

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Los Gatos Planning Commissioners:  
Melanie Hanssen, Chair  
Kathryn Janoff, Vice Chair  
Mary Badame  
Jeffrey Barnett  
Kendra Burch  
Matthew Hudes  
Reza Tavana

Town Manager: Laurel Prevetti

Community Development Director: Joel Paulson

Town Attorney: Robert Schultz

Transcribed by: Vicki L. Blandin  
(619) 541-3405

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S :

CHAIR HANSSEN: We have three public hearing items on the agenda, all items related to the Town of Los Gatos, and the first one is Item 2, which is to recommend a preferred land use alternative framework for the General Plan Update to Town Council.

This is a defined item in the process of updating the General Plan through 2040. We are to consider the recommendation of the GPAC from January 30<sup>th</sup> and determine what recommendation we will make to the Town Council regarding the preferred land use alternative framework and the Town Council will consider this matter in March.

Ms. Armer, I understand you will be giving the Staff Report this evening, and I would also like to say for the audience that because this is a Town special project over a two-year period we won't be using the five-minute applicant time for speaking; the consultants will be speaking a little longer.

JENNIFER ARMER: Good evening, Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioners. The item in front of you is the preferred land use alternative recommendation to you from the General

1 Plan Update Advisory Committee, and provided to you for  
2 your review, consideration, and recommendation to Town  
3 Council.

4           Tonight we have the Town's consultant, Rick Rust  
5 of Mintier Harnish with a presentation for you before you  
6 start your discussion of this item. Mintier Harnish is the  
7 consultant that has worked with the Town and supports us  
8 through this process. Their presentation will include a  
9 discussion and summary of the General Plan Update process,  
10 the land use alternatives process, and the GPAC preferred  
11 alternative.

12           This concludes Staff's portion of the  
13 presentation, but I will now hand it off to Rick Rust for  
14 the consultant's presentation.

15           RICK RUST: Thank you. Good evening, Madam Chair  
16 and Planning Commissioners and to the public. Tonight we'd  
17 like to give you a brief overview of the land use  
18 alternatives process and where we're at, and a little bit  
19 about the General Plan too for the audience that is  
20 watching this evening.

21           As we go through this we want to talk a little  
22 bit about what is the General Plan for our audience  
23 members. This is required by state law. Every jurisdiction,  
24  
25

1 city, or county in the state must have a General Plan to  
2 represent its blueprint for the future, and it really  
3 represents the community's vision for where they want to be  
4 in the year 2040.

5           The Town Council at the beginning of this process  
6 laid out five key issues they would like to have addressed:  
7 land use, transportation and mobility, environmental  
8 sustainability, evaluation and modification of objective  
9 standards—that's relative to housing—and fiscal stability  
10 and responsibility.

11           In addition to that we're also looking at the  
12 entire General Plan and we'll be working with the GPAC over  
13 the next few months to look at the individual elements that  
14 make up that plan and talk about the policy components.  
15 Tonight we're just talking about the actual land use  
16 alternative.

17           As far as the state element, you now have to have  
18 nine of them included in your document. You don't have to  
19 have them specifically called out with these names, many  
20 jurisdictions combine them, and we also talk about having  
21 some optional elements that reflect the needs of the  
22 locality.

1           As we do this one of the big changes that we'll  
2 be going through is addressing new state laws. One of the  
3 biggest guides to this is the new State Guidelines for  
4 General Plans which was published in 2017. You can download  
5 a copy by going to the project website for this project,  
6 which is losgatos2040.com and you can obtain a copy of the  
7 General Plan Guidelines, which gives you a great look at  
8 what the state expects out of the different elements of  
9 General Plans.

10  
11           Part of this is looking at what laws have changed  
12 over time, and there's a wide range of items that we're  
13 going to have addressed: environmental justice, enhancing  
14 the Complete Street components that are already in the  
15 Town's planning, looking at vehicle miles travelled as far  
16 as how we might change for transportation impacts going  
17 forward, wildfire and how to better protect. This project  
18 is partly supported by a grant from CAL FIRE and CAL FIRE  
19 has been an active participant in providing us some  
20 guidance on how to enhance the Town's policies regarding  
21 protection from wildfire.

22           So, these are all things that we're going to have  
23 to look at going forward in the overall planning process.  
24 Now, that planning process, these aren't equivalent little  
25

1 blocks so we're at least past the halfway point, but we're  
2 starting to get into the important and exciting components  
3 that make the plan move forward.

4           As I said, we're looking at the land use  
5 alternatives. This is an opportunity, as we have throughout  
6 the process, to update the Planning Commission and to  
7 provide your guidance to the Town Council at key steps in  
8 the process. The land use alternatives will guide a lot of  
9 the combinations of what we have to do. Some of the things  
10 that we do in policy though will affect the outcomes of the  
11 land use alternatives, so this will be something you're not  
12 one and done tonight. You're giving us your guidance for  
13 where you'd like the land use alternatives to go.

15           This will get further refined as we do the policy  
16 document and we'll come back for your approval again when  
17 we have a public draft document for hearings and review at  
18 that point. So, not a final decision, but we'd certainly  
19 like to make sure we're in the right place. The next steps  
20 are developing the policy, and as I mentioned, we'll be  
21 doing that with the GPAC over the next couple of months.

22           Developing the document we have had a number of  
23 public input events. There's a complete list starting at  
24 the bottom of page 13 of your Staff Report. Spring into  
25

1 Green was a great event we had last April 14<sup>th</sup>, which  
2 brought a lot of people that don't normally get involved in  
3 workshops and normal Planning Commission events, or Town  
4 Council's for that matter, to be involved in the General  
5 Plan and understand what we're doing and give their input.

6 We're expecting to be part of your Spring into  
7 Green again this year, which is on April 19<sup>th</sup> this year, and  
8 engage people in the discussion about the future and  
9 alternatives and where we're going for these next steps.

10 Now let's look at our land use alternatives,  
11 which is what we're here to for tonight. As everything, we  
12 started off earlier looking at a Vision and Guiding  
13 Principles. The Vision Statement provides what you  
14 envision. What would the Town be like 20 years from now if  
15 you were to report back and how would you describe the  
16 community? What is it you're trying to achieve?

17 The Planning Commission reviewed this Vision  
18 Statement as well as the Guiding Principles on July 10<sup>th</sup> and  
19 moved them forward to Town Council who accepted them as  
20 being in the right direction with their modifications on  
21 August 20<sup>th</sup>. Again, all this is subject to change until the  
22 final gavel comes down at the final document later in the  
23 year, but they did give our blessing from the Planning  
24  
25

1 Commission and Town Council on direction. Won't read that  
2 all for you tonight. It is available on the website if  
3 anybody would like to look at the details.

4           There are nine Guiding Principles. The Guiding  
5 Principles, as you look at this we start to get more  
6 refined in what we look at. The vision is the broad  
7 picture, the principles are some key directions that we'd  
8 like to take, and then each of the elements has a set of  
9 goals, policies, and implementations that get more and more  
10 refined about how we achieve the vision that's stated on  
11 that last slide.

12           But our principles cover things such as  
13 transportation, sustainability, protecting natural  
14 resources, fiscal sustainability and responsibility,  
15 government transparency, community vitality, diverse  
16 neighborhoods, inclusivity, and the promotion of public  
17 safety. So, this provides a guide for where we're going  
18 with our policies and these will be important as we look at  
19 the policy documents in the next few months.

20           The land use alternatives we looked at, we  
21 created four. The names aren't that important because  
22 whether one is medium-high or low it's all relative to what  
23  
24  
25

1 they actually say about your future rather than what it  
2 might be named.

3           But we looked at developing some alternatives  
4 with the GPAC. We talked originally about looking at the  
5 2,000 unit as being a key factor for our future. Why is  
6 that number there? Well, the state gives us a regional  
7 housing needs allocation which states how much housing we  
8 need to develop over given time periods. The Town does not  
9 have the numbers that will be coming up in another year for  
10 where the Town needs to go in its next cycle, but we're  
11 looking at having about three cycles and the last cycle was  
12 about 600 housing units, so for a 20-year period the 2,000  
13 number kind of was in the right place.

15           And the alternatives report also talks about some  
16 other projections from the Department of Finance as well as  
17 our own economist looking at different growth rates, and  
18 that 2,000 number is approximately correct in that context  
19 as well.

20           When we looked at the land use alternatives we  
21 were really looking at modifications to residential density  
22 and infill potential that might occur in the Town. As  
23 you're well aware, there's not a whole lot of vacant land  
24 lying around to be developed. The North Forty was one of  
25

1 your last big pieces and that's already been plotted out  
2 for its use, so we're looking at more of a redevelopment  
3 construct.

4           To do this we identified a number of opportunity  
5 areas. These opportunity areas are areas that provide us  
6 either through their location, their existing  
7 infrastructure or access, roadway capacity, and  
8 compatibility with adjacent uses, typically your  
9 intersections or corridors. These are areas that might be  
10 able to sustain a little higher development potential than  
11 other parts of the community, and these are the seven areas  
12 that were identified as part of that.

14           I want to note that in all of this we're looking  
15 more at the residential, although we have looked at a lot  
16 of mixed-use development as part of the community's future.  
17 We have a zero loss assumed as far as commercial space  
18 within our current commercial corridors. That is, if we're  
19 going to build it we're going to replace the commercial  
20 that's there with at least as much as is there today or  
21 perhaps more as we add residential on top of those types of  
22 units in a mixed-use construct.

24           The scope of what we looked at is the five land  
25 use designations on the side. We looked at areas that are

1 designated low-density residential, medium-density  
2 residential, and high-density residential. We also looked  
3 at neighborhood commercial and mixed-use commercial, both  
4 of which can provide residential components within those  
5 designations. We looked at both inside the opportunity  
6 areas, and again they had a higher amount of density  
7 potential in the opportunity area, but we also looked at  
8 some potential for redevelopment that might occur  
9 throughout the rest of the Town only for these five  
10 designations.

