

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF LOS ALTOS, HELD ON THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022 BEGINNING AT
6:00 P.M. HELD VIA VIDEO/TELECONFERENCE PER EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20**

Per California Executive Order N-29-20, the Commission will meet via teleconference only. Members of the Public may call (650) 419-1505 to participate in the conference call (Meeting ID: 481935182 or via the web at <https://tinyurl.com/yfhf3rpy>) Members of the Public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Public testimony will be taken at the direction of the Chair and members of the public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit written testimony prior to the meeting at PlanningCommission@losaltosca.gov. Emails received prior to the meeting will be included in the public record.

ESTABLISH QUORUM

PRESENT: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, Bodner (entered meeting at 6:20 PM), Roche (entered meeting at 6:10 PM), and Steinle

ABSENT: Commissioner Marek

STAFF: Interim Planning Services Manager Golden, Contract Planner Hayagreev, City Attorney Houston

STUDY SESSION

- PPR21-0011 – DeNardi Wang Homes – 996 Loraine Avenue**
The applicant requests preliminary project feedback from the Planning Commission for a three (3) story mixed-use building with 1,195 square feet of retail on the first story and 12 residential units at the second and third story, including two moderate income restricted units, and one level of at grade parking. The Planning Commission’s feedback on this preliminary project is not considered a “project” pursuant to Section 15378 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. *Project Planner: Hayagreev*

STAFF PRESENTATION
Contract Planner Hayagreev

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Albert Wang, Jeff Potts

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

Steinle

- The parking should address the requirements under 14.42. Mr. Steinle believes that the parking ratio for the should be applied to the gross floor area of the building, not just the portion of the building that is designated non-residential

PUBLIC COMMENT

Guest

- Building has been exposed to elements
- Made comments about the building at 1540 Miramonte

Nancy

- Building doesn't fit the specific plan
- Building should conform to the design standards
- Applicant will ask for concessions with disregard to the neighborhood and surrounding area

Makesh (spelling?)

- Opposed to project
- Concerned about height
- Too bulky

Mark Ivey

- Opposed to project
- Concerned about height
- Recommends a shadow study, lives adjacent and is concerned about having shadows
- Too bulky and maximizing volume

MJ

- Building fits more of the transit district and the proposal doesn't fit the scale of the district which is more of a neighborhood
- Two BMR units doesn't afford the concessions requested

Alice Shyu

- Concerned about the size of the building
- Concerned about potential parking and traffic impacts

Debbie

- Concerned about the proposed project
- Not a good place for children

Kamil

- What if everyone with similar property develops this type of property?
- What if all other properties had commercial?

RICHARD ROCHE ENTERED MEETING

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ahi

- 2017 Specific Plan Update design elements and policy are not being addressed
- The objective design standards are not being addressed
- Articulation could be improved
- Façade facing the R1 zoning district doesn't address design standards
- Corner of the building should be retail, not private

- Blank walls facing outward
- Elevator tower is too tall
- Uncovered parking should be addressed
- The project should be redesigned prior to formal submittal

Steinle

- Project doesn't meet the objective standards. Staff should not bring projects forward if they do not comply with the standards.
- Materials don't match what is expected
- Entrances are dull, need to be redesigned
- Change the color palette
- Retail space is very small. Could be reoriented per Commissioner Ahi's suggestions. Supports mixed use
- Height of wall plates should be reduced

Mensingher

- Need to address objective standards, specific plan, and the site context

Roche

- Building is too tall. Specific plan identifies specifics that aren't being addressed in the proposal.
- Concerned about impacts to the one-story residence abutting project site
- Recommends to redesign the project and notes many issues and concerns with regards to privacy, noise impacts from utility box and light glare from headlights of parked cars
- Doesn't support the carports
- Lack of parking
- Doesn't address context of the neighborhood

Doran

- This is a gateway type of property
- Project should have addressed input from the neighborhood
- Density bonus will still need to address community concerns
- The zero lot setback on Miramonte Avenue should be increased
- Agrees with other commissioner comments

