



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 11, 2008

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

---

**CALL TO ORDER** – 7:04 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – Bims, Bressler, Deziel (Chair), Keith, O'Malley, Pagee, Riggs (Vice chair)

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner

### **A. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were none.

### **B. CONSENT**

There were no items on the consent calendar.

### **C. PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **Use Permit/Joseph A. Nunley/310 Pope St.** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said staff had distributed to the Commission an updated set of elevation renderings pursuant to a discussion staff had with the applicants about double-checking the grade in respect to the overall height of the structure. He said upon review the applicant indicated an overall increase in height would be needed to fully comply with the flood zone requirements. He said that the Commission had received the left side and rear elevations that were updated to reflect the required height of the structure at 27-feet, 5.5-inches. He said the Commission had also received a rendering that would provide perspective on the proposed design. He said if the Commission were to approve the project that staff would recommend a project-specific condition that: "Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans with a maximum building

height of up to 27-feet, 5.5-inches in order to correct the location of existing grade, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.”

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O’Malley noted the project was an alley property and asked whether the applicant needed to get all of the neighbors whose properties abutted the alley to sign an alley maintenance agreement. Planner Rogers said the applicant did not have to get the other neighbors to join in the maintenance agreement, but that also meant the applicant received no financial contributions toward the maintenance agreement from the neighbors between his property and the outlet to the street. Commissioner O’Malley noted two existing garage entrances that backed to the alley and the site of the project garage and asked if the two existing garages were in the alley or on private property. Planner Rogers directed Commissioner O’Malley’s attention to page A.1, which showed the alley with bold lines. He noted that alleys were neither private property nor City-owned property.

Commissioner Keith noted a discrepancy in floor area limit (FAL) between the data sheet that indicated 2,952 square feet and the staff report in the project description that indicated 2,953 square feet. Planner Rogers said that the more conservative number was probably the right number but he would clarify.

Commissioner Pagee noted a discrepancy in square footage between the applicant’s calculations on page 2 of the large plans that showed 990.92 square feet for the second floor and the staff report that showed 985 square feet. Planner Rogers said the applicant lumped in a skylight shaft with the area that created a double height penalty for total second floor area; he said the skylight shaft was approximately six square feet. He said the data table in the staff report showed the skylight shaft in its own category and that six square feet added to the area square footage was 991 square feet. Commissioner Pagee confirmed that the six feet was not attic space. Planner Rogers said it was interior ceiling height that was greater than 12 feet. Commissioner Keith noted that the numbers on the plans were hard to read.

Public Comment: Mr. Peter Hadrovic, Menlo Park, said he and his wife had bought the Pope property and that one of the main reasons they were going to rebuild was his height in addition to their growing family. He said they wanted to build a Craftsman style home with a big front porch. He said Mr. Joe Nunley was the builder; he noted they had hired him on the recommendation of neighbors as he had done a number of successful projects in the Willows.

Commissioner O’Malley asked which alley entrance they intended to use. Mr. Hadrovic said they would use the entrance closest to their home, which was the entrance to the left of their home.

Commissioner Pagee asked if the applicant had verified that the placement of windows did not view into side neighbors’ windows and yards. Mr. Hadrovich said the neighbors on the left side had a single-story and there were mature trees situated between the two properties. He said that the neighbors on both sides had reviewed the plans. Mr.

