and reducing heat generating paved surfaces and gas-fueled cars) and set new families and low-income residents up for success.

As you know, we are several months into the Housing Element process. Palo Alto must identify sites and policies that make an additional 6,086 homes feasible in our opportunity-rich city. Failure to demonstrate a willingness to act in good faith will likely result in state intervention. NVCAP should be utilized as an opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to equitably meeting our housing needs and regional goals.

The staff report includes a number of policy areas that provide substantial opportunity for improved feasibility of affordable housing development in NVCAP. Including tools, such as land dedication, reduced parking requirements, and increased height allowances allows developers to create the greatest number of homes with the deepest levels of affordability. We believe there is room to reduce the parking requirement further.

Given the proximity to transit and the California Avenue business district, we expect

the parking demand will be lower than other neighborhoods. A [2020 study by the Regional Transportation District \(RTD\) of Metro Denver](#) highlights the reduced parking utilization within half a mile of transit:

“At market-rate properties, 40% of parking spaces go unused at peak, while income restricted properties provide 50% more parking than used.”

The City of Palo Alto has been a leader in affordable housing and sustainability in the region. But we've developed a reputation for making housing difficult and expensive to build. [The mean approval time for housing proposals in Palo Alto is substantially higher](#) than neighborhood cities; this contributes to even higher project development costs.. Clear development guidelines which emphasize streamlining and incentives for affordable housing would go a long way in changing that. We have an opportunity in NVCAP to become leaders again - and meet the current and future needs of our community.

Gail A. Price
President, Palo Alto Forward

cc: Planning and Transportation Commission, Housing Element Update Working Group

From: [Susan Usman](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Item # 8 - At Places Memo
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 7:36:35 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I'm not sure how this item got on your agenda. It has nothing to do with the work the NVCAP working group has done trying to determine the best use of the "Fry's" space for the citizens of the city of Palo Alto. Please, please don't sell out to a big developer!! We need to develop this land for the betterment of our community. Sobrato is just seeing \$\$\$\$. They don't care about quality of life in this part of the city. The NVCAP working group and the general citizens of Palo Alto need to be able to study this new proposal.

Thank you,

Susan Usman
Triple El

From: [Katie Hammerson](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Item #8, September 20, 2021 - Please delay consideration of the At Places Memo
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 2:42:56 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor DuBois and City Council Members:

Please postpone discussion of the two proposals being offered in the At Places Memo for City Council's discussion about NVCAP at the 9/20/21 meeting.

The public as well as the Council have not had enough time to study these proposals.

This is a major concern, since the proposals offer major departures away from the intent of the working group's findings. As such, they require more time for study and review.

Also this appears to be an end-run around the NVCAP process, and is particularly upsetting to friends and neighbors who volunteered thousands of hours to craft a new and better vision for North Ventura. Please don't ignore the valuable work already done on this topic and subvert the valuable input it provides

Thank you.

Katie and Bill Hammerson
Evergreen Park
Palo Alto

From: [Arthur Keller](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Item 8 NVCAP
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 9:39:19 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Please adopt Alternative 1 (which reflects the adaptive reuse of the former Alternative M).

Do not consider the late submissions for the sites, or if you must, then the meeting must be postponed. This is per the Policies and Procedures for the City Council.

The current parking ratio is warranted. Look at the developments at East Meadow Circle or El Camino and Charleston for the overflow parking that results from even the current level of parking requirements.

Best regards,
Arthur Keller

From: [Magic](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Item 8: at places memo
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 10:31:38 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members,

Many Palo Altans devoted thousands of hours to carefully considering alternatives and making recommendations about how we can use the Fry's site to community benefit. In a democracy, this will be sufficient to establish boundaries on proposals considered. Elected officials and city employees will advise any who suggest uses outside these boundaries that those will be rejected for failure to serve community interest.

Instead, city employees have carried such out-of-bounds proposals to you, our elected representatives. Worse, they've done so at the eleventh hour, limiting notice to much of the interested public and recommending your consideration at a meeting only a few days later. In my gut I feel this too close to what I expect from corrupt, authoritarian regimes.

You now have opportunity to honor the Palo Alto voters you represent by refusing to be enlisted in this anti-democratic gambit, and by directing the employees who brought it to you to make this the last time they do something of this kind. These employees deserve clear instructions from you to which they can point when asked to collaborate in community-damaging schemes by people with little regard for Palo Altans' well-being. You deserve to be served by professionals who understand how you perceive your ethical responsibilities to your constituents, and who support you in fulfilling them.

You also have opportunity to unequivocally communicate to the applicants submitting these proposals that they're wasting their resources and undermining their claims to be honest contributors to the community. You might add that you perceive them to be insulting you and your constituents by ignoring the outcome of the process to plan for this site that you created and in which so many participated.

The people of the Ventura neighborhood have been saddled with a grossly disproportionate share of the burdens of accommodating Palo Alto resident and workforce growth. In fairness they deserve that the Fry's site be used in a way that brings them closer to parity with other neighborhoods in terms of parks and open space and other benefits, and in terms of traffic and other costs.

Please return this memo to staff and direct them to advise these and other applicants that if they want to build on the Fry's site, they will craft plans consistent with the recommendations of the Palo Altans who participated in the NVCAP process and with the well-being of all of your constituents.

Thank you for considering these views.

David Schrom

***** Magic, 1979-2021: forty-two years of valuescience leadership *****

Magic demonstrates how people can address individual, social, and environmental ills nearer their roots by applying science to discern value more accurately and realize it more fully.

Enjoy the satisfaction of furthering Magic's work by making one-time or recurring [gifts](#). Magic is a 501(c)(3) public charity. Contributions are tax-deductible to the full extent permitted by law.

