



**NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN
WORKING GROUP MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
Thursday, June 25, 2020
Virtual Meeting
5:30 PM**

Call to Order

Roll Call:

Present: Tim Steele, Waldek Kaczmarek, Angela Dellaporta, Gail Price, Doria Summa

Absent: Heather Rosen, Siyi Zhang

Oral Communications:

David Meyer works for Silicon Valley at Home, an affordable housing organization. He noted planning for the future is difficult. The reason for trying to maximize housing in this space has to do with meeting the City's current and future needs. The regional housing needs assessments obligation the State regulates affordable housing for different cities. The numbers for the next cycle are double for the Bay Area of what they were previously. The City will have an obligation to create more housing and affordable housing and this is an opportunity to help meet those numbers. The City Council has prioritized housing and passed some policies to get housing built, but recent reports from consultants indicated that despite some of these policies, there still remain issues with financial feasibility of housing. A lot is related to height allowances, parking requirements and some retail requirements. These issues are making housing around the City infeasible.

Discussion Items:

Discussion of topics in NVCAP Handbook – Staff and Co-Chairs

Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director of Planning Development Services advised today's meeting will cover topics in the NVCAP Handbook. Hopefully through this process the group will get to some agreements or perhaps new ideas. If agreement is not obtained after ten to fifteen minutes of dialogue, a vote could be taken of this group looking for a preference for certain

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

things for a preferred alternative to put forward. An example was put forward to explain this process.

Ms. Dellaporta explained when working on this handbook, she felt everyone's opinion needed to be heard on these issues. She tried to represent fairly what everyone wrote. She has the sense these decisions need to be made soon.

Ms. Price asked if there was an aspiration goal to get through at least 50 or 60 percent?

Ms. Tanner replied 40 to 50 percent seemed like a good goal for this meeting.

Ms. Summa noted the format of this was a little confusing. She did not see a link to get the actual results with percentages of the handbook survey. Only twelve people participated and there was an overwhelming pattern of people skipping more than answered. All the options people voted for and all the comments were contained in a different document.

Ms. Tanner remarked all the tasks were mostly she or Chitra making sure the survey was ready and these were not Working Group Members.

Question 2. Which office space policy option do you support?

Ms. Price preferred Option E, Other. There are many uncertainties regarding the ration of office square footage that would be functional and appropriate. She supports a combination of office, retail and residential and mixed use. Her estimate of 100,000 to 130,000 of office space is speculative. Offices support local retail and more low and moderate-income housing. It appeared to her that capping office now in these areas doesn't make sense. In an ideal situation jobs near housing and transit are very promising. The evolution of California Avenue and El Camino Real will serve as catalysts for viable office square footage in the NVCAP area. She did not have detailed opinions about the type of office use. She thought the 10,000 square foot question meant a total of new square footage and she was opposed to that.

Mr. Kaczmariski explained his approach was that no one will be forced to do anything. This is only setting the rules but this will only work if people voluntarily want to redevelop the area. To prevent stifling the development, it makes sense to put a cap on some things, such as the current number of office space, then put the emphasis on developing the residential. A rule could be created that would somehow benefit converting some office to residential. It does not make sense to put caps because that might stop the redevelopment altogether. He voted for keeping the current number of square footage with the asterisk that incentives should be created to redevelop toward residential.

Ms. Summa chose other on this question. She noted some of the biggest problems that residents and people who work in Palo Alto complain about are traffic and parking issues.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Greenhouse gas emissions are a huge problem globally and Palo Alto is trying to address those in a very aggressive way. The bulk of greenhouse gas emissions are created by the huge number of commuters and the number of people coming into Palo Alto to work at the big tech companies. That also results in a huge job/housing imbalance and RHNA allocation of housing, in her opinion, will never fulfill itself. To address the lack of affordable housing and acknowledge the traffic and parking problems, she believed no more commercial square footage should be created, other than that needed to provide services for those who live and work in the area, such as social retail, medical and small offices for single operators. She did not feel removing current office space by any extraordinary measures was needed other than to identify the areas where there is already a consistent pattern of housing and continue multi-family housing for future growth. Park Boulevard is a good place to do that because at the very edge of the NVCAP there is a multi-use building. It has office and she would recommend retail and neighborhood-service office only. She felt it would be appropriate to change that zoning so when those properties do get rebuilt, they become similar to the Hoback project at the northerly end. She reminded everyone that the way Palo Alto has been able traditionally to create truly affordable housing for people who are at lower levels of income have not been very successful. She was interested in the unique financing idea that was provided in Measure M because it addresses the housing shortage that is truly affordable, not market rate.

