## 20. (Optional) Unasked Question

If there is a question you think we should have asked, ask and answer it.

## **Leonard Ely III:**

Who was in charge of the restriping on California Ave and Middlefield along Jordan Middle School? I have no answer but I would like to see if they would send their 10 to 14 year old into the face of rush hour traffic on a bike.

## **Adrian Fine:**

How will you make Palo Alto a more inclusive and diverse city?

First, we need to invest in transportation solutions that enable all residents and workers to efficiently go where they need to be.

Second, we need to encourage housing choices and affordable housing in the right places so that seniors, young families, renters, and low-income citizens can live here.

Third, we need to reinvigorate the city's spirit, so that our civic culture is as dynamic, efficient, and creative as our entrepreneurial culture.

## **Arthur Keller:**

How do we know you won't advocate moderate growth before the election and then pivot to promoting growth after the election?

My track record on the Planning and Transportation Commission is well known. Gennady Sheyner of the Palo Alto Weekly reported, "the computer scientist is known as much for his wonky, detail-oriented approach to new development projects as for his staunch criticism of commercial growth." <a href="http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2016/07/28/arthur-keller-enters-city-council-race-in-palo-alto">http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2016/07/28/arthur-keller-enters-city-council-race-in-palo-alto</a>

But I am not opposed to all growth. I made the motion and cast the deciding vote in favor of initiating the PC Zone for the Maybell low-income housing project, while Commissioner Tanaka opposed it. <a href="http://paloaltoonline.com/news/2013/02/13/planned-senior-housing-complex-wins-key-vote">http://paloaltoonline.com/news/2013/02/13/planned-senior-housing-complex-wins-key-vote</a> I along with others on the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) did encourage the Palo Alto Housing Corp to reduce the number and size of houses on Maybell Avenue when the plan came back to the PTC, which the Palo Alto Housing Corporation did not do. Commissioner Tanaka and I were absent for the final vote.

http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2013/05/22/divisive-maybell-avenue-proposal-wins-zoning-victory I did sign the letter supporting the current plan for this site that fits into the neighborhood.

Planning and Transportation Commission Chair Adrian Fine, who is an ex officio member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) on the Comprehensive Plan Update (which I co-chair with Dan Garber), said at the CAC meeting on May 17, 2016 (<a href="http://www.paloaltocompplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CAC-Draft-Minutes-\_05.17.2016.pdf">http://www.paloaltocompplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CAC-Draft-Minutes-\_05.17.2016.pdf</a> page 31):

6 Adrian Fine: To start on the height limit, I'm in support of removing the cap for a few reasons. 7 One is it's from the 1970s, and 50 feet is pretty arbitrary. It was just kind of chosen out of thin 8 air at the time. Even though there is a lot of buildable space across the City, it's not always in 9 the best places. Removing the height limit not only allows density in transit and service-rich

10 areas, but it'll also provide future real estate value which can be taxed and diverted to services 11 such as transit, retail preservation, parks, whatever you name it. One other thing. If you're 12 going to talk about the environment and sustainability, tall buildings are way more efficient. 13 There's a funny policy in the Comprehensive Plan I actually wanted to comment on; it's not a 14 big thing, saying promote infill development in Palo Alto. All we do in Palo Alto is infill 15 development. There's actually nothing else. It's kind of funny to actually promote that and 16 then not even consider building up or building more efficient structures. For those reasons, I'm 17 in favor of removing the cap. Finally, I actually like some tall buildings in the mix. I think it adds 18 diversity to the City, and it's a nice thing. In terms of growth management, I'm also kind of on 19 the pro development spectrum here, where I'm in favor of Option 5. I'm a strong believer that 20 Palo Altans are not against growth itself, but rather the negative effects of that growth. I think 21 performance zoning and management has proven to be really effective particularly with office, 22 research and industrial uses, maybe a little less so with residential uses. For me, it comes

23 to the fact that Palo Alto really is a world-class place because we have supported innovative 24 and efficient and new businesses, which are increasingly unable to locate in Palo Alto due to 25 costs. Recent office prices have reached a massive high; they're some of the most expensive in

26 the world per square foot office rents, which leads to a monoculture of business types. I don't 27 think that's healthy for the City economy. I'm in favor of Option 5 and growth management.