



## **PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE**

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, on matters listed on the agenda please email [PublicComment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PublicComment@losaltosca.gov)

**From:** [Roberta Phillips](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Housing Element July 12 Item #7  
**Date:** Saturday, July 9, 2022 10:10:12 AM

---

Dear Council Members

I disagree with a section I found in the draft for HCD in the Housing Element document. The City Council should have the decision making power to approve or disapprove housing projects. You are the elected officials. The Planning Commission and Staff are not. I understand that you are trying to speed up the process, but most delays are caused by incomplete applications from developers. They do not make requested changes by the Commission nor Peer review. It is only when Council gets involved that needed modifications are made or negotiated.

Also the idea of consolidating Planning Commission with Design review is not wise. In the past, the Planning Commission has had so much on their plate that when they were responsible for transportation, they did not have the bandwidth to address the issues. Putting more on their plate will slow things down.

Please see the section that I am referring to below.

It appears that this might be a power grab on the part of the Planning Commission and the Planning Department to take away the decision making power from the City Council and give the power to themselves. It is very bad optics.

Sincerely

Roberta Phillips



30	Consolidate the Design Review Commission and Planning Commission into one body. Modify design review process so Council serves only as the decision-making authority for appeal of design review decisions. Eliminate requirement for story poles
----	---

**From:** [Pat and Jerry Brodkey](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 7, July 12, 2022  
**Date:** Saturday, July 9, 2022 11:40:34 AM

---

Dear Mayor Enander and Members of the City Council,  
Congratulations to all who have worked so hard on the Housing Element.  
I am so pleased to see as a city we are willing to change to make our town an even better place. The plans to develop in the downtown area with the parking plaza and development along San Antonio are outstanding.

Change can be difficult and it is great that as a community we are willing to step up and do our part to increase the supply of housing.

All the best,

Pat Brodkey  
120 Los Altos Ave  
28 year resident

**From:** [Pat Marriot](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 7 JULY 12, 2022 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE  
**Date:** Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:41:19 PM

---

Council Members:

PDF page 30 and page 173 Program 3.H: Amend design review process and requirements.

The City's Design Review Commission and Planning Commission had previously been consolidated into one commission, which was again separated into two commissions in recent years.

*I think this is an error. It was the Planning & Transportation Commission that was split a few years ago.*

The City will consolidate the Design Review Commission and Planning Commission into one body comprised of a maximum of seven appointed residents.

*This is a bad idea if the consultants really mean the Design Review Commission. Reviewing single-family homes is quite different from reviewing multifamily, mixed use, commercial. Different criteria. Planning Commission has to consider many more complicated issues.*

The City's design review process and applicability thresholds will be modified so that City Council serves only as the decision-making authority for appeal of design review decisions.

*Another bad idea. Council has learned a lot regarding SB35 and understands the need to use only OBJECTIVE standards. The Planning Commission is a group of residents that makes recommendations to Council. I want my elected representatives involved in reviewing major projects, not just looking at appeals.*

Pat Marriott Los Altos

**From:** [Roberta Phillips](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Housing Element Council meeting July 12.2022  
**Date:** Sunday, July 10, 2022 10:36:00 AM

---

Dear Council Members

I was reading the draft for Tuesday's meeting and found an error.

The report says:

Program 3.H: Amend design review process and requirements. The City's Design Review Commission and Planning Commission had previously been consolidated into one commission, which was again separated into two commissions in recent years. The current structure of the Design Review Commission is a five-person body appointed by the City Council, while the Planning Commission is a seven-person body. Recent changes in State law drastically reduced the Design Review Commission's purview, and the City's well developed objective design standards for a variety of development types (adopted in 2021) effectively created an Administrative Design Review that has been well implemented by City staff. The City will consolidate the Design Review Commission and Planning Commission into one body comprised of a maximum of seven appointed residents. The City's design review process and applicability thresholds will be modified so that City Council serves only as the decision-making authority for appeal of design review decisions. Additionally, housing developments and emergency shelters will only be subject to objective design standards consistent with State law, and the requirement for the installation of story poles will be eliminated"

This is factually incorrect

The Planning Commission and Design Review Commission were never joined as one and then separated out. The Planning Commission was once the Planning and Transportation Commission, but then the transportation part was separated out and the Complete Streets Commission was formed. Council made that decision with the Planning Commissions as the planning Commission did not pay attention and were happy to get it off their plate.

