



## **MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting  
July 7, 2003  
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 (Chair), Halleck (Vice-chair) (arrived at 7:15 p.m.), Pagee, Sinnott, Soffer present; Bims absent

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Murphy, O'Connell, Thompson

### **A. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were none.

### **B. CONSENT**

#### **1. Consideration of the transcripts of the October 21, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.**

Commissioners Fergusson and Pagee noted four corrections.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Fergusson to approve with the following changes:

- Page 2, Line 8: Insert "Kelly" before "Fergusson."
- Page 7, Line 10: Change "pear" to "appear."
- Page 7, Line 18: Change "threw" to "through."
- Page 7, Line 20: Change "with her" to "whether."

Motion carried, 3-0-2-1 with Commissioners Sinnott and Soffer abstaining and Commissioner Halleck not yet in attendance.

#### **2. Sign Review/Noel Marguis/1850 El Camino Real:** Request for sign approval for refacing an existing pole sign with a new sign face containing the color red and exposed-tube neon lighting.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Fergusson to approve as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.

2. Make a finding that the monument sign is appropriate and compatible with the businesses and signage on El Camino Real, and is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Signs.
3. Approve the pole sign subject to the following conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Amcoe Sign Co., consisting of one plan sheet received by the Planning Division on April 11, 2003, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003.
  - b. 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 new construction.
  - c. Within 30 days of the Planning Commission approval of this item, the applicant shall submit a complete application for any required building permits for the pole sign. This building permit application shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Building Division.

The motion carried, 5-0, with Commissioner Halleck not yet in attendance.

### **C. PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **Use Permit/William and Diana Holliday/375 Felton Drive:** Request for a use permit to construct first and second floor additions to an existing single-family residence on a lot that is substandard in regard to lot width and lot area and for additions to an existing legal, nonconforming residence to exceed 50% of the replacement cost of the structure within a 12-month period.

Staff Comment: Planner O'Connell said that the application was for a use permit to construct first floor additions and a second floor at 375 Felton Drive. He noted that the existing residence was legal, but has a nonconforming right side setback. He said that there have been no communications from the neighbors.

Chair Fry asked for clarification on the dimensions and size of the garage. Planner O'Connell said that the architect, who was present, may wish to respond to that question.

Public Hearing: The architect, Jim Maliski, Maliski and Associates, said that the garage was 417 square feet and that the calculation of the floor area included the thickness of the wall. He said that a legal two-car garage has interior dimensions of 20 feet in length and 20 feet in width for a total of 400-square feet. He noted that the proposed garage is just under that dimension.

The applicant and owner Diana Holliday said that the purpose of the project was to expand the existing 1900 square foot home to accommodate their five-member

family, as well as upgrade the appearance of the home in keeping with the style and character of the neighborhood.

Chair Fry asked if the driveway would be gravel. Ms. Holliday indicated that the driveway material was not yet determined. She said that they would prefer a more informal, country type look and asphalt would not be their first choice. She said that they would probably want some hardscape by the front of the garage. She indicated that embedded gravel might be their choice.

Commissioner Pagee said that the windows on either side were discretely done. She asked whether the new home that was being built to the rear of the subject property was occupied yet. Ms. Holliday said that it would be occupied soon, but that she and her husband would meet with the builders of that home and come to some agreement to plant trees and other greenery for the privacy of both properties. Commissioner Pagee commended Ms. Holliday for a nice design.

Commission Action: M/S Fry/Soffer to close the public hearing.

Motion carried, 5-0, with Commissioner Halleck not yet in attendance.

Commission Action: Fry/Pagee to approve as recommended in the staff report.

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. Approve the use permit subject to the following conditions:
  - a) Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Jim Maliski and Associates, dated received by the Planning Division on June 30, 2003, consisting of 11 plan sheets, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
  - b) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all 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 applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Transportation Division, and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the new construction.
  - d) Prior to issuance of a demolition permit or building permit, the applicants shall submit a plan for construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area for review and approval of the Building Division.

The Building Official may waive this requirement on a case-by-case basis. The fences shall be installed according to the plan prior to commencing construction.

- e) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utilities shall be placed underground. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- f) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicants shall submit revised plans that clearly indicate that no attic space exceeds five (5) feet in height and that no finished floor to ceiling space exceeds 12 feet in height unless the areas of excessive height are counted at 200% in FAL calculations and result in an FAL of no more than 3,271 square feet. The revised plans shall be subject to Building Division staff review and approval.