Ms. Dellaporta would like a combination of A and B. There is a very large jobs/housing imbalance in Palo Alto and adding new office space would just make that worse. The current square footage of office space is 578,000 square feet, which seems like adequate office space. If any businesses currently using office space left, they should be replaced by small locally usable offices only because they bring in foot traffic, they support local retail, they revitalize the neighborhoods, serve local residents and reduce car trips. She did not support G because offices do subsidize low and moderate-income housing.

Mr. Steele noted he is a property owner of a building that is over 200,000 square feet, the Fry's Building. He noted one of the things that might not be connected in these questions is, when reoccupying existing space, the types of impacts that the retail had on the streets is similar to what the impacts would be from having that as office. In fact, it would probably improve because of the proximity to the transit opportunities, whereas the retail traffic impacts there at Fry's was not something that could be offset by mass transit to any degree. Looking at all the comments so far and thinking about the word incentive, to restore an historic resource that has been identified, keeping the same amount of actual commercial square footage when considering retail and office to be commercial with similar traffic and parking and no new commercial outside of the numbers that already exist within the area. The idea that you can take a larger space and only require small tenants would be extremely difficult. His thought was, looking at impacts in the areas, he is not adding any new commercial, including retail and office, but the two should be interchangeable as far as square footage uses in the area because they have similar impacts on the community.

Ms. Tanner advised Mr. Kaczmariski supported option A, Ms. Price supported allowing 100,000 to 130,000 square feet of office near the transit and help subsidize some of the housing, Ms. Summa supported allowing what exists to continue, and future office spaces would be more favored toward retail or local serving offices, Ms. Dellaporta supported a combination of A and B, no new office square footage and any new would be smaller, Mr. Steele supported letting commercial use be interchangeable with office within the existing square footage. She indicated there seemed to be a pull towards leaving the existing there and having some interchangeable towards local retail with 3 in support of that.

Mr. Kaczmariski clarified that he didn't mean existing buildings should be kept. By keep existing square footage he meant the number, but still allow redevelopment. Also, he agreed that actual office buildings can take advantage of mass transportation better than commercial space does. This site is near public transportation. This is the best place to have office space in Palo Alto, so possibly reduce office in other places. His comment to incentivize the redevelopment to residential was meant to allow people to develop more to densify this area to develop more towards residential.

Ms. Dellaporta referred to Ms. Price's suggestion of 100,000 to 130,000, which would be a reduction of the amount of square feet of office space and asked if that was what she was aiming for, a reduction?

Ms. Price clarified that her intention was to retain the square footage and have the possibility of adding more office square footage. This is a long-term plan and it is very important to take advantage of the transit. She thought it was very important also to have bargaining chips with developers, so if a property owner considers developing more residential and would like a little more office space or some combination, that is worth considering. The commercial or retail services should be primarily local serving, but it is important to realize that by the development of these parcels there is some flexibility. She felt strongly about significant residential space being added to the property and that the office square footage is a valuable bargaining chip.

Ms. Tanner noted Mr. Steele thinks it is more about commercial such as retail and office being interchangeable in their existing square footage. Ms. Dellaporta and Ms. Summa did not want to add additional square footage or have the existing office go away.

Ms. Dellaporta did not feel the retail and office should be interchangeable.