Factually incorrect statements do not belong in the report.

It is a bad idea to join the Planning and Design review Commission into one Commission and restrict City Council from reviewing proposed buildings . City Council are elected officials . They need to maintain responsibility and accountability.

**From:** [Pamela Schreiber](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Public Comment Agenda Item # 7 for meeting 7/12/2022 2100 Woods Lane Los Altos Parcel 1, APN 34204078 Parcel 2, APN 34204089  
**Date:** Sunday, July 10, 2022 8:00:03 PM

---

Dear Council,

I would like to respectfully provide feedback on the proposed development which is in proximity to the Toyon Farm community. My husband and I have been resident homeowners at Toyon Farm for over 15 years. It is a wonderful place to live for many reasons. One key reason is the community and land has been well cared for. I have grave concerns in the push to build more dwellings that this would negatively impact those of us who call Toyon Farm home. Please see a list of concerns below as it relates to these parcels of land. I stand with our neighbors in raising these concerns.

1. Parcel 1, APN 34204078, has a lot size of 1.12 acres, with a maximum 5 units and a realistic number of 1 unit. This is the smallest parcel close to 280. It has no ingress or egress and is at the back of parcel 2 (APN 34204089).

2. Parcel 2, APN 34204089, has a lot size of 7.97 acres, with a maximum 35 units and a realistic number of 10 units. Parcel 2 has a riparian watershed through the center of the property, 2 dams and the Woods Lane road. The Woods Lane road is the only ingress and egress for Toyon Farm residents living on Woods Lane, Citation Drive and for the 2100 Woods Lane property.

The concerns expressed by residents for Parcel 2 (APN 34204089) include:

1. Future development of the riparian watershed area has to be approved by the SF Bay Water Quality Board, CA Fish and Wildlife and US Army Corps of Engineers.
2. Toyon Farm could be flooded if the 2 dams are removed, damaged or blocked during development. The 2 dams serve as reservoirs to protect TFHOA property and homes on Woods Lane and Farm Road from flooding during heavy rains. It is also questionable if the 2 dams could hold back the additional run-off water from any new development upstream.
3. An increase in Woods Lane traffic will impact Toyon Farm residents, visitors, pedestrians, bikers and vehicular traffic. This is a safety issue as there are no sidewalks and residents of Toyon Farm enjoy walking in the wooded areas and along the roads that were never designed to carry frequent car traffic.
4. Woods Lane is a narrow and winding private lane. It is an ingress and egress for Toyon residents living on Woods Lane and Citation Drive and the only ingress and egress to the 2100 Woods Lane property. It is bounded by a steep hill and on the other side by vegetation and water/pond
5. Woods Lane may not be able to safely accommodate an increase in traffic from Toyon Farm and a development on the 2100 Woods Lane property during an emergency or wildfire.

Thank you so very much for considering these issues. Toyon Farm is our home and one that we want to live in for a long time to come.

Pamela Schreiber-Carey

Pamela Schreiber-Carey



July, 2022

Mayor Enander and Members of the City Council  
City of Los Altos  
1 N. San Antonio Road  
Los Altos, CA 94022

Re: Agenda Item #7 – Sixth Cycle Housing Element, Council Meeting July 12th

Dear Mayor Enander and Members of the City Council:

The League continues to support a comprehensive plan to address housing that follows State law, and we thank the Staff and LWC for a Draft Housing Element that provides bold steps towards a compliant Housing Element. We appreciate Staff providing street addresses along with APN#s as these are easier for the public to understand. That said, we have some major concerns.

First, we would like the downtown parking plazas to be identified with their Lot numbers as they are in the Downtown Vision. Second, although we are pleased to see that a large buffer has been proposed, we think this buffer could rapidly disappear if the recommended rezonings and programs are not put in place.

