



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 14, 2008

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

Teleconference with participation by Commissioner Keith from:
13073 Northwoods Blvd.
Truckee, CA 96161
(Posted July 11, 2008)

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bims (Absent), Bressler, Deziel (Chair), Keith (By teleconference and stopped participating at 8:41 p.m.), O'Malley, Pagee (Arrived at 7:03 p.m.), Riggs (Vice chair)

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

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

B. CONSENT

Commissioner O'Malley moved to approve the consent calendar. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Keith in attendance by teleconference, Commissioner Pagee not yet in attendance, and Commissioner Bims absent.

Planner Chow noted that there was a speaker card for 111 Forest Lane.

Commissioner Pagee arrived at the dais.

Chair Deziel said that B.1 would be removed from the consent calendar approval.

1. **Architectural Control/David Hernandez/111 Forest Lane:** Request for architectural control to add 109 square feet by enclosing a balcony and to remodel the front and rear elevations of a townhouse in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district.

Staff had no comments on the project and the Commission had no questions of staff.

Public Comment: Mr. Steve Peckler, Menlo Park, said the back of his unit faces the front side of the subject property. He supported the project but was concerned with noise and interference during construction. He said he would like the construction hours posted in both Spanish and English that there would not be any construction on the weekend or before 8 a.m. on weekdays. He also requested that his side yard not be used for washing of equipment or paint brushes such as had occurred in the past. He also noted that a parking stall near his front door was usually taken by workers during construction.

Mr. David Hernandez said he was the architect for the project and that he would pass onto the owners and the contractor Mr. Peckler's concerns and they would ensure compliance with the City's prescribed construction hours and use. He said that they would also keep a parking stall in the side yard vacant for Mr. Peckler's use.

Chair Deziel asked if the construction hours were normally posted. Planner Chow said it was written in as a requirement in the City's code, but said the requirement might be added to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Pagee asked about the cleaning of painting equipment or concrete debris into the storm drain. Planner Chow said she did not know what the Code was regarding washing paint brushes or vehicles.

Chair Deziel said the City tended to take a complaint base approach to enforcing code. He asked how the City approached reactive and proactive response. Planner Chow said that noise complaints involved the City responding. Chair Deziel asked what the consequences were for contractors who violated the City's code. Planner Chow said there were fines.

Mr. Peckler said if the City was proactive in posting signs in both English and Spanish that would help. He said usually police officers responded to complaints and that was a waste of their time. Planner Chow said that code enforcement personnel were part of the police department.

Commissioner Keith asked if it was possible to post in both English and Spanish. Planner Chow said that staff would request that of the applicant.

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

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:

- a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - c. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following **standard** conditions of approval:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Heritage Architecture, consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received by the Planning Division on June 11, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 14, 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 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. Landscaping shall properly screen all utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and cannot be placed underground. 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 architectural control request subject to the following project-specific conditions of approval:***
- a. Prior to construction activity, the applicant shall post or have posted a notice of the construction hours and days in both English and Spanish.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith participating by teleconference and Commissioner Bims not in attendance.

2. **Architectural Control/Engelhart Electric Co., Inc./2250 Avy Avenue:**
Request for architectural control for the replacement of existing exterior lighting and installation of new exterior lighting fixtures in the parking lot and landscaping areas, and wall-mounted lights on several buildings at St. Denis Church located in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban) zoning district.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/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. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following **standard** conditions of approval:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Koltai Lighting Design, dated received July 2, 2008, consisting of 22 plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on July 14, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. 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 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. Landscaping shall properly screen all utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith in attendance by teleconference, and Commissioner Bims absent.