Ms. Summa replied she thought Mr. Steele meant parking and congestion are more alike for retail and office than housing and she agreed with that. The changes in the area would not come about overnight. Housing is extremely lucrative but this project is trying to maintain and improve the neighborhood. Currently all transit in the Bay Area has been going down in ridership and the VTA is reducing service every year. She did not want planning decisions made on hopes for the public transit in the area. She encouraged doing everything possible to

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

encourage the kind of mixed use wanted with sensible parking and services for those residences.

Ms. Tanner advised there seemed to be a difference in the role transit should plan in the development of offices and the area in general.

Mr. Kaczmariski remarked the discussion involves such a wide spectrum and felt the main question was basically how much office space should be allowed and agreement may be close. He asked if all members could live with allowing the square footage of future development to remain the same as it is currently.

Ms. Tanner indicated by a show of hands that Ms. Dellaporta and Mr. Kaczmariski supported Mr. Kaczmariski's proposal. Mr. Steele did not support that.

Mr. Steele indicated the way the questions are all around office doesn't look at whether the larger sites are redeveloped or restoring them. If you restore the larger sites with brand new buildings, then you have an exceptional range of things that could happen. If you are reusing, repurposing or restoring existing buildings and not adding new structures, there is a much small universe. The questions are very broad to apply to both of those. Going back to the question of preserving the Fry's Building, it gives two different answers relative to how much office you would have or not have or how many more residential units you could have or could not have. That may be why members are struggling with the right amount of office space.

Ms. Tanner agreed with Mr. Steele but thought some members were okay with the existing office square footage could be made into new buildings. That would probably include revitalizing or rebuilding.

Ms. Summa clarified that she would like to use zoning as a tool in the long-term planning. She would like to limit the number of multi-use buildings and does not want big office buildings. She felt Park Boulevard was a good place to rezone some of those properties which would mean in the future there may be a different type of development there that had a mixture of appropriate commercial and housing.

Ms. Tanner thought if the group did not want to have any new office square footage, then the rezoning would not allow any new building to tear down and build additional square footage.

Ms. Summa noted she would like to see the right mix of commercial, which in her opinion was neighborhood-serving commercial and retail.

Ms. Price remarked for this area local retail and commercial is useful, but this is part of a region and the area, because of the flow of commuters and residents is an area of opportunity. The development of housing in Palo Alto is extremely expensive in Palo Alto so affordable housing

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

developers need support and the flexibility of zoning could allow for that. The population of Palo Alto is expected to be 85,000 in 3035.

Ms. Dellaporta supported the smaller offices if older ones moved out so new ones are not built. She did not support building new office space.

Ms. Tanner asked if anyone was persuaded by Ms. Price's argument to change their opinion. No one answered.

Ms. Dellaporta noted there is a huge amount of material to get through and a deadline of September. She asked if anyone had a suggestion on how to get through this more quickly.

Mr. Kaczmariski suggested after the initial presentation, trying to put together things that are similar and try to create a middle-of-the-road statement and then vote.

Mr. Steele remarked this was the first question and thought all the questions had a common thread of discussion. Each question did not have to be solved immediately and could be left unfinished and taken up again at a different time.

Question 3. Where should office space be located?

Ms. Tanned indicated no one argued against any of the sites having office space, but there might be preferences as to what is more appropriate or less appropriate. One difference that had come up was whether it is El Camino Real that had some office and commercial uses or Park Boulevard following the pattern of the other buildings, thinking of offices as smaller, local-servicing offices.

Ms. Dellaporta supported primarily A and C because offices already exist in those areas. They are easily accessible from the busy streets of Page Mill and El Camino. She could support B but she is worried about the traffic on Park.

Mr. Steele pointed out that 340 Portage already has 110,000 square feet of office space in the building. If the building is kept and a portion of the vacant space was converted to office, it would have the same traffic impacts on the neighborhood. He felt Cloudera would be an ideal location for additional residential, since it has an unimproved parking lot that could be intensified.

