



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 10, 2008

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bims, Bressler, Deziel (Chair), Keith (Arrived 7:03 p.m.), O'Malley, Pagee, Riggs (Vice chair)

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

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Kristin Duriseti, Oak Knoll School Neighborhood Association, said a Negative Declaration for proposed development at the Oak Knoll School, would be released for comment shortly. She said she and her husband were talking to various City Commissions to urge them to advise the City Council that the project would have significant negative impacts. She said that there were offsite impacts from the proposed project and that area was in the City's jurisdiction. She said the school district was proposing what she and many others in the neighborhood considered to be a very dangerous curb cut. She said that the project would also have serious impacts on the storm water drainage system because of the proposed parking lot that would greatly increase impervious surface. She commented that the existing storm drain system was a 12-inch pipe that flooded significantly in the area between Oak Avenue and Bay Laurel. She said the school district also planned to extend the traffic lane down Oak Knoll Lane, which she said would severely reduce access to the site with a narrow corridor for the bus stop, vehicles, pedestrian and bicycles in which 700 school children would arrive to and leave from each day. She said the District was also proposing to create an entrance into the parking lot from Oak Avenue off Oak Knoll Lane in the instance they do not get the curb cut. She showed photographs that indicated there would be no access from the left hand corner of the campus. She said the original bond referendum proposal before the voters in June 2006 situated the classrooms and multipurpose room at the back of the campus where flows would have gone to a 36-inch storm drain. She said changes to the project meant however the flow was now going to drain toward the inadequate 12-inch storm drain. She indicated that two other people had donated their speaking time to her in response to a query from Chair Deziel. She said also a 100-year old heritage tree and a playing field would be removed to accommodate the parking lot even though existing parking was adequate. She said the San Francisquito Creek runs behind the campus and had experienced a lot of erosion and water from the creek overflows into the inadequate 12-inch storm drain. She said

during the winter's rains this area flooded so badly that the street had to be closed. She said eight heritage trees in total would be removed with the project.

Mr. Rich Rollins, Oak Knoll School Neighborhood Association, said that the original proposal kept the playing field and heritage tree where a parking lot was now being proposed. He requested the Commission place the Negative Declaration on the March 24 agenda as the 30-day review period would begin March 11, 2008.

Commissioner Keith asked if this was an item that would normally come before the Commission. Development Services Manager Murphy said that normally this would not come before the Commission unless directed by the Council. Commissioner Keith said she thought all of the school improvements were going before the school board. Chair Deziel said the zoning ordinance indicated school districts were their own domain. He asked if there was anyone on staff assigned to this environmental review for questions. Development Services Manager Murphy said that the speakers had spoken about offsite impacts for which there was City domain in terms of encroachment permits. He said that no planning staff was assigned to review this proposal and environmental document; the Department of Public Works was looking at traffic and drainage impacts. He said there was no City purview of onsite improvements. Chair Deziel observed that there was no process then for the City to review the Negative Declaration. Development Services Manager Murphy said the City was the responsible agency for offsite work, but there was no City Council established policy on how this environmental document might get reviewed.

Chair Deziel asked Mr. Rollins whether this item was before the City Council the next night. Mr. Rollins said it was not, but that they had made a presentation to the City Council on February 29 similar to the one made to the Commission this evening. He said any drainage and traffic work offsite was the City's purview. Chair Deziel asked if the City could comment on the Negative Declaration or assist the speakers in how to respond to the Negative Declaration. Development Services Manager Murphy said these issues had been raised and he would follow up with the City Manager as to direction related to response to the Negative Declaration. He said Mr. Chip Taylor and Mr. Kent Steffens would be the City's staff persons most familiar with the project. He said the Negative Declaration would tell the public who at the school district would be the contact person.

Mr. Rollins said that the Environmental Quality, Bicycle, and Transportation Commissions had all agendized review of the Negative Declaration. He said that they were requesting that the Planning Commission review and comment as well as they felt this involved very important community issues.

Mr. Clem Maloney, Menlo Park, said he was participating in the visioning project for downtown and the El Camino Real corridor. He said he worked in Redwood City and had been participating in their downtown visioning project for about eight years. He said Redwood City holds forums to educate the public about planning such as Menlo Park's visioning process was doing. He said there was one such forum held on Form-

Menlo Park Planning Commission

March 10, 2008

Draft Minutes

Based Codes in February. He said the presenter, who had written a book on this topic, said that Form Based Codes are the nexus where environmental controls can meet with planning for downtowns and housing. Statistics show that the primary source of carbon emissions was from automobiles and commuting. He said that Form Based Codes addressed more compact development, smart growth, transit-oriented communities and desirable walkable communities. He said the City of Redwood City had been moving in this direction and was very pleased with the results thus far. He said Form Based Codes were very good for downtowns, corridors, historic preservation and specific plans. He said that he was making every effort to attend all of the City of Menlo Park's forums and committee meetings for the downtown and El Camino Real corridor visioning project.

B. CONSENT

There were no consent items.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/Axis LCP, Inc./550 Ravenswood Avenue:** Request to renew a use permit for a private recreational use (personal training) and for new associated massage services in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district.

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley noted on page 3 of the staff report a discussion of in-lieu sales tax fees and noted that the fee for this business was different from those imposed on other businesses. He asked whether there was a formula that determined different in-lieu sales tax fees and whether this calculation was made arbitrarily, perhaps based on location. Planner Fisher said each fee was to be indexed annually according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco/Oakland Metropolitan Area. She said when the fee was considered for one of the properties at Santa Cruz Avenue staff had looked at the range of sales tax received for the area and had selected a mid-range amount as the starting fee. She said there was no formula per se but a consideration of proximity to the downtown area. Commissioner O'Malley asked who decided what amount an in-lieu sales tax should be. Planner Fisher said staff researched and proposed fees to the Commission and City Council and those were adopted in the past.