3. **Approval of minutes from the June 2, 2008, Planning Commission meeting.**

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Deziel to approve the minutes as submitted.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith in attendance by teleconference, and Commissioner Bims absent.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit and Variance/David W. Terpening/1076 Santa Cruz Avenue:**
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district and for a variance to encroach into the required daylight plane on the right side of the residence. The project includes a request for a six-foot tall front fence where four feet is the maximum height allowed in the front setback. As part of this development, the following three heritage trees are proposed for removal: one redwood in the front yard with an 15-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) in fair condition, one redwood in the front yard with a 16-inch DBH in fair condition, and a fig in the middle of the property with a 19-inch DBH in poor condition.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said that the lot depth in the data sheet indicated 208.2 feet but should read 280.2. He said all mentions of the lot depth in the staff report were otherwise correct. He said there was an additional piece of correspondence that had been distributed to the Commissioners at the dais and to the public on the table in the rear. He said the letter was from Ms. Ronnie Fisher. She had originally opposed removal of the Heritage trees in the front. Planner Rogers said he had talked with Ms. Fisher about the fence and trees, and she had now sent a letter indicating that she was fine with the removal of the Heritage trees noting the existence of other larger trees.

Commissioner Keith said staff had indicated that they could not make the findings for the variance and asked if staff had talked to the applicant about that. Planner Rogers said that staff had.

Commissioner O'Malley said earth would be removed from one part of the parcel and asked how that impacted the adjoining property. Planner Rogers said the applicant was proposing to remove the earth only from their side and to construct a wall or fence at that area to keep the earth on the adjoining property.

Public Comment: Mr. Philippe Morali, property owner, said he and his family were very happy to be moving to Menlo Park. He said their intent was to design a traditional and timeless house, beautifully simplistic, open to the light and nature, with integrity of design that would preserve the character of the neighborhood. He said their design supported the visioning plan for the downtown. He said they did neighborhood outreach and the neighbors liked the proposal and had noted that it was reasonable in size and had a lot of character. He said there had been an oversight related to the City's requirement for a daylight plane, and with their plan a small portion of the roof would encroach into the side setback. He said they respectfully requested that the Commission approve their project including the variance request. He said that the variance met the findings for three reasons. He said their property was 18-feet or 17% of the conforming width of 110 feet. He said the 280.2 feet depth was more than three times the lot width of 90-feet. He said this was very constraining for a street-facing house. He said they requested the variance to maximize the outdoor living space and create a natural space. He said other lots in the neighborhood were not constrained like this lot. He said they had provided a greater setback on the right side and the house would cast the least shadow on the right side. He said that homes in Menlo Park were unique in size and orientation, and approval of the variance would not set precedence. He said the right-side neighbor who would be the only one impacted by the variance was supportive of the project.

Commissioner Riggs asked Mr. Morali if he had asked his architect for alternative designs when he realized the oversight of the daylight plane. Mr. Morali said the architect did look at alternatives. Commissioner Riggs asked if they had shown any alternative designs to staff. Mr. Morali said he did not know if his architect had. Commissioner Riggs asked if staff had explained the meaning of a hardship. Mr. Morali said that Planner Rogers had. He said that a different orientation would put a home facing the neighbors and not the street, and would impact the proposed garden space.

Mr. David Terpening, project architect, said the narrowness of the lot was a unique issue combined with the nonconforming lot. He said they were asking only for the small part of the roof to intrude and not to move the daylight plane in. He said he had looked at other designs which were unworkable if the house were to face the street. He passed out sheets showing alternatives he had considered (two sets of 10 pages each).

Chair Deziel said for Commissioner Keith's benefit that on one sheet they had clipped the roof and the roof followed the daylight plane.

Mr. Terpening said this alternative was the same design as the proposal but with the roof clipped. He said the other alternative was to present a hip roof with all equal sides, which changed the style of the architecture considerably.

Chair Deziel said for Commissioner Keith's benefit that the second alternative showed a hip roof with a much shallower slope.

Mr. Terpening said this roof basically changed the design from a French rural home to an Italian type home. He said if the lot was 110-feet wide there would be no issue with the proposal. He said the project otherwise was well within the setbacks of size and height.