11  
12           You will notice there are a number of  
13 designations that aren't in this discussion, for instance,  
14 hillside residential is kind of off the table, if you will.  
15 We weren't looking at this as an opportunity to provide  
16 future housing opportunities because of the wildfire risk  
17 on the community's edge. I will note on our slide the  
18 central business district downtown; we'll asterisk that  
19 because the GPAC at this last meeting did request that we  
20 add an opportunity area for the downtown as part of their  
21 recommendation.

22           As I mentioned, we look at several factors. We  
23 look at redevelopment percentage, that is how much do we  
24 assume will change over the next 20 years? What percentage  
25

1 of an area in this land area would change? And then we look  
2 at density ranges, and we did look at how these might be  
3 increased and that's how we achieved the 2,000 units, by  
4 increasing some of the densities and looking at what the  
5 redevelopment potential would be.

6           On a lot of the tables you'll also see something  
7 called typical density. When we talked to the state about  
8 housing production they don't allow us to look at maximum  
9 density, we have to look at what would be typical within  
10 that designation, and so you'll see on the tables a range  
11 of typical densities in these columns here, and those are,  
12 if you look at the simple math you look at the number of  
13 acres times the percent redevelopment times the typical  
14 densities, these get you towards the units that we're going  
15 to be developing going forward. So, we've got lots of  
16 tables in your Staff Report as well as available in the  
17 alternatives reports that's online.

18           One of the things with density, to hit a certain  
19 density you have to start going up in height, and so these  
20 are the different height limits that would be associated  
21 with some of the alternatives. For Alternative C in the  
22 opportunity areas that's a four-story maximum in those  
23 areas. Then in the alternatives report you had a series of  
24  
25

1 these maps. Now, the alternatives report does not include  
2 the net Accessory Dwelling Units. The GPAC did ask us to  
3 include that as a look for what might be in these future  
4 options. Again, we're trying to look at what would be the  
5 new land uses.

6           As you look at these tables in here, this is the  
7 number, the net new dwelling units that came from doing  
8 that math that I talked about. This is the net new  
9 Accessory Dwelling Units. This is basically 20 Accessory  
10 Dwelling Units per year, which is pretty in line with what  
11 the Town has been seeing, plus an additional five Accessory  
12 Dwelling Units that would be considered Junior unit, and  
13 that is a unit that's inside of an existing home. This  
14 gives us our total new, and this is the number that we're  
15 really looking at as we compare different alternatives.  
16 Four hundred and seventy five is a number that's consistent  
17 throughout all the alternatives, and that's the number that  
18 the Town currently has as pending or approved. For  
19 instance, some of the part one of the North Forty are in  
20 that number there, in fact 75-percent of those units come  
21 from the North Forty first phase. So, these maps give you  
22 that kind of look.  
23  
24  
25

1 I do want to point out because we have this map  
2 up here, when we talk about areas outside the opportunity  
3 areas that would be the areas that are colored on this map.  
4 Again, those are the designations we're looking at for  
5 potential infills or redevelopments for the future but at a  
6 much lower density and expectation for redevelopment  
7 percentage. So again, we have 1,181 here. We have 1,916  
8 here, so we're very close on B. We have 2,328 for  
9 Alternative C. And 3,201.

11 We got some questions as to why did you perhaps  
12 include even A, and we wanted to make sure that we provided  
13 a look at what kind of staying the same and not doing a  
14 whole lot would turn up, and it didn't turn up a whole lot  
15 as you saw in meeting that 2,000 unit number, so again,  
16 that's why we wanted to give the GPAC a good range to look  
17 at in their considerations, and the GPAC did take time and  
18 do a lot of consideration of this.

19 We had four meetings with the GPAC that addressed  
20 different aspects of the alternatives development process,  
21 whether it was looking at the opportunity areas and  
22 identification of those, whether it was looking at the  
23 different alternatives and the different assumptions that  
24 would be used.

1           The last meeting the GPAC held concerning this  
2 was on January 30<sup>th</sup>, at that time to discuss community  
3 feedback. We did have a community workshop in mid-January  
4 where we had some individuals come and have a look at the  
5 different alternatives and provide some feedback that the  
6 GPAC used in their final consideration on this. The  
7 majority of the GPAC members agreed that Alternatives A and  
8 D did not meet the direction, that is, Alternative A was  
9 too low, it didn't hit that 2,000, and Alternative D was,  
10 in a term, being too intense for what the Town needed.  
11

12           So, the GPAC narrowed down on Alternative C as a  
13 basis for looking forward. Alternative C does exceed the  
14 2,000 net dwelling units that were required or part of  
15 their original goal for the development of the  
16 alternatives. It allows a maximum height of 50' or four  
17 stories.

18           I will caveat this will be something we'll look  
19 at this. These could be some of the pieces that could  
20 change as we look at policies. For instance, we didn't have  
21 a chance with the GPAC to talk about downtown, which has a  
22 45' height right now and that may be considered to be  
23 staying the same as we go to those areas. So, those are the  
24

25

1 kinds of things where policy starts to come in and make  
2 some tweaks as we move forward.

3           The big thing in the GPAC alternatives, as in all  
4 the alternatives, is providing for a wider range of housing  
5 types. A lot of the infill was seen as doing things like a  
6 duplex where you might replace an older single-family home  
7 with a duplex that reflects the same look and feel of the  
8 neighborhood. You've got something in your document that  
9 talks about the "missing middle" as far as housing. It  
10 explains in good detail about how you can put infill where  
11 you're using a duplex or a triplex to keep within the  
12 character of the neighborhoods while at the same time  
13 providing better affordability and better access to housing  
14 for your entire population.

16           Now, in recommending the Alternative C as a  
17 framework for the downtown, that was the one change they  
18 made to Alternative C was to add the downtown area. The  
19 downtown was defined as the area that's currently in your  
20 General Plan as the central business district, also which  
21 is the C-2 zoning designation, and the idea there was that  
22 there was more opportunity for housing so the density in  
23 the downtown area would be allowed to go up a little bit in  
24 keeping with Alternative C. So, you might go up to about a  
25

1 26 as a typical as opposed to a 20 dwelling units per acre  
2 being typical in the downtown today. And again, the idea  
3 with the higher densities and intensities was that would  
4 encourage economic investment into these areas and thus  
5 provide the incentive to do these redevelopment type  
6 projects.

7           So, here are your final numbers then for the  
8 GPAC. The 1,964, the 500, those all came from the original  
9 Alternative C. The 136 is the potential that would come out  
10 of doing the same kind of calculations in the downtown if  
11 we have that as an opportunity area.

12           In your Staff Report and other materials one  
13 thing the GPAC did ask in their considerations is they  
14 wanted to see all the different breakdowns in case there  
15 was an idea to do a hybrid type alternative, and so we  
16 broke things down by looking at the different alternatives,  
17 what were the different land use designations, etc., within  
18 those item? And these tables kind of give you a breakdown  
19 of some of that. I just wanted to point out here is the 26  
20 we used for the central business district moving forward  
21 with that item.

22           So, that was a quick overview of what took the  
23 GPAC to go through eight hours and much studying on their  
24  
25

1 part to get through, but they've done a great job in  
2 getting us to this stage of the effort and providing some  
3 guidance for the Planning Commission's consideration. What  
4 we're looking for is for you to make a recommendation to  
5 the Town Council for their consideration and the Staff  
6 Report lays out your considerations, which could be to  
7 accept what the GPAC and forward that on, it could be to  
8 modify that or to continue this all for some further  
9 discussion as you feel appropriate.  
10

11 And with that, any questions I'd be glad to help.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: I will take questions from the  
13 Commission in a second. Could you please explain to the  
14 Commission what is going to happen after this meeting?

15 RICK RUST: As I was mentioning, this is just to  
16 give us a nod we're going in the right direction. We will  
17 take your recommendation up to the Town Council and convey  
18 to them all this background: the alternatives report, the  
19 GPAC actions, the public input, the Planning Commission's  
20 recommendations, and take that to Town Council and get  
21 their direction on what would be a preferred land use  
22 alternative.  
23

24 From that point we'll be working with the GPAC  
25 over the next few months on looking at each of the elements

1 that are being proposed and look at the changes that are  
2 being proposed and the actual elements, that is the goals,  
3 the policies, and the implementations that make this  
4 happen.

5           That document, once it comes back from the GPAC  
6 then will be brought to the Planning Commission and you'll  
7 have a chance to look at that document, and also to Town  
8 Council to try to get a sense of we have a public draft and  
9 then we can go off and do the environmental analysis on  
10 that document, and then you'll have another set of hearings  
11 to do the final approvals.  
12

13           CHAIR HANSSSEN: The reason I asked the question  
14 is because a number of the GPAC members had questions about  
15 what we had agreed to when we recommended Alternative C,  
16 and as I was understanding it, and I'm asking you the  
17 question, that we recommended a framework but we hadn't  
18 voted on recommending specific policy changes at this time  
19 because that will come later in the process.

20           RICK RUST: Right. We're just doing this idea  
21 about the densities, the opportunity areas and locations,  
22 and again, that all may have an effect by looking at the  
23 policies that may make some tweaks. As I mentioned, you may  
24 say the downtown will have a 45' height to stay consistent  
25

1 with the CBD, other opportunity areas may be the 50'  
2 height, and those are discussions of policy that the GPAC  
3 has not weighed in on yet.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, thank you. Now I'd like to  
5 ask if any of the Commissioners have questions for the  
6 consultants or Staff? Commissioner Hudes.

7 COMMISSIONER HUDES: I had a lot of questions but  
8 one is related to overall questions about the process and  
9 everything. I was a participant in the last round and so  
10 some of this is familiar and some of this is different, and  
11 so I wanted to make sure I understood.

12 First of all, the timeframe for this. Our last  
13 General Plan was adopted with ten years left on the clock.  
14 This one appears to have like 19 years or something like  
15 that, is that correct?

16 RICK RUST: Well, the timeframe will start from  
17 when the Town Council adopts it, and right now we're  
18 looking towards the early part of 2021 for that adoption,  
19 and then you'll have... Yeah, I guess we call it a 2040 plan,  
20 so yeah, you'll have a little less than 20 years, but  
21 that's the idea.