REGULAR MEETING

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Rashi Sharma

- Made comments with regards to reducing light glare in planning and design

Mircea

- Made comments with regards to story poles and addressing with other options and alternatives
- Safety concerns regarding story poles

Roberta Phillips

- Concerned about the agenda because the study session was posted at 7pm

- Made comments regarding the 996 Loraine Ave project. Is not in favor of project

Terresa Morris

- Concerned about light glare
- Concerned about posting of the agenda

Joe Cintas

- Concerned about the agenda posting and early start time
- Concerned about construction noise
- Concerned about project, blocking the sunlight

Carla

- Made comments with regards to 4350 ECR

COMMISSIONER BODNER ENTERED THE MEETING.

**Change the orders of the meeting so that Item #5 is moved before Item #4.*

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Ahi, the Commission recommends approval:

The motion was approved (6-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, and Steinle, Marek, Bodner, Roche

NOES:

ABSENT: Marek

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. **Planning Commission Minutes**
Approve minutes of the Regular meeting of February 17, 2022 and March 3, 2022 Study Session and Regular meeting.
3. **Annual Housing Element Progress Report**
Planner: Golden

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Bodner, the Commission recommends approval:

The motion was approved (6-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, and Steinle, Marek, Bodner, Roche

NOES:

ABSENT: Marek

PUBLIC HEARING

4. **Wireless Communications Ordinance Amendment**

Revisions to the City of Los Altos' existing standards for the development of wireless telecommunications facilities, including an ordinance to regulate permissible locations and preferences for the location of wireless facilities. These locational standards, which would replace the locational standards now provided in City of Los Altos Resolution No. 2019-35, would be adopted by ordinance into Chapter 14.82 of the Los Altos Municipal Code. In addition, the City proposes to expand and supplement existing development standards and design guidelines and preferences for wireless telecommunications facilities contained in Resolution No. 2019-35 by (1) adding a set of basic design principles that would apply to all wireless telecommunications facilities and (2) identifying configuration preferences along with design guidelines for specific types of wireless facilities. *City Staff: Jolie Houston, City Attorney* THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 3, 2022 PC MEETING.

STAFF PRESENTATION – Lloyd Zola

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

None

OPENED PUBLIC COMMENTS

Melissa

- The ordinance amendment should address accessibility requirements and sensitivities
- Does not want faster services
- Quoted RF impacts to children
- Consider location impacts

Roberta Phillips

- Concerned about the proposed location of antennas and concerned about placing only on collector streets
- Will not protect the city against lawsuits

Paul Albritton

- Outside counsel for Verizon
- The ordinance should address the comments
- Doesn't believe the demonstration of need is required to provide maps of the system
- Locations should not apply to multiple carriers
- Other concerns regarding proposed ordinance

Terresa Morris

- Concerned about fans running in the boxes
- Concerned about RF, electricity usage
- Concerned about public safety

Joe

- Supports more cell service in the city which currently has bad service

Erik

- Supports more cell service.
- Requested clarity of the preferred location facilities with regards to small cell nodes

Steven Aldrich

- Supports more cell service which is needed in home and community. The need cell for public safety.
- Stated that the power of smaller devices in your home are more detrimental than services on a pole further away

Nancy Morten (sp?)

- Doesn't support more services. 5G is more powerful than 4G.
- Concerned about public health and cell service

Kate Disney

- Not concerned about radiation but worried about noise.

Johnathan Shores

- Supports fiber optics installation
- Concerned about public and biological health

Jane Osborn

- Quoted a PhD, Joel Moscovitz (sp?)
- Interference of planes
- Concerned about location preferences

Carey

- Location preferences can be 'gamed' by providers
- Poles are located much closer
- You can't turn off small cell nodes in proximity to your house while you can turn off your devices in your house
- City should hire a location analysis expert
- Antennas should be provided at the front of those requesting the service
- The poles requested are currently in front of schools. Palo Alto is much further along in services and installations
- Firehouses in other cities were exempt from cell node installation because of potential impacts

Jeanine Valadez – speaking as a resident

- The carriers should be more forthcoming regarding the installation of towers.
- Concerned about power transmission from antennas
- Should be distributed throughout city

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

Doran: Page 21, installation cannot be accomplished on wood pole. How to install in Los Altos?