Menlo Park Planning Commission

Minutes

February 11, 2008

Hadrovic said the property on the right was two-story and they addressed placement with that neighbor. He said they had removed two windows next to the fireplace from the design because he had been concerned those would view the neighbors' property. He said however looking now at the design those windows would only look out on the islands. He said he would like to include those windows but with the neighbors' approval.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Pagee said she would move to approve with the addition of condition 4.c as stated by staff and a condition 4.d for high placed windows next to the fireplace with input from the neighbor on that side. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion. Commissioner Riggs asked about the height. Commissioner Pagee suggested the windows be at five-feet. Commissioner Riggs said since the neighbors needed to approve the window placement that it might be better to not specify the height. Other Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Pagee changed her motion to read that the applicant may submit revised plans adding two windows on either side of the first-floor fireplace, subject to review and approval of the adjacent right side neighbor and the Planning Division. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion as modified.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Riggs to approve with the following modifications.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current 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 **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Nunley Custom Homes, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received February 6, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 11, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - 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, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. 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 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.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
  - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an Alley Improvement Plan. The plan shall show all areas that do not currently qualify as all-weather surfacing and shall specify the method by which they will be improved. The plan shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning and Engineering Divisions.
  - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a draft Access Alley Maintenance Agreement, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and City Attorney. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit documentation of the approved Access Alley Maintenance Agreement's recordation, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - c. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans with a maximum building height of up to 27-feet, 5.5-inches in order to correct the location of existing grade, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***
  - d. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans adding two windows on either side of the first-floor fireplace, subject to review and approval of the adjacent right side neighbor (302 Pope Street) and the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Use Permit/Janet Moody/650 Cotton Street:** Request for a use permit to construct a new 1,649-square-foot accessory structure resulting in a total floor area of 2,706 square feet for all accessory structures on the property where a maximum of 790 square feet is allowed on the subject property located in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Chow said the applicant had expressed an interest in having some flexibility built into an approval related to the style, materials, and color of the roofing.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Keith said there was reference in the staff report that the applicant would donate to Trees for Menlo and staff was also looking at possible fees to be paid toward the planting of trees. Planner Chow said the City arborist and environmentalist would work with the applicant as to the best way to donate trees for the City.

Commissioner O'Malley asked about regulations related to the distance between an accessory structure and the rear property line. Planner Chow said that accessory structures could be built three feet from the property line unless it was an alley, but there was not an alley.

Commissioner Pagee asked about a requirement to have a 10-foot separation between a residence and the garage and a 10-foot separation between an adjacent property and a garage. Planner Chow said accessory structures needed to have a 10-foot separation from the primary structure on the lot and similarly between them and the primary structure on an adjacent property.

Public Comment: Ms. Janet Moody, property owner and architect, said she was proposing a new garage. She said the lot was large and they had chosen to keep their residence small to retain yard space for other uses. She said the existing garage accommodated one vehicle they used most often and their bicycles. She said to be able to park their other cars in a garage to the rear of the property would allow them to remove a deteriorating carport on the side of the property and would keep the cars out of view of the neighbors and street. She said she would prefer to have a metal roof as it provided clean rain water for reuse in the garden. She said she was looking for a metal roof that had a matching profile integral skylight panel to make the skylight less visible and it being flush that it would allow for the possibility of future solar panels. She said she had not yet found a standing seam profile with an integral skylight panel but she had found a ribbed panel with a similar appearance to a standing seam. She said she would like the right to review choices with staff before making the final roof material choices. She said the siding would be recycled, solid redwood. She described how the garage would pick up features of the residence.

Commissioner Pagee said three windows were proposed on the garage at three feet from the property line but Building Code – fire protection requirements did not allow openings at three-feet from a property line. She said the garage would also be some

distance from the street and a fire hydrant and she indicated the Fire District might make requirement related to that. She commented on the restricted accessibility for an emergency vehicle to get to the garage. She said she liked the look of the design and asked the applicant where the pumps would be located. Ms. Moody indicated she did not know yet but agreed with Commissioner Pagee that most likely they would be down with the tank.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said this was good land use and use of space and materials. He said his one concern was the roofing material. He said usually the fallback for an accessory structure was materials that reflect the materials of the primary residence. He said the Commission did not require that necessarily but he was concerned that the ribbed roofing was industrial-looking and would be unattractive.

Chair Deziel said this property was an inspiring callback to old Menlo Park. He said he did not recall the Commission requiring an accessory structure to match the primary structure.

Commissioner Bims said this building should reflect the other accessory buildings more so than the primary residence. He said he did not think the Fire District would have a problem with the distance from the street or would find a way to mitigate it.

