



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 25, 2008

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

---

**CALL TO ORDER** – 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – Bims, Bressler (Arrived at 7:04 p.m.), Deziel (Chair), Keith, O'Malley, Pagee, Riggs (Vice chair)

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Megan Fisher, Associate Planner, Kyle Perata, Planning Intern, Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner

### A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

### B. CONSENT

Chair Deziel pulled 145 El Camino Real from the consent calendar and at the requests of Commissioners Bims and Keith, respectively, the minutes of June 30 and July 14 were pulled.

Commissioner Bressler arrived.

1. **Approval of minutes from the June 30, 2008, Planning Commission meeting.**

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

- Page 10, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, Replace “said” with “asked.”
- Page 10, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, Delete “also.”

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Approval of minutes from the July 14, 2008, Planning Commission meeting.**

Commission Action: M/S Deziel/Bims to approve the minutes as modified.

- Page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, Replace the sentence with “Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith in attendance by teleconference and Commissioner Bims absent.”
- Page 5, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, Replace the sentence with “Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Keith in attendance by teleconference and Commissioner Bims absent.”
- Page 5, last paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Add in the word “asked” after the word “and” and added the word “about that” after the word “applicant.”

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Review of Substantial Conformance/145 El Camino Real:** Review of an existing commercial building for substantial conformance with earlier City approvals with regard to exterior color.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said the Commission had a colors board with two colors: the color currently painted on the building and a proposed lighter color. He said the stone sample was an example of the existing stone.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs said staff indicated that the windows were modified at the administrative level and asked if the mullion color had been recorded as a change administratively. Planner Rogers said that there did not seem a record of any change to the color of the mullions.

Commissioner Pagee asked if the first photo was the east elevation facing El Camino Real and the second photo was of the elevation facing south. Planner Rogers said that was correct. Commissioner Pagee asked if Ms. Ruth Sherman, a neighbor of the property, who was to work with the applicants on the color, had seen and approved the color requested. Planner Rogers said that Ms. Sherman had come by the City to see the color and had not objected, and she had been notified of this evening’s meeting.

There was no public comment.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith moved to find the proposed color in substantial conformance with the original project plans. Commissioner Bims seconded the motion. Commissioner Keith said this color was arrived at through communication between the applicant and Ms. Sherman, a professional colorist. Commissioner Riggs said the color was in harmony with the stone and existing non-conforming stone, but it was not in conformance with the Commission’s approval of the use permit. He said the contrast of color and intensity between the slate roof and the stucco made the building interesting. He said without the combination of lights and darks and overall warmth that this was not the building previously approved by the Commission. He said the change in the color of the mullions altered what the Commission had approved. Commissioner Bressler said he agreed with the points made by Commissioner Riggs but he was not sure if that was the best thing. He said he would like to hear from the owner or applicant as to the reasoning behind the change of color.

Mr. Mike Bruno, one of the owners of the building, said they could not get a permit for retail until approval of the color of the shell. He assured Commissioner Bressler, who asked, that they would have no problem getting a tenant into the space. Commissioner Keith confirmed with Mr. Bruno that the awnings would remain the color proposed.

Commissioner Pagee asked when the changes were made. Mr. Bruno said his company would occupy the building and he had not been aware that changes had been made, but they had worked with the original architect, Mr. Kenneth Rodriguez. Commissioner Pagee asked how they had adjusted the color. Mr. Bruno said he met with Ms. Sherman and she proposed the color before the Commission.

The Commission looked at the options of colors that the applicant had considered.

Chair Deziel said that the Commission was being asked to look at the color of the walls but the Commission could not act on the mullions and awning color. Planner Rogers said those changes had been approved through a building permit, and the Commission's action would not be construed as approval of the changes of color to the mullions and awning. Chair Deziel noted that a member of the public could make issue if they did not like the colors of the mullion and awning.

Commissioner Bims said the staff report indicated there was communication regarding the colors of the wall and if that was the team members, and whether they had communicated that to the property owners. Mr. Bruno said the idea in the change in color came from one person in the group; the architect went to the City and staff indicated that the color board for the project could not be found. The staff person thought the color might be a few shades darker than what was proposed, but as the color board was not available, what the staff person suggested was actually 30 shades darker.