22 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Are there any implications  
23 of dealing with a longer time horizon in a General Plan?  
24  
25

1           RICK RUST: The state actually encourages that  
2 you do a long-term horizon, and typical in California is 20  
3 to 25 years.

4           COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay. I had a couple other  
5 overall questions.

6           CHAIR HANSSEN: Go ahead.

7           COMMISSIONER HUDES: One of the other things I'm  
8 not that familiar with is the detail that we're getting on  
9 housing at this point. Some of that last time was in the  
10 Housing Element that followed the General Plan here and  
11 we're now down to tables and numbers and things like that.  
12 I'm also just a little bit off kilter on how do you look at  
13 and evaluate alternatives if you haven't developed goals?  
14 And so it seems like we're trying to select between  
15 alternatives, yet the goals are not there yet. For  
16 instance, in the 2020 plan there was a goal, LU-4, to  
17 provide for "well planned, careful growth that reflects the  
18 Town's existing character and infrastructure," and while we  
19 have some high-level goals we don't have anything that  
20 specific in land use at this time, so the selection to me  
21 is a little more challenging without goals.  
22

23           RICK RUST: From that standpoint in some of the  
24 land use pieces it could be a chicken and egg conversation  
25

1 of which comes first, but for a lot of what goes into a  
2 document anymore as far as environmental implications, as  
3 far as traffic implications, you can't run \$70,000 traffic  
4 models on multiple choice options and come back with the  
5 right answers. We have to kind of get in a ballpark of  
6 where we're going to look at before we turn loose all that  
7 analysis that needs to go to support that.

8  
9 Now, we did look at the different alternatives in  
10 a broad sense from traffic impacts, and that was included  
11 in the alternatives report. We had a small piece on fiscal,  
12 which will be enhanced as we go forward in the next steps.  
13 We did look at environmental protections, but because of  
14 the designations used that was not a major issue. So, we  
15 have incorporated some of those concepts in, and based upon  
16 your old General Plan as far as looking at what it was  
17 guiding as well as the new Vision and the new Guiding  
18 Principles, so we didn't start from a plain sheet of paper,  
19 but there are important things that we need to get in the  
20 right ballpark.

21 Now, as I said, the GPAC, the Planning  
22 Commission, and the Town Council will still have time to  
23 modify and make corrections even before we start the  
24 environmental document once we've gone to the next step of  
25

1 preparing the policy refinements. In doing this, this  
2 activity of doing the land use alternative and getting some  
3 buy-in on direction has been typical in every plan I've  
4 been involved in. Not to mean you couldn't do it the other  
5 way, but that's not a typical.

6 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Thank you.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Burch.

8 COMMISSIONER BURCH: So, this may not necessarily  
9 be a question. I kind of wanted to address the question  
10 from Commissioner Hudes from the GPAC side.  
11

12 While we may not have technically written a land  
13 use policy that was guiding this, it came from a careful  
14 discussion of state housing requirements, where they stand  
15 today and where we feel they are going to be moving into  
16 the future and taking into account that number, then taking  
17 a look at the Town as an overall and where we felt these  
18 areas of designation where we could increase some density  
19 without actually impacting the general character of our  
20 town, or whereby increasing the density it created actually  
21 a better impact on that area, such as perhaps loss in the  
22 downtown. So while it wasn't like a written like what we  
23 already had, I felt that the GPAC did a very good job of  
24 saying these are characteristics that we like, this is  
25

1 where we know the state needs us to be, so let's carefully  
2 go through the Town and see where we may be able to add  
3 another floor over a retail or something along those lines  
4 to create those opportunity zones, so while it maybe wasn't  
5 a written policy or goal yet, it actually was taken from  
6 some very defined parameters. Does that help?

7           COMMISSIONER HUDES: Yes, thanks.

8           CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Burch. I  
9 would add onto that for the benefit of the audience the  
10 composition of the GPAC includes all of the members of the  
11 General Plan Committee, which is comprised of two members  
12 of Town Council as well as three Planning Commissioners,  
13 Vice Chair Janoff, myself, and Commissioner Burch at the  
14 present, and then we have a number of at-large members to  
15 the General Plan Committee as well as there are  
16 additionally three residents that were appointed by Town  
17 Council to sit on the General Plan Advisory Committee  
18 specifically.

19           So, there was a lot of discussion, as  
20 Commissioner Burch mentioned, kind of going into this and  
21 based on input from Staff and the knowledge of all of the  
22 people on GPAC we felt like 2,000 was a good target number  
23 because the numbers that we're hearing from some of the  
24  
25

1 jurisdictions that are on a different cycle than us are  
2 going to have much, much bigger numbers than they've ever  
3 had in the past, and they haven't gotten to Santa Clara  
4 County yet where the housing crisis is about as bad as it  
5 can be.

6           So, that being the case we're also relying very  
7 closely on the process that's been set by our consultants  
8 who work with many, many jurisdictions to do this. There  
9 were a few questions from GPAC members about do you put the  
10 cart before the horse, but you have to follow a process,  
11 and so this is the process that we're following the  
12 direction of our consultants to kind of move forward, and I  
13 think as was mentioned it's an iterative process in that  
14 any recommendation we make now, once we have more data and  
15 what the implications are of that, we might go back and  
16 make revisions.

17           So, having said that, are there other questions  
18 for the consultants or Staff from the Commissioners before  
19 I take public comment? Okay, so that being the case now we  
20 will invite comments from members of the public. If you  
21 have not already turned in a speaker card to Staff, please  
22 do so at this time, and when you're called to speak  
23 remember to state your name and address for the record and  
24  
25

1 adjust the microphone so that you speak directly into it,  
2 and you'll have three minutes. Do we have any members of  
3 the public that would like to make comments on this agenda  
4 item? You could fill out your card later, so you could go  
5 to the microphone, state your name and address for the  
6 record, and then please fill out a speaker card when you're  
7 completed.

8           KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: Okay. I'm Kim Bryan and I live  
9 at 268 Marchmont Drive in Los Gatos.

10           I appreciate all the time and effort that many  
11 people have put into this process and I admit freely that I  
12 just saw the first of the information when this agenda came  
13 out, and the reason I came to speak is because I was quite  
14 alarmed at the delta that I see between the current town  
15 and the buildings that were put forth as potentials with  
16 Plan C in particular, which is the one that was going to be  
17 recommended.

18           There was a lot of information in the Planning  
19 Commission agenda tonight about the missing middle and the  
20 housing choices that can make that possible like duplexes  
21 and fourplexes and tiny houses, and all of those things  
22 felt to me like a much better fit for Los Gatos to find  
23  
24  
25

1 some areas in our town where we could maybe allow more  
2 buildings on a lot or think of ways to incorporate that.

3           Even in the documentation provided one of the  
4 things that they said is that conventional zoning doesn't  
5 work and that a lot of the numbers we're using don't help  
6 you to be able to add those buildings in, so I just wanted  
7 to put that forth.

8           The other thing that I had in my head was that  
9 when we got to the North Forty we had approved heights that  
10 we thought were the maximum we wanted, but then based on  
11 all the laws from California they were able to get bonuses  
12 and make them taller and bigger and get more units, and it  
13 seems to me like we are doing our best to go for a worst  
14 case scenario of how many houses we need would be 2,000 and  
15 to overcompensate for that, and then when it actually gets  
16 to the developers they might come in and they might add  
17 another floor and another number of units.

18           In particular the empty car lot, the drawing that  
19 you had that was the options, the five- and six-story  
20 buildings that are allowed in Option C seemed to me to be  
21 much larger than anything anywhere near there, and  
22 certainly if you anticipated a Los Gatos Boulevard where  
23 there were many of those in a row, so I just wanted to  
24  
25

1 encourage you to maybe take a slightly more conservative  
2 approach and take... Or not conservative but take the Option  
3 B which was not quite to the 2,000 but was close and assume  
4 that at least let's see what happens with people being able  
5 to have secondary units on their property and maybe it will  
6 be more than the 500 that you were anticipating and that  
7 gets us to 1,800 and it keeps some of that height that to  
8 me was the biggest problem.

9  
10 I mean, when I looked at those drawings provided  
11 of what high-density housing looks like, this is allowed in  
12 Option C, so for me that was something that I was surprised  
13 by and I did not expect to see, and I think that you will  
14 get some of the same late-to-the-game anger that was there  
15 for the North Forty when people start realizing that things  
16 like that could be put on Los Gatos Boulevard. Thank you.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. Does  
18 anyone have questions for the speaker? Commissioner Badame.

19 COMMISSIONER BADAME: All right, so you  
20 referenced this missing middle housing study.

21 KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER BADAME: When I read through it, it  
23 talks about a number of housing styles that could fit into  
24 what's called the missing middle study and one of those is  
25

1 high-density housing, but you're opposed to that. Did you  
2 say the duplexes or the ADUs, or you're not fond of the  
3 high-density housing with the height, is that how I  
4 understand?

5 KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: It's mostly the fact that right  
6 now nothing in town is higher than 35' and the minimum for  
7 these multi-densities is five-stories, which is clearly at  
8 least 50'.

9 COMMISSIONER BADAME: If you did see that we had  
10 to increase the stories, what would be the maximum that you  
11 could see anywhere in town?  
12

13 KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: Well, someone just mentioned  
14 like putting a third floor on top of two floors of retail.  
15 I mean, that seems to me like a much better fit than five  
16 stories, so I would say three.

17 COMMISSIONER BADAME: And your thought process on  
18 four stories?

19 KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: I mean, if we have to go to  
20 four stories, we can, it's just I felt like when I was  
21 taking part as much as I could in the North Forty process  
22 that there are these bonuses that the developers were  
23 getting based on following these rules that so even though  
24 we had said the max was going to be 35' I think there are  
25

1 places they go higher than that, so I just imagine that if  
2 we are accepting that all along...