Commissioner Pagee said because of the orientation of the lot that the daylight plane leaned more to the north side of the property. She asked if he was familiar with the casting of shadow. Mr. Terpening said it worked in their favor that the lot was almost north-south in its orientation. He said they held a greater setback on the north side. He said they had mitigated the daylight plane for the neighbor to the north. Commissioner Pagee said that in winter the shadow would be twice the height. Mr. Terpening said that the roof ridge was only eight feet in height.

Commissioner Keith said in a letter dated March 24 that the applicants had held a neighborhood meeting and received no negative feedback. She asked if Ms. Ronnie Fisher had attended. Mr. Morali said an invitation was sent but she did not attend. Commissioner Keith asked if the fence height was addressed at the March meeting. Mr. Morali said that it was not nor did it come up as a concern.

Commissioner Pagee asked about the furnace and water heater location in the detached garage, noting that usually the garage is attached. Mr. Terpening said they were going to do a hydronic system and thought that would be successful, but if it became an issue, they might move the furnace to the crawl space or attic. Commissioner Pagee confirmed there would be no air conditioning units.

Mr. Warren Barnes, project landscape architect, said that Commissioner O'Malley had concerns with the grade at the property line. He said he had talked to the arborist about the grade at the property line, who indicated that if they stayed five feet away from that property line that any grading impact on the neighbor would be minimized. He said they revised the plans to keep the grade change five feet away from the property line.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Deziel said he had thought through whether the variance findings could be made and he had an approach that might work. Commissioner O'Malley said he thought the home would be beautiful as designed and he would be pleased if the variance issue could be resolved. He said that narrowness of the lot was not unique.

Commissioner Pagee said the home was nice, but there had been other narrow lots for which architects had successfully designed to that did not require a variance. She said that they could have shifted the second floor to accommodate the daylight plane.

Commissioner Keith said it would be great if the Commission could make the findings for the variance, but she agreed that the narrowness of the lot should not be considered a hardship.

Chair Deziel said that the style of home proposed would not usually have a hip roof. He said the alternative that clipped the roof made the line asymmetrical. He said the second alternative made the home more Americana and took away the uniqueness of the first design. He said regarding hardship that the house was on Santa Cruz Avenue and there was a need to turn around in the front of the property to enter the busy street which used front yard space. He said staff had routinely used narrowness of a lot for all manner of variances. He said the narrowness of the lot pushed the house back as well as the need for the turnaround. He said in the context of building a 2,500 square foot house street-facing that the narrowness of the lot created a hardship. He said it was inequitable to allow narrowness of a lot in the R-I-U as a basis for a variance and not allow the same for a larger lot which was proportionally impacted. He said the question was how much relief was allowed and what was the standard property right that the applicants were being denied. He said the substantial property right was the right to make an exceptional design on an estate lot; otherwise the lot was forcing a home designed to have a hip roof and oriented to the side yard. He said that it was in the City's benefit for a house on Santa Cruz Avenue to have an authentic looking design. He said the substantial right that the applicants were entitled to was to have an authentic design that was commensurate with the size of the lot. He said that design would not allow actual square footage to go into the setbacks. He said looking at page A9 that the daylight plane was to protect daylight to the adjoining property. He said on the left hand side that the second story was set back an additional seven and a half feet. He said it was reasonable to allow relief from monotony of hip roofs on the many narrow lots in town particularly on an estate lot on Santa Cruz Avenue. He said that the design would not be materially detrimental to the public related to finding number three. He said alternatively there could be a ridge line running at 28-feet in height rather than just a point at 28-feet. He said related to the fourth finding as to whether this was generally applicable was that the lot was on Santa Cruz Avenue and it was unique in that it only applied to the design. He said the granting of the variance was tied to the constraints and the proposed design.

Planner Rogers said regarding R-1-U that there had not been any daylight plane variance requests to his knowledge. Chair Deziel said that he had not said daylight plane variance requests rather variance requests.

