

From: [jenny chen](#)
To: [Kallas, Emily](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [hermesmh1@gmail.com](#); [jayashreed@yahoo.com](#); [altairtang@gmail.com](#); [Yanfengwang2@yahoo.com](#); [wkneighbour@gmail.com](#); [Lee_lilning@yahoo.com](#); [Ziming Weng](#); [jennietuchan@hotmail.com](#); [garrettchan@hotmail.com](#); [Chen Jenny](#)
Subject: Opposition to Palo Alto Commons Expansion
Date: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 4:36:40 PM

You don't often get email from jennyslchen@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Emily,

We extend our gratitude for meeting with us, Mona He, Yanfeng Wang, and Jenny Chen, on Thursday, April 4, 2024, regarding the interpretation of Palo Alto municipal code 18.38.150(e) concerning the daylight plane.

During the February 28, 2024 meeting, Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commissioner Keith Reckdahl provided clarification (video timestamp 3:51:43-3:52:34 [Planning and Transportation Commission | Midpen Media Center](#)), stating, "In the code there are two ways of implementing the daylight plane, PC option or R1 setback option. PC daylight plane starts at 10 feet and ascends at a shallow 30-degree angle. R1 setback on the rear of an R1 is 20 feet. Therefore, the R1 setback optional daylight plane would commence 20 feet into the property. R1 option cannot be applied here due to the current building setback being only 10 feet. PC optional daylight plane must be applied in this case. This could significantly impact the types of units permitted in the rear."

We concur with Commissioner Reckdahl's interpretation of the daylight plane regulation.

Sincerely,

Jenny Chen