THANK YOU!

www.ecomagic.org ----- (650) 323-7333----- Magic, Box 15894, Stanford, CA 94309

From: [Keri Wagner](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Keri Wagner](#)
Subject: NVCAP report: biking considerations
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 10:49:10 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Council Members —

The most recent NVCAP report considers fully the development options for the area, however not much time was left for the committee to really consider a rail/Alma separated bike crossing in the North Ventura area. The separated bike/ped crossing in North Ventura is especially critical given that staff is proposing a reduction to the required on-site parking for these developments. If parking requirements are reduced, more cars could be pushed to park on the streets which would degrade bike safety.

Given the severe shortage of park space currently existing in and planned for the Ventura neighborhood, a separated bike/ped crossing becomes more critical for children and families who must bike farther for park-like amenities. The bike/ped crossing in Ventura will also grant easier access for bikes to connect North Ventura with Midtown shopping and cafes, the Mitchell Park Library with its community center and wide variety of recreational opportunities, and the Charleston Shopping Center.

The City has a rare opportunity when developing the North Ventura area, which is the chance to improve bike connectivity for South Palo Alto residents and to provide a long-awaited separated bike/ped crossing, of which there are none in South Palo Alto. A separated bike/ped crossing in North Ventura also allows safer bike connectivity and helps abate the impact to bikes and pedestrians during the construction of the grade separations at East Meadow/Alma and East Charleston/Alma.

I am a resident of Charleston Meadows and I strongly urge Council to fund a study of where to build this separated bike/ped crossing, and how to mitigate the impact to bikes and pedestrians during the multi-year construction which will take place in North Ventura and at the two rail crossings.

Thank you,
Keri Wagner
Edlee Ave
Palo Alto

650-740-7964

From: [Boelens, Arnout](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: NVCAP: no minimum parking requirements
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 9:14:54 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council,

In the NVCAP staff report there is a fair amount of space dedicated to what should be the minimum parking requirements in this new neighborhood. We would like to suggest to not set any minimums. As has been extensively written about by Donald Shoup at UCLA, setting a parking minimum will make new apartments needlessly expensive, turns scarce land into asphalt and, considering the neighborhood's proximity to the California Ave station, it is not necessary. The market is perfectly able to determine the right amount of parking on its own. Thank you for considering our comments.

Kind regards,

Nicole, Arnout, & Ava Zoeller Boelens

From: [Susan Kemp](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Please delay consideration of the At Places Memo regarding NVCAP
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 2:58:01 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Re: Item #8, September 20, 2021 - Please delay consideration of the At Places Memo

Dear Mayor DuBois and City Council Members:

Please postpone discussion of the two proposals being offered in the At Places Memo for City Council's discussion about NVCAP at the 9/20/21 meeting.

The public as well as the Council has not had enough time to study these proposals.

The proposals offer major departures away from the intent of the NVCAP working group's findings, so these are major not minor concerns, and as such they require more study and review.

In addition to the lack of time for public and council evaluation, the optics of last minute maneuverings smack of an attempt to co-opt public discourse, subvert our processes and do an end run around the Working Group which devoted thousands of hours to this process.

Thank you.

Susan Kemp
Ventura Neighborhood Resident

From: [Rebecca Sanders](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: Item #8, September 20, 2021 - Please delay consideration of the At Places Memo - We Need More Time
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 1:59:58 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor DuBois and City Council Members:

Please postpone discussion of the two proposals being offered in the At Places Memo for City Council's discussion about NVCAP at the 9/20/21 meeting.

The public as well as the Council has not had enough time to study these proposals.

The proposals offer major departures away from the intent of the working group's findings, so these are major not minor concerns, and as such they require more study and review.

In addition to the lack of time for public and council evaluation, the optics of last minute maneuverings smack of an attempt to co-opt public discourse, subvert our processes and do an end run around the Working Group which devoted 1000s of hours to this process.

Thank you.

Becky Sanders
Ventura

From: [wcmoss](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: sobrato 10+ story proposal
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 11:09:20 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council members,

As a 38 year resident of the Ventura Neighborhood. I strongly oppose the idea of a 10 plus story building in the Ventura neighborhood. It will overload the neighborhood with cars, businesses and people. Ventura is a far cry from downtown San Francisco or San Jose. It is and always has been a residential neighborhood. I urge you to not set a precedent by allowing these huge buildings to be erected.
Sincerely William Moss 650 856-2666

From: [susan_chamberlain](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Yes on North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan
Date: Sunday, September 19, 2021 8:17:51 AM
Attachments: [clip_image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.



September 19, 2021

Dear Mayor Tom Dubois, Vice-Mayor Pat Burt, Council Members Cormack, Filseth, Kou, Stone and Tanaka

We're writing on behalf of the [350.org](#) Silicon Valley Palo Alto Team regarding the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP). This plan has been in development for many years, with enormous energy and work by Staff, input from the PTC and residents. Rarely can a project present such a unique opportunity to deliver on many fronts: much needed housing, social justice by including many types of housing (including affordable housing), and an opportunity to create an environmentally sensitive community that helps reduce greenhouse gases.

Situated proximate to the best transit corridor that currently exists on the Peninsula, adjacent to our "second" downtown, and near many jobs, it is a perfect place to create a "walkable community" attractive to many potential residents. **We strongly encourage you to adopt the 3B alternative as the Staff and PTC recommend.** We can take advantage of this unique opportunity to help us address our jobs/housing imbalance, and provide housing that is less reliant on cars, thereby reducing greenhouse gases.

Sincerely,

350 SV Palo Alto Steering Committee