Motion carried, 5-0, with Commissioner Halleck not yet in attendance.

- 2. Use Permit/Benjamin Botero/1374 Madera Avenue:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story residence and construct a new two-story residence on a lot that is substandard in regard to lot width and lot area.

Staff Comment: Planner Thompson said that the applicant was requesting a use permit to demolish an existing single-story residence at 1374 Madera Avenue. She said that the property is located in the R-1-U zoning district. She noted that the lot is substandard in regard to lot width, possessing a width of 50 feet where 65 feet is required and in regard to lot area, possessing a lot area of 6,000 square feet where 7,000 square feet is required.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Fergusson noted that the project is located in the FEMA Flood Area and asked how the height of the proposed home was measured. Planner Thompson said that the height was measured from the existing grade as shown on page B-3 of the staff report and page A-4, section A.A. of the larger plans. Commissioner Fergusson confirmed with Planner Thompson that the finished floor needed to comply with the base flood elevation.

Public Hearing: The applicant Mr. Benjamin Botero said that he was speaking on behalf of Mr. Romero. He said that he thinks that overall everyone is happy with the design.

Commissioner Fergusson said that there was only one window on the back of the house. Mr. Botero said that the garage was in the back and limited the amount of windows. He said that Mr. Romero wanted the home to have a nice appearance in the front and that is why he decided he would prefer the garage in the back. Commissioner Fergusson said that the front elevation was beautiful.

Commissioner Pagee noted that the staff report indicated that the garage ceiling height should be kept under 12 feet. She said that the plate is at 10-foot 6-inches and wondered how the ceiling would be kept under 12 feet. Mr. Botero said that because the house area had been reduced and the garage changed from two-car to one-car, Mr. Romero expressed a need for more storage area. He asked that the ceiling be vaulted in the garage for that purpose. Mr. Botero indicated that the vaulted area could be closed off using ceiling joints.

Commissioner Halleck asked staff to comment the second floor setbacks. Planner Thompson said that the first and second floor are flush on the side elevations, and set back two and a half feet on the front elevation. She said that in the rear, the first and second floors are flush along the wall where the two bedrooms align.

Commissioner Halleck asked if the concern was with the sides or the front. Planner Thompson indicated that it was with the side elevations. Commissioner Halleck said that staff had indicated in the staff report that they wanted the Commission to address the roof design. He said that he thought it was fairly well broken up. Commissioner Halleck asked if the neighbors had seen the plans and had no concerns. Mr. Botero said that the neighbors had reviewed the plans. He said they tried to break up the second floor from the first floor so that the home would not look like a box. Commissioner Halleck asked if the windows were under the eaves on the right elevation. Mr. Botero said that they are and the roof is lowered to meet the daylight plane requirements. Chair Fry noted that the eaves are not the same on the left and right elevations. Mr. Botero said that was correct, as there was not an issue on the left elevation with the daylight plane because of the setbacks and driveway.

Commission Action: M/S Fry/Halleck to close the public hearing.

Motion carried, 6-0.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Pagee said that the large gable and windows in front at first concerned her. She said that the applicant has done such a great job of breaking up the other sides of the house without having two-story walls more than 24-feet long. She said that the second-story windows are fairly discrete. She wondered why the applicant did not choose to do a two-car garage. Mr. Botero said that originally the overall footprint did not seem to support a two-car garage. The owner eventually came to prefer the concept of a one-car garage to preserve the yard.

Commissioner Fergusson said that there appeared to be opportunities for windows that would look out into the backyard. Commissioner Fergusson said that she would like to move approval with a condition to allow the applicant some flexibility to add windows in the rear elevation. Chair Fry asked about the size of the windows. Commissioner Fergusson asked if Planner Murphy could suggest wording. Planner Murphy said that allowing for the size of the slider windows would give the applicant the most flexibility.

Chair Fry said that she would be willing to second the motion with a friendly amendment. She said that she was concerned with the massing of the window on the front elevation. She agreed with Commissioner Pagee because the massing was on the western side and it would become very hot. She said that she would not

require that the window be smaller but that the condition might allow the applicant to have fewer windows. Commissioner Fergusson said that she accepted that friendly amendment as long as the windows were balanced.

Commission Action: M/S Fergusson/Fry to approve as recommended in the staff report with an additional condition "h."