Ms. Price supported office locations in various parts of the site, primarily closer to transportation corridors and boundaries of NVCAP. That would mean the Cloudera site and some limited number on Park. The Portage site near Park has some possibilities. Parcel ownership may change over time, and it is important not to be wedded to the current

conditions and current perspectives. This is a local and regional serving area and the combination of uses can make this a very vital neighborhood.

Ms. Summa agreed with the Cloudera site. The large surface parking site could be redeveloped and there could be an opportunity for housing there. The Fry's site is already zoned housing but that will not provide all the office, all the housing, all the parking and all the expanded creek-side park. The existing zoning suits the area very well and it is important that the transitions should be respected.

Mr. Kaczmariski assumed this process was to set the zoning for this area so he thought members should open their minds as far as placement of anything. He would like to see separation of cars from people. He doesn't want cars to travel through the area. People can take advantage of public transportation and more density toward the train station the better. Regarding the location of the offices, he would like to see them located at Cloudera and along Park Boulevard because that's the closest to the train station. The parking should be on the other side close to El Camino.

Ms. Tanner noted it seemed like many liked A as well as D, some liked E. She asked if anyone opposed any of these.

Mr. Kaczmariski opposed putting any offices in the middle of the area. That should be reserved for residential, quieter. Office and commercial should be on the parameter of the area.

Ms. Tanner assumed no one was interested in Lambert. Most were okay with the Cloudera site. The 340 Portage site would need mitigation for traffic and congestion. This could be an office and housing combination with the offices closer to Park Boulevard.

Ms. Price felt it was conceivable to have a very modest office building at the foot of Portage near Ash. Her continued points were about the variety of design and height and location is important. If an office building was put there, you could have a modest amount of retail, mixed use that is closer to El Camino. All of the frontages except Lambert seem appropriate for office and residential if they are designed appropriately.

Ms. Tanner asked if anyone opposed what Mr. Kaczmariski and Ms. Price just said.

Ms. Summa also thought it was very important to have the kind of office that is wanted in this office. Her goal for this area is to eventually restore the consistent pattern there in residential neighborhoods that abut El Camino and Page Mill. She disagreed with what Mr. Kaczmariski said about Park Boulevard. She envisions having commercial on the big streets that segues to residential. It can be multi-family. The group should be thoughtful about the sites within the NVCAP that are already in the housing element. Alternative M called out those sites which really need to be mostly housing.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Ms. Price indicated the new housing element is on the work plan and is going to be revised in the next year. The numbers in the current housing element need to be addressed. The housing opportunity sites are not set in stone because the area is in transition.

Ms. Dellaporta pointed out there are already office on all three corners at Ash and Portage.

Ms. Tanner summarized opinions as follows. Office could be okay on all street except Lambert, if the massing, office type and height is appropriate for that area. Everyone supported mixed use and not too much segregation between areas.

Ms. Summa asked if this statement wasn't eliminating housing in the existing R1 area on Olive and Pepper? Lambert could be improved by rezoning for less office on that street.

Question 4. Where should the tallest buildings be located in the NVCAP area?

Ms. Tanner indicated this was irrespective of the uses, but thinking about the form the area would take as it is revitalized.

Ms. Dellaporta felt the tallest buildings were most appropriate along the busiest streets, so supports A and B. Placing the tallest buildings there would also keep some traffic out of the NVCAP and would provide easy access to public transit, both train and bus. This would also create a noise buffer for the internal areas of the NVCAP and allow them to retain their quieter, lower density feel. She did not support C, Park Boulevard because she would like to keep traffic away from Park Boulevard as much as possible.

Mr. Steele agreed with Ms. Dellaporta.

Mr. Kaczmariski preferred to see the separation of the car parking versus the places where people live or work, so he sees Park Boulevard to be a possible location for tall buildings, as long as parking for them is along El Camino and Page Mill.

Ms. Summa mostly agreed with Ms. Dellaporta and Mr. Steele. She also encouraged following the other development standards and transition standards, so the livability for neighbors is not degraded. She does not agree with Mr. Kaczmariski because separating parking from housing creates a convenience and safety problem and serious problems for people with disabilities.