In addition, many sites listed are unlikely to be developed. For example, all the downtown parking plazas are listed; it is unrealistic to think that all will be developed with housing as the City will want to retain some surface parking and one parcel has already been designated for a potential theater. Therefore, the projected number of units on each lot is unrealistic. However, perhaps the total projected number for all the lots (138) could be a goal for one or two of the lots, better explained as part of Program 1.H. Also, for any of these sites to be attractive to affordable housing developers, as is discussed in Programs, the density/height must be increased, and the City will need to provide financial resources.

Other sites such as Draegers have been recently remodeled, making it unlikely they will be developed with housing during the next Housing Element cycle. Spokespeople for the two churches designated have stated they have no interest in building housing. Foothill Crossing, projected for 80 units, recently signed a long-term lease with a major new tenant and has expressed no interest. We suggest that these sites and others be more vigorously vetted before they are included in the site inventory.

We applaud many of the programs. We especially like Program 1.H with its specific timeline for developing affordable housing on at least one downtown parking plaza. But without some City financing and upzoning, this program is unrealistic.

Another program the City should include is an Affordable Housing Overlay Zone for the downtown parking lots as well as other areas of the City. The City should meet with developers to see what needs to be included in order to encourage housing, i.e., height, density, fees, setbacks, etc.)

We also commend the following programs: 1.B re the CT District, 1.C re the OA District, 1.E re Loyola Corners and 1.F re Village Court. However, we would like to see specifics, such as allow an additional story, rather than “increase building heights” (1.B), and, again, specific proposed modifications for density and height (1.E).

Program 1.I to incentivize Downtown lot consolidation is also commendable, and we recommend that lot consolidation be encouraged for other areas such as Sherwood Triangle., but there is a lack of commitment to measurable success criteria. This program and others should have metrics-based objectives.


We have long advocated that the City adopt a commercial linkage fee as envisioned by an enabling ordinance adopted four years ago (Muni Code 3.49.070, Ord. No. 2018-444), but don’t understand why this should take till the end of 2025. Re ADUs, we strongly support providing permit ready standard ADU plans (2.D), but don’t like the verbiage “consider permit fee waivers...”as once again this reflects a lack of commitment.

All the programs listed under Goal 3 to Remove constraints to the development of housing should be included, but we especially recommend updating the parking requirements (3.A) and Amending design review process (3.H). Some specific changes to parking requirements could be promised in the Housing Element based upon the draft parking ordinance approved by the Planning Commission in 2018, such as reducing the width of parking spaces, and lane dimensions, creating a program with in-lieu parking fees, along with reducing parking for senior and deed-restricted units, and specific requirements for buildings with mechanical lifts. A parking in-lieu fee program would allow development on smaller lots downtown where the owners cannot provide the required parking on site and would generate funds to expand and enhance the parking supply. The Design Review process will be improved by eliminating the DRC as a separate body and by eliminating story poles and ensuring that all design standards are objective. Programs 3.B and 3.C are necessary for some of the sites listed in the inventory to be developed.

Program 5.B re the City’s contract with Alta Housing should be updated to reflect the recent Council discussion with Alta and the possibility that another administrative agency might be retained at the end of Alta’s contract next year.

Finally, we would urge the City to commit to providing some safe parking for vehicle-dwellers, whether on City-owned property or by working with faith-based institutions. As the Housing Element notes, several of the churches have large parking lots; these are being used for safe parking in other nearby communities.

In summary, we hope all the programs proposed in the Draft Housing Element will be adopted with some additions and changes to make the programs and timelines more specific.