Commissioner Pagee said that businesses needed to renew their business license annually, and asked why the outstanding in-lieu sales tax fees were not discovered at that time for this business. Development Services Manager Murphy said this was one of four places that had in-lieu sales tax fees and whereas the other three properties had processes in place for the Finance Department to monitor payment of the fees, this property for some reason was not included in those processes, but would be included in the future.

Public Comment: Mr. Larry Krieger, CEO of Axis, said that they had not been aware of the in-lieu sales tax fee when they had bought the business four years prior. He said the fees were now being paid.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith moved, and Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion, to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the lag between the 2006 expiration of the use permit and the 2008 processing of the renewal request.

Development Services Manager Murphy said that the applicant had applied in June 2007 for a renewal and there had been communication between staff and the applicant to get the request in the appropriate form for the Commission to consider, including a reconciliation of fees paid or due. He said related to the lag between 2006 and June 2007 this was due to limited staff resources to track time-limited use permits. He said that there were some others that would come before the Commission that had gone beyond the expiration date. Commissioner Riggs asked if a business could be forced out of business if they failed to renew their use permit. Development Services Manager Murphy said that would be an onerous process and burdensome on the City. He said it was the business owner's responsibility to reapply and in this instance, ownership had changed. He said staff had worked with the new owner to bring the renewal forward.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/O'Malley to approve the item 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** condition:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by the applicant, consisting of three plan sheets, dated received February 27, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 10, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **ongoing, project-specific** conditions:

- a. All massage therapists shall hold a valid permit from the Menlo Park Police Department, per the requirements of Municipal Code Section 5.28.060.
- b. The applicant shall pay an annual in-lieu retail sales tax fee, equal to \$0.67 per square foot of non-retail space as determined by Planning Division staff. The fee shall be indexed annually according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco/Oakland Metropolitan Area. The fee shall be paid annually, as long as the fitness center is in operation on the property. Additionally, the applicant shall follow the payment plan outlined in Attachment D for the payment of sales tax in-lieu fees for 2001-2006.
- c. The use permit shall expire ten (10) years from the date of Planning Commission approval.

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Use Permit/Gerard Culas/657 Oak Grove Avenue:** Request for a use permit for wine tasting and retail sale of wine associated with an eating establishment (café and specialty market) in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher said that copies of letters of support had been distributed to the Commission on the dais.

Public Comment: Ms. Teresa Rabey Culas, resident of San Mateo County, said she was representing her husband Mr. Gerald Culas, her brother Mr. Carl Rabey, and her brother-in-law Mr. Bruce Tomlinson. She said her husband was from France and had been a master cheese maker there and wanted to bring the concept of cheese tasting and combining cheese, meats and wine through a cheese and wine tasting bar and an eating establishment. She said there was a retail element for the sale of cheese and wine and that they would offer classes. She said their architect would explain the layout design to support the three services proposed.

Mr. Vern Wheat, Peterson Architects, Palo Alto, said the building was previously a funeral home and was entered from Oak Grove Avenue and the plaza level. He said their intent was to create the street level entrances with activity areas with the café on the outside and the tasting and retail areas in the center of the building.

Ms. Florence Gerlac said she was pleased to support the project as this would be an independently owned business. She provided the Commission with five additional letters of support.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Pagee asked if this proposed retail site would be part of the Oak Grove Parking Assessment District. Planner Fisher said it was.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings and approve the use permit and make the required determination as stated in the staff report. Commissioner Pagee seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bims said he was in support of the motion for the project met public convenience and need, and had independent ownership, which he thought was appropriate for the downtown area.

Commissioner Keith noted that other restaurants downtown served alcohol.

Commissioner O'Malley said he supported the proposal and looked forward to the business opening.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Pagee to approve the item 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. Make a determination, as per Section 23958.4 of the State Business and Professions Code that the granting of an on-sale retail license by the State Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control would provide a public convenience related to the operation of a café and market.
4. 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 Peterson Architects, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received February 20, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 10, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Any citation or notification of violation by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the sale of alcoholic beverages will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Use Permit/The Hagman Group/1010 Doyle Street:** Request for use permit approval to add 84 square feet to an existing building that currently exceeds 100 percent FAR in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district, and to apply the use based parking guidelines to retain the nine existing off-street parking spaces

where one additional parking space would otherwise be required for the additional floor area.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher said that one of the Commissioners had noted additional handouts on the dais, most of which were for this item. She said there were floor plans numbered 4 and 5 which would replace what was submitted in the packet. She said there were no changes to the plans but a tenant had pointed out some inaccuracies in how the tenant space was divided and the plans had been changed to more accurately show existing conditions. She said there was also a letter from the property owner, Brock Development LLC, requesting that the Commission remove condition 4.a. to which staff was opposed as allowing a medical use in the space would require greater parking needs. She said there were also copies of e-mails from Ms. Patti Frye and Mr. Morris Brown objecting to the use of use based parking guidelines for the project, but also indicating that they did not have a problem with the proposed addition for the ADA improvements. She said staff considered the use based parking guidelines appropriate for this project and their use would not set precedence.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Bims said the applicant had originally applied for use based parking guidelines but now wanted to remove condition 4.a to allow for medical use. Planner Fisher said that working with the applicant, staff had indicated that medical office use would not be permitted under the use based parking guidelines proposed and non-medical use office space would need to be located on the second floor. Development Services Manager Murphy said that the applicant, the architect for the project, had represented the property owner, but the last correspondence received requesting removal condition 4.a was from the property owner.

Chair Deziel asked how many additional parking spaces would be needed if the use based parking guidelines for medical use were applied to the application. Planner Fisher said that four or five additional spaces would be needed for medical use.