Mr. Kaczmariski clarified his comment was in respect to office buildings, not residential.

Ms. Price agreed with Ms. Dellaporta. She also agreed with Mr. Kaczmariski in terms of some taller buildings might be appropriate along Park Avenue. They should all have great design and be stepped back so the architectural details would help reduce a canyon effect that may

emerge. She did not address parking directly because she assumed this would be addressed under the parking questions.

Ms. Tanner noted there was a lot of support for F. Mr. Kaczmariski supported F in addition to Park. It may be difficult for a person who purchases and redevelops a property on Park to secure parking at another site.

Ms. Price thought a lot of this depends on the site plan, the flexibility of the zoning. Precise decision right now may be premature.

Ms. Dellaporta suggested leaving tall buildings on Park Boulevard for further discussion later.

Question 5. What should be the maximum height for the tallest buildings in the NVCAP area?

Ms. Dellaporta pointed out when she was reading the comments, people seemed to get mixed up between maximum height and general height. This is just supposed to be talking about maximum height of the buildings. She supported mostly three- and four-story buildings throughout the NVCAP looking for a suburban character for the area. She does support affordable housing and realizes that along the periphery, especially El Camino at Page Mill, a six-story building would not be totally out of place. That would allow more affordable housing to be included. She supported C, allowing six stories as a maximum height for a few buildings, mostly three- and four-story buildings.

Mr. Steele pointed out a five-story office building and a five-story residential building are two different heights. A residential building is about ten to eleven feet per story and an office building is usually about fifteen to sixteen feet on the first floor, fourteen in the middle, and sixteen to eighteen on the top floor. He suggested when referring to building height, making this feet or something that is specific to residential and to office. He did think residential made sense outside of what is called Type 3, which would be limited to six and seven stories which is the maximum that can be built. Higher than that becomes about 30 percent more expensive. He recommended staying around the maximum for a Type 3 for residential and comparable height for an office building. Type 3 residential is six to seven stories maximum and that is counting possibly an above-ground portion of a podium parking.

Mr. Kaczmariski didn't see the difference between the two previous speakers. He agrees with Ms. Dellaporta and tall buildings on the parameter.

Mr. Steele agreed with that.

Ms. Summa agreed it is problematic to speak about height in terms of stories. She is comfortable with a 50-foot height limit and the affordable housing overlay allows going higher for affordable housing. Most affordable housing projects do not want to go very much above

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

what it was allowed. She supported rewriting this question for height instead of stories. She is comfortable with a 50-foot height limit for this area, since there is a single-family home neighborhood and the transitions will make it impossible to have taller buildings along El Camino.

Ms. Price felt six to eight stories gives the flexibility for developing affordable housing. The zoning and how flexible the zoning will be is not known. Also, the needs in fifteen or twenty years are not known today. She would not preclude a taller building if it was appropriate and met the needs of the community. She felt the current height limit is straining in this economy and needs to be reexamined. Overlay would provide some of that flexibility.

Ms. Tanner summarized the majority agreed on six to eight stories with some saying up to six.

Ms. Summa pointed out zoning is very flexible and can be changed. She was concerned that if there was an economic recovery, there could be a boom of development at those heights which are difficult to transition, given the size of the parcels in most cases, to the adjacent zones. It is important to remember that the Council just reinstated the planned community zone for housing projects.

Ms. Price noted on the site plan, it relates to the building orientation. It may be possible to have well-designed transitions. She agreed the parcel sizes are a problem and parcel assembly would make a huge difference on this general site. That may happen more in the future.

Ms. Tanner asked for a vote. Three voted for six stories maximum. One voted for eight stories maximum. Two voted for five stories. Two voted for a 50-foot height limit.

Question 6. The current NVCAP/California Avenue area has a population density of 6.5 thousand per square mile. Looking at areas of inspiration from Working Group members, what population density would you support in the plan area?

Mr. Kaczmariski had a problem with the way this is defined. When crunching the numbers, they are very low but at the same time what happens is they take a large part of the city which included some portions that were single-family housing, some were multi-story and taking an average. The numbers per square mile seemed very low to him.