3           Like one of the opportunity areas is quite long,  
4 so I think it's along Los Gatos Boulevard, so if they can  
5 come in and tear down a one-story retail and put in five-  
6 story high-density housing I can just imagine there would  
7 be a lot of people that would think that would be  
8 worthwhile and that would definitely change the Town, and  
9 the traffic at that intersection is the one that we're most  
10 worried about with the North Forty, so to me it was not a  
11 good tradeoff.  
12

13           COMMISSIONER BADAME: Thank you for your  
14 comments.

15           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Burch.

16           COMMISSIONER BURCH: Yeah, thank you for your  
17 comments. You're right, I feel like sometimes we get pretty  
18 far in the process before people start reading up and  
19 asking questions.

20           KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: And I apologize for that.

21           COMMISSIONER BURCH: No, I'm thanking you. I want  
22 to point out a couple of things and then I'm going to ask a  
23 couple of questions.  
24

25

1 I do want to confirm for you that in Option C  
2 that was the recommended it is limited to four-stories, and  
3 during our discussions that we had in the General Plan  
4 meeting was a confirmation I guess to those of us that sit  
5 up here and the see the applications, that these  
6 applications would still be coming to us to make sure that  
7 while that may be like you're allowed four stories that  
8 doesn't mean cart blanche along a whole long corridor. We  
9 all have the same questions and comments that you had in  
10 hoping we could anticipate state needs but also be very  
11 sensitive to the Town.  
12

13 So then my question for you is because it's a  
14 little, I think, newer on the plate is I heard what you  
15 said about the boulevard but I'm curious about what you  
16 feel about the downtown option of taking some of our one-  
17 or two-story retail and adding lofts on that? I don't know  
18 if you saw that much.

19 KIMBERLYLY BRYAN: I mean, to me that's great  
20 because I do support walking and biking and then there are  
21 people that can live and eat and drink and get a more  
22 vibrant downtown, so for me that is a much better fit for  
23 what I would see for Los Gatos.  
24

25 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Perfect. Thank you.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Again, thank you for your  
2 comments. There are cards in the back. Thank you very much.  
3 If you could hand your speaker...

4 LEE FAGOT: Lee Fagot, 845 Lilac Way in Los  
5 Gatos.

6 I just want to say that I agree absolutely with  
7 the previous speaker. She articulated very well, I think,  
8 the sentiment of a lot of folks in town and I endorse what  
9 she said.

10 The question of the height limit, downtown on the  
11 plaza the height limit, I believe, is 45' only in that area  
12 on the plaza. The rest of it is 40', and then in the  
13 neighborhood it drops down. So, going to 45' downtown,  
14 retail at the bottom, using the post office as an example  
15 because that tenant may be leaving, the post office may be  
16 moving out, if that is redeveloped, again with retail on  
17 the bottom level and then housing above, it makes sense  
18 going to that 45' height.

19 Los Gatos Boulevard, I think we saw the argument  
20 on both sides on the Shannon Road interchange with Los  
21 Gatos Boulevard and the developer there in trying to find  
22 the right height and the right setbacks from the sidewalks  
23 and so forth. I think using that discussion to help with  
24  
25

1 some guidance will be very instructive for the developers  
2 coming in and helpful to keep the same look and feel, the  
3 famous look and feel of Los Gatos so that it is not  
4 obstructing the hillsides and the views and it is a more  
5 inviting pathway going up and down Los Gatos Boulevard.

6           Again, I really endorse the previous speaker  
7 because she articulated very well those points.

8           CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. Do  
9 any Commissioners have questions? Thank you very much.  
10 Would anyone else like to speak on this topic? If you could  
11 give your speaker card to Staff.

12           JAN MURRAY: Hi, I'm Jan Murray. I live on Lasuen  
13 Court and public speaking is not my thing, so I'll give  
14 this a try.

15           I live near the development at 15975 Union  
16 Avenue, Blossom Hill and Union. The Planning Commission  
17 recommended against this development and the Town of Los  
18 Gatos Council overrode the Planning Commission's  
19 recommendation. Those homes do not meet the mass, bulk, and  
20 height character of the Town. In addition, they are  
21 elevated, so I agree with the previous speaker's commentary  
22 that good intentions get modified when the developers come  
23 in and talk and offer street redevelopment, stoplight  
24  
25

1 redevelopment, and things like this to incent the Town  
2 Council to deviate.

3 I would highly recommend that when we talk about  
4 height and stories we talk about not having 11' first  
5 floors with the environmental impact of material use, long-  
6 term power for heating and cooling these buildings so that  
7 four people live in a 4,000 square foot home with 12'  
8 ceilings on the first floor and 10' ceilings in the little  
9 kids' bedrooms. They've changed the bulk of these spaces,  
10 they're perpetuating the lifetime of the residents of that  
11 home to waste electricity and heat. It's just  
12 environmentally unfriendly.

14 Then, in addition the impermeable surface  
15 deviations that they've gotten to impact the environment,  
16 the ability to have carbon neutrals may be awfully strong  
17 but they're the opposite and they don't have green space  
18 around these homes, and for three homes they've put in 14  
19 or 15 parking places. So, if you look at adding 2,300  
20 dwelling units to this town it sounds like it's four cars  
21 per dwelling unit and you are truly changing the traffic  
22 just here.

23 Then when you expand that to the context of the  
24 85 corridor you're negatively compounding life for the  
25

1 local residents if you do not include parks, libraries,  
2 restaurants, and all the retail into your lifestyle  
3 planning that you have. You can't just increase density of  
4 homes on Union Avenue and not increase lifestyle businesses  
5 and environment, because then you've got everyone commuting  
6 to the downtown and creating this incredible congestion in  
7 the beautiful downtown. You've got to create neighborhood  
8 pockets.

9  
10 I'll just finish with I hope they're using  
11 baselines for planned communities that have been done in  
12 other parts of the country when creating this kind of a  
13 lifestyle, and that's the character of Los Gatos.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. Do  
15 any Commissioners have questions? Commissioner Burch.

16 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Sorry, I hope I'm not  
17 commentating too much based on the GPAC meetings, but I  
18 feel like it's important to share when people are bringing  
19 up points that we discussed, is that okay?

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think that is very well said and  
21 I think that there's really nowhere to characterize the  
22 many, many, many hours of discussion on exactly these  
23 points that the GPAC has had.

1                   COMMISSIONER BURCH: Okay, a couple comments. I  
2 hope that you will please pay attention then to the GPAC  
3 meetings, because part of the requirements and the points  
4 that we will be moving into have a lot to do with the  
5 environment and sustainability. It's actually something the  
6 GPAC has identified as something we care a lot about. We  
7 have another GPAC member here in the audience that has felt  
8 very passionately about creating the services that serve  
9 the neighborhood to get people out of their cars and  
10 walking to their local coffee and everything, so those are  
11 points that whatever use we choose are aspects that we have  
12 discussed pretty thoroughly and want to make sure that,  
13 like you said, this isn't just a plan for housing, this is  
14 a more robust plan on community. I liked your comments a  
15 lot and they're very accurate on how the domino effect can  
16 happen with decisions, so I hope you'll pay attention and  
17 come back because I think as we get into those particular  
18 aspects I think you'll have a lot to add to that. Thank  
19 you.  
20

21                   CHAIR HANSSEN: Any other questions for the  
22 speaker? Seeing none, is there anyone else.. Oh,  
23 Commissioner Barnett had a question. Commissioner Barnett  
24 had a question for you; I apologize.  
25

1                   COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Good evening. In your last  
2 comment in your presentation you mentioned common interest  
3 developments or similar multi-family housing that is  
4 included in the missing middle presentation. Did you have a  
5 concept about the size of those types of residential  
6 improvements.

7                   JAN MURRAY: My mom retired to Texas with my  
8 brother instead of Los Gatos after we looked at senior  
9 living facilities in Los Gatos, just to be clear. So  
10 there's an area in Texas called The Woodlands, which was a  
11 planned community and they've made it so that people with  
12 small children and 80-year-old little old ladies could walk  
13 to the grocery and the park and the library along beautiful  
14 corridors, but in addition they have these home areas with  
15 beautiful kind of Monte Sereno homes, but sort of like  
16 Baltimore where it's a bunch of townhouses. When I lived in  
17 Maryland there were so many more—it's kind of like what you  
18 think of a brownstone in New York—a series of townhouses so  
19 that like the property at 15975 Union could have had five  
20 townhouses and still had smaller bulk than what they've  
21 done, and some green space around it. So it's that use of  
22 other neighborhoods that have appealing planning I think as  
23 a benchmark outside of Los Gatos to kind of compare what it  
24  
25

1 could be. Anyway, I think the use of townhouses is much  
2 cleverer sometimes than even duplexes and triplexes.

3 COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Okay, thank you.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Any other questions? Okay, so the  
5 next speaker. If there is anyone else that plans to speak  
6 on this item, if you could bring your cards up to Staff now  
7 that would be helpful.

8 EMERALD HATHAWAY: Good evening, my name is  
9 Emerald Hathaway and I own 208 Carlester Drive in Los  
10 Gatos. I've been here for over 50 years and I have watched  
11 many, many changes in this beautiful town. One of the  
12 reasons why so many people want to come here is because of  
13 the ambiance, the beauty, the safety, and the beautiful  
14 schools that we have that are top rated in the nation, and  
15 the friendliness. In all the years that I've lived here, it  
16 doesn't matter who you are or what you do, or your walk in  
17 life, your business, whatever you're doing, people love you  
18 here.

19  
20 It's a beautiful town and I really feel badly  
21 when I read that we're going to try to change the town into  
22 four-story buildings all along Los Gatos Boulevard. It  
23 doesn't make any sense. It should be easy to add 2,000  
24 homes or dwellings without putting in four-story buildings.  
25

1 Our town is not designed for it and never was, and people  
2 want to come and live here.

3 I have watched the prices on our homes go up, and  
4 up, and up. The reason why is because of the desirability  
5 of wanting to live in this kind of a town, which is rare.  
6 If you look at the national average, Los Gatos is one of  
7 the safest places to live in the nation, and it's because  
8 we have worked hard to have a good police force, to have  
9 correct kinds of housing that works well for everyone. We  
10 want to have a multi-use, multi-ethnic diversity in our  
11 community of course, that's what our nation is built on,  
12 but we don't want to destroy our town while we're trying to  
13 be so diverse. We don't need to have that many stories.