Commissioner Keith asked if staff could explain about the letter dated October 6, 2006 indicating that medical use would not intensify the use. Development Services Manager Murphy said he had written the letter in response to a letter from Dr. Jocelyn Dunn and some other doctors who were looking to occupy this space and this predated the current property owner involvement with the property. He said the doctors had proposed medical office use on the second floor and his letter was regarding that proposal. He said the proposal approved by the Commission last summer was for no change in use and space. He said the applicant then proposed an elevator which changed the square footage requirements which resulted in this application for a use permit. Commissioner Keith asked him to explain why he had indicated that the use would not be more intense in the letter. Development Services Manager Murphy said this proposal was for non-medical use with application of use based parking guidelines and for them to request medical office use at this point would require a variance. He said that staff would not be able to recommend the variance. He said the tradeoff for the office use and the use based parking guidelines was no allowance for medical use. Commissioner Keith asked why this proposal would not merit a variance. Development Services Manager

Murphy said that the C-3 district was in the parking assessment district but there was a direct connection between floor area ratios and parking requirements. He said the way to increase floor area ratio above 100 percent was to provide onsite or offsite parking. He said that it would be difficult to make the findings for a hardship. He said one trigger for a use permit was an increase in gross floor area and another to exceed 100 percent floor area ratio and in this case the building already exceeded the 100 percent threshold. He said the second need was to remedy the parking situation and the option was to use the use based parking guidelines, which could be handled administratively, but in this case was bundled into the use permit. Commissioner Keith confirmed with Mr. Murphy that the City Attorney had indicated with the use of the use based parking guidelines that a variance was not supportable.

Chair Deziel said one of the members of the public wrote a letter saying there was no justification for using the use based parking guidelines. He said his understanding was that if the applicant chose to qualify the use allowed in the building and restrict uses to those for which one could use industry standard numbers as adopted by the City these were applied as the basis for the parking requirements as opposed to the zoning ordinance requirements. Planner Fisher said the zoning ordinance parking standards cover all uses that could be used in that zone. She said restaurants require six spaces per 1,000 square feet, and that 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet were comparable requirements for non-medical use.

Commissioner Pagee confirmed that the restaurant on the ground floor would remain and asked if the square footage of that had been considered in the establishment of the parking required. Planner Fisher said that 100 percent of the FAR was credited with the parking plaza for 100 percent of the building and that included a mix of uses including the restaurant, personal service and office space. She said the balance of the FAR exceeding 100 percent was looked at as office use. Commissioner Pagee asked if these were owner-driven ADA upgrades. Planner Fisher said that the upgrades proposed required ADA upgrades. She said that the bathroom and stairs needed to be modified to meet the ADA requirements but the elevator was not needed. Development Services Manager Murphy clarified that an elevator was not triggered as an ADA requirement for a second floor unless that floor was a medical office facility. Commissioner Pagee asked what triggered ADA upgrades. Planner Fisher said that the extent of upgrades to a building triggered a certain threshold at which ADA upgrade was required and there was an itemized list that showed what ADA upgrades would happen first. Commissioner Pagee confirmed with Planner Fisher that there would not be ADA upgrades on the first floor and for the parking for the restaurant use.

Commissioner Riggs said on the cover sheet data table in the FAR boxes under zoning ordinance it was indicated that 50 percent FAR maximum could be office use, but the tabulation for existing and proposed indicated 100 percent FAR maximum for office use. Planner Fisher said it was 100 percent of FAR but due to changes to zoning ordinance and then other changes built into the ordinance in the non-conforming section this meant that the building was not non-conforming.

Commissioner Riggs asked if Transportation had reviewed the revised condition for the exit onto Doyle Street. Planner Fisher said that Transportation had not reviewed the exit. Commissioner Riggs said it appeared the driveway was 18-feet wide and where the edge of the building and sidewalk met, he was concerned about visibility and pedestrian safety.

Commissioner O'Malley said one of the letters received had indicated the project could be approved without application of the use based parking guidelines. Planner Fisher said with the addition of floor area the project could not meet the parking requirements in the C-3 district in the zoning ordinance without the application of use based parking guidelines.

Public Comment: Mr. Dennis Meitinger, Hagman Group Architects, said they had previously gotten approval to make exterior improvements. He said they then looked at doing second floor improvements and realized they would need to improve the stairway and bathroom. He said they then decided to provide full accessibility through an elevator and to include that they had to move the stairway. He said they were losing 400 square feet of usable office space on the second floor, which meant they would have a less intense office use. He said in their application they had never requested a medical use and to his knowledge neither had the property owner. He said they had a copy of the letter from Mr. Murphy that under certain circumstances a medical use could be approved even if nothing was done to the building. He said they would prefer a condition that indicated that statement more than a negative that medical use would never be a possibility. He said they wanted the businesses on the second floor to have full accessibility for their clients.

Mr. Stu Soffer, Menlo Park, said he was speaking both as a resident and a business owner. He said his business was within 300-feet of this site and he had not been noticed about this project. He said for that reason the project needed to be continued. He said parking was an issue and that as a business owner he paid \$500 annually for a parking permit for Lot 8. He said this project would add to the impact of parking in Lot 8. He said he thought that the medical office use was the intent for the second floor if not immediately, sometime in the future. He said the use based parking guidelines hid problems. He said the nail salon had come before the Commission when he served on it and it had parking deficiencies. He said he thought the parking requirements for all of the uses should be re-tabulated. He said there were a number of things that had to be resolved and the project should be continued. He said the City Attorney should also be present at the next review of this project.

Commissioner Keith asked how Mr. Soffer found out about the hearing. Mr. Soffer said a neighbor told him about it.