Ms. Dellaporta remarked 10 thousand residents per square mile is six dwelling units per acre, if you assume 2.5 or 2.6 residents per dwelling unit.

Mr. Kaczmariski noted the picture showed four story buildings, but the average includes some residential neighborhood that are 80 percent of the town.

Ms. Tanner explained some parts of an area are dense with the four-story building and some areas adjacent that are single family homes.

Mr. Kaczmariski indicated it would depend on how much is residential and how much is high density. He believed this should be the most crucial element to control the development. The standard for density should be set but a more defined number.

Ms. Dellaporta advised questions 6, 7 and 8 all have to do with density and they all look at density in a different way. The NVCAP area will be a mixture of things. This question could be skipped and go directly to dwelling units per acre.

Question 7. What should be the overall housing density for the NVCAP area?

Mr. Kaczmariski preferred thirty to forty dwelling units per acre. He likes tall buildings, but at the same time he would like to have a significant amount of greenery between the buildings. Instead of trying to limit the density by limiting the height, he would rather limit the density by the number of units per acre.

Ms. Summa remarked that density per acre is not a big anguish point for her. If developers want to build more densely and they can sell it and other development standards associated with it don't have negative impacts, such as parking they should be able to do it. She leans toward thirty to forty.

Ms. Dellaporta agrees with Mr. Kaczmariski. An average of twenty to thirty units per acre would be acceptable and comfortable to most people in the area. This would result in about 1,000 to 1,500 total residents in the area. That would satisfy new housing needs and it would also be enough to require four acres of new park land. Greater density than about thirty would feel out of place.

Ms. Price supported the forty-one to seventy-five dwelling units per acre. This gives a range of flexibility, increases capacity over current conditions and can accommodate a wide range of building designs, densities and unit size. If you had more compact development and some flexibility in the height, you would have greater areas for green space and open space. She thought the R1 neighborhood zones currently there and in the adjacent neighborhood in fifteen to twenty years, those would be one and two story largely residential buildings. She felt there will be a change in the existing residential units because of changing needs and cost of development.

Mr. Steele pointed out that generally speaking, like the height issue with the residential and commercial buildings, there will be that kind of issue here in some respects of you just focus on the dwelling units per acre. The tendency currently, especially on the rental is moving to smaller units within the same volume of space. A sense of size or mass that goes along with this

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

is needed. Also, he thought what will happen is there will be mostly twenty-one to forty units per acre because there will be a height limit that discourages the sixty-five unit per acre project. There will be more pressure on ownership housing in a town-home configuration, and that will be twenty to twenty-five units per acre. The dwelling units per acre isn't exactly the right measurement here.

Ms. Dellaporta referred to the comment about the sizes of the buildings. The dwelling units and the number of residents does make a big difference, because that indicates what the impact would be, traffic and people in the area, etc.

Ms. Tanner indicated there might be a difference what is zone for, what the market is pushing for. This is a way to get at the number of residents to plan for.

Ms. Price reminded everyone there were many examples at the earlier meetings of complexes which reflected the fifty, sixty, seventy units per acre. That has taken place in Palo Alto. Asked with the prices of land in this community, if it is zoned for 30, the chances of having ten units is very small, unless they are the very expensive market-rate units.

Question 8. Looking at the feasible building typologies, which type and associated housing density do you prefer?

Mr. Kaczmariski had a problem with giving the typology with the units per acre. He likes low-rise greenway, but doesn't necessarily agree with 100 units per acre. That should be separated. He likes the low-rise greenway because it provides the green space that is accessible to the public space that can be shared. It should be disconnected from the units per acre number.

Ms. Tanner believed part of the challenge is someone likes four-story buildings, but when looking at those buildings that would be built today, they are at a higher density than wanted. The low-rise greenway building that is four stories does not have 107 units in it, but the density of that building is 107 units per acre. If it was spread out over a full acre, that is how many units would be in a building of that massing and with that green space provided.