(Please send any questions about this email to )

Karin Bricker, President LWV of Los Altos/Mountain View Area  
Cc: Gabe Engeland.      Nick Zornes      Angel Rodriguez



**From:** [Monica Waldman](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External Sender]PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM 7 for 7/12/22  
**Date:** Monday, July 11, 2022 11:23:59 AM

---

Dear Mayor Enander and Members of the City Council,

I have some concerns about the Public Review Draft of the 6th Cycle Housing Element 2023-2031 by Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. to be discussed during the 7/12/22 meeting:

1. Some verbiage placed into the draft as nice to have:

-Page 30-34 “Goal 4: Create housing opportunities for people with special needs” Includes many programs with “Funding Source: General Fund.” Los Altos has a smaller tax base than neighboring cities such as Mountain View and Palo Alto, where is the money from the “General Fund” going to come from to fund these programs?

-Page 29 “The Zoning Code will also be amended to allow large residential care facilities (seven or more persons) in all residential zones without discretionary review (i.e., subject only to objective standards). Residential care facilities will not be limited to individuals of 60 years of age or over, and a barrier-free definition of “family” that encompasses unrelated individuals living together as a single residential unit will be added consistent with State law.”

I had a family member in a residential care facility with more than six individuals living in a house in a residential portion of Menlo Park. The facility created excess cars on the street belonging to staff and visitors which included family, friends, delivery vehicles and County staff. Occasionally residents exited the facility, causing police intervention and lock downs of nearby homes. I ask that Los Altos not allow large facilities, often run by private equity firms (<https://middlemarketgrowth.org/the-round-alcohol-and-drug-treatment-centers-draw-private-equity-backing/>), to be permitted in residential areas.

-Page 31 says “The Zoning Code does not address low barrier navigation centers (LBNCs), defined as Housing First, low-barrier, service enriched shelters focused on moving people into permanent housing that provide temporary living facilities while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing (Government Code §65660). State law requires LBNCs to be permitted by-right in areas zoned for mixed-use and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses provided they satisfying the provisions established by AB 101 (see Government Code §65662). This would allow LBNCs in the CD/R3, CN, CD, CRS, CT, and CRS-OAD districts. The City will amend its Zoning Code to explicitly allow LBNCs as provided by State law.”

Government Code §65662 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2020/code-gov/title-7/division-1/chapter-3/article-12/section-65662/>) says “A local jurisdiction shall permit a Low Barrier Navigation Center development provided that it meets the following requirements:  
(a) It offers services to connect people to permanent housing through a services plan that identifies services staffing. [...]”

At this time Los Altos does not have any Low Barrier Navigation Center(s) nor do we have a plan to offer services to connect people to permanent housing. The suggestion should be taken out of the Housing Element.

-Page 165 says “State law requires local governments to treat licensed residential care facilities (sometimes called group homes) with six or fewer residents as a residential use and subject to the same development standards as a single-family dwelling. Furthermore, no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of a residential facility that serves six or fewer persons that is not required of a family dwelling of the same type in the same zone. The residents and operators of a residential care facility shall be considered a family for the purposes of any law or zoning ordinance that relates to the residential use of property. However, “six or fewer persons” does not include the operator, operator’s family, or persons employed as staff.

No State law is cited. Please have the document updated to include the State law we need to comply with.

2. ADUs

Page 23-24 If the City is serious and wants to encourage ADUs than the City’s ADU rules should be revisited:

2A The Los Altos ADU regulations include “a detached ADU that does not exceed eight hundred fifty (850) square feet in size nor sixteen (16) feet in height” ([https://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community\\_development/page/49094/accessory\\_dwelling\\_unit\\_handout\\_12.29.21.pdf](https://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/49094/accessory_dwelling_unit_handout_12.29.21.pdf)) should be revisited to allow for taller ADUs built on top of detached garages and other dwelling units.

2B Gas is a less expensive energy choice than electric. Exempting ADUs from the REACH codes and allowing gas cooking, heating and appliance options would help low income residents who want to rent ADUs in our community. Update Goal 7 on page 136 to echo this.

2C Allow exemptions to ADU height requirements for homes with detached garages less than 10 feet from the property line.

Page 119-120 If the City really wants to encourage and streamline the review process for ADUs, they should loosen the rules governing ADU building before January 2027. Waiving fees and “local financing programs for ADUs, etc.” are not going to create more ADUs in Los Altos.

Monica Waldman  
Los Altos Resident