14 Now, in the downtown area, when everyone was  
15 talking I was thinking about how we have beautiful  
16 buildings downtown that are at least three stories, but on  
17 the boulevard, no. We don't want to turn into Campbell or  
18 downtown San Jose, so I just ask you to please consider the  
19 height and the amount of traffic that it would cause and  
20 the change in the beauty of the Town; it just wouldn't look  
21 the same. So, do you have any questions?

22 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you very much for your  
23 comments. Do any Commissioners have questions for the  
24  
25

1 speaker? Again, thank you very much for your comments; it's  
2 very helpful. Is there anyone else that would like to speak  
3 on this item? Okay, yes.

4 MARK GRIMES: Hi, I'm Mark Grimes; I live at  
5 15561 Corinne Drive, which is over near to Lark.

6 My question is I read some of this before I came  
7 here and there was an assumption made on how many  
8 additional cars would be added based on they thought more  
9 folks would start using public transportation, and I'd like  
10 to know the factors they used to come up with this  
11 assumption that most people would start using public  
12 transportation.  
13

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: When we have comments from the  
15 public we're not able to answer your questions in a  
16 discussion format, so you can pose your questions and then  
17 perhaps Staff could follow up with you later and when we're  
18 having our discussion we might be able to answer your  
19 question indirectly.

20 MARK GRIMES: Okay, right. Thanks.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Did you have anything else you  
22 wanted to say? Okay.

23 MARK GRIMES: (Inaudible).  
24  
25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you, it's a good question.  
2 Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on  
3 this topic? Seeing none, I'm going to close the public  
4 portion of the hearing and we will ask if Commissioners  
5 have questions of Staff, wish to comment on the item, or  
6 introduce a motion for consideration by the Commission?

7  
8 Before we do that I did want to suggest to my  
9 fellow commissioners that... And this is a process that was  
10 similar that GPAC took, and this was probably the biggest  
11 point of discussion when we made the recommendation and  
12 people were concerned. Am I agreeing to have 12 dwelling  
13 units per acre in low-density residential? Am I agreeing to  
14 force four-story buildings anywhere there's an opportunity  
15 area? And so we gave the direction to the GPAC and I'm  
16 giving you all the same direction, and I think as our  
17 consultants mentioned, the policy part of this is going to  
18 happen later. It's a general framework and so any vote to  
19 support Alternative C doesn't imply that we're going to  
20 allow four-story buildings anywhere in town.

21 But the other side of this is also that to get to  
22 a certain number they have to put in more density somewhere  
23 or more height somewhere, so if we take one thing away it  
24 will have to come from somewhere else.  
25

1           So, that being the case, we'll go into the  
2 questions. I'm hoping that what we can do as a commission  
3 is make a vote on the preferred land use alternative  
4 framework, be it C or something else if that's the will of  
5 the Commission, and then we can also vote to provide  
6 additional recommendations to the Council on things that we  
7 need to be wary of. For instance, we have to be really  
8 careful about four stories and where we're going to put it  
9 and how we would allow it and so on and so forth. So, that  
10 being the case I want to put it to the Commission to ask  
11 any questions, make any comments, or if you feel that  
12 you're ready to make a motion, which you're probably not.  
13 Commissioner Badame.  
14

15           COMMISSIONER BADAME: I was hoping we'd get more  
16 public testimony with the amount of people in the audience.  
17 That being said, I see a member in the audience that was  
18 part of the GPAC, so my question is two of those members,  
19 one being here in the audience and one not unless I don't  
20 recognize that person, they opposed Alternative C, so if I  
21 could get some feedback possibly as to why they opposed  
22 Alternative C and which alternative did they prefer?  
23

24           CHAIR HANSSEN: You want to take that one, Staff?  
25

1           JOEL PAULSON: Well, I will start off with I can  
2 barely read my own mind, so I think obviously there are  
3 concerns and this type of process is always difficult,  
4 because as Commissioner Hudes mentioned before it's kind of  
5 what comes first, and maybe you were comfortable with some  
6 portions of the alternative but not all of them and since  
7 that's how the motion was framed you're not comfortable  
8 supporting it. I don't know if Jennifer or the consultant  
9 remember anything specific from Mr. Rosenberg or Ms.  
10 Quintana as far as what their concerns were. There were an  
11 awful lot of questions and I'll let Ms. Armer provide any  
12 additional information.  
13

14           JENNIFER ARMER: In thinking back to the meeting  
15 where the preferred alternative recommendation was made by  
16 the GPAC, the concerns that kind of came to the forefront  
17 there were some concerns about additional density within  
18 the low-density residential areas. There were also concerns  
19 about exactly how this would then be implemented as has  
20 been discussed this evening and kind of what this framework  
21 meant in term of how much flexibility there might be in the  
22 future.  
23

24           COMMISSIONER BADAME: The reason why I ask is we  
25 have limited information, so unless we were actually on

1 this committee, the rest of us, we don't have any minutes  
2 to read from, so unless we were part of the committee or  
3 present during the hearing. I just wanted to know what some  
4 of the thought process was, especially from the public.

5 CHAIR HANSSSEN: I can comment. We had two  
6 dissenting votes on the recommendation, and one of them was  
7 Ms. Quintana who is here in the audience, and the other one  
8 was Mr. Rosenberg. I personally spoke to Mr. Rosenberg  
9 after the meeting and he stated his concern during the  
10 meeting. It was actually the opposite of what some of the  
11 public comments were. It was more about, as Ms. Armer said,  
12 having any of the growth happen in low-density residential,  
13 and I think it's simply because it's hard to visualize, so  
14 he had this idea that in any typical single-family  
15 neighborhood there might be 12 houses, or 16 or 20 houses,  
16 in an acre and the reality of this thing is that if you say  
17 12 dwelling units per acre and you have an 8,000 square  
18 foot lot you may only be able to have one house on that  
19 lot. So that's one thing.

21 And so he was actually preferring to have the  
22 density go into, say, a mixed-use, and this is a discussion  
23 that many of the GPAC members had is that mixed-use was a  
24 great way to go because we would have neighborhood-serving  
25

1 commercial and then we would have some housing above, but  
2 there's still the concern about transition into the  
3 neighborhoods that are nearby, so I'm going to go back to  
4 what was said earlier that while we're agreeing to a  
5 generalized framework we are not agreeing to any specific  
6 changes in the General Plan use designations at this time,  
7 and in addition there is another process that will take  
8 place even after the General Plan is done.

9  
10           One element that is not done with the current  
11 General Plan Update is the Housing Element, and in the  
12 Housing Element is where we get more into the zoning  
13 implications of what we're doing, so when we're doing the  
14 General Plan Update it's going to be followed by the  
15 Housing Element, which when we start the Housing Element we  
16 will actually have our regional housing needs allocation  
17 from the state to help plan for specifically for that. So,  
18 I hear that people are alarmed about this, but again, it's  
19 sort of like the process is we aren't going to have all the  
20 pieces of information that we need to go forward so we have  
21 to kind of put a stake in the ground and there are no  
22 decisions being made on exactly how Alternative C would be  
23 implemented at this point. Commissioner Badame.

1 COMMISSIONER BADAME: Okay, thank you for that.  
2 Going forward, would it be possible for us to get minutes  
3 of the GPAC meetings?

4 JOEL PAULSON: We can give you GPAC minutes.  
5 They're just action minutes, they are not verbatim minutes,  
6 so I'm not sure they would be much more helpful. I know we  
7 have at least one commissioner, if not more, that raised  
8 those concerns that hasn't been modified, but they're not  
9 typical minutes like verbatim minutes that would give you  
10 the whole story.

11 COMMISSIONER BADAME: Thank you.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Hudes.

13 COMMISSIONER HUDES: To follow up on a comment  
14 from the public, or question from the public, the heights  
15 that are indicated in Alternative C, will bonuses increase  
16 the height over the maximums that are listed in the  
17 alternatives now?

18 JOEL PAULSON: If someone proposes a bonus, then  
19 yes, they could request that, as they can currently. I  
20 think the speaker is completely accurate and I know the  
21 Commission is well aware of we have at least two projects  
22 that have used those types of exceptions in the past. The  
23 state continues to take away local control and provide more  
24  
25

1 opportunities for developers. I don't see that slowing down  
2 any time soon, so that will continue to be an option. I  
3 think the challenge is once we get to our Housing Element  
4 preparation we're not going to be able to put a comment in  
5 there that says we're only going to plan for this many  
6 units because we're going to plan that everyone is going to  
7 do an exception or this many people are going to do an  
8 exception. What we'll really ultimately do is when we get  
9 down into the nuts and bolts of... There's really the areas,  
10 the density, and the height.

11  
12 COMMISSIONER HUDES: What are the numbers?  
13 Currently what's the maximum and what's the maximum of the  
14 bonus? And under Alternative C what would the maximum be  
15 with a bonus?

16 JOEL PAULSON: I don't know that there is  
17 technically a maximum, but ultimately that's going to be a  
18 developer's decision and generally they don't go very much  
19 higher. I think the North Forty it was in the 15-20' range.  
20 Obviously, you hear a lot of conversations about  
21 developments near transit being able to go up to four to  
22 five stories automatically and if you do X, Y, and Z you  
23 can go another story. We're not going to be able to  
24 accommodate or plan for that.  
25

1           What we're willing to do is ultimately once we  
2 get through this discussion the GPAC goes through the Land  
3 Use Element and the draft plan comes through with some  
4 proposed densities and heights. That's going to be the time  
5 we can have those conversations.

6           I know the general concern was specifically with  
7 the low-density residential, so your R-1:Ds, your R-1:8s,  
8 those properties. The numbers in and of themselves are  
9 scary. It's not that this Alternative C is going to say you  
10 can have 50' in R-1:8; it's not. Ultimately, you can have a  
11 density. I think the low-density residential proposed now  
12 in C is up to 16 units per acre. So, if you have an 8,000  
13 square foot lot with a 16 unit max per acre you can only  
14 have two units.