Mr. Kaczmariski remarked that is just a little more space between the buildings. If it has to be 100 units per acre to have this kind of development, then he would not like it.

Ms. Tanner noted there seems to be an affinity for the European style community that has been expressed and that is a higher density community than twenty to thirty units per acre.

Ms. Dellaporta suggested something new. She likes A, B and D combined. She thought it was necessary to add a requirement that the result over the whole NVCAP would be no more than forth units per acre total. That would include single-family homes, townhomes, offices, so there

would be a variety of different densities over the whole area. Overall, though, there should be a cap on the units per acre.

Ms. Price liked the mid-rise E, F and G. She separated it from the dwelling units per acre, because she is focused on the typology. Given the values of the property, the capacity trying to be built, focusing on residential units over a twenty-year period, providing the different designs in the E, F, G options and the different typologies really gives a lot of flexibility. There are designs and ways these kinds of buildings can be made very attractive.

Ms. Tanner clarified Ms. Price said E is the mid-rise block, F is A, B, D and E, and G is a new solution.

Ms. Price explained G is kind of a combination of different heights. She still believes the Olive and Pepper area will be at a different kind of density.

Ms. Summa noted she had a hard time with building types and units per acre together. There are already forty units per acre, the Mike's Bike site or the VTA site that is unfinished are a little over forty units per acre. If it is fifty units per acre, there is almost no open space. She did not favor typologies being associated with units per acre, but she has some flexibility above forty units per acre. More discussion is needed about what that would be. She is most comfortable with the current units, but is open to having more units per acre, especially if the developers feel they can sell or rent smaller units. She did emphasize this is a family community, so she did not want to overdo tiny units

Ms. Tanner advised in the typologies that are part of this question the dwelling units per acre are for as specific typology.

Ms. Summa did not like these because they restricted building styles to units per acre. Those two things don't go together.

Ms. Tanner reiterated that the townhome typology as provided by the consultant is designed at a thirty-three dwelling units per acre typology. There could be townhomes that could be many typologies. The link provided with that question would link to these typologies with those dwelling units per acre. She asked Ms. Summa if there was any typology she did like if density was separated.

Ms. Summa thought this question should be passed because the way it is phrased, the units per acre are associated with typologies.

Mr. Steele advised this is more complicated than the simple answers because these typographies can be used together and one should not be precluded from another if it is handled in an architecturally sensitive way that fits into the context. The larger the site, the

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

more changes are you will use more than one typography and the small the site, the fewer typographies could be used. He felt the real way to capture this is to go back to more of a zoning-based question of, is it units per acre or FAR for this site. Let the architectural process decide what is appropriate for the context the site is within.

Ms. Tanner indicated she would list his answer as a variety over the area and architecture needs to fit the context.

Ms. Dellaporta reported it sounded to her as if most people were agreeing with F, maybe not all of the typologies were supported but most of them. Most do want to separate out the density connected with those. Maybe it would be better to change the word “all” under F to “most” and ignore the densities, and add “most of the above in appropriate locations”. Then maybe everyone could support that.

Ms. Summa voted not.

Mr. Kaczmariski remarked that for him the issue was the green typology was the only one that was giving the shared, open space to the public. The other ones were building to the property lines. His vision was that buildings were surrounded by the green areas. To him, height is less of an issue as long as there is a green belt between the walkway and the building, so there is less of an impact of a concrete corridor. He understands typology as basically, in this case, opening the green landscape to the public versus creating the courtyards that are private and the public walks on the concrete space between concrete buildings.

Ms. Tanner asked if adding to F is a desire to try to either refine or modify D to have more publicly accessible open space, so there is that open space that is accessible to the public.

Ms. Kaczmariski noted sometimes it is written in a way that there is a requirement for a certain amount of landscape area to be publicly accessible.