Commissioner Riggs said he did not think it was common for the building permit to include colors. He asked if Planning had received color samples for the mullions and awnings. Planner Rogers said the roof had the green slate color and the awnings had a color listed, but not the mullions. Commissioner Riggs asked if the awnings were black. Planner Rogers said he thought so but he had not brought the plans with him. Commissioner Riggs asked Mr. Bruno if his drawings included the colors for the mullions or awnings. Mr. Bruno said not the mullions but the awnings were called out on the drawings as black.

Commissioner Keith asked if the planter boxes would be the same color as was being proposed for the walls. Mr. Bruno said they would. Commissioner Keith confirmed with staff that members of the public who had provided correspondence or comments were notified of tonight's meeting. Commissioner Keith asked Mr. Bruno if he had contacted other persons who had comments or just Ms. Sherman. Mr. Bruno said he made phone calls to two other persons, but they had not returned his call. He noted that Ms.

Sherman intended to attend the meeting but misunderstood and thought the meeting was the following evening.

Chair Deziel said that approving this change created a perception that a favor was being granted to create expediency for a project. He said that the developer ignored the architectural review. He said the practicality was that the Commission was being asked to look at a color but it should not be construed as the Commission approving other non-conformities. Commissioner Keith said she did not think the Commission would be doing the developer a favor but that the developer was being asked to bring the project into conformance with what was supposed to happen originally. Commissioner Bressler said the Commission's job was to interpret and be pragmatic, help people and do what made sense for the community, which was why he supported the motion on the floor.

Commissioner Riggs said he would vote against the motion but he would not stop the approval. He said his disappointment was with staff but those staff persons were no longer at the City. Commissioner Pagee said she intended to vote against the approval but if it meant that the project could not proceed, she would vote in favor.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Bims to approve the item as recommended in the staff report to find the proposed color in substantial conformance with the original project plans.

Motion carried 5-2 with Commissioners Pagee and Riggs opposed.

### C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/Farhad Ashrafi/611 College Avenue:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. As part of this development, the following three heritage trees are proposed for removal: A Hollywood juniper on the right side of the property with a 18-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) in good condition, a Hollywood juniper on the right side of the property with a 15-inch DBH in good condition, and a Hollywood juniper in the middle of the property with a 15-inch DBH in poor condition.

Staff Comment: Planning Intern Perata said that a color board had been distributed to the Commission.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Keith asked if the chimney height had been discussed with the applicant. Planning Intern Perata said it had not. Commissioner O'Malley asked if the front of the new home was identical to the existing home in terms of the front setback. Planning Intern Perata said the proposed home would be have a 20-foot setback in the front as opposed to the existing setback of 24 feet.

Public Comment: Mr. Farhad Ashrafi, project architect, said they would demolish the existing home and sheds, and consolidate those footprints into a smaller footprint within a two-story structure. He said they would improve the landscaping and increase permeable surface. He said the chimney was for a gas fireplace and did not have to be as high; he said he thought the height proposed was in scale with the building.

Commissioner Pagee asked if the windows would have grids on the outside or inside the glass. Mr. Ashrafi said that they were simulated divided light with aluminum molding. Commissioner Pagee asked if the windows on bedroom 2 opened and asked about the proximity of those to the gas fireplace flue. Mr. Ashrafi said the windows were 10-feet away as required by code. Commissioner Pagee asked if the house would be air conditioned. Mr. Ashrafi said it would be and the equipment would be located near the fireplace area outside, within the building envelope and would not be visible.

Commissioner O'Malley asked about neighborhood outreach. Mr. Ashrafi said he was not in attendance at the meetings but the owner had shown the plans to all of the neighbors.

Commissioner Keith said on page A-4 that the front elevation the chimney looked short to her. She said it did not have to be taller because it was a gas fireplace but it did not seem proportionate. Mr. Ashrafi showed a different drawing to demonstrate that if the chimney was taller that it would look like an isolated singular element.