15           Now again, there are a lot of other caveats to  
16 that because we're not talking about ADUs and those have  
17 their own implications, but ultimately, regardless of the  
18 density we can still control the urban form, as Chair  
19 Hanssen was speaking about, through the zoning regulations.  
20 I mean, there is technically a scenario where we change the  
21 density for these designations but we don't change any of  
22 our zoning regulations. Now, some may think that's too  
23 restrictive, but ultimately that will maintain the urban  
24  
25

1 form of at least those single-family neighborhoods, but you  
2 potentially will have more units in those areas.

3 COMMISSIONER HUDES: So, if I may, that raises a  
4 question for the Town Attorney. Is it possible to  
5 essentially describe and select an alternative that is  
6 inconsistent with the zoning of the Town, or does the  
7 zoning have to change to meet what's in the General Plan  
8 and what's in the Housing Element?  
9

10 JOEL PAULSON: Ultimately, when the General Plan  
11 gets adopted, then there will be necessary modifications to  
12 the Zoning Code that will have to take place. Those will be  
13 implementation measures that will be done following the  
14 General Plan.

15 COMMISSIONER HUDES: That's what I recall.

16 JOEL PAULSON: Yup.

17 COMMISSIONER HUDES: When we did the North Forty  
18 Specific Plan a number of changes were made because we  
19 couldn't be in a situation where the zoning didn't permit  
20 what was permitted in the plan.

21 JOEL PAULSON: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER HUDES: So I was a little confused  
23 by your comment that the urban form might not allow what's  
24 actually described in the General Plan.  
25

1 JOEL PAULSON: Maybe you misunderstood me. It  
2 would still allow it, but you don't have to change  
3 setbacks, height, coverage, those types of things. You can  
4 still accommodate an increased density in those same  
5 parameters. You basically have what would otherwise look  
6 like a single-family house but it has two, or three, or  
7 four units which is that missing middle housing document  
8 that you have. So there are ways to try to maintain some of  
9 that, but again, some folks may say well if we're going to  
10 allow increased density maybe we should allow, as we do  
11 currently, I think the ADUs a 10-percent increase in FAR  
12 because we're getting increased units. But ultimately,  
13 whatever gets adopted in the General Plan, if there is  
14 anything inconsistent in the zoning regulations they will  
15 have to be modified.

17 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay, thank you.

18 CHAIR HANSEN: Vice Chair Janoff.

19 VICE CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you. I wanted to step  
20 back a little bit because the comments from the public and  
21 the question from Commissioners not on the GPAC all speak  
22 to a concern about how what we're talking about  
23 recommending to Council fundamentally changes the Town.  
24 What we are essentially doing is enabling the consultant by  
25

1 giving them a framework of density and height specifically  
2 targeting areas of town where it may be reasonable to have  
3 higher density, higher height, in order for us to carefully  
4 analyze how the Town can get from the number of units it  
5 has today to responding to the increase in units over time  
6 we anticipate the state will bring down to the Town.

7           So, we're not saying we're going to build... Well,  
8 the Town can't build. The Town enables builders and  
9 developers to build, so the Town isn't building, the Town  
10 is saying if we have these requirements from the state and  
11 we have to accommodate a number of units, how can the Town  
12 absorb that increase without fundamentally changing the  
13 look and character that we all cherish?

14           So, we understood that if we didn't give the  
15 consultants a little bit larger number than we might feel  
16 comfortable with, knowing that you may plan for 2,000 units  
17 but you may only wind up seeing 800 built, usually, at  
18 least from discussions with Staff, we're seeing an  
19 underperformance against our target, so the fact that we  
20 are shooting for a goal of 2,000, we could expect something  
21 less typically in terms of an actual build.

22           This gives the Town the ultimate ability to  
23 carefully analyze where those increases might occur. It  
24  
25

1 doesn't say they will occur and they don't say specifically  
2 how high or how not high, it just gives the consultants the  
3 framework to talk to us about can we get close to those  
4 targets we think are going to be mandated, and if so, how?  
5 That's all this framework does. It doesn't say it's going  
6 to happen, it just gives us the details, the data, to be  
7 able to make an informed decision for the Town.

8  
9           If we adopt a framework that's less aggressive on  
10 the number of units we're going to fall short of whatever  
11 the state is mandating, and then we may see other problems  
12 in terms of developers coming in and asking for exemptions  
13 because the state is allowing it and we haven't provided  
14 that, so we're trying to do just what I said, trying to  
15 accommodate what we think the growth requirements are going  
16 to be but also do it in a reflective, thoughtful, careful  
17 way that is respectful of the Town and what we want to see  
18 happen in it.

19           We recommended Alternative C generally  
20 understanding that that was sort of the outer limits of the  
21 framework. What we don't know is whether the consultants  
22 will come back and say that framework gives you the  
23 opportunity to create 6,000 units, in which case we might  
24 say let's lower the height and change some of the areas of  
25

1 opportunity. We just don't know what's possible yet and  
2 we're looking forward to the consultant's input so that we  
3 can make informed decisions going forward, so that's kind  
4 of the overarching reason why we recommended Alternative C.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Hudes.

6 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Thank you, that's very  
7 helpful, and I really appreciate the work and the  
8 involvement of my fellow commissioners and of everyone who  
9 is on the GPAC, because it's not possible to dive in and  
10 understand that in the snapshot that we're in now, so I  
11 have a lot of respect for the recommendations and the  
12 direction that's coming from fellow commissioners.  
13

14 I had a question for the consultant though, who  
15 is probably more up to speed on the housing numbers that  
16 are going to be coming down from the state, and really the  
17 question is does Alternative B meet the state mandated  
18 housing requirements over the next 20 years? I want to hear  
19 the consultant.

20 RICK RUST: Well, we're looking at doing the  
21 2,000 as the basis for that, and that was based off past  
22 performance. That doesn't even account for what the state  
23 might do to you. What has happened in the state has been  
24 all over the board and some areas have actually doubled or  
25

1 tripled the RHNA numbers, some areas have only had a small  
2 percentage increase. We were looking at just keeping yours  
3 fairly similar to what has happened in the past with future  
4 adjustments might as needed by Housing and Community  
5 Development on the state side, so it was felt that this  
6 2,000 number would get you through to this 20-year period.  
7 If your RHNA does expand significantly you have time to  
8 make readjustments as we go forward in the planning cycle,  
9 because while your General Plan is supposed to have a 20-  
10 year vision it's also supposed to be adjusted, and many of  
11 our plans actually relook at themselves every five years to  
12 see if there are any notable changes.

14 COMMISSIONER HUDES: My question was about  
15 Alternative B.

16 RICK RUST: It falls just right around that 2,000  
17 number as far as the totals that would be allowed; it's  
18 1,916 as far as this number, so it's in the ballpark. I  
19 think what had been explained is the GPAC wanted to make  
20 sure we had a little wiggle room, for instance, some of the  
21 public mentioned what if we go down a floor? Or what if we  
22 don't let the downtown go as big? So, as we make those  
23 changes, if we have no wiggle room to start with we've  
24

25

1 already underperformed and we don't have the ability to  
2 make those changes.

3 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Thank you.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: I just want to make one more  
5 comment and then Commissioner Badame. I think there's  
6 something really important that wasn't said at this point  
7 either that the GPAC discussed at great length. When we  
8 started talking about the land use needs of our town  
9 certainly the state requirements are part of it. We have to  
10 address that, but probably more important than that is if  
11 we have to grow we want to grow in a way that benefits our  
12 residents and our future residents, and every member of the  
13 GPAC felt that it was really important that we address the  
14 housing needs of moving-down seniors as well as our young  
15 Millennials that are unable to buy into town right now  
16 because of the cost of single-family housing.

17  
18 While we don't have the policies in place to make  
19 this happen I think for all of us, our thinking was if  
20 we're going to add 2,000 units we're not going to be adding  
21 2,000 3,500 square foot housing, we're going to be adding  
22 smaller townhouses, maybe taking a single-family home and  
23 it becomes a duplex or a threplex, but if we're going to  
24 have mixed-use what we really would like to see is that  
25

1 those units are going to be 500-1,000 square feet on top of  
2 retail and it's something that a 25-year-old could afford  
3 to live in, or there will places that would be appropriate  
4 for move-down seniors that want to move out of those 3,500  
5 square foot homes.

6           So, again, it kind of gets down to the policies  
7 that make this happen. Where we are right now is really  
8 just talking about an overall number and then we have to go  
9 through that process and figure out how we can do it to  
10 preserve what makes our town great as well as take care of  
11 the people that are in our town right now.

12           I don't know if people in the audience are aware,  
13 but we heard this when we did the Housing Element the last  
14 time and we've continued to hear it through the process,  
15 but something like 35- or 40-percent of our residents are  
16 going to be over the age of 65 in this decade, so again, I  
17 think it's really important to think in terms of growth  
18 that we're not looking at adding the same kind of growth  
19 that we had in the past, we're looking at much, much  
20 smaller units and then we need to figure out how can we  
21 make that happen.

22           Commissioner Badame, you had a question or  
23 comment?  
24  
25

1 COMMISSIONER BADAME: My question was quick and  
2 actually it's a continuation of questions for the  
3 consultant pertaining to Commissioner Hudes' question, so  
4 that was back to Alternative B versus C. So, B still meets  
5 the criteria for the number of housing units, but the  
6 primary difference, the major difference, between B and C  
7 would be the difference between allowable height and number  
8 of stories, is that correct?

9  
10 RICK RUST: Alternative B only produces 1,916  
11 units. The 475, if you look at 2,391 number, those are  
12 existing approved and pending projects, so they do not go  
13 towards the state's requirements for housing, because it's  
14 expected they'll be built or permitted prior to your next  
15 housing cycle.

16 COMMISSIONER BADAME: But what about the ADU  
17 units that add to that? Five hundred?

18 RICK RUST: Yeah, that was in the 1,916.

19 COMMISSIONER BADAME: Okay. Thank you.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Hudes.

21 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Question about the ADU  
22 units. Does that assume the change that we'll be looking at  
23 tonight on adding Junior ADU units to the inventory? And  
24

25

1 you've got that as a constant across all the alternatives,  
2 correct?