Commissioner Keith asked staff about the noticing. Planner Fisher said notice went out bulk mail to property owners and occupants. Development Services Manager Murphy said that the notice had gone out 18 days prior and that with multiple tenants in a

building sometimes the City did not have all of the current suite numbers. He said a lack of notice being received did not invalidate the proceedings.

Mr. Morris Brown, Menlo Park, said he was speaking for Menlo Park Tomorrow. He said their main objection was to the use of the administrative parking guidelines as it was quite apparent there was already a serious parking problem. He said his understanding was that the guidelines should not be used if they would create a greater parking problem. He said that non-medical use should also apply to the first floor. He said medical use would violate the guidelines. He said for a project at the Gaylord's site that staff had suggested reduced parking for a project using the administrative parking guidelines. The approval was appealed and the City Council denied the reduced parking. He urged the Commission to deny the project with the use of the administrative parking guidelines. He indicated that if the City did approve the project as recommended an appeal would probably be made.

Mr. Allen Rappaport said he was a tenant in the building. He said there were pull-in parking spaces under the building and too frequently people parked in back of those cars. He said he has had his car blocked in quite often. He asked about the doctors who had inquired about using the second floor for medical office use and wondered what percentage of the second floor would be for medical use. Chair Deziel said that was not the proposal before the Commission. Mr. Rappaport questioned the need for the elevator.

Mr. Charles Brock, Brock Development, the property owner, said the reason they decided to put in the elevator was to make it a nicer building. He said if they were going to improve the building and spend \$1,000,000 on it anyway they thought it only made sense to make it fully accessible. He said they had no intent to have medical office use and would prefer the existing tenants. He said he did not like medical use tenants but he did not know what would be needed in the future. He said that there were so many restrictions on the building that he did not like the additional restriction regarding medical use imposed.

Commissioner Bims said the applicant had asked to use the administrative parking guidelines based on non-medical use but it appeared the property owners might want the flexibility to have medical office space. He asked if they wanted to have different parking guidelines that would not tie the requirement to certain uses. Mr. Brock said they bought the building with a letter from the City to a group of doctors indicating that medical office use was possible. He said the building had to be improved and it needed ADA improvements and that they were spending so much money on the investment that it did not make sense to only do 85 percent accessibility.

Commissioner Bims said about nine months prior there had been an application for exterior improvements and now the application was for interior improvements. He asked if Mr. Brock saw a market need to have these interior improvements. Mr. Brock said it was apparent they had to do exterior improvements and with the required ADA

upgrades they considered leaving space for a future elevator but that meant shifting space around so they decided to go ahead with an elevator.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Bressler said if there was a new definition for FAR that this project might not even have come before the Commission. He said it was apparent that these improvements were for a future medical office use. He said there was plenty of evidence that there was a parking problem in the area. He said the administrative parking guidelines gave the applicant a lot of discretion about where to apply parking. He said his understanding was that the administrative parking guidelines should only be used when there was not an existing parking problem. He said there was also a problem with the noticing and he thought the project should be continued and re-heard with the City Attorney present.

Commissioner Riggs said he was familiar with the goals of office buildings and what made a building Class A. He said he was familiar with applying to a Planning Commission and then proceeding to architectural plans and budgets. He said it was logical during development that an elevator would be identified as a need as second floor space was not as desirable unless there was an elevator. He said he did not think they should judge the applicant for this choice. He said however they had to base the use of the administrative parking guidelines on the absence of medical office or that there would not be a net increase of use. He said they agreed that the FAR should be adjusted for certain things and ADA improvements fell within that. He asked staff if the City was close enough in the FAR process and upcoming adjustments to the zoning ordinance, and given the small request of excess floor area being made, for staff to make an interpretation at staff level. Development Services Manager Murphy said no. Commissioner Riggs suggested that the applicant should either agree to staff's recommendation or wait until the City Council reviewed FAR. He asked when that would be discussed by the Council. Development Services Manager Murphy said his understanding was that the next step was the Planning Commission's review. He said staff was creating a staff report with Commissioners' input, which might be possibly heard by the Commission in April.

Chair Deziel said that the owner and applicant did not seem to understand the concept of the administrative parking guidelines. He said perhaps the applicant might want to wait until FAR was addressed. He said however with the project as proposed there would be 400 square feet less of usable space and so the use would be less intense. He said the exterior improvements would be a benefit to the downtown. He said the issue surrounding the parking seemed to be confusion about parking intensity on Doyle Street because of The Left Bank and other businesses. He said the question was whether this project would add to the intensity or not. He said he did not think this proposal would add to the problem as they could fit within the use based parking guidelines, with 3.3 spaces for non-medical office use. He said that this would not make future conversion to medical use more possible and medical use would not be allowed on the first floor without a discretionary review decision. He said he was quite

comfortable making the findings and approving the project as recommended by staff. He asked staff if the applicant should be asked if they wanted to go ahead now or if they wanted to wait until FAR was reviewed by the City. Development Services Manager Murphy said there could either be a continuance or a decision to approve or deny, which could be appealed. He said it would be worthwhile to clarify what the applicant would prefer.