Commissioner Bressler said it sounded like there was an attempt to allow a variance because of the large lot and the design, and he did not think that was fair. He said there were letters from a neighbor that showed they did not support the project and then they

did. Planner Rogers said that the neighbor to the right that would be impacted had written a letter of support. The neighbor across the street had written one letter of concern and then another indicating support of the project. Commissioner Bressler said that the applicant would have a really large yard and he thought the applicants should have to compromise like other applicants who have lot constraints.

Chair Deziel said that it was not the bigger lot that was allowed but rather that the larger lot should have the same allowance as the smaller lots. Commissioner Bressler said he did not agree and nonconforming lots needed to have Planning Commission review for development. He said that the daylight plane was a protection for residents.

Commissioner Keith said that there was 61.7 feet of buildable width and she had a problem making the fourth finding related to uniqueness.

Commissioner Riggs said this would be a very handsome house and the other modifications would detract from it. He said however there was enough room on the lot to build a home without a variance. He said a French country home style did not seem to work for this lot. He said he could not make the four findings for the variance. He said he agreed with Mr. Terpening that there was a downside to have a sliding scale for daylight plane, but that was the City's rules.

Commissioner O'Malley said he wished that Chair Deziel's arguments would have swayed him, but they had not. He said if he was on Council he would approve the project.

Commissioner Pagee moved to deny the project as recommended by staff. Chair Deziel said that staff's recommendation was to approve the design as proposed and deny the variance for the intrusion into the daylight plane and for changes to the design to remove the need for a variance for the review and approval of staff. Motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Riggs asked whether the applicants might indicate which of the alternatives presented they would like. Chair Deziel said that staff was trying to allow the project to go ahead without the daylight intrusion. Commissioner Riggs said perhaps the project could come back on a consent calendar. He asked if they could ask the applicant if they would like the Commission to vote on one of the alternatives.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the applicant would like to redesign and come back to the Commission, or whether the applicant would like the Commission to move on one of the alternatives. Mr. Morali said they cared deeply about the character of the home because of their roots, and they would have to consider whether they would want a more Americana home as one of the alternatives was characterized. He said they would like to proceed. He asked the Commission to reconsider finding four as he felt their lot, their situation and the design were unique. He said he could not understand why the first three findings could be made but not the fourth.

Chair Deziel moved to approve as recommended by staff to deny the daylight plane intrusion variance and to approve the use permit with the applicant revising the design for staff's review and approval. He said if the redesign deviated significantly then staff would require the redesign to come back before the Commission. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion.

Planner Rogers said that condition 6.a was relatively specific to the right side of the roof with an allowance for the left side of the roof to match. He said because of that the applicant's second alternative would not be allowed. He suggested the condition could be written more generally. Commissioner Keith suggested removing "right side" from the second line. Chair Deziel said that the last sentence would have to be removed as well. He asked if that would allow the applicant to change the footprint of the house slightly. Planner Rogers said that footprint changes would not fall under staff's discretion.

Commissioner Riggs as the maker of the second said he would accept the changes proposed to condition 6.a. He said if that was not flexible enough there were other avenues for the applicants to pursue.

Commission Action: M/S Deziel/Riggs to approve with the following modification.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of variances:
 - a. The subject parcel is similar in size and width to other parcels in the vicinity, and offers sufficient flexibility for any number of feasible design alternatives that would not require a variance. The selection of a specific architectural style, building footprint, and side setbacks is an act of the property owner and does not constitute a hardship that is peculiar to the property.
 - b. The range of feasible design alternatives offer the potential for the applicants to preserve and enjoy property rights possessed by other property in the vicinity without the requested variance. Because feasible design alternatives are available, and because other parcels in the vicinity are substandard in width but still comply with the daylight plane requirements, the granting of the requested variance would constitute a special privilege.
 - c. Except for the requested variance, the proposed construction would conform to all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, and the proposal would comply with the daylight plane as measured at the theoretical 10-foot minimum side setback. Granting of the variance would not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property.