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 Solutions for Living, dated June 2003, consisting of four plan sheets, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003 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 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) Prior to issuance of a demolition permit or building permit, the applicant shall submit a plan for construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area for review and approval of the Building Division. The Building Official may waive this requirement on a case-by-case basis. The fences shall be installed according to the plan prior to commencing construction.
  - e) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utilities shall be placed underground. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - f) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a tree protection plan for the heritage tree located on the subject property

adjacent to the rear property line subject to review and approval by the Building Division.

- g) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit revised plans that demonstrate the ceiling height of the garage does not exceed 12 feet. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building Division.
- h) *The applicant shall have flexibility to make the following changes to the project plans: 1) include an additional window, similar to the proposed windows on the second floor of the side elevations, in bedroom number four or in the stairway on the rear elevation; and 2) reduce the size of the proposed windows on the second floor of the front elevation. Changes shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.*

Motion carried, 6-0.

- 3. Use Permit Revision/Sharon Heights Golf & Country Club/2900 Sand Hill Road:** Request for a use permit revision to construct an accessory structure for providing golf lessons to members located adjacent to hole number one.

Staff Comment: Planner Murphy stated that the Sharon Heights Golf & Country Club were requesting a use permit revision to add a teaching shelter to replace a previous facility that was housed within a tent. He said the exterior finishes of the teaching shelter would match the colors and materials of the newly constructed clubhouse. He noted that architectural control was not required for the construction of an accessory building.

Questions of Staff: Chair Fry confirmed with Planner Murphy that the ratio of square footage met the requirements for an accessory building. Commissioner Pagee asked if notification of the project was made to the adjacent properties within 300-feet of the project site. Planner Murphy indicated that notification was made. Commissioner Fergusson asked if the 300-foot notification was the entire border of the parcels on which the club was situated. Planner Murphy said that would be the proper notification area. Planner Murphy also noted that the entire parcel area of the Club was used to determine the allowable size of the accessory structure.

Public Hearing: Mr. Bob Glockner, a member of the Board of Directors for the Sharon Heights Golf and Country Club, said that the staff report outlined the project well.

In response to a question from Chair Fry, Mr. Glockner said that people would receive instruction within the structure. The purpose was to protect other golfers from those receiving lessons and to protect the students from inclement weather.

Commission Action: M/S Fry/Soffer to close the public hearing.

Motion carried, 6-0.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Sinnott to approve as recommended in the staff report.

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed project is compatible with the character of the surrounding area and 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 request subject to the following conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Burns Nettle, consisting of three plan sheets dated March 13, 2003, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
  - b. 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.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the West Bay Sanitary District, the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and the utility companies that are directly applicable to the project.

Motion carried, 6-0.

4. **Use Permit and Architectural Control/Paula Alloro (Menlo Park Fire Protection District)/1467 Chilco Street:** Request for a use permit for the storage and use of hazardous materials on the property and for architectural control for the installation of a 2,000-gallon above ground fuel tank and the construction of an accessory building to house a generator at Fire Station No. 77.

Staff Comment: Planner Thompson said that the applicant was proposing to install one above ground 2,000-gallon fuel tank at 1467 Chilco Street. She noted that the two-compartment tank would hold 2,000 gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel available for fire apparatus. She stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a use permit for hazardous materials associated with the fuel tank and architectural control review of the fuel tank and an accessory building to house the generator.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Pagee asked if it was usual to put the tanks above ground, whether the tanks might be underground, and were the tanks a potential hazard for neighboring residences. Planner Thompson said that staff's understanding was that aboveground tanks were environmentally superior, but that the applicant was present and would be able to answer questions. Commissioner Pagee asked about access for a



fueling truck. Planner Murphy said that the location for the tanks was determined for accessibility. Chair Fry confirmed with Planner Thompson that the tanks would be along a fence next to residential properties. Chair Fry asked if something more substantial than a wooden fence was required between the tanks and neighboring properties. Planner Murphy said that staff was not aware of any codes or requirements to require a more substantial wall; he noted that the project had been reviewed by the Building Division, Menlo Park Fire Protection District and Environmental Health. Chair Fry confirmed with Planner Murphy that all of the agencies he mentioned had responded.

Commissioner Soffer asked that the Fire District might address security for the tank site. He asked staff about the status of the Habitat for Humanity project on the adjacent site and the soils contamination. Planner Murphy said that there had been a decision to split the environmental review to do traffic analysis under the Housing Element Update and another analysis of other potential impacts including contaminated soil and noise from the proposed Dumbarton Rail. He said that he has not received further information on that review.

Public Hearing: Mr. Jim Lichenstein, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, indicated that he would be replacing Paula Alloro as the staff person for the project. Mr. Lichenstein said that the primary reason for the project was to provide an uninterruptible source of fuel, which was of great importance during an emergency. He said that generators allowed for fueling during loss of electrical power. Mr. Lichenstein said the tanks are protected from impact, explosives, projectiles and spills. He noted that also the new tanks would help them with their inventory control. He said that containment and environmental issues would be addressed through daily inspections. He emphasized that they were well aware of the need to maintain vigilant security at their site.

Mr. Frank Kozma, Project Engineer, in response to Commissioner Pagee, said that the generator would be diesel fueled. He said that the interior of the tanks is ¼-inch carbon steel; then a second layer of lightweight concrete; and then 3/8-inch layer of carbon steel that is bulletproof. He indicated that the tank was fireproof.

Commissioner Pagee said that her concern was with people delivering fuel and accidentally spilling fuel. She asked how the tanks might be shut off and leakage stopped. Mr. Lichenstein said that they block the drains and use absorbent for disposal. He said that they monitor the activities of all the vendors. Mr. Kozma said that they also have spill containers on the tank.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fergusson, Mr. Kozma said that the distance from the slab to the fence was eight feet. Chair Fry asked for the hours during which the tanks would be filled with fuel. Mr. Lichenstein said that the fuel vendors would not come before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m. He said that fire vehicles are refilled at the ¾ mark. He said that if refueling was needed in the middle of the night that most likely Station 1 would be used.

Commission Action: M/S Fergusson/Soffer to close the public hearing.

The motion carried, 6-0.

Commissioner Soffer moved and Commissioner Sinnott seconded to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Fergusson suggested a friendly

amendment to require that the corner of the pad closest to the residential property line be a minimum of eight feet from that property line.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Sinnott to approve as recommended in the staff report with the addition of condition "h" as indicated below.

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make a finding, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permit, that the proposed use will be compatible with the surrounding land uses and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons 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 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.
4. Approve the use permit and 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 EVM/FMK, consisting of two plan sheets dated December 12, 2002, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003, 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 there is a substantial change in the quantity of chemicals or hazardous materials, or a change in the use and/or storage of the hazardous

materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.

- e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
- f. In the event that the use is discontinued for 90 consecutive days, the use permit will automatically expire.
- g. The oil/water separator shall be inspected by West Bay Sanitary District on a semi annual basis.
- h. *Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit revised plans that demonstrate the proposed concrete pad is set back a minimum of eight feet from the southerly property line. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.*

Motion carried, 6-0.

- 5. **Use Permit/S. Sebastian/1080 Lemon Street:** Request for a use permit to maintain hedges and construct a fence of six feet in height within the front setback of the property where the maximum allowed height is four feet and within the line-of-sight triangle at the corner of the property where the maximum allowed height is three feet.

This item was continued prior to this meeting to the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 4, 2003.

- 6. **Use Permit Extension/Don Fox/1320A Willow Road:** Request for an extension to the existing use permit to allow for the retail sale and on-site consumption of wine in association with the operation of a wine storage and production facility.

This item was continued prior to this meeting to the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 4, 2003.

#### **D. REGULAR BUSINESS**

- 1. **Architectural Control/Paula Alloro (Menlo Park Fire Protection District)/300 Middlefield Road:** Request for architectural control review for the removal of two existing underground fuel tanks and the installation of one 4,000-gallon above ground fuel tank at Fire Station No. 1.

Staff Comment: Planner Thompson said that the applicant was requesting architectural control review for the removal of two existing underground fuel tanks and the installation of one 4,000-gallon above ground fuel tank at Fire Station No. 1, 350 Middlefield Road, for the fueling of fire apparatus.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Fergusson asked about setback requirements. Planner Murphy said the zoning was R-1-S, but that the Fire District as a public safety agency was exempt from certain requirements of the City. He said that the Fire District makes efforts to comply with R-1-S requirements whenever possible. Commissioner Soffer said that landscaping would screen the site on the Santa Monica side.

Public Comment: Mr. Lichenstein, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, said that parking for the area was at a premium. He said that perhaps they could put a planter box tree area right along the fence line. He said that he would prefer portable plants.