Ms. Price agreed with many of Mr. Steele’s points. This is trying to force fit into typologies, when what would be more flexible is looking at the range of typologies, recognizing the sites, the unknown assembly of parcels that may take place. This may not stay exactly like it is today in terms of potential assembly of parcels, and that also influences development options, design options, setbacks, etc. She is not sure the Group can come to a comfortable agreement on this.

Ms. Tanner related it seemed like most people agreed with F.

Ms. Price reiterated F provided greater flexibility, did not preclude one typology over another. She believed it depends and there is much more discussed needed to make this realistic.

Ms. Tanner explained F said most of the above but specifically called out A (townhomes), B (low-rise greenway) and D (low-rise with retail). Combining this answer with some from the other questions about location of the tallest buildings, location of retail, that brings the process of putting the pieces together.

Ms. Price responded she is focusing on E, F and G. Her emphasis is E and F but there are some existing residential corridors that could have townhouses on them, that would be below the E level.

Ms. Tanner understood there were four people who favored F, Ms. Dellaporta, Ms. Price, Mr. Steele, Mr. Kaczmariski with adding the refining of the massing of the E option might meet his needs. Ms. Summa did not want to vote on this one, and wanted to separate out the dwelling units per acre from the typologies.

Ms. Dellaporta suggested since time is running out, maybe next time the densities should be taken away as part of the discussion and focus on the typologies and why there is support or not support for them. This assumes they would only be used in appropriate places and no one typology would be used throughout.

Ms. Summa thought it was important to discuss the dwelling units per acre and development standards that would go along with that. That is where the building envelope is created. The mid-rise block will not happen at certain densities per acre. Discussion is needed about densities per acre and development standards that go along with that.

Ms. Tanner replied the buildings provided brought those things together. If no one likes the typologies and the densities, but that means looking at much smaller buildings with lower densities. The mid-rise block typology is designed at a rate of 159 dwelling units per acre. It is not necessarily the number of units in that building.

Public Comment:

Ken Joye remarked earlier the Group discussed how the greenway of one of the building typologies could be considered public space. He did not think that was appropriate, because if you are building a residential complex, the property is for the residents who live in that complex. In the workbook there are some questions about parks and how they should be spread about. Public space should refer to parks and purchasing the land. The type of building and the grounds around the building can give a much different feeling, such as 101 Alma versus the feeling of 850 Webster. If you are going to talk about building typologies and how many units fit in a space, and want to have the visual examples for guidance, could there be consideration of talking about the density of these four properties in Palo Alto: 101 Alma, 501 Forest, 850 Webster and 850 Arastradero. Those are examples of buildings discussed earlier in this meeting regarding building height, but there is space around the building. He also asked if

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

the Working Group would be making any recommendations in its proposal to Council regarding the distribution of ownership, residential units versus rental units? For the rental units, will the Working Group include in its proposal to Council any recommendation regarding market-rate rental versus below market rate?

NVCAP Comments:

Ms. Tanner noted mistakenly the chat feature was enabled. That should not be on during these meetings.

Ms. Price asked if Mr. Steele could write out the different heights for the residential versus the commercial? Is it possible to get a copy of the presentation by SV at home where they illustrated different densities?

Ms. Tanner replied both of those things could probably be done. There is also a two-page printout that could be sent that is actual buildings in Palo Alto that included the density per acre. This was a really robust conversation. There were some areas of convergence and some not. The plan, if the Group agreed, would be to try to have this group meet a second time in July and she asked for comments about the way the meeting was done.

Ms. Summa thought the format worked fairly well.

Mr. Kaczmariski requested language that would specify that there is a certain amount of landscape required that is publicly accessible.

Ms. Dellaporta indicated care needs to be taken with time, because there so much to get through. She encouraged everyone to look at the questions and note if there is a better way to write them or discuss them.

Mr. Steele recommended where there are multiple questions around the same idea, those could be simplified if all the question were categorized into three or four primary questions. The questions were good, but it is difficult in a Zoom environment that there will be an expeditious conversation.

Adjournment: 8:32 PM

Note: Copies of meeting materials will be posted on the City's project website:

<https://bit.ly/2OtGFJG>.