Commissioner Bressler said the roofing would only be seen by the neighbors and if they liked it he thought that was sufficient. He said the Fire District would probably be thrilled with a metal roof. He asked about the three-feet, one-inch distance from the property line mentioned by Commissioner Pagee. Chair Deziel said that would be a Fire District restriction and he thought the project would be found in substantial conformance because of that. Planner Chow indicated that was the case.

Commissioner Bressler moved to approve as recommended in the staff report and to allow the applicant flexibility related to the roofing materials and colors with review and approval by the neighbors and Planning Division staff. Chair Deziel seconded the motion and asked if the condition would be "subject to staff review and neighbor approval of the roofing materials and color." Planner Chow asked which neighbors. Commissioner Riggs said it would be 683 Hermosa and 600 Cotton Street. He said the neighbors reviewed the project with a standing seam metal roof and indicated approval of that design. He said perhaps the Commission should approve the project as submitted and offer an option subject to neighbor approval to modify the roof material presented. He noted that the approval did not just affect current neighbors but future property owners of the properties. He said the roof material now being presented was more industrial. He said the property would have three different architectural styles on it but he thought that was fine. In response to Chair Deziel, Commissioner Riggs said that it was on B.3 under project description that the materials would be standing seam metal for the roof.

Chair Deziel said the motion on the table required neighbor approval and staff review for the finalizing of the roof materials. He said Commissioner Riggs was suggesting approval as proposed with standing seam roof. He asked for clarification on the color. Commissioner Riggs said the applicant had indicated weathered copper. Chair Deziel asked if Commissioner Riggs wanted all three color options. Commissioner Riggs said that was fine but if there was to be a change to the roof design that this should be subject to neighbor approval and staff review.

Commissioner Keith said Commissioner Riggs had indicated a metal roof was a departure, but noted that there was approval of a metal roof on a property on Woodland Avenue as well as another one. She said she liked the weathered copper and the charcoal, the darker colors.

Commissioner Bims asked if the neighbors who would approve were the five neighbors who had already give approval. Commissioner Riggs said there were only two neighbors really who would be able to see the roof.

Recognized by the Chair, Commissioner Pagee asked the applicant about the standing seam roof and the skylight. Ms. Moody said her research had shown that the skylight for a standing seam roof would need to be curved and that a ribbed roof would allow an integral skylight that would not have flashing.

Commissioner Riggs asked why it was important to have a flush skylight as opposed to more conventional systems. Ms. Moody said it was adequate to have a small flat panel in the garage.

Chair Deziel said the motion on the table was to approve requiring neighbor approval of any selection of material or color for the roof, but it was not clear which neighbors. He said there was also a suggestion to approve per the staff report and to allow different materials with neighbor approval and staff review. Commissioner Bressler said he thought the second motion was preferable.

Commissioner Pagee said that excavation was not allowed in setbacks. Planner Chow said excavation in side yard setbacks required a use permit. Commissioner Pagee said the project would need to be continued to provide notification to identify excavation. Chair Deziel asked the property owner to address excavation. Ms. Moody said excavation would be under only the inside third of the building. Commissioner Pagee said that was in the three-feet to the rear. Planner Chow said the Code indicated that within residential districts excavation into a required setback shall not be permitted unless a use permit was obtained. Chair Deziel asked if the project then was not notified properly. Planner Chow said that it could be continued or moved forward without the basement. Ms. Moody asked if the required setback was for a dwelling and not an accessory building. Planner Chow said that this had not been noticed because it was an accessory building. Ms. Moody said the setback for the accessory building was three-feet. Commissioner Pagee said the intent was to protect neighbors from impacts from excavating near the neighbors' property line.

Planner Chow said the Code had an exclusion for the foundation of an accessory building but not for excavation for a full basement.

