

From: French, Amy
To: Dao, Veronica
Subject: FW: Questions Re 3265 El Camino
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 5:34:30 PM
Attachments: image009.png
image010.png
image001.png
image003.png
image007.png
image012.png
image014.png

Let's see if there is more back and forth, then before PTC tomorrow we can publish in our Commissioner Correspondence column on the PTC webpage.

From: Sauls, Garrett <Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 3:44 PM
To: Bryna Chang <brynachang@gmail.com>
Cc: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: Questions Re 3265 El Camino

Hi Bryna,

Please see my responses below in red.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Best regards,



Garrett Sauls
Senior Planner
Planning and Development Services Department
(650) 329-2471 | Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org



[NEW Parcel Report](#) | [Palo Alto Municipal Code](#) | [Online Permitting System](#) | [Planning Application Forms & Handouts](#) | [Planning Applications Mapped](#)

From: Bryna Chang <brynachang@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 1:22 AM
To: Sauls, Garrett <Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Questions Re 3265 El Camino

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

Hi Garrett,

In advance of Wednesday's PTC meeting, I had some questions for you. No need to answer them right now unless you already know the answers; I just wanted to give you a heads up so that staff and the applicant can be ready to answer if possible.

1. For how long will the units be deed restricted? This was asked at the CC pre-screen and Jonathan had said he'd need to look into it. He wasn't sure if it was 50 or 99 years.
PAMC 16.65.075 requires that affordable units be rented for a minimum 99 years. The City could elect to allow the units be deed restricted for 55 years if that is tied to maintaining tax credit eligibility.
2. How have the plans changed since they were shown to CC (if at all)? One thing I noticed was that the rooftop open space was reduced from 1750 to 1150 sqft and I wanted to understand why, as well as if anything else changed.
The project is substantially similar to what was proposed to Council. The rooftop terrace was reduced and the driveway was widened from 14 ft to 20 ft to accommodate two lane traffic. The parking layout has fluctuated a little bit from the initial formal submittal but the number of parking spaces has increased from 22 to 25.
3. Why did the applicant not design for the standard rear setback?
The applicant can speak more to this but given the smaller size for the parcel and target units they were trying to provide that was likely a constraint to their design.
4. Why did the applicant not design for the required parking?
In addition to what was said above, the site is well situated in relation to job centers (Stanford Research Park) and public transit (VTA Route 22) which provides a good opportunity for multi-modal forms of transit to and from work. They are also providing subsidized passes and un-bundling parking which are measures that are effective tools to encourage alternative forms of trips to and from work.

Thanks,
Bryna