- d. The subject parcel is similar in size and width to other parcels in the vicinity, and as such the conditions upon which requested variance is based would be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
- 3. Deny the variance.
 - 4. 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.
 - 5. 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 David W. Terpening Architect AIA Inc., consisting of 24 plan sheets, dated received July 3, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 14, 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 or building permit.

- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
- 6. 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 revised plans with a modified ~~right-side~~ second-story roof that does not require a variance for the review and approval of the Planning Division. ~~The left-side second-story roof may also be modified to match the right side.~~

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith participating by teleconference and Commissioner Bims not in attendance.

- 2. **Use Permit and Architectural Control/D. Michael Kastrop/210 Oak Grove:**
Request for a use permit and architectural control for a 498-square-foot addition to the rear of an existing church (Church of Nativity) located on a standard size lot in the RE (Residential Estate) zoning district.

Staff Comment: There was none.

Public Comment: Monsignor Steven Otellini, Church of Nativity, said as stated in the staff report that Nativity was built in 1872 and then moved to its present location in 1878. He said the sacristy had not been changed for the last 130 years. He said they would like to expand the sacristy about 500 feet to accommodate more modern use. He said that the proposed remodel kept the historic appearance of the building.

Mr. Mike Kastrop, project architect, said this was a very modest proposal and they were working with the historical features and details. He said the foundation would change from brick to concrete, and windows would be different except one window that would be reused.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Pagee seconded the motion. Commissioner Keith said she liked that trees would not be impacted and the reuse of a window. Commissioner Pagee said she felt the architect had designed sensitively. Commissioner Riggs commended the Church for going through this process, and he looked forward to its completion.

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

1. Adopt a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 31 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. 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.
4. Approve the architectural control and use permit requests subject to the following **standard** conditions of approval:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by The Kastrop Group, Inc, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received July 7, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 14, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. The applicant shall comply with all County, State and Federal regulations that are directly applicable to the project.

- 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. 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.
 - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
5. Approve the architectural control and use permit requests subject to the following **project-specific** conditions of approval:
- a. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building application, the applicant shall include a statement in the plans that certify that the work will be performed in a manner consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith participating by teleconference and Commissioner Bims not in attendance.

Commissioner Keith excused herself from the rest of the meeting.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS

There was none.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Review of planning items on City Council agendas.

A. Downtown/El Camino Real Vision Plan scheduled for July 15, 2008.

Planner Rogers said the Council would consider the Vision Plan. He said a decision had been made to split El Camino and Downtown visioning. He said they were coming to the end of the first phase.

Commissioner Riggs asked if there had been many revisions. Planner Rogers said that the revised set of goals was all in the spirit of the 12 goals originally presented.

B. Final Map for 1050-1060 Pine Street scheduled for July 15, 2008.

Commissioner Bressler said he was distributing a number of photos of 64 Willow Road to the Commission and then to staff. He said the building was much more imposing than the previous structure. He said the applicants were now enclosing the interior courtyard as well as sections on the front.

Chair Deziel said that the Commission had reviewed the project in September 11, 2006 which included a complete renovation of the building with some additional square footage. He said that the Commission was not aware they were going to reduce the building to metal studs, and later the applicants pursued demolition through staff ministerial review. Commissioner Bressler said he thought the applicants were pushing the design and enclosing sections while previously there was a pleasant grass area. He said enclosing sections added to the FAR. He indicated that he would review the design submitted. Chair Deziel said he recalled the enclosed patios. Planner Chow said fencing for commercial development was reviewed case by case. She said a covered walk would count toward building coverage but not toward square footage.

Commissioner Riggs asked that when there was a six-foot fence such as proposed for along 1076 Santa Cruz Avenue that the applicant be required to do a wall elevation.

F. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett