



MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

August 20, 2007

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bims, Bressler (arrived 7:16 p.m.), Deziel (Vice chair), Keith (Chair), O'Malley, Pagee, Riggs

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager, Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Megan Fisher, Associate Planner

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

B. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

- 1. Discussion of correspondence from Morris Brown regarding the study session scheduled for August 27, 2007 on the Bohannon Hotel and Office project located at 101 to 155 Constitution Drive and 100 to 190 Independence Drive.**

Chair Keith said the e-mail correspondence from Mr. Morris Brown was a request to continue the study session on the Bohannon project scheduled for August 27, 2007. Planner Chow said that the August 27, 2007 meeting had four use permit items and this study session; she noted that there were no study sessions scheduled for September and that September 17 could be designated for this study session, or it could be added to the end of the agenda for the one of the other two September dates.

Chair Keith said the 27th had been chosen for the study session as it was after school started and the expectation had been that more people would be in town.

Commissioner Deziel asked staff to estimate the time needed for the consideration of the scheduled four items for August 27. Planner Chow said that those items might possibly be considered in an hour or so, but it was dependent upon public comment.

Commissioner O'Malley said that an important project such as this would be best considered at the beginning of a meeting rather than at the end, and asked how staff would notify the public if the item was continued. Planner Chow said that notice could be posted on the project website, but there was not sufficient time to publish a

Menlo Park Planning Commission

Minutes

August 20, 2007

newspaper notice.

After a discussion of alternatives related to the study session item, the Commission decided by consensus to set a time specific of 8:00 p.m. on August 27 before which the study session would not be heard and that consideration of the four other items on the agenda would be concluded prior to the start of the study session. It was noted that the Bohannon project was complex and would be further considered in public hearings as it progressed.

Chair Keith opened items C.1 and D.1 concurrently for discussion.

C. SCOPING SESSION

1. Review and comment on the content of the Environment Impact Report to be prepared for the project.

Rezoning, Planned Development Permit, Minor Subdivision, and Environmental Review/Sand Hill Property Company/1300 El Camino Real:

- 1) Rezoning the property from the C-4 (ECR) zoning district (General Commercial Applicable to El Camino Real) to the P-D zoning district (Planned Development);
- 2) Planned Development Permit to establish specific development regulations and architectural designs for the demolition of existing commercial structures associated with the former car dealership and the construction of:
- 3)
 - Two commercial buildings totaling 108,850 square feet and to include one of the following mix of uses:

Primary Project

Grocery store/Market (50,850 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

Variant 1

Grocery store/Market (15,000 square feet)

Retail/Restaurant (10,850 square feet)

Health and Fitness Club with associated massage (25,000 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

Variant 2

Retail/Restaurant (25,850 square feet)

Health and Fitness Club with associated massage (25,000 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

- An approximate commercial FAR of 74 percent where 75 percent is the maximum FAR permitted;

- Two-story building elements with a maximum building height of approximately 40 feet where 30 feet is the maximum building height permitted by the pre-existing zoning designation; and
 - 412 parking spaces in an at-grade and below-grade parking structure where 654 parking spaces would be required by the pre-existing zoning designation.
- 4) Lot Merger and Minor Subdivision to merge six existing lots and create up to four commercial condominium units;
 - 5) BMR Agreement for the payment of in-lieu fees associated with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program;
 - 6) Heritage Tree Removal Permit to remove three onsite and four offsite heritage trees from the project site; and
 - 7) Environmental Impact Report to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposal.

D. STUDY SESSION

- 1. *Review and comment on the project components, such as architectural design, site layout, parking ratios, and use aspects, of the following project:***

Rezoning, Planned Development Permit, Minor Subdivision, and Environmental Review/Sand Hill Property Company/1300 El Camino Real:

- 1) Rezoning the property from the C-4 (ECR) zoning district (General Commercial Applicable to El Camino Real) to the P-D zoning district (Planned Development);
- 2) Planned Development Permit to establish specific development regulations and architectural designs for the demolition of existing commercial structures associated with the former car dealership and the construction of:
 - Two commercial buildings totaling 108,850 square feet and to include one of the following mix of uses:

Project Description

Grocery store/Market (50,850 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

Variant 1

Grocery store/Market (15,000 square feet)

Retail/Restaurant (10,850 square feet)

Health and Fitness Club with associated massage (25,000 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

Variant 2

Retail/Restaurant (25,850 square feet)

Health and Fitness Club with associated massage (25,000 square feet)

Non-medical Office (58,000 square feet)

- An approximate commercial FAR of 74 percent where 75 percent is the maximum FAR permitted;
 - Two-story building elements with a maximum building height of approximately 40 feet where 30 feet is the maximum building height permitted by the pre-existing zoning designation; and
 - 412 parking spaces in an at-grade and below-grade parking structure where 654 parking spaces would be required by the pre-existing zoning designation.
- 3) Lot Merger and Minor Subdivision to merge six existing lots and create up to four commercial condominium units;
 - 4) BMR Agreement for the payment of in-lieu fees associated with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program;
 - 5) Heritage Tree Removal Permit to remove three onsite and four offsite heritage trees from the project site; and
 - 6) Environmental Impact Report to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposal.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher outlined the project description and the approval process, and suggested procedure for the scoping and study sessions being currently considered. The proposed project is two commercial buildings with mixed use and with different use variants as noted on page 2 of the staff report. Planner Fisher noted that:

- The project would not exceed 108,850 square feet for any of the proposed variants.
- Height of the project would exceed that allowed in the C-4 (ECR) District thus the applicant was applying for a Planned Development Permit (PDP).
- Application for the project to be considered under the "Use Based Parking Guidelines" rather than the C-4 ECR District parking requirements.
- The project complies with the allowable Floor Area Ratio for the C-4 ECR District parking requirements.
- Request to rezone to P-D, merge lots and develop an up to four unit commercial condominium subdivision.
- Request for a Below Market Rate agreement for payment of in-lieu fees.
- Application for a Heritage Tree Permit removal for seven trees

Planner Fisher said that because of the revisions to the project description, staff would release a revised NPR, following which there would be a 30-day comment period, and the consultant would begin preparation of an EIR. She said the Commission would see the project when the draft EIR was released, which hearing would likely be combined with a study session for the project. She said the Commission would again see the project when the final EIR was released and would have an opportunity to make comments and recommendations to the City Council. She said at some point the BMR agreement would need to be reviewed by the Housing Commission. She said the final project EIR and request for the PDP would then be considered by the City Council in a public hearing. She said if the rezoning was approved by the City Council at that meeting, there would be another meeting for adoption of an ordinance to do so.

Public Comment: Mr. Jeff Warmoth, Sand Hill Property Company, said they have owned the property for two years and began discussions with staff related to the project at that time. He noted that there was only one Heritage tree onsite that was proposed for removal due to its poor health. He said the other six Heritage trees proposed for removal were not on the site and their removal was related to the extension of Garwood Way.

Mr. Ken Rodriguez, Kenneth Rodriguez & Partners, the architectural firm designing the project, went through the schematic drawings with the Commission using slides. He said the major entry for the project would be from El Camino Real with a large parking area for the ground floor retail tenant space. He said there were no retail tenants secured at this time but the space was flexible to allow for a combination of differently sized retail spaces. He said there would be an underground parking garage and that office parking would be accessed from Garwood Way for employees of both the office and retail businesses to keep the other parking available for retail customers. He reviewed the materials proposed noting that they were high quality and appropriate for the uses and area. He said the request to exceed the height limit for C-4 ECR District related to the proposed large retail space and the desire to have a 20-foot ceiling. He showed a slide of the height component noting the sloped roof and the height stepped backed from El Camino Real. He said the Redwood trees had been examined by the arborist, who indicated what setbacks would be needed to protect the health of those trees.

Commissioner Bressler asked if the project design would be complementary to the nearby proposed Derry project. Mr. Rodriguez said they had worked closely with the developers of the Derry project on materials and design so that it would be complementary.

Chair Keith said that previously walkways had been proposed between the two projects. Mr. Rodriguez said that would be the next step based on the outcome of this study session and would be in the materials for the permit application and the landscaping plan. Chair Keith asked about the dedicated open space. Mr. Rodriguez said there would be a courtyard, noting that the Derry project would also have a courtyard. He said there would be open space on the top of the Garwood Way building and a nice plaza from the El Camino Real side.

Commissioner Deziel asked what the “no-project” alternative would mean and if that was an auto dealership. Planner Fisher said that the “no-project” alternative could use the occupation of a car dealership or analyze a typical use permitted under the C-4 ECR zoning district. Commissioner Deziel said that an auto dealership had skewed traffic patterns with a much lower a.m. traffic peak and asked if that would create complications for this project. Planner Fisher said not necessarily noting the “no-project” alternative was a required alternative to be considered as part of the EIR, but if it was found to be the least environmentally impacting, then a different alternative

needed identifying as part of that review, which could be this project or another alternative.

Commissioner Deziel asked about permeability requirements for the site as well as for the “green space.” Planner Fisher said there was not a specific requirement for permeability but a hydrology report would be required. She said that no increase of runoff was allowed because of the capacity of the City’s storm drain system. She said there was a 10-percent requirement for “green space” in the C-4 zoning district and this project would exceed that requirement, and the runoff from the “green space” would also be considered in the hydrology report.

Commissioner Deziel asked about the trees proposed in the surface parking above the below parking area. Mr. Rodriguez said the proposed planting was on a “podium” and would need raised planters with a dropped slab. He said with the permit application they would bring a full landscape plan with the type and species of trees. He said the entire perimeter of the project would have in-the-ground planting to which the podium surface would drain. He said that provided the opportunity to use bio-swales and would reduce hydrology much more than the existing expanse of asphalt.

Commissioner Bressler said he had heard that Whole Foods had considered the project for tenant occupancy and asked whether the space was adequate for their use. Mr. Warmoth said that the space was adequate for a tenant such as Whole Foods. Commissioner Bressler asked about the request to exceed height limits and parking requirements for the C-4 ECR zoning district. Planner Fisher said the applicant wanted to apply for a PDP so that they could build to a greater height than that allowed in the C-4 ECR zoning district. She noted that a P-D zoning district provided flexibility for changes to height and setbacks requirements. She said that the C-4 zoning district had a blanket requirement for parking of six spaces per 1,000 square feet and did not address use and related parking needs. She said with that requirement the project could be “over-parked.” She said the City’s Use-Based Parking Guidelines was used administratively by the City to apply parking needs based on use. Mr. Warmoth noted that the City required five spaces per 1,000 square feet for retail uses and 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Commissioner Pagee asked how the largest proposed retail space at 50,000 square feet compared to the Safeway project in terms of parking. Planner Fisher said the Safeway project was 65,000 square feet and she recalled that the parking requirement for it was 4.87 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Commissioner Pagee asked about the typical back up length requirement for trucks and trailers in the parking lot. Planner Fisher said she was not aware of a requirement, noting that the Transportation Division would review the project plans and make determinations. Commissioner Pagee asked if there were current regulations prohibiting commercial vehicles on Garwood Way. Planner Fisher said that she was not aware of any but thought commercial vehicles probably did not use Garwood Way because it dead-ended, but if this project and the Derry project were built then Garwood Way would be connected and commercial trucks

would probably use it. Mr. Rodriguez said they had looked at backup length for trailers and would provide a diagram with that information to the Transportation Division.

Commissioner Pagee noted her concern that the mixed use would have traffic and deliveries next to a residential building. Mr. Rodriguez said the loading area would be fully recessed and covered, which would mitigate sound. Commissioner Pagee asked about delivery times and that potential noise impact to the residential area. Mr. Rodriguez said that the project was not developed to that level of detail yet but would be so when the application was submitted. He said from his experience with other projects that retailers have the ability to set hours, designate delivery hours, and establish requirements as to what types of trucks were allowed on site. Commissioner Pagee asked about the relationship of the project with the adjacent Derry and Glenwood properties. Mr. Rodriguez said that they had aerial views of the other properties and would use setbacks and landscaping to fit this project in with its neighbors. Commissioner Pagee said her interest was in decreasing the distance for pedestrians from those sites to the proposed retail sites in this project. Mr. Rodriguez indicated those connections would be developed in detail with the setbacks and landscaping plan. Commissioner Pagee noted Elevation 1 and that the same elevation on sheets A.2.1 and A.3.1 did not seem to correspond. Mr. Rodriguez said balconies were proposed for the second floor overlooking El Camino Real but they were not proposed behind the sloped roof. He said they also intended to have balconies in the section of building along Garwood Way. Commissioner Pagee said that retail/commercial tenant spaces would need larger mechanical equipment than office use and asked how much of the equipment would be exposed behind the parapet. Mr. Rodriguez said the equipment would be on the lower elevation and not the upper elevation and would not be seen. He said there would be smaller mechanical equipment for the office building along Garwood Way and that would be entirely screened by the parapet. Commissioner Pagee asked if they would use quieter mechanical equipment where there were residential buildings adjacent. Mr. Rodriguez said that they would and the details would be developed for the application. Commissioner Pagee noted that there was only one entrance to and exit from the parking lot, and suggested that might limit parking access. She said ingress/egress and path of travel needed to be addressed. Mr. Rodriguez said they would do a traffic study. He noted street parking on El Camino Real the length of the project and said part of that might be used to create an accelerator and decelerator lane for the project. Commissioner Pagee said that would limit the City from increasing traffic lanes along El Camino Real. Mr. Rodriguez said there was a difference of opinion relating to the desirability of additional traffic lanes but that would be considered in the traffic study and by the Transportation Division. Commissioner Pagee asked about the typical hours of operation for an ideal retail tenant such as Whole Foods. Mr. Rodriguez said that the project was not to that level of detail but hours of operation would be addressed as part of the application.

Ms. Elisabeth Lasensky, Menlo Park, said she appreciated the revised plan. She requested however that instead of BMR in-lieu fees that the applicant would build housing where the office space was proposed the rear of the property.

Ms. Anne Moser, Menlo Park, said she agreed with the previous speaker about the housing. She asked whether the City really needed another large grocery store noting that the Belle Haven community did not have any large grocery store. She said if the project went forward she was very concerned about traffic and questioned the routes of delivery trucks to and from the site, noting that El Camino Real was already impacted by traffic. She questioned traffic patterns by people coming from and going back to outlying communities and wondered about possible u-turns on Valparaiso and Oak Grove. She said she spoke with the City's Finance Department and found out that grocery stores do not bring as much revenue to a city as retail as much grocery is nontaxable, and noted that the City of Menlo Park needs revenue. She said the structure proposed looked medieval and not inviting. She asked about the Grand Boulevard scheme for El Camino Real and what that plan might want from El Camino Real.

Mr. Anthony Draeger, Menlo Park, thanked the developer for the variants offered. He said he was not sure the area could support another large market, and he thought that it could draw people from the downtown businesses many of which are locally owned. He said that the applicant should comply with the parking requirements and the height limits. He suggested the City could use some good restaurants and hoped the developers were looking at that. He said there was a nearby retirement home. He said that one of his stores was near retirement apartments and that all of the delivery had to be received entirely within the store because of the proximity of the retirement units. He said there were variants that made economic sense and urged the Commission to consider those more closely.

Mr. Morris Brown, Menlo Park, said this project was much more agreeable to him than prior iterations. He said his greatest concern was parking, noting the Derry Project had not provided six spaces per 1,000 square feet. He said if the project met even the minimum parking requirements of the Use Based Parking Guidelines that he estimated this project was under-parked about 25 parking spaces. He said it was indicated that attorney and law offices might be tenants. He said that 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet was inadequate for a successful law firm and should be a minimum of 6 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Chair Keith asked Mr. Warmoth if he had additional comments. Mr. Warmoth said that all of the new buildings built on the proposed project side of El Camino Real were 50 or more feet in height, and that the 40-foot height desired for this project was driven by the needs of the tenant space. He said the variants were proposed because there were no definite tenants yet, and it was possible that they would need to build based on tenants' needs as the tenants emerged. He said they were the developers of the project, but they were also the property owners, and would continue as the property owners once the project was completed. He said they would meet the minimum administrative parking standards and would provide whatever additional parking future tenants might need. He said the receiving area for the grocery store was located entirely within the building.

Chair Keith said in response to Commissioner Deziel's request that they would consider the study session item first and then the scoping session item.

Commissioner Deziel said the project was within the P-D area and the zoning ordinance provided incentives to applicants for the development of projects that created novel designs and open spaces and made more efficient use of the land, and those incentives included some flexibility on certain zoning ordinance requirements such as height, parking and setbacks. He said that he was comfortable with the proposed height and parking ratio. He said the zoning ordinance would allow a building at this site to be 30-feet high and no requirement for setbacks, whereas in the spirit of the P-D zoning, the applicant was proposing significant setbacks between the retirement home and the office building; was investing heavily in underground parking to allow for trees and open spaces aboveground as well as providing an 8,000 square foot plaza along El Camino Real. He said the applicant was requesting to increase the allowable height of the project by a third but with setbacks they were also shrinking the lot coverage by at least a third.

Chair Keith asked the applicant to respond to the public comment that there was no need for another grocery store in this part of Menlo Park. Mr. Warmoth said sophisticated companies had done analysis on desirable locations for their grocery businesses and had approached his company because they wanted their businesses to be in Menlo Park. Chair Keith noted that Variant 1 was for a 15,000 square foot grocery store as opposed to a 50,000 square foot grocery store. Mr. Warmoth said they had included that variant because they were approached by a company who was interested in having a 15,000 square foot grocery store at this site. He noted that the parking requirements for restaurants, unless they were located within an existing parking district in Menlo Park, were very stringent. Chair Keith asked whether it was the grocery store that required the 20-foot height clear from the finished grade. Mr. Warmoth said that many retail businesses wanted higher ceilings, including restaurants. Chair Keith asked how a vehicle traveling southbound on El Camino Real would enter the site. Mr. Warmoth said there were two ways: make a left on Glenwood Avenue, right on Garwood Way and enter by the parking garage; or make a left turn at Oak Grove and left at the new Garwood Way. He said that Garwood Way would become a real street with sidewalks and on-street parallel parking. Chair Keith asked the applicant to respond to the public comment that this site would draw business away from the Central District. Mr. Warmoth said that a large grocery store was more of a destination business. He said that the variants had been developed because the City has an exhaustive EIR process and that required them to be forward thinking. He said he hoped with the commercial growth at the Derry Project and this project that the Central District would be expanded. Chair Keith asked if the buildings would be "green." Mr. Warmoth said that they were committed to the LEED process. Chair Keith asked about bicycle lockers. Mr. Warmoth said that there would be showers for bicyclist commuters and bicycle lockers.

Chair Keith asked the architect to respond to the public comment regarding the “medieval” look of the tower. Mr. Rodriguez said he would bring back detailed plans that would show this feature better.

Commissioner Riggs asked how many employees were expected for a 58,000 square foot office. Mr. Warmoth said they calculated 160 employees based on current professional standards. Commissioner Riggs asked the applicant where he thought these employees would come from. Mr. Warmoth said the site was near the shuttle and Caltrain and hoped that many of the employees would be using such public transit. Commissioner Riggs asked if there would be incentives to use transit in the proposal. Mr. Warmoth said they had would do a Transportation Demand Management Plan. Commissioner Riggs said that there were two public comments regarding the need for housing rather than office space. Mr. Warmoth said that they had initially considered a residential development and looked at various scenarios all of which were impossible under the C-4 zoning because of the needed height and density. He said that the needed height and density would have required a General Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Pagee said that the schematics indicated there was about 20-feet between the Derry Project and the proposed office space and suggested that they review window placement. Mr. Warmoth said that there had been ongoing discussions with that property owner. Commissioner Pagee said that those discussions should also occur with the Glenwood facility. Mr. Warmoth indicated that would occur.

Chair Keith asked about commercial condominiums. Mr. Warmoth said that this provided some flexibility in case the property was to be divided differently in the future. Chair Keith asked about the BMR agreement. Mr. Warmoth said that these fees would contribute to a program toward acquisition of BMRs in other developments.

In response to Commissioner Deziel, Mr. Warmoth said they had previously explored leasing night-time and weekend parking as a public benefit. He said there some issues such as who does the security and management. Commissioner Deziel asked how steep the garage entry off Garwood Way would be. Mr. Warmoth said that a blended-slope would be used for the entrance to the underground parking structure. Commissioner Deziel said the redwood tree on the right seemed unhealthy and if it was savable, it needed immediate attention. Mr. Warmoth said they would contact the arborist in the morning and find out what could be done.

Commissioner Pagee said there was tandem parking indicated in the garage and suggested that they have a parking valet. Mr. Rodriguez said there were only six tandem spaces.

Chair Keith asked if there would be functional windows in the buildings. Mr. Rodriguez said they had not gotten to that level of detail with the office buildings and he expected that they probably would not be functional because of noise from nearby Caltrain.

Chair Keith closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Keith opened discussion on the project proposal and plans.

Commissioner Deziel said he had previously commented on the height and that he was comfortable with the application of the Use-Based Parking Guidelines. He said there was a great deal of miscommunication about parking needs in the City and suggested it be included in the Commission's priority setting. He said that the applicant had tried very hard with the housing but that without additional FAR allowed, rental housing was not viable for the applicant. He said that for the garage entry that there should not be a slope in the sidewalk and should have the least slope possible. He suggested the applicant be given the flexibility to lease parking at night and weekend. He encouraged the applicant to explore Variant 1 thoroughly and mentioned several examples of retail spaces in Berkeley and San Francisco that used 5,000 to 15,000 square feet creatively.

Commissioner Riggs said Whole Foods seemed to work well in conjunction with housing and that a mix of grocery businesses might make Menlo Park a destination for shopping similar to Palo Alto and Redwood City. He said the growth of El Camino Real in the transit area would be an addition to Menlo Park life and was one of the City's goals. He said he was glad there was a height element for the project along El Camino Real. He said he would like transit use emphasized to the site. He said when the EIR was prepared there should be an alternative for housing. He said parking below grade was an asset but he would encourage two attractive stairwells in addition to an elevator.

Commissioner Bressler said he appreciated that the applicant had revised the project to largely conform to the General Plan. He said it was relevant to him that the applicant was the property owner and was not a speculative developer. He said it was regrettable that there was not plan in place for the El Camino Real Corridor.

Commissioner Pagee said she would like to see more options. She said she was concerned about a heavily used retail business at this site and mixing up delivery trucks with a parking lot for an active office building and the cars and pedestrians. She said she liked a nice stairwell from the garage and a skylight for ventilation and light such as was used at Kepler's. She said she liked how the proposed architecture picked up its cues from the Derry project. She said the deep set balconies would enhance the sight of the project from the street but she would like to see more detail on the stone fascia. She said if there was to be lighting at night that needed to be considered; also the views from the office windows to the nearby residential area. She said she was concerned with the entry into the site from El Camino Real noting traffic, movement of people through a parking lot, and grocery cart traffic. She said the City needs more residential and that rental properties were needed as well.

Chair Keith said the height seemed appropriate as it was stepped back and interesting. She said she would like to see the 18.5 per acre residential use as a variant and a great restaurant on the site, which would be an asset to the City. She expressed her support for pursuing the LEED process and including bike racks and showers facilities. She

said she would like to see functional windows in the project. She said that parking and traffic would be crucial in the EIR. She said it was important that the receiving area would be completely enclosed. She said it was great the applicant was offering 38,000 square feet of open and landscape space. She suggested doing something right away to save the Redwood tree. She said she agreed that the staircases from the below ground parking structure had to be bright and clean or people would not use them.

Commissioner Deziel said that he hoped with the variants to define some flexibility with the property and have the EIR allow that flexibility. He said the variants listed were defined to protect the Applicant and he would like staff to identify some other variants that protect the public's interest. He said the desire for a good restaurant had been expressed and that would impact the parking and skew traffic. He suggested that staff should identify a new variant so that if the applicant sold the whole project, a new owner would be allowed to put in restaurant, personal services, retail, etc. He said the parking and traffic analysis would need to support restaurant use. He said that the ECR was a huge thoroughfare and the "no-project" alternative should look at an average of a.m. and p.m. peak traffic related to a car dealership – in no instance should the traffic impact be considered "zero." He said the proposal would add back green and improve hydrology and the applicant should receive credit for that. He said related to aesthetics that the proposal was a definite improvement over an auto dealership.

Following is a summary of the Commissioners' comments.

Planning Commissioners made the following comments:

- Traffic, parking, and site access issues should be explored as part of the EIR process;
- Immediate action should be taken to preserve the existing Redwood trees along El Camino Real;
- Parking should at a minimum comply with the administrative use-based standards;
- Retail loading areas and windows should be designed to be sensitive to adjacent residents;
- The EIR should consider an alternative with housing;
- Supportive of a commercial project at this site;
- Supportive of having multiple proposed use options;
- Supportive of the proposed height of the buildings;
- Encouraged the developer to pursue Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building certification of the buildings;
- Encouraged bicycle parking;
- Encouraged the addition of skylights and attractive stairwells to the parking garage;
- Encouraged the consideration of functional windows;
- Questioned the feasibility of incorporating housing into the project;

- Questioned where pedestrian connectivity would be provided;
- Questioned the screening and noise levels of the mechanical equipment;
- Questioned the typical hours of operation and number of employees;
- Questioned what the proposed slope of the ramps would be; and
- Requested material samples.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

There were none

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS, REPORTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Review of upcoming planning items on the City Council agenda.

Planner Chow reminded the Commissioners of League of California Planning Commissioner training on October 4, 2007

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Prepared by: Brenda Bennett, Recording Secretary

Approved by Planning Commission on October 22, 2007.