There was discussion about the location of the proposed fence to be moved away from the property line and flush with the existing fence, the installation of vinyl slats and softening visual impacts. Mr. Lichenstein indicated that they were amenable to using landscaping as indicated previously and additional vinyl slats to improve the visual impact.

Commission Action: M/S Fry/Page to close public comment.

Motion carried, 6-0.

Commission Action: M/S Fergusson/Soffer to approve as recommended in the staff report with the modified and additional conditions as indicated.

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt 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 EVM\FMK Designs, consisting of two plan sheets dated December 2, 2002, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 7, 2003, 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. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall revise the plans to indicate *the installation of matching vinyl slats in the existing chain link fence surrounding of the existing generator and the proposed fuel tanks on the Santa Monica Avenue side and the rear of the building.*
- e. *Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall revise plans to indicate the proposed chain link fence enclosing the proposed fuel tank is set back from the property line to be flush with the existing chain link fence enclosing the generator.*
- f. *Prior to final inspection, the applicant shall provide landscaping along the Santa Monica Avenue property line to screen the proposed equipment.*

Motion carried, 6-0.

**2. Sign Review/Kanti Patel/1704 El Camino Real:** Request for sign approval for a sign at the Red Cottage Inn containing the colors red.

Staff Comment: Planner Murphy said that the Red Cottage Motel had changed its name to the Red Cottage Inn and Suites, and were making a request for approval of the installation of a new sign face that contains a burgundy-red background color. He said that the applicant's representative had been at the meeting earlier, but had left. He noted that the sign was already installed as the applicant had not realized that a permit was needed. He asked that the Commission provide staff with direction as to whether this shade of red, a burgundy, needed Commission review or whether staff might approve administratively.

Chair Fry confirmed with Planner Murphy that the sign met the size requirements. Commissioner Pagee said that she would want to see signs with red color for review because of the potential visual impact. Commissioner Soffer said that he did not have a problem with the color burgundy. Chair Fry said that she would prefer to review signs of this color and size. She said that the corporate logo that had a gold border was much better looking than the sign. There was discussion about ways that the red might have been muted.

Planner Murphy said that if the Commission had improvements to suggest that he could speak with the owner to see if he would be willing to do modifications. He said that staff was asking whether the color burgundy was acceptable for staff to approve administratively. He said that since the applicant was not present, the item might be continued.

Commissioner Fergusson moved to continue the item to a future meeting.

Commissioner Pagee said that she would like the owner to consider some modifications and have the applicant come back to the July 14, 2003 meeting. Commissioner Halleck said that the sign was very blank and big. He said that it was out of scale for that area.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Commission Action: M/S Soffer/Pagee to continue this item to the meeting of July 21, 2003 in order to give the applicant an opportunity to be present to respond to questions about the proposal and for staff to work with the applicant on potential modifications to the sign.

Motion carried, 6-0.

Chair Fry noted that staff had asked for direction on the use of the color burgundy for signs. Commissioner Soffer said that there are standards of color chips such as the PMS system. He suggested that such a system be used to standardize color standards for the Commission, staff and designers. Planner Murphy said that staff would look for such a system and bring the discussion back to the Commission.

## **E. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

Commissioner Sinnott said that temporary signs are often in violation of the sign ordinance and the car dealerships' temporary signs along El Camino Real were any eyesore. Commissioner Pagee asked if there were regulations regarding temporary signs. Planner Murphy said that those regulations were more informal than sign regulations. The Commission indicated that they would like to discuss the Sign Design Guidelines, including a specific discussion of bright colors at a future meeting.

Chair Fry suggested that the comments Ezio Alviti made to the Commission on October 21, 2002 about the impacts of new development in the public realm on the blind and visually impaired be agendized.

The Commission indicated that they would like an opportunity to discuss Commissioner Soffer's idea regarding the possibility of including additional statistics in staff reports to get a better understanding of application processing times.

Commissioner Fergusson provided information on her summer vacation schedule. Planner Murphy reported on the dates of the future summer meetings. Commissioner Fergusson asked if attendance at Commission meeting was possible through teleconference. Planner Murphy said that he would revisit the requirements for attending a public meeting by teleconference.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Justin Murphy, Principal Planner

Prepared by: Brenda Bennett, Recording Secretary

Approved by Planning Commission on March 8, 2004.