



## HOUSING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 1, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.  
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Administrative Building Conference Room, First Floor

---

Chair Boyle called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. in the Administrative Building Conference Room.

### **ROLL CALL –**

**Commission Members Present:** John Bautista, Patricia Boyle (Chair), Carolyn Clarke, Anne Moser, Yvonne Murray, Brigid Van Randall (Vice-Chair).

**Commission Members Absent:** None.

### **A. PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

#### 1. Email Submitted by Howard Crittenden

Chair Boyle read an email from Howard Crittenden, who identified himself as a Menlo Park El Camino Real Property Owner. The email had been sent to Planning Division staff. Mr. Crittenden recommended that the City accept the Beltramo's offer to provide one BMR unit and that 13.333% of the remaining 15 unit's proceeds be paid into the City's BMR fund, which the City could then utilize to purchase two market rate units for conversion into BMR units if desired.

#### 2. Phone Call to Vice-Chair Van Randall

Vice-Chair Van Randall reported she had received a phone call from a resident whose name she thought was Steve Pickler. The resident told her that he is not in favor of an in-lieu payment because of the need in the community (for BMR units).

### **B. REGULAR BUSINESS**

#### 1. Beltramo's BMR Agreement

The applicants, John and Daniel Beltramo, were present. Land use attorney Amy Nefouse joined via speaker phone. The Commissioners asked questions and discussed the applicant's latest offer in response to the Commission's August 4, 2010 meeting. Discussion focused on this most recent proposal as detailed by Ms. Nefouse in her August 13, 2010 letter to City Attorney Bill McClure (Attachment F of the Commission's staff report).

Speaking in favor of the Beltramo's latest offer, John Beltramo said they would like to realize a profit margin of at least fifteen percent whereas the industry standard is closer to twenty percent. Commissioner Bautista commented that the Beltramo's latest offer, which (as outlined in Attachment F) proposes a graduated approach to the City revenue sharing concept, does not guarantee that the City will actually realize revenue as a result. In addition, he said, it creates a perverse incentive for

the applicants to keep sales prices low to avoid participating in the revenue share. He recommended that the proportions suggested in Attachment F (related to a potentially increased total project cost and the minimum average sales price at which the City revenue share would begin) also apply if total project cost is below \$21,958,351 and/or average sales prices are below the minimum \$1,050,000 sharing point.

The Commission discussed revising Attachment F by amending the fifth bullet point. As agreed upon previously by both parties, the Commission continued to express its acceptance of the applicant's offer to provide one BMR unit, in-lieu fees, and commercial linkage fees in addition to the City revenue sharing component. The Commission also agreed that should it vote to revise Attachment F by amending the fifth bullet point, and should the applicants later agree to such revision with City staff, then the Commission would not need to consider the applicant's offer/BMR Agreement again.

M/S Bautista/Murray to accept the applicant's offer to provide one BMR unit, in-lieu fees, and commercial linkage fees, and revise their proposal for a graduated approach to the City revenue sharing component by inserting the following sentence between the third and fourth sentences of the fifth bullet point of Attachment F (page F1 of the staff report): "Should that cost decrease, the average sales price at which the City share would begin would be decreased by the same percentage;" 6-0-0.

John Beltramo said they cannot presently agree to the Commission's recommended revision but they will consider it. He distributed copies of the project site plan from the existing, previously approved BMR Agreement. The site plan shows the locations of the three formerly approved BMR units. The Commission discussed how the location of the one BMR unit would be chosen and expressed interest in having the Planning Commission determine its location.

Commissioner Moser said she strongly recommends that the one BMR unit be handicap accessible and/or ADA compliant. She said if it cannot be fully accessible or compliant then it should have at least one downstairs bedroom.

## 2. Housing Element Law

Chair Boyle provided a report. The Commission discussed how the Housing Element may relate to the City's proposed downtown/EI Camino Real plan, which includes development of new housing, and the Commission's role respective to the housing. Chair Boyle requested that staff provide the Commission with one or two copies of the downtown/EI Camino Real development proposal.

## 3. Wait List Response to Senior Condo Survey

The Commissioners accepted the report.

## 4. Continuation of Process for Commission 2-Year Workplan

City Clerk Margaret Roberts provided visual aids, handouts, and led the discussion. The Commission decided to skip Step 3 of the Commission Work Plan

Guidelines because the Council's current list of established priorities does not address housing. The Commission worked on Step 4 of the Commission Work Plan Guidelines and identified the following goals, projects or priorities: Housing Element; El Camino Real Downtown Specific Plan as it relates to housing locations; and community outreach for awareness and input. City Clerk Roberts said she will type up notes from the Commission's Step 4 discussion and forward them to Housing Manager Frederick, who will forward them to the Commission.

Commissioner Bautista left the meeting early at 6:40 p.m.

5. Approval of the Commission Meeting Minutes from August 4, 2010

M/S Boyle/Clarke to approve the minutes as presented; 5-0-0.

**C. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Update on Housing Activity (Report from Staff)

Housing Manager Frederick reported the following: two of the three BMR resales are complete and the third will close later this month; one PAL loan was approved last week; the rehabilitation of Mr. Hill's home is almost complete; and two or three other housing rehabilitation projects are being discussed.

2. Monthly Report on Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program for July 2010

The Commissioners accepted the report.

3. Housing Study Session for Council October 19<sup>th</sup>

Housing Manager Frederick said the Commission will review this item at next month's meeting. City Clerk Roberts suggested someone speak on behalf of the Commission at the October 19 Council meeting.

4. Report from the Chair

There was no report.

5. Commission Member Reports

There was no report.

**D. INFORMATION ITEMS – None.**

**E. PUBLIC COMMENT #2 – None.**

**F. ADJOURNMENT – 7:00 p.m.**

Minutes submitted by: Megan Nee, Management Analyst