Chair Deziel said that there were not many windows on the right side. Mr. Ashrafi said that side was the kitchen with a wall for the gas range and butler pantry. He said that in his experience Planning Commissions did not like windows looking into neighbors' properties so he tried to concentrate windows on the front and rear elevations. Commissioner Keith asked if there could be a window in the pantry. Mr. Ashrafi said he could look at that although the pantry was only five feet. He said the owners preferred cabinet space to windows.

Commissioner Riggs said the design was sensitive and attractive. He asked about the color of the free standing shed roofs. Mr. Ashrafi said it would be a patina or copper that would go with the green proposed for the walls. Commissioner Riggs suggested the Commission give the applicant some flexibility to gray out the green wall color a bit as large expanses of green often were much greener than what was visualized.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings and approve as recommended by staff. He said the replacement trees were very nice, and the setback on the second story was very sensitive. He said that he wanted a condition added to allow the applicants to tone down the wall color if desired subject to staff review. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/O'Malley to approve the item 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 16.82.030 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 Ashrafi Architect, consisting of eleven plan sheets, dated received August 12, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on August 25, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.

- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance. Prior to the building permit issuance, the applicant shall implement the tree protection plan and technique recommendations in the Arborist Report for all applicable heritage trees.
4. ***Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific condition.***
- a. ***If desired in the future, the applicant may alter the shade of green for the wood shingle siding. Any revision to the color of the wood shingles would be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 7-0.

- 2. **Use Permit/Michael Henkin/330 August Circle:** Request for a use permit for excavation into a required rear yard setback for a lightwell associated with a basement in the R-1-S (Residential Single-Family Suburban) zoning district. The lightwell would encroach a maximum of 7.3 feet into the required rear yard.

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley asked if the basement was intended to go under part of the existing building. Planner Fisher said that sheet A-1.1 or attachment B-6 showed the proposed demolition and that part of the existing house would be demolished, the basement would be constructed there and then that part of the house rebuilt.

Public Comment: Mr. Michael Henkin, property owner, said he and his family had lived in Menlo Park for 10 years, and moved to August Circle two years prior. He said there were nine homes in the neighborhood which carried CC&Rs that there could be no second-story addition unless there was unanimous consent of the neighbors. He said they worked with the neighbors on the remodel and wanted to preserve their landscaping and heritage trees. He said they wanted to preserve their living areas and give additional functionality to the home, noting that it had been originally built in the 1960s. He said it became clear that neighbors were opposed to a second story. He said they do not use their rear yard and working collaboratively this proposed design was the best for all. He said the intent for the larger lightwell was for additional lighting

and ventilation, and for access. He said as required by the CC&Rs they had gotten written approval of their neighbors for the project as proposed.

Mr. Steve Borlick, project architect, said the design was based on the unique shape of the property, which was a pie shape and a triangle. He said on each side the neighbors present their side yards, and that the owners' pool was in the large rear area. He said to get nice light, ventilation and circulation to the basement it was necessary to have the light well in this location close to neighbors' side yard to allow the circulation from this home to where there was a more generous yard and to make less of an impact on the neighbor. He said they were grateful to staff for their support and complimented the property owners for the great public outreach they did with the neighbors.

Commissioner Pagee said it looked like there would need to be a 58 and 38 feet tree protection zone as the trunks of the trees were so large, but the addition would be much closer than that. She asked how they would be able to monitor the protection of the trees. Mr. Borlick said that the distance would be a radius but there were some places where they might be closer than optimal. He said they left it to the staff arborist as to whether they should have an arborist. He said that it was being left to City inspectors to take action if they saw the fencing protection being abuse and to then require them to bring in an arborist. He said they were conservatively protecting the trees, but were sensitive to them. He said if during the course of the project, it became clear that an arborist was needed they would obtain one. Commissioner Pagee said the significant size of the trees meant larger roots and care would need to be taken with those roots during trenching.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Deziel said the rule of 10 times the diameter of a tree put the protection zone at 19 feet and from the trees to the edge of the lightwell was about 16 feet. Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings and approve the use permit. He said that most times he would not approve a lightwell in a setback but the reasoning behind this made it the most practical and protective solution for the neighbors. Commissioner O'Malley said it was a nice design and would improve the home and neighborhood as well. He seconded the motion.

