



MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

July 1, 2002

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

801 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Fergusson, Fry, Halleck, O'Donnell (Vice-Chair), Pagee, Soffer (Chair), Stein (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Heineck, McClure, O'Connell, Smith

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planner Heineck announced that the Recording Secretary, Gina Kessler, had resigned from the City of Menlo Park and that the Commission would be without a Recording Secretary until the position can be filled.

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one from the public addressed the Commission.

B. MINUTES

- Consideration of draft minutes of the May 6, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.

M/S Fry/O'Donnell to approve the minutes.

Motion carried, 4-0-2 with Commissioners Fergusson and Pagee abstaining and Commissioner Stein absent.

- Consideration of draft minutes of the May 20, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.

M/S Fry/O'Donnell to approve the minutes.

Motion carried, 6-0 with Commissioner Stein absent.

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **Architectural Control Revision/Mike Ma, DES Architects & Engineers/416 Sand Hill Circle:** Request for approval of a revision to a previously granted architectural control to add a second floor bay window to an existing townhouse.

Commission Action: M/S O'Donnell/Halleck to:

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following conditions of approval.
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects and Engineers, received on May 2, 2002, consisting of six plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Transportation Division and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the new construction.
 - d. If required by State or Federal regulations, or by the Building Division, construction safety fences shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area. A plan for safety fences necessary during construction shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

- e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a letter of approval from the Homeowner's Association specifically approving the second floor bay window and its encroachment into the common area.

Motion carried, 6-0 with Commissioner Stein absent.

- 2. Architectural Control Revision/Gary Ahern, Focal Point Design/1150 El Camino Real:** Request for approval of an architectural control revision for exterior modifications to an existing two-story commercial building.

Public Comment: In response to a question by Commissioner Fry regarding the possibility of adding awnings to the first floor windows on the front elevation, the applicant, Gary Ahern, explained that he had considered awnings, but felt that they would tend to make the design appear heavy. He added that the Trees for Menlo program would result in a tree being planted between the two front windows. He indicated that he would be amenable to a condition to add awnings if the Commission felt the awnings would benefit the project.

Commission Discussion: The Commission generally agreed that the proposed changes were an enhancement of the building and that a tree planted in front of the building would adequately address concerns regarding the front elevation.

Commission Action: M/S Halleck/Soffer to:

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following conditions of approval.
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the

plans prepared by Focal Point Design, received on April 29, 2002, consisting of five plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.

- b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Transportation Division and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the new construction.
- d. If required by State or Federal regulations, or by the Building Division, construction safety fences shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area. A plan for safety fences necessary during construction shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

Motion carried, 6-0 with Commissioner Stein absent.

(Commissioner Stein joined the proceedings at 7:15 p.m.)

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3. Use Permit/Jennifer Francica /99 San Mateo Drive:** Request for a use permit to allow the demolition of an existing single-family residence and the construction of a new two-story residence located on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot width.

Staff Comment: Planner O'Connell presented the staff report and noted that a model and colored rendering of the project were available for the Commission's review.

Commission Questions of Staff: Commissioner Soffer asked how trees with multiple trunks are measured for purposes of determining if the tree is a heritage tree. Planner O'Connell explained that the Heritage Tree Ordinance specifies that multi-trunk trees be measured at the point where the trunks separate, rather than at the standard 48 inches above grade for single-trunk trees.

Commissioner Fry asked if the proposed construction area signs at the San Mateo pedestrian/bicycle bridge could be placed on both sides of the bridge or whether the signs could be made bi-directional. Planner Heineck responded that the signs could be made bi-directional.

Commissioner Pagee asked if the daylight plane was indicated correctly on the plans. Planner Heineck acknowledged that it may be shown incorrectly and that conformance with the daylight plane would need to be verified as part of the building permit submittal.

Public Comment: Jennifer Francica, project applicant and designer, explained the evaluation process used to complete the proposed design and described key features of the design. She then responded to questions by the Commission related to the proposed landscaping, the design of the garage doors, window placement on the front elevation, the design of the fireplace and stone accent walls, and input from adjacent property owners.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Halleck to close the public hearing, carried 7-0.

Commission Discussion: The Commission generally agreed that, based on the model and colored rendering, the residence was appropriately designed. Commissioner Halleck referenced the use of the specific building materials, including cedar siding, color-integrated concrete and slate stone, window placement and the setback from the San Francisquito Creek as being attractive features of the residence. He also emphasized the importance of any proposed landscaping changes being in compliance with the Creek Master Plan. Planner Heineck commented that the landscaping on the site is required to be in conformance with the Creek Master Plan. Commissioner Fergusson asked if the property was impacted by the 1998 floods. The City Attorney responded that the property did not experience any flooding.

Commissioner Stein asked the Commission if it wished to consider requiring two individual doors as opposed to the single-door proposed for the garage. The applicant explained that she had considered two garage doors, but felt that the simple, monolithic design was more in keeping with the design concept for the residence.

Commissioner Fry raised a question for discussion regarding the potential solar impacts on the neighboring property. The applicant explained the design features of the residence that would serve to lessen the impacts on the neighboring property.

Commissioner Soffer requested that the applicant explain the energy efficient elements of the proposal and commented that he had concerns regarding whether the Commission should approve the future accessory building proposed for the property. Planner Heineck explained that the proposed plans establish the maximum size of the accessory structure at 135 square feet and designates the location. For this reason, staff was comfortable with a condition that allowed for staff review of the actual design at a future time and requires the design to be compatible with the main residence.

Commissioner Fergusson asked if the property was impacted by the 1998 floods. The City Attorney responded that the property did not experience any flooding.

Commission Action: M/S Stein/Pagee to:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Garcia & Francica Architects, received by the Planning Division on June 25, 2002, consisting of thirteen plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Transportation Division, and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the new construction.
 - d. If required by State or Federal regulations, or by the Building Division, construction safety fences shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area. A plan for safety fences necessary during construction shall be submitted to the Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - e. A utility plan, showing the exact location of all meters that are being installed outside the building and provisions being made to screen such equipment from view, shall be submitted to and approved by Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - f. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for a detached accessory structure, the applicant shall submit plans for Planning Staff review and approval. The accessory structure shall be located as indicated on the approved plans, be no greater than 135 square feet in size and shall otherwise comply with all requirements relating to accessory structures and designed to be compatible with the main residence.
 - g. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a landscape plan for the project site. The landscape plan shall be integrated with the natural plantings along the creek and incorporate the recommendations of the applicant's consulting arborist. The landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the contract City Arborist.
 - h. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit revised plans that include and clearly indicate that the following conditions be adhered to during the construction process; all construction equipment

and construction materials shall be kept off the roadway, especially in the vicinity of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge; at end of construction day, all debris and dirt shall be swept off the roadway for the benefit of bicyclists and pedestrians using the bridge; and signs to warn bicyclists and pedestrians of ongoing construction near the bridge shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Transportation Division.

Motion carried, 7-0.

- 4. Use Permit/Nicole Perkins/883 Santa Cruz Avenue:** Request for a use permit to allow for a private recreational use, a yoga studio, to locate in the C-3 Central Commercial District and on a property that is legal, nonconforming with regard to parking.

Staff Comment: Planner Smith presented the staff report and noted that the applicant had submitted an additional letter stating that the maximum number of students the proposed tenant space could accommodate is 15 people, as opposed to the 25 people originally projected.

Commission Questions of Staff: Commissioner Fry asked about parking impacts during the day in the adjacent parking plaza. Planner Heineck explained that the parking plaza operates somewhat differently than others in the downtown based on the proximity of Draeger's Supermarket. She explained that the parking plaza has capacity during the morning hours, but is often full during evening hours.

Public Comment: In response to questions from the Commission, the applicant, Nicole Perkins, explained that her preference would be to have the flexibility necessary to add classes for children and seniors during daytime hours. She further explained that six to seven instructors work at the facility, but only one class is held at a time.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Fergusson to close the hearing; carried 7-0.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Halleck to:

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit request subject to the following conditions of approval.

- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by the applicant, consisting of three plan sheets dated received March 26, 2002, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
- b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Transportation Division and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. Prior to installation of any signs, the applicant shall apply for any necessary sign permits from the Planning Division.

Motion carried, 7-0.

- 5. Use Permit, Architectural Control, and Revised Mitigated Negative Declaration/Corey Brand/996, 1000 and 1002 Willow Road:** Request for use permit and architectural control approval for the demolition of an existing commercial structure and construction of a new 11,334 square foot, two-story, general office building in the C-2-B (Neighborhood Commercial, Restrictive) Zoning District. The proposal also requires the review of a Revised Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project. *(Continued to the meeting of July 15, 2002)*
- 6. Use Permit and Architectural Control Revisions/Pauline Schley, Ford Land Company, LLC/3000 Sand Hill Road:** Request for approval of use permit and architectural control revisions for an approximately 120 square foot expansion and renovation of an existing conference center at the Sand Hill Circle office complex.

Staff Comment: Planner Smith presented the staff report.

Public Comment: In response to questions from the Commission, the applicant, Pauline Schley explained that the conference room is solely for the use of the tenants of Sand Hill Circle and that no future modifications of the building are anticipated at this time.

Commission Action: Soffer/Stein to close the public hearing, carried 7-0.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Halleck to:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Adopt findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance and scale of the additions are in keeping with the character of the existing development on the site;
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City;
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City ordinances, and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
4. Approve the use permit and architectural control revision requests subject to the following conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Tom Eliot Fisch, consisting of four plan sheets dated May 6, 2002, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility company regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. If required by state or federal regulations, or by the Building Division, construction safety fences shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area. A plan for safety fences necessary during construction

shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

- e. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a utility plan showing the exact location of all meters, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, back-flow prevention devices, etc., that are being installed outside the building and provisions being made to screen such equipment from view, shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division.

Motion carried, 7-0.

- 7. Use Permit and Architectural Control Revisions/Pauline Schley, Ford Land Company, LLC/2730 Sand Hill Road:** Request for approval of use permit and architectural control revisions for an approximately 80 square foot expansion and renovation of the existing office building located at 2730 Sand Hill Road.

Staff Comment: Planner Smith presented the staff report.

Commission Questions of Staff: Commissioner Fry asked for the location of the parking spaces that would be lost as a result of the proposal. Planner Smith explained that spaces on the left and front sides of the building would be lost as a result of new pedestrian walkways. Commissioner Fry asked for the required size of a parking space. Planner Smith stated that it is 8.5 feet in width by as little as 16 feet in length depending on the designed use of overhang areas.

Public Comment: In response to questions from the Commission, the applicant, Pauline Schley, explained that the parking on the site is adequate at this time and that the Ford Land Company has no intent to remove spaces from landscape reserve. She also explained that the main entrance to the building is on the south side and how the handicap parking relates to the entrance.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/O'Donnell to close the public hearing, 7-0.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/O'Donnell to:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Adopt findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance and scale of the additions are in keeping with the character of the existing development on the site;
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City;
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City ordinances, and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
4. Approve the use permit and architectural control revision requests subject to the following conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by B.H. Bocook AIA Architect, consisting of three plan sheets dated May 1, 2002, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2002, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility company regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. If required by state or federal regulations, or by the Building Division, construction safety fences shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area. A plan for safety fences necessary during construction shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - e. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a utility plan showing the exact location of all meters, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, back-flow prevention devices, etc., that are being installed outside the building and provisions being made to screen such equipment from view, shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division.

Motion carried, 7-0.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

- Planner Heineck advised the Commission of upcoming items on the City Council's calendar, including further review of the proposed changes to regulations for single-family residential development on July 16, 2002, further review of housing sites related to the Housing Element update on July 23, 2002 and consideration of the revisions to the Below Market Rate Housing Program Guidelines and a study session on the proposed development at 175 Linfield Drive on July 30, 2002.
- Planner Heineck advised the Commission that the July 22, 2002 study session had been cancelled for lack of business.
- Commissioner Fergusson requested a copy of the San Francisquito Creek Master Plan

ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Arlinda Heineck, Chief Planner

V:\minutes\2002\070102