3 RICK RUST: Yes, it does, the short answer. We  
4 looked at 20 units per year as a regular detached ADU and  
5 we looked at five units per year as a Junior ADU over the  
6 20-year period. That's what gives you the 500.

7 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay, thank you.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: Are there other questions or  
9 comments? Commissioner Burch.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Would it be appropriate then  
12 to direct towards the consultant the question concerning  
13 the vehicle trips? It is one of the items that gets looked  
14 at with the different alternatives. Or would that be  
15 something that would maybe be more appropriate once an  
16 alternative is selected? I'm asking the Chair that.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think you can ask your  
18 question.

19 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Okay. So, you've heard the  
20 audience; I don't need to repeat their question. In our  
21 GPAC packet, page 29, you go through the vehicle trip  
22 estimates per alternative, and I know there were some  
23 assumptions made with public transit, so I was wondering  
24

25

1 if... We can't really have dialogue with the audience but  
2 maybe you could assist in answering that question.

3           RICK RUST: In the phrasing of it at times it was  
4 said most would go transit. That's certainly not the case.  
5 The traffic estimates were done using the ITE estimations  
6 for household sizes; that's the standard used across the  
7 United States for generation as far as what would happen in  
8 different kinds of land uses. Now, in the conversation  
9 there's certainly discussion about the fact that if you  
10 have a more walkable area, like your downtown; your  
11 downtown has mixed-use components. It's not as much  
12 residential as you might see in other places in the future  
13 but it's a mixed-use area. You have a lot of people on  
14 foot. You obviously have tourist traffic that parks there,  
15 but the idea is that the people could live in that area,  
16 walk around the shops and neighborhood shopping, and they  
17 would have lesser need for automobiles.

18  
19           Long-term how much parking is required is going  
20 to be something that will change in the community. There's  
21 not a requirement for four. I think that was mentioned at  
22 one point and that wouldn't be the case in the future. Most  
23 communities are actually looking to go down towards one  
24 parking per unit, especially on smaller units because the  
25

1 occupancies are typically single individuals in a lot of  
2 cases, or they don't have a car so it balances out to that  
3 one, and so a lot of places are finding that to be a sweet  
4 spot moving forward. So parking numbers actually would go  
5 down in the future.

6           We expect some transit to be enhanced over this  
7 20-year period. It's not going to happen next year after we  
8 approve this, but it will happen over the long term and as  
9 we have some enhancements to density you'll be able to  
10 better support transit, but we did consider the automobile  
11 still as being a dominant player in the environment.

12           COMMISSIONER BURCH: Thank you.

13           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Hudes.

14           COMMISSIONER HUDES: I have some questions about  
15 the chart on page 70, I think. It's the first large table.  
16 So I had some questions. I'm trying to understand how the  
17 numbers were developed. It talks about population first and  
18 then it says, "total new population," and "total  
19 population," and then "total projected 2040 population."  
20 What does total population mean? That's a tenth of the size  
21 of the Town.

22           RICK RUST: Total net new goes along with those  
23 net units we've talked about before. The total population  
24  
25

1 is taking that net new and adding to it the population that  
2 would come with the 475 pending and approved projects to  
3 give you a total.

4           COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay. The other question I  
5 had is on the descriptions on the traffic congestion  
6 increase levels. We're just beginning to use VMT and those  
7 kinds of numbers. There's a description here that says,  
8 minimal, minimal, moderate, and moderate. How confident are  
9 you that that's what residents are going to experience with  
10 this alternative, that it will be what they would  
11 characterize as a moderate traffic increase or congestion  
12 increase?  
13

14           RICK RUST: The traffic engineers ran this based  
15 on a preliminary model. Now, there's a difference in the  
16 traffic engineering for what will be done now versus what  
17 will be done for the Environmental Impact Report. These  
18 were meant to be comparative analyses. As we go forward  
19 with this we will do full traffic analyses to finding out  
20 the actual impacts.

21           The VMT numbers, the big one to look at there is  
22 the VMT per capita, because you'll see at the higher  
23 alternatives the VMT per capita decreases and that's one of  
24 the key indicators that your better performing  
25

1 transportation system, you're traveling less per person  
2 overall, and some of that again is that enhanced  
3 walkability long term. But it is not a full scale traffic  
4 model at this point, again going back to that is a  
5 significant undertaking and not something you do for each  
6 alternative.

7           COMMISSIONER HUDES: But my concern is about  
8 standing behind the terminology "moderate" or "minimal"  
9 that's in the report. I understand the differences and I  
10 believe I understand the numbers, but I don't believe that  
11 we have the experience to know whether that's the way we'll  
12 perceive it and I am concerned about approving the General  
13 Plan that causes unacceptable traffic and then somebody  
14 pointing to this report that says it was only going to be  
15 moderate.

17           RICK RUST: Well, when you actually make an  
18 approval of a plan you'll have a detailed traffic analysis  
19 that you can point to and know exactly numerically what  
20 that means. This was done by Fehr & Peers, which is the  
21 leader in transportation analysis in the State of  
22 California and they've done traffic analyses all over the  
23 state, and so they're characterizing this based on their  
24 experience in looking to the future.

1                   Now, traffic, I've worked in more than 200  
2 communities. I could probably say 199 of them said traffic  
3 was the biggest thing. Just finished a plan in South Dakota  
4 and their idea of bad traffic was because they had to sit  
5 behind a pickup at the light, so people's perception of  
6 that. You obviously have a lot of traffic in town. You have  
7 issues with your school system putting out on the streets  
8 and what happens to the street during that half-hour pick  
9 time. You've got issues with cut-through traffic on  
10 weekends and other problems of overloading the highways, so  
11 it's not that you don't have problems and not that it won't  
12 make it more people will add more cars.

14                   We likely do not have the ability to enhance your  
15 transportation system significantly in town. We're not  
16 adding lanes, in other words. So, we will get more people  
17 into biking circumstances, more people into walking, more  
18 on transit, but you're still going to have increases in the  
19 overall traffic on your roadway systems and peoples'  
20 perceptions of any increase in traffic will likely be not  
21 happy, but they're all part of the tradeoff that you need  
22 to make if you're going to meet the housing requirement.

23                   COMMISSIONER HUDES: I'm just reacting to  
24 approving a report that says things are going to be minimal  
25

1 or moderate when we have no experience with VMT in reality  
2 in town, and even less experience with these alternatives  
3 and how that translates through to peoples' actual  
4 experience, so I'm more reacting to that.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Janoff.

6 VICE CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you. In response to  
7 Commissioner Hudes' concerns about traffic, there isn't a  
8 person in this room, there isn't a person in town, there  
9 isn't a person on GPAC who didn't start the conversation  
10 with, "But what about traffic?" I guess that's not starting  
11 the conversation, but we didn't view thinking of traffic as  
12 our highest priority, although maybe it is the higher  
13 priority for a lot of us today. The GPAC felt that in  
14 itself couldn't be the reason to not call an increased  
15 number of residential units. Don't like the traffic  
16 situation we have. There need to be some changes. We hope  
17 that there are changes in the works. We know that an  
18 increase in the number of units will likely exacerbate the  
19 problem, but we didn't feel it was our purview to say  
20 sorry, we can't go to higher units because it's going to  
21 make traffic worse.

22 So, I hope that reflects what the GPAC members  
23 were thinking and discussing, but I just want to emphasize  
24  
25

1 that traffic is a concern and we all realize that and these  
2 particular areas of opportunity are going to have a  
3 negative impact potentially, but that's an outcome of the  
4 increase in units, and again, what we are asking the  
5 Planning Commission for today is a recommendation that the  
6 alternative that the GPAC is recommending, recommended to  
7 Town Council so that there can be approval for the full  
8 analysis upon which we'll have much more information to  
9 determine what the traffic impact might be and how many  
10 units, where density, where height.

12 I think it's important to get all of these  
13 concerns out and I would hope that tonight with whatever  
14 the Planning Commission puts forward to Town Council,  
15 whether it forwards the recommendation of GPAC, that if you  
16 have concerns about the recommendation of Alternative C we  
17 also provide a list of those bullets so that the Council  
18 can see—well, they'll hear those concerns of course if they  
19 listen to these transcripts—but they can see perhaps  
20 Alternative C is the one of have a more complete analysis  
21 of, but we're concerned about these things and that can  
22 still be part of the recommendation going forward.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: I would also add that we're not  
24 approving anything, we're only making a recommendation to  
25

1 Council, and if the Council goes forward with this  
2 recommendation as Vice Chair Janoff stated, that will  
3 initiate a process of more thorough analysis of the  
4 preferred land use alternative, and there will be a full  
5 Environmental Impact Report done for our General Plan  
6 Update and that has to include transportation and all kinds  
7 of issues.

8           We had some of this same discussion when we had  
9 the GPAC meeting a few weeks ago about what are we  
10 approving? We're not approving the General Plan yet, we're  
11 approving a framework to move forward for doing more  
12 analysis on the Land Use Element so that we can come up  
13 with the right policies that would go with it. Commissioner  
14 Hudes.

15           COMMISSIONER HUDES: I had a few questions. I  
16 crunched some numbers and sometimes I get more comfortable  
17 when I see numbers, so I wanted to just maybe make a  
18 statement and then ask a question about it.

19           First I looked at the different alternatives in  
20 terms of population increase, and then I compared it to the  
21 historical population that was in the previous information  
22 that was provided in the previous General Plan, and it  
23 looked to me like from sort of modern times, 2008 to 2020,  
24  
25

1 overall there's been an annual population growth of 1.4-  
2 percent in town, given the numbers in your chart and in  
3 here, and that what is being suggested to accommodate for  
4 in Alternative C is 0.9-percent increase. And I did see  
5 that these percentages varied as I went back to 1963 and I  
6 looked at each year, so I'm not uncomfortable with planning  
7 for a population increase of 0.9-percent in Alternative C  
8 given that we've experienced a 1.4-percent increase in sort  
9 of recent history, so I don't find that C is out line.  
10 Could you tell me if I'm right on my general understanding  
11 of the population increases?  
12

13 RICK RUST: Yeah, that's about right. Our numbers  
14 originally started also with looking at what the California  
15 Department of Finance projects using historic trends going  
16 into the future as well as what our economics professional  
17 looked at, and they were also in the sub-1-percent range.