Chair Deziel said that when the excavator began to work to have someone to look out for the roots.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/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 State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be



detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Approve the use permit subject to the following *standard* conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Young and Borlick Architects, Inc., consisting of fourteen plan sheets, dated June 25, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on August 25, 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. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
  - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Use Permit and Variance/Roger Kohler/1066 Pine Street:** Request for a use permit to demolish a single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct two new two-story, single-family residences on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district.

In addition, a request for a variance to reduce the required separation between the main buildings on the subject lot and the main building on the adjacent right side property from 20 feet to 14 feet, nine inches. As part of this development, the following heritage tree is proposed for removal: a redwood in the rear yard with a 16-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) in good condition.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Roger Kohler, project architect, said there was a neighboring apartment that had been built with different setbacks. It was being remodeled into condominiums and because of that this proposed project now had inadequate setbacks. He said the second story was at a 20-foot setback but the setback on the right setback was diminished to 14 feet nine inches. He said the property owners did neighbor outreach, through which they subsequently bought a neighboring property that they will bring forward later for development. He said between the two properties there would be a common sharing of parking. He said a colors and material board had been distributed to the Commission. He said that they had worked with Planning, Transportation and Public Works. He said they would use Milgard fiber glass simulated divided light windows with mutton bars inside and outside. He said that there was wood veneer on the inside of the window and the outside looked like aluminum clad.

Commissioner Riggs said the roofing was dominant and asked how the attic space would be vented. Mr. Kohler said it would be a Hagen vent, which were designed to fit and blend in with materials and colors. He said it would be on the back and not visible.

Commissioner Keith noted sheet A-7, section A.A and asked if near bedroom 3 whether the roof angled the entire way. Mr. Kohler said the plate height was at 8 feet but the flat ceiling in the center was at 9-foot three-inches. Commissioner Keith asked which elevation that was. Mr. Kohler realized that sheet A-7 was the back house and what Commissioner Keith was looking at was a cross section from the garage. Commissioner Keith wanted the elevation to look at the front. Mr. Kohler said page A-6 was the front or the east side elevation. Commissioner Keith said her question was answered looking at that sheet.

Commissioner Pagee said that page A-7 showed Blaugard windows. Mr. Kohler said that was a previous iteration and that they would use the Millgard windows.

Chair Deziel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith moved to approve the use permit as recommended by the staff report and make the findings for the variance as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion. He noted that the neighboring building created a hardship as did the effort to preserve the trees.

Commissioner Keith asked if anyone had comments about the Redwood tree number 7 which was proposed for removal. Commissioner Pagee said she liked trees to provide

privacy but it was noted that on the neighboring property there was a eucalyptus and other trees which had crowded this Redwood. She said the addition of an Oak tree would give the backyard some shade. Planner Rogers said he had photographs of the tree which was healthy but it was very curved at the top because of the eucalyptus. Commissioner Pagee said she was not against the removal of one tree from a backyard. Commissioner Keith asked what size the Cork oak tree would be. Planner Rogers said it was proposed as a 24-inch box tree. Chair Deziel asked if it was possible to get it planted away from the canopy of the eucalyptus tree. Planner Rogers said a non-heritage tree would be removed and the intent was to plant the tree outside of the leaf line of the eucalyptus. Commissioner Keith said that perhaps a better tree should be planted instead of the eucalyptus. Commissioner Riggs said the eucalyptus was the neighbor's tree and he thought the Cork oak should be sited by an arborist. Chair Deziel said a number of trees were being removed along the side. He said two replacement trees for a heritage tree removal would be desirable. Chair Deziel asked if the new Cork oak tree was being replaced in the corner. Planner Rogers said it was in the far left corner. Commissioner Keith said she would modify her motion to require the planting of a second 24-inch box tree subject to staff approval. Commissioner Riggs said as the maker of the second that he would accept that change.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Riggs to approve the item 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 16.82.030 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 the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of variances:
  - a. The hardship is based upon the placement of the buildings on the adjacent lot, the location of the existing heritage trees, and the narrowness of the subject lot, and is particular to the property and not created by any act of the owner.

- b. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other conforming property in the vicinity, in particular with regard to the width of the developable area, which would otherwise be restricted to 24 feet