Zola: All equipment on pole or underground. Exterior equipment or new poles in right-of-way.

Deborah Fox

- Addressing Verizon comment with regards to 1000ft separation. The Commission could apply a buffer to individual carriers (apply to each carrier with regards to small cell nodes). Carrier A separation 1000ft to another carrier A facility but not Carrier B facility. Other options: allow exemption if justified; reduce separation altogether; study further and apply separation as needed.

Mensinger: Do something vs. nothing? What is the legal implications?

Fox: The 1000ft separation has been determined to be impermissible by Verizon, not city team, but would be a fact to further determine.

Doran: Would a permit still be required for individual locations?

Zola: Yes

Ahi: 1500ft barrier vs 1000ft

Fox: Increased the number of sites. Positive position by the city to address carrier concerns. Mapping and modeling not available to the commission. Consider further requirements if more information is made available to the Council.

Bodner: What is the volume of applications?

Zola: Cannot be determined at this time.

Fox: 13 applications in 2019. Carrier typically makes one application to understand process and then subsequently submits additional applications.

Bodner: By reducing to 1000ft separation, how many more applications are possible?

Zola: Showed maps onscreen to show proposed, preferred, less preferred locations

Roche

- Concerned about lawsuit

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Steinle, seconded by Commissioner Bodner, the Commission recommends City Council approval:

CEQA Resolution

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Steinle, the Commission recommends approval:

Ordinance with redline comments and with the 3 options per Mr. Zola's explanation.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Mensinger, the Commission recommends City Council approval:

Resolution with revisions in the annotated version with the effective date of the resolution corresponding dates of the ordinance

The motion was approved (6-0-1) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, and Steinle, Bodner, Roche

NOES:

ABSENT: Marek

5. **19-D-01, 19-UP-01 and 19-SD-01 – Gregory and Angela Galatolo – 4350 El Camino Real**
Multiple-Family Design Review, Conditional Use Permit and Tentative Subdivision map for a new multiple-family development with a five-story building with 47 condominium units along El Camino Real with two levels of underground parking. The proposal includes seven affordable units with four moderate-income units and three very-low-income units, and a density bonus with development incentives to allow for increased building height and a reduced parking aisle width. A Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be considered. *Project Planner: Hayagreev* THIS ITEM IS RECOMMENDED TO BE CONTINUED TO THE APRIL 7, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Mensinger, the Commission recommends approval:

The motion was approved (6-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, and Steinle, Bodner, Roche

NOES:

ABSENT: Marek

DISCUSSION

6. **Housing Element Update**
Update from Community Meeting on March 1, 2022.
Project Planner: Simpson

Oral Presentation by Laura Simpson

DISCUSSION/COMMENTS

Ahi

- Went on walk and found some constraints that should be brought forward

PUBLIC COMMENT

Anne Paulson

- Present site list are constrained and the sites should have a design or feasibility analysis

Mircea

- Went on site walk with group over the group
- 4946 and 4940 ECR potential sites for development have parking easements so cannot be developed
- The site analysis needs to have more information on each site

Roberta Phillips

- Should speak with Laura Simpson directly
- More participation is beneficial

Jeanine Valadez – speaking as a resident

- Went on walk over the weekend

Sue Russell – Women’s league of voters

- Need community feedback and specific sites/parcels with information
- Need additional meetings, need to discuss programs and policies and is required in the HE

COMMISSIONERS’ REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Roche – Need parcel specific information

Doran: Do we reach out to property owners?

Simpson: We are reaching out to property owners.

POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden gave an overview of future agenda items.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Doran adjourned the meeting at 9:38 P.M.

Steve Golden
Interim Planning Services Manager