Commissioner Pagee asked regarding the parking assessment district whether in the instance a business was required to have more parking than what they could provide if the difference was required to be paid into a fund. Development Services Manager Murphy said the parking assessment district was no longer active and there were no in-lieu fees that could be paid and that additional parking had to be obtained either on the property itself or on adjacent or nearby private property. Chair Deziel said the parking assessment district historically had been funded and the parking in the common lots provided effectively six parking spaces per 1,000 square feet for up to 100 percent FAR. Commissioner Pagee asked how in-lieu fees would be determined if there was a parking assessment district created for a parking garage. She said that this owner would not be able to provide more parking. She said the majority of the buildings downtown had six spaces per 1,000 square feet and in this case the requirement was being reduced to 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Chair Deziel said that the project had 5,000 square feet at the six per 1,000 square feet and 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the additional 2,700 square feet. He said if the City wanted to collect fees for a parking garage as Commissioner Pagee had observed from that perspective the property owner would be off the hook with the 3.3 parking spaces. He said the closest example to this idea was a project at 695 Oak Grove Avenue that converted to condominiums for medical use. He said the Commission recommended an in-lieu fee for parking in exchange for medical use. He said the Commission was not in a position to start an assessment district, and the idea had gone to the City Council and it had not been supported.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if there was any reason to prohibit medical use on the second floor, but not prohibit medical use on the first floor as well. Planner Fisher said that the first floor had a restaurant use and personal services use and for the use to change to medical office use would require a use permit.

Commissioner Keith confirmed with staff that dental use was included under the heading of medical use. She asked about the statement staff made that the receipt of notices was not grounds to invalidate the hearing. Development Services Manager Murphy said that was in the zoning ordinance. Commissioner Keith asked for the section. Development Services Manager Murphy said he would look up the section number. Commissioner Keith said it had been indicated that the use based parking guidelines could not be used in areas that lacked parking. Development Services Manager Murphy said the use based parking guidelines addressed a number of factors and there were no absolutes. He said there was a requirement that whenever the guidelines were applied that notification of their use had to be made to neighbors and the Planning Commission, even if that happened administratively. He said for the use

of these guidelines that all factors had to be considered and required a case-by-case review so there was no possibility of setting precedence. He said in this case, the applicant wished to add 84 square feet; in exchange for that staff was recommending that restriction be placed on the uses as opposed to the current situation of the property without the additional square footage, which did not necessarily restrict other uses.

Development Services Manager Murphy said the section of the ordinance Commissioner Keith asked about was Section 16.84.020: *The failure of any property owner to receive such notice of hearing will not invalidate the proceedings.*

Commissioner Keith said she did not want to discourage property owners from improving their properties nor did she think it was the intent of the property owner to convert to medical use in the future. She noted two-story office buildings she had worked in that provided elevators to the second floor. She said there clearly was a parking issue and she would not approve without condition 4.a. She said it was unfortunate that a property owner had not received notice about the meeting. She said one tenant indicated he had a parking problem. She said however the applicants were decreasing the amount of usable space.

Commissioner Bims said the applicant should be commended for doing improvements to the exterior and for making the interior space better for tenants. He thought the elevator would be a benefit for second floor tenants. He said however the applicant would like the flexibility to have medical office use tenants. He said the applicant however had made application for the use based parking guidelines and the restriction on non-medical use had to apply. He said regarding the Council's decision on a parking assessment district that he would not like to impose a moratorium on using the guidelines until the Council took it up and made a decision. He thought the project should be approved and if it was appealed, the Council would have to resolve the issues.

Chair Deziel asked whether the project had proceeded without a request for additional square footage if it would have needed use permit review. Planner Fisher said that it would have only gone through the building permit process. Development Services Manager Murphy clarified that was true as long as the improvements had been made within the existing footprint and substantially conformed to the existing use permit.

Commissioner Bressler said the administrative parking guidelines had been grandfathered and that there might not be a need to have a use permit to have medical use dependent upon the definition of FAR, which revealed a flaw and loophole in the administrative parking guidelines. He said he would like the project continued so that the City Attorney might be present during the hearing and set a precedent for this use. Chair Deziel said the administrative parking guidelines would not be triggered if there was no request for additional square footage. Commissioner Bressler said in that instance the applicant could maintain the 3.3 parking space per 1,000 square foot ratio even without a use permit and then switch to medical/dental use in what was already an over-parked area. Chair Deziel said many parcels in the City were similar in that

regard. Commissioner Bressler said that was why he wanted an opportunity to review this matter and to not have medical/dental uses downtown with inadequate parking.

Commissioner Keith said that the Commission did not have the benefit of the City Attorney at their meetings, but staff had indicated that they had spoken to the City Attorney and he had said that the recommendation before the Commission was the best way to proceed with this request. She said in reality because of the possibility of appeals that the Council had the ultimate decision on projects.

Chair Deziel, with the consensus of the Commission, explained to Mr. Brock that the situation with which he was faced for this project was created because of the current definition of floor area, a definition which was in flux and which by Council decision had reverted to a more conservative definition. He said the request for an additional 84 square feet had triggered a rule regarding parking. He said if the applicant did not add any new square footage then the applicant would not be required to come before the Commission. He said to get the additional 84 square feet the applicant could meet parking requirements with the use of the administrative parking guidelines as long as medical use was prohibited. He said the applicant might get approval tonight with what staff had recommended if there was a consensus of the Commission. He said perhaps the applicant might indicate that they wanted the potential to have medical use and might either wait for clarification of FAR or redesign so that no additional square footage was needed, and might request a continuance.

Commissioner Bressler summarized that if the Commission approved as recommended by staff that the applicants would get what they requested but they would never be able to have medical office use. He said if the applicant wanted the flexibility to have medical office use that they could reduce the square footage so it did not exceed the current definition of FAR. He said the third option was to wait for a new definition of the way square footage was computed and that new definition might allow them to build as presently designed and allow for medical office use on the second floor.

Mr. Brock asked if it was correct that he would need a use permit to get medical office use on the second floor if they did not request any new square footage. Development Services Manager Murphy said medical office use was a subset of professional use and it could be potentially said that it would be acceptable without a use permit but intensity of use would need to be reviewed. He said that there could be a condition that required a use permit review in the future should medical office use be sought.