18 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Now, to the question that I  
19 had, I also looked at the number of new units per person  
20 added under the four different alternatives, and I included  
21 the ones that had been approved, all of them basically. I  
22 think the population lives in all those places.

23 Then I also turned it around and looked at the  
24 average number of people per unit added and I was  
25

1 interested that between Alternative A we started at 1.7 per  
2 unit and when we got to Alternative D we were at 2.09 per  
3 person. Why would that be? Maybe you could explain why  
4 there are more people per unit as we move up in the  
5 options?

6 RICK RUST: I'm not sure of the math offhand, but  
7 our factor we used was 2.4 persons per dwelling unit, which  
8 is what the Town currently uses for projections.

9 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay, well, you may have  
10 been using a different number. You may have been excluding  
11 in the process and the ADUs maybe? What I found interesting  
12 was that it changed from alternative to alternative. In  
13 your analysis you kept it constant?

14 RICK RUST: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay. So, those are the  
16 questions that I had on the numbers. Like I said, one of  
17 them gave me some sort of comfort that we're in the general  
18 ballpark with Alternative C.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Burch.

20 COMMISSIONER BURCH: I'm curious if it might be  
21 appropriate for me to go ahead and venture a motion?  
22  
23  
24  
25

1                   COMMISSIONER BADAME: I was about to suggest that  
2 to the Commission, that we should attempt a motion to see  
3 where we stand.

4                   COMMISSIONER HUDES: If I could just ask one  
5 question of Staff real quick on process.

6                   CHAIR HANSEN: Sure.

7                   COMMISSIONER HUDES: This has been billed as the  
8 land use alternatives but we haven't talked about anything  
9 other than housing. Will we be talking about other land  
10 uses at the Planning Commission?  
11

12                   JOEL PAULSON: Ultimately, when the GPAC  
13 discusses land uses we probably will have some  
14 conversation. I'm sure you noticed throughout the  
15 commercial was kept constant; there wasn't an increase  
16 shown. This really was to explore housing from a land use  
17 perspective, and we will have to have some factors that go  
18 into the Environmental Impact Report as far as what we  
19 think future growth in office, commercial, various  
20 commercial sectors will be over the next 20 years so that  
21 that can also be plugged into the Environmental Impact  
22 Report.

23                   COMMISSIONER HUDES: Okay, because as I pointed  
24 out before, I think we're ignoring some of the  
25

1 opportunities to be more oriented toward the innovation  
2 economy in town and I think that this discussion about the  
3 middle points out something that's missing. I think in the  
4 commercial and in hotels as well as office space that  
5 there's something missing there that's pretty fundamental  
6 and pretty important for the Town. I've written up  
7 something on this topic I can provide to Staff and to the  
8 GPAC, but I just feel like if we are going to do a motion  
9 and we're not going to address that I want to have some  
10 comfort that there will be some opportunity to address  
11 something that I think is important and missing.

13           JOEL PAULSON: Absolutely. I think ultimately  
14 that's been brought up in GPAC multiple times, so once we  
15 get to goals and policies from the Environmental Impact  
16 Report it's really a square footage, and so then that  
17 equates to employee population and greenhouse gas and  
18 traffic, so it would be some kind of cap from an individual  
19 commercial standpoint, but those types of items we  
20 definitely welcome; definitely send those to us. We will  
21 get those to the GPAC and the consultant and make sure that  
22 those are addressed prior to the Land Use Element coming  
23 back before Planning Commission.

24           COMMISSIONER HUDES: Thank you.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I'd like to add a comment to  
2 that. Way back in the process when we talked about the  
3 focus of the GPAC discussions it was decided that we needed  
4 to focus most on the housing, but that doesn't mean as we  
5 process through the Land Use Element that we can't add  
6 goals and policies for commercial as well. I don't think  
7 anyone on the GPAC wants to add 2,300 housing units and  
8 then not have more commercial to support the neighbors, and  
9 of course we want the people to have the jobs close to  
10 them, so I'm sure that all that will be factored in later.  
11 It's just it wasn't the focus of the land use alternatives  
12 report, so I just want to make it clear that by making this  
13 motion and recommendation to Council we're not saying we're  
14 excluding commercial. So, Commissioner Burch, if you are  
15 ready to make a motion.

17 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Yes, I am comfortable making  
18 a motion that based on the recommendation of the GPAC we  
19 will recommend approval.. Or, I'm sorry, moving forward with  
20 the study for land use Alternative C and the framework as  
21 included in Exhibit 11.

22 I think I kind of butchered their recommendation,  
23 but I'm comfortable making that although I've heard all the  
24 discussion about the numbers, because truly this is really  
25

1 just authorizing our consultant to start something. We have  
2 to give him a line in the sand somewhere on how to start  
3 with this. There will be many more discussions about what  
4 this looks like. We've got Los Gatos Boulevard everywhere.  
5 Will it be in pocket areas? And then as our Chair  
6 mentioned, we will be having discussions about now what  
7 does this impact as far as our retail or local services?  
8 It's all one big package. We just need to move forward with  
9 this to get to that point, so I'm very comfortable doing  
10 that.

11  
12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Do we have a second? Vice Chair  
13 Janoff.

14 VICE CHAIR JANOFF: I'll second the motion.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Would any Commissioners like to  
16 add comments for questions before we take a vote?  
17 Commissioner Barnett.

18 COMMISSIONER BARNETT: We've discussed the fact  
19 that there's going to be further time for analysis and  
20 review and modification. I wonder if it would be  
21 overreaching to say it would be appropriate to footnote in  
22 the motion that we anticipate there will be that kind of  
23 further input?

24  
25

1 COMMISSIONER BURCH: Yeah, I would be very  
2 comfortable with that.

3 VICE CHAIR JANOFF: As would I.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think I would also add that I  
5 think even subsequent to taking a vote on moving forward  
6 with the framework it's perfectly appropriate since we're  
7 making a recommendation to Council to take suggestions from  
8 Commissioners as to things that should be considered when  
9 the Council considers this as well. But your motion is  
10 amended to include Commissioner Barnett's comments? Okay.  
11 And does the seconder agree?  
12

13 VICE CHAIR JANOFF: Yes.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, now is there anyone else  
15 that wants to make comments before we take a vote.

16 COMMISSIONER HUDES: I've been wrestling with  
17 this for some time, and better understanding the process  
18 and better understanding the involvement of the public and  
19 the members of the GPAC allows me to get more comfortable  
20 with something I was not initially comfortable with, and  
21 relative to having more input I believe that this really  
22 should be done after we have developed goals. To me this is  
23 the cart before the horse. It's very difficult to select  
24 alternatives when you don't know what you're trying to  
25

1 achieve, and so I would just sort of reserve the right to  
2 come back, and when this does come back and when there are  
3 goals, to really look to see does this alternative meet the  
4 goals with the risk that maybe we do another round at that  
5 point.

6 I will be supporting the motion and let me just  
7 give you some of the reasons for my discomfort that maybe  
8 we could think about as we start to develop this.

9 One is that this is a longer timeframe than we've  
10 done before. Longer timeframe to me means we're dealing  
11 with more uncertainty. There's also more uncertainty in the  
12 environment that we're in today. We've just seen SB50 all  
13 over the place and we have a lot of uncertainty in other  
14 aspects of retail as well. So, given the longer timeframe  
15 and the more uncertainty I would tend to more conservative  
16 numbers rather than put down numbers that might allow more  
17 development than would be normal.

18 I also didn't hear yet that Alternative C really  
19 is necessary to meet state requirements and could we manage  
20 with a fewer number, and I'd be looking for that as the  
21 process goes on.

22 As well, I felt that the middle is still missing,  
23 and the missing middle is missing from Alternative C. It  
24  
25

1 pushes us more toward the more dense and taller buildings  
2 when perhaps it could be achieved more if we worked harder  
3 at a smaller alternative focusing on that particular item.  
4 Frankly, to me, I read the very interesting article on the  
5 missing middle but then I didn't see the missing middle  
6 that much in the actual proposals that were developed.

7           But like I said, I will be supporting the motion  
8 because I think we need to move this forward and it is an  
9 iterative process and this will give us the opportunity to  
10 do that.

11           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Badame.

12           COMMISSIONER BADAME: I'll also be supporting the  
13 motion, but I just wanted to add the comment that I work in  
14 the downtown area, so adding that as an eighth opportunity  
15 area I think was great and I fully support that. I  
16 experience it downtown. I think the more mixed-use that we  
17 can have adds to the vibrancy and the walkability, so I'll  
18 be supporting the motion as well.

19           COMMISSIONER BADAME: Commissioner Tavana.

20           COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I would add that I'll be  
21 supporting the motion as well, however, I did notice that  
22 the GPAC preferred alternative is the only one that  
23 includes the downtown district for the opportunity area, so  
24  
25

1 I would wonder if we could add that to the other  
2 alternatives to see what the total number would be if we  
3 can include that in future studies as well.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. Any other comments?  
5 Commissioner Hudes.

6 COMMISSIONER HUDES: One minor thing is I would  
7 recommend taking out words that characterize traffic as  
8 minimal or moderate before forwarding this recommendation.  
9 I just don't think it's a great idea to do that.  
10

11 CHAIR HANSSEN: Question for Staff. Will you be  
12 taking the comments of the Commissioners and adding that to  
13 the recommendation, or do we need to do that post the vote?

14 JENNIFER ARMER: The Town Council will have  
15 verbatim minutes from this meeting as well as we will  
16 provide a summary of what Staff has heard in the Staff  
17 Report to Town Council.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. That being the case, I will  
19 call the question. All in favor? Opposed? No abstentions.  
20 It passes unanimously. All right, thank you.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25