Chair Deziel said there was an original and substitute motion on the floor both of which included approval; he suggested taking the substitute motion and approving the most the Commission could and that if staff determined a use permit was needed for the excavation, which was not noticed and could not be granted at this time, that the Commission could approve the project without the basement. Planner Chow suggested the item be continued. Chair Deziel said he had an issue with continuance as it was just a garage. He said the Commission might approve the project without a basement and then if the applicant wanted to pursue the basement they could go back through for that use permit approval.

Commissioner Pagee suggested the Commission provide the applicant some guidelines on architecture and she agreed with staff that the project should be continued. She said it would also give the applicant time to research the materials more.

Ms. Moody, recognized by the Chair, said that if the Commission determined the basement had to be 20-feet from the rear property line whether the Commission could approve a reduced basement size. Chair Deziel said that was possible to approve as long as the excavation was not in the setback. Commissioner Bressler said the concern was with notification, and he was uncomfortable with making an exception.

Commissioner Riggs said that the Commission should not assume that the neighbors could sufficiently review plans and he thought this was appropriate to notice. He said if they approved without a basement and had the applicant bring the basement back for another use permit that would mean more fees however.

Commissioner Bims said it was clear that excavation needed a use permit application. He said the section related to accessory buildings did not define a side yard setback differently and that 20-foot still applied but the accessory building might be located in the setback. He said they needed to either limit the basement so it did not encroach in the rear setback or an application needed to be made for a use permit for the excavation. He said in that case the condition about the roof materials would not be needed as there would be sufficient time to resolve that.

Commissioner Keith asked whether the use permit was only needed for excavation in a setback. Planner Chow said excavation could occur without a use permit as long as it was not within the setback.

Commissioner Bims said possibly the approval could allow excavation subject to the 17-foot restriction on the basement so it did not encroach in the setback and with approval of adjacent neighbors for roof materials, or if the applicant wanted the plan to move forward with a full basement then the applicant would come back with an



application for a use permit to excavate and with no requirement of the condition related to the materials of the roof as that would give the applicant time to resolve that issue.

Commissioner Keith moved to approve per the staff report with the condition that the applicant could excavate as long as it was not within any setback and that approval of the standing seam roof was included. Chair Deziel said the applicant had circulated a different type of roof. He asked about the colors. Commissioner Keith said colors of weathered copper or charcoal. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion. Commissioner Bims said this would require a change in the plans and asked if the changes would be subject to staff review and approval. Commissioner Keith said that was correct.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/O'Malley to make a substitute motion.

Motion carried 7-0.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/O'Malley to approve with the following modifications.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current 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 revision subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Janet Moody, consisting of ten plan sheets, dated received January 30, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 11, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
  - 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, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. 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 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.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
  - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
- a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall present to the City recordation of declaration of conditions and covenants relative to the uses of the proposed accessory building, subject to review by the Planning Division and the City Attorney's office.
  - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing no excavation in any of the required yards for the basement storage under the new accessory building, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
  - c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall either select "Charcoal" or "Weathered Copper" as the paint color for the standing seam metal roof on the new accessory building, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**

Motion carried 7-0.

- 3. **Use Permit/Phillip Patrick Wagner/165-A Constitution Drive:** Request for a use permit for a private recreational facility (personal athlete training) and associated massage services in an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said staff had no additional comments.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Keith asked if there was a changing area with the showers. Planner Rogers suggested the applicant might answer that.

Public Comment: Mr. Phil Wagner, applicant, said the changing areas would be within the showers. He said this facility would be to train athletes, and he had operated a similar facility in the Santa Barbara area. He said that he had moved north however to be closer to his family. He said his contractor was submitting a striping plan for 55 parking spaces.

Commissioner Keith asked how many athletes would be in the facility at any one time. Mr. Wagner said 10 athletes would be the most in the facility at any one time.

Commissioner O'Malley said the building adjacent had hazardous materials related to paint spraying and asked if the applicant would inform his customers that the building adjacent had hazardous materials. Commissioner O'Malley asked if the materials could enter into the applicant's site. Mr. Wagner said that there were no vents or fans on the roof of his building.

Commissioner Bims asked if there was air conditioning. Mr. Wagner said there was not nor would it be installed. Commissioner Bims asked about windows for ventilation. Mr. Wagner said there were roll up doors at the end facing the bay. Commissioner Bims asked if their research would need medical or non-medical staff. Mr. Wagner said the research was non-medical. He said they gather information from force plates embedded in the floor that read the amount of pressure, time and direction of the movement of athletes.

Commissioner Pagee said that they would need a mechanical plan when they got a building permit for interior renovation. She said if the paint spray company next door was sending out exhaust that some of that might enter into Mr. Wagner's facility intake fan. She said the concern was this facility would have people breathing more deeply as they trained; thus the air quality really needed to be addressed.

Chair Deziel asked staff if it was the responsibility of the emitter to keep their emissions contained. Planner Rogers said staff had verified that the next door business was up to date with its permits with the County and the Fire District, and there were no violations.

Commissioner Keith said she also shared the concern about the spray painting and asked if the applicant had looked at any other sites. Mr. Wagner said he had but this site had a long uninterrupted space and high ceilings plus it was near the highway and central to three airports. Commissioner Keith asked about the shower size. Mr. Wagner said there were two showers in a 13-foot width and 10-foot deep space.

Commissioner Bressler asked if air humidity and air quality were important factors in their training research. Mr. Wagner said that was not the focus of their research and training.

Commissioner Bims asked how tall the ceilings were. Mr. Wagner said they were about 18-feet in height.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report and Commissioner Bims seconded the motion.

Commissioner Keith asked whether the Commission might consider requiring air conditioning. Commissioner Bressler said he thought air conditioning would be good for the facility but he was not going to require it. Commissioner O'Malley asked that there be notification to the clients that a facility next door had hazardous materials. Commissioner Keith said she would like signage. Commissioner Riggs said he had visited the painting facility that day and it was apparent that spraying was occurring but he could not smell anything. He said he did not think the risks were prominent and that being located next to the bay the air was probably better than anywhere in Los Angeles. Commissioner O'Malley said that his concern was not that the clients would have health problems but rather it might impact the extra performance edge they would be seeking. He said he would like an amendment to provide signage noting there was a painting facility with hazardous materials next door. Chair Deziel noted that this might be subject to staff review and approval related to style, size, and color.

Chair Deziel asked for a vote on adding the amendment with Commissioners Bims, Keith, and O'Malley voting in support and Commissioners Bressler, Deziel, Pagee and Riggs voting against.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Bims to approve as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current 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 **standard** conditions:

- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Phillip Patrick Wagner, consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received February 5, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 11, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - 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, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. 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 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.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following ***construction-related, project-specific*** conditions:
    - a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan showing striping to accommodate 55 parking spaces in general accordance with the original development plans for this parcel, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  5. Approve the use permit subject to the following ***ongoing, project-specific*** conditions:
    - a. The operator of the business and all massage therapists shall hold a valid permit from the Menlo Park Police Department, per the requirements of Municipal Code Section 5.28.060.

Motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Keith voting against the motion.

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

1. **Consideration of minutes from the December 3, 2007, Planning Commission meeting.**

Commission Action: M/S Unanimous consent to approve the minutes as modified.

- Page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Replace the word "how" with the word "if:" remove words "had" and "in."
- Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line: Replace the word "surround" with the word "surrounding."

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Consideration of minutes from the January 14, 2007, Planning Commission meeting.**

Commission Action: M/S Unanimous consent to approve the minutes as submitted.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Riggs abstaining.

**E. COMMISSION BUSINESS, REPORTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

Planner Chow provided a review of upcoming planning items on the City Council agenda.

Planner Rogers provided a report on the first public meeting of the El Camino Downtown Visioning Project, and future events related to that project leading to the first community workshop in the Recreation Center ballroom on March 6 at 7 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Prepared by: Brenda Bennett, Recording Secretary

Approved by Planning Commission on March 10, 2008.