Chair Deziel said because numerous City rules were ambiguous that there was a large effort underway to clarify the rules. He said over time the likelihood that the applicant could kind of slip in with another use because of grandfathering and an existing use permit would most likely erode over time. Or if the applicant was able to have medical office use and those businesses had many clients, which spurred public complaints that the use permit might have to undergo review by the Commission. He said there was uncertainty of a diminished market in that not all types of doctors would fit the rules and uncertainty of how the rules might change. He said staff was suggesting that condition

4.a might be revised to say that medical/dental office use would be subject to a use permit.

Mr. Brock said that a professional could be a doctor and might not necessarily be a dentist with a lot of patients. He said it would be acceptable to him if condition 4.a was revised to state that any medical use would require a use permit. He asked however if they left their project as it was approved in July whether they could proceed with that project or did this request supercede that approval. Chair Deziel said the applicant could withdraw this request.

Commissioner Bims asked how revising condition 4.a would be any different from the request in the future for a revised use permit. Chair Deziel said the restriction of the medical use might prejudice future Commissions. Commissioner Bims said that the applicant requested the use of the administrative parking guidelines which had a restriction and was equitable. He said revising the condition would indicate to future Commissions that there was the possibility to increase intensity.

Commissioner Keith moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion. He said there was a compelling statement about the existing parking problem and that was an owner/tenant issue and was not solvable by the Commission. He said for an 84 square foot technical addition and the reduction of 400 square feet in usable space that it would be embarrassing if the City could not assist this applicant and this project was made use of to make a political statement.

Mr. Brock asked when the City Council might consider FAR. Commissioner Riggs said he estimated that this would go before the Council in August. Mr. Brock asked if the rules were to change and would be more beneficial to this project whether those rules would then apply to this project. Development Services Manager Murphy said that this approval would supersede any future changes and that the applicant would have to apply for a use permit revision.

Mr. Brock said he would withdraw his application. Commissioner Pagee called for the vote. Commissioner Keith withdrew her motion. Commissioner Riggs said he wanted the applicant to know that the letter of October 6, 2006 only applied to the exact proposal made by those doctors and it would not guaranteed approval. Chair Deziel said that condition 4.a was written essentially as they proposed to revise it. Mr. Brock said the recommendation indicated absolutely no medical uses. Chair Deziel said this was not a permitted or absolutely acceptable use. Commissioner Keith suggested that the applicant might want the project to be continued so he could evaluate what he wanted. Mr. Brock asked if the approval proceeded as recommended what his obligations would be and what they would be if he did not revise anything. Development Services Manager Murphy said that architectural control approvals did not expire and building permits would expire after 180 days. He said regarding the use permit there had to be a decision and 15 days for appeal and if he wanted to revert to the architectural control, approval would become complicated and it would have to be

decided what would need to be done procedurally. He said if the applicant reverted back to not having an elevator, the Commission would be notified in writing. Mr. Brock said he would leave this application for consideration and he understood he would have the right to proceed with it or not. Thus, Commissioner Keith's motion and Commissioner Riggs second were back on the table.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Riggs to approve the item 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 The Hagman Group, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated February 5, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 10, 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 applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Health Department, and utility company's regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. 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 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 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 revised plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and driveway approach. These revised plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Building and Engineering Divisions.
 - g. The street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall implement a tree protection plan subject to the review and approval by the Building Division.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following ***ongoing, project specific*** condition:
- a. Non-medical office is the only permitted use on the second floor of the building. All other uses would require a revision to the use permit for nonconforming parking.

Motion carried 5-1 with Commissioner Pagee opposed and Commissioner Bressler abstaining.

Commissioner Pagee said she liked the architectural changes and appreciated his efforts to upgrade the interior.

4. Planned Development Permit Extension, Vesting Tentative Map Extension, and Planned Development Permit Amendment/Beltramo's Investment Co. Inc./1452 & 1460 El Camino Real and 1457 & 1473 San Antonio Street:

Request for the following: 1) a two-year extension of a Planned Development (PD) Permit for the construction of a new 26,800-square-foot, two-story commercial building with at-grade and subterranean parking and 16 two-story townhomes with partially submerged parking, 2) a two-year extension for a Vesting Tentative Map for the creation of 16 residential lots with associated common areas and one commercial lot for condominium purposes not to exceed 40 commercial units on an approximate 1.5-acre site, and 3) a Planned Development Permit Amendment to modify condition 6.30.1 regarding installation of a temporary 8 foot high plywood noise barrier around the perimeter of the project site. The applicant proposes to install a chain link fence around the construction site with black or green netting, and provide a solid plywood fence where the property abuts residential uses. The rezoning from C-4 (General Commercial, Applicable to El Camino Real) to P-D (Planned Development), the PD Permit, and the Vesting Tentative Map were previously approved by the City Council in August 2006.

Staff Comment: Development Services Manager Murphy said that there was correspondence from Mr. Steven Cohen of DLA Piper regarding noise mitigation with a slightly different request to focus on the noise impacts identified in the EIR and the mitigation to correspond with the impacts as identified in the EIR. He said that would focus the construction of the plywood fence on the shared property line for the

residences on the south and beyond the property line on San Antonio. He said staff had reviewed this and believed the Commission could modify and still maintain the environmental review clearance for the project with the exception that the plywood fence would have to wrap the property on the north side of the shared property line with the liquor store for approximately 20 feet in depth to account for property on San Antonio northeast of this property. He said through consultation with the City Attorney, the City Attorney and staff believed the Commission could recommend this modification and forward it with the requests for extensions to the City Council.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs said the noise barrier should probably extend all the way to El Camino Real to control noise, and asked why it was limited to 20 feet. Development Services Manager Murphy said he wanted to differentiate between a staff recommendation and what the Commission or Council might recommend or decide and which would be within the realm of possibilities for the Commission and Council to consider. He said staff was not in a position to make that recommendation.

Commissioner Pagee asked what the intent of the fence placement was and if there was a drawing. Development Services Manager Murphy said there was not but offered to draw it and showed the basic shape of the minimum fencing recommended.

Public Comment: Mr. Steve Cohen, DLA Piper, said they had no objection to bringing the fence wall around the north or northeasterly side from the San Antonio and Encinal side toward El Camino. He said it was unusual to require an eight-foot fence to attenuate noise and he was not aware of that requirement for any other project in the City. He suggested that Beltramo's Wine Shop itself would serve as a noise attenuating device to properties to the north. He said they certainly wanted to address neighbors' concerns. He said they had completed the agreement requesting the extension of time for the Conditional Development Permit and the Vesting Tentative Map.

Commissioner Pagee asked if they had consulted with a sound consultant. Mr. Cohen said they had not but he had reviewed the specific impact identified in the EIR which referred to sensitive receptors on the southeast side and east side. He said they left the sound barrier in both of those areas and agreed to wrap around the other corner as well. He said sound that traveled toward El Camino and the Wine Shop would not be going the other direction and that they did not see the need to spend the extra cost to wrap the entire property.

Commissioner Pagee asked how the construction project would be phased. Mr. Cohen said he recollected that the El Camino side would happen first and then the San Antonio side. He said there was a condition as to where the trucks could enter and exit. Commissioner Pagee asked if he would be amicable to extending the fence 150 feet from San Antonio. Mr. Cohen said he would be much more agreeable with staff's suggestion of 20 feet because the Wine Shop building ran most of the length of the property line and would attenuate noise better than a fence. Commissioner Pagee said that if there was a clear space between the building and the fence that noise would not

be baffled there. Mr. Cohen said they were willing to bring the fence to the corner of the building.

Chair Deziel asked if Mr. Cohen's statement in his letter of October 18, 2007 that the project had taken 10 years to receive City approvals was saying it was the City's fault. Mr. Cohen said that was not meant to imply that in anyway.

Commissioner O'Malley asked when they had first identified contaminants in the soil. Mr. Cohen said one of the conditions of the project approval was to close three wells on the property during which process testing was done of the soil by the County Environmental Health Department that indicated contaminants. He said that there had been a report in October 2007 made by their consultant to the County that recommended no further action was necessary. However, the County had indicated that it would take their staff six months to test and respond.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed that Mr. Cohen represented the Beltramo's this evening.

Mr. Morris Brown, Menlo Park, Menlo Park Tomorrow, said they liked the project and would support it. He requested that the Commission only recommend approval of a one-year extension. He said he thought the applicant was banking the project to wait until things shifted so he could come back with a denser project. He said he hoped the project would move ahead at a faster pace. He said a one-year extension would push the applicant to move more quickly.

Ms. June DuPee, Menlo Park, said she was an adjacent neighbor and wanted assurance she would be protected from the noise impact of construction. She said in response to Chair Deziel that she was on the Glenwood Avenue side.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith asked if she could ask a question of Mr. Cohen about the six month delay to make a finding on the contaminants in the soil. Mr. Cohen said that this delay was caused by staff change and backlog of work at the County. He said they expected a response from the County by May and hoped that it would indicate that no further action was needed. He said after that they would need to obtain financing, pre-lease, and finish construction level drawings before they could pull building permits. He said they expected it would take longer than one year. He said the approvals would expire in August 2008 and the maximum extension allowed was only two years. Commissioner Keith said there were concerns about the length of time the process was taking. Mr. Cohen said the design and architectural process was different from cleaning up soils and developing plans for the building permit submittals. Commissioner Keith asked if 18 months would be enough time. Mr. Cohen said that it would be difficult. Commissioner Keith asked if the extension was from the meeting date or from August. Development Services Manager Murphy said it would be from August.

Commissioner Riggs asked what had to occur to prevent the permit from expiring. Development Services Manager Murphy said that would require a complete building permit submittal.

Commissioner Riggs moved to recommend approval to City Council to make the findings; for the sound fence to be maintained as originally proposed with the exception of the El Camino façade and within 100 feet of El Camino; and to approve a one-year extension from August 2008. Commissioner Bims seconded the motion.

Commissioner Keith asked if that would include the fence coming to the corner of the building as offered by the applicant. Commissioner Riggs said he would call for a 200-foot return on the Encinal side. Chair Deziel asked if it would also be 200-feet on the Glenwood side. Development Services Manager Murphy said the liquor store was located at about 100 feet and that Commissioner Riggs was requesting twice what Mr. Cohen had offered. He said on the south side the fence should extend as recommended by staff.

The Commission looked at a map and talked about the length and location of fence needed.

Chair Deziel said the motion was to recommend to the Council staff's recommendation but with modification for a one-year extension, and to replace recommendation 6 with a recommendation to allow substitution of the wood fence for the full front of San Antonio, 200 feet on the Beltramo store side, and about 100 feet on Garwood with another 150-foot return. Development Services Manager Murphy noted that he had the Commission's intent drawn on the plan.

Commissioner Pagee said she was supportive of the two-year extension as the market was very unusual right now. She said she anticipated some problems with financing and it would be to the applicant's benefit to get the plans done soon as prices were dropping. She said she would like to allow them the two years as it was a very good project. Commissioner O'Malley agreed with Commissioner Pagee. Commissioner Keith said that a one year extension from August was reasonable. Chair Deziel said he considered there to be a contract between the community and commercial property owners in that the community supports commerce and the commercial property owners provide benefit to the community.. He said this project seemed to have run along a very lengthy time schedule and the community would prefer the project get built sooner than later.

Commissioner O'Malley said he was not sure the one-year extension would be enough time and he thought the applicant would move as quickly as possible. Commissioner Pagee asked if the project could be brought back in one-year as a consent item for a request for another one-year extension. Development Services Manager Murphy said that the Commission could approve for two-years with a review after one year or

approve for one-year with an option for an extension of an additional year as a consent calendar item.

Commissioner Riggs said as the maker of the motion that he was open to the option to approve for one year with an option for an extension of an additional year as a consent calendar item. Commissioner Bims said as the maker of the second that the applicant already had an option to request an additional year extension. Development Services Manager Murphy said that if the Council accepted the option then any request for another year extension might come back before the Commission and not have to go back before the Council. Commissioner Bims said with that information he was willing to support the modification.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Bims to recommend approval to the City Council with the following modifications.

Recommend to the City Council:

1. Make a finding that the project is consistent with the *Environmental Impact Report for 1460 El Camino Real* and the Response to Comments certified by the City Council on August 1, 2006.
2. Make a finding as per Section 16.82.170 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the extension of time limit for permits where unusual circumstances not of the applicant's making caused a delay in acting on the planned development permit approval, and that there is good cause to extend the time limit for the planned development permit.
3. Approve the planned development permit extension for a period of ~~two~~ **one** years ***from August 1, 2008 to August 1, 2009. The applicant may request one additional one-year extension from August 1, 2009 to August 1, 2010. This second one-year extension may be granted by the Planning Commission as a consent calendar item.*** .
4. Make a finding per section 15.20.070 of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to the extension of time for tentative maps where good cause is provided and for which the extension shall not exceed an aggregate a period of two years.
5. Approve the vesting tentative subdivision map extension for a period of ~~two~~ **one** years ***from August 1, 2008 to August 1, 2009. The applicant may request one additional one-year extension from August 1, 2009 to August 1, 2010. This second one-year extension may be granted by the Planning Commission as a consent calendar item.*** .
6. Deny the proposed modification to condition 6.30.1 of the planned development permit.

Modify condition 6.30.1: "Prior to construction, a temporary 8-foot high plywood noise barrier shall be constructed around the perimeter of the project site; ***except for the El Camino Real frontage, the northerly side property line for a distance of 100 feet from the El Camino Real property line, and the southerly side property line for a distance of 150 feet from the El Camino Real property line.***

Motion carried 7-0.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. Consideration of minutes from the February 11, 2008, Planning Commission meeting.

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

- Page 2, 2nd paragraph, 8th line: Add the word "entrances" after the word "garage."
- Page 2, 6th paragraph, 1st line: Replace the word "tended" with the word "intended" and add the words "which was the entrance to the left of their home" at the end of the sentence.
- Page 5, last paragraph, 2nd line: After the word "but" replace the words "Fire District" with the words "Building Code-fire protection."

The minutes were approved by general consent.

2. Review of 2008-09 Project Priority Recommendations

Chair Deziel said in the memo dated January 25 he would have liked the definition of the scale shown. He said the graph was numbered but did not tie into the reference numbers. He said these were suggestions for the next go around. Commissioner O'Malley said he would have liked to review this memo before it had gone to the Council. Chair Deziel said they could possibly begin the process earlier.

Development Services Manager Murphy said it would be easy for staff to submit the definition of the scale contained in Chair Deziel's memo to the Council the next evening. Commissioner Riggs said that would be better served by an oral comment. Commissioner Keith said a comment by staff would be good. Development Services Manager Murphy said he would have to make that request of the City Manager. He said the basic sequencing to have the Commission review before the memo went out could be improved the next year. He said that having the Commission see the memo before the Council was an improvement over last year's process.

Chair Deziel said he thought it would be better to e-mail the memo regarding the definition of the scale. Commissioner Pagee suggested that Chair Deziel send it.

Development Services Manager Murphy said with the consensus of the Commission the Chair could e-mail that information to the Council.

Chair Deziel said the speakers under Public Comment had made good points about the Negative Declaration to be released for a school development project, and asked if the Commission wanted to put it on an agenda. Development Services Manager Murphy said the speakers were looking for the Commission's expertise to craft a comment letter. He said he would need to verify that this matter was going before the other Commissions. He said perhaps the Council would direct the Commission to review the environmental document. He said staff's plan for March 24 was to hold a study session with Mr. McClure attending; hold a March 31 meeting for the Derry project; and the next regular meeting would be April 7 that would be routine regular items. He said that the response was due on the Negative Declaration by April 9.

Chair Deziel suggested tabling the Negative Declaration agenda possibility until the scheduling was decided. He asked why the Derry project could not be done in two different meetings. Commissioner Bressler said he would prefer the project be considered at only one meeting. Commissioner Keith said there was a mediated agreement and thought doing the project in one meeting would be acceptable. Commissioner Riggs said the Commission was obligated to review the project. Commissioner Keith asked what two meetings would be available for this review. Development Services Manager Murphy said he would like to distinguish between dedicating a meeting to the Derry project and inferring that the Commission had to act that night on the project. Chair Deziel asked if the Derry project was scheduled for the Council. Development Services Manager Murphy said the sequence would be about five weeks for the Council to see the project after the Commission reviewed and had a recommendation on the project. The suggestion was made to reserve time on the April 7 agenda if the Commission continued the consideration of the Derry project from the March 31 meeting. This had Commission consensus.

Chair Deziel asked what the Commission wanted to do about the environmental review for the Oak Knoll School Development. Through discussion and consensus, Development Services Manager Murphy said he would gather information about other staff and Commissions review of the environmental document and convey that to the Chair to make a decision as whether to have the item on the agenda for March 24.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS, REPORTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

No report was made.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:21 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager Murphy

Prepared by: Brenda Bennett, Recording Secretary

Approved by Planning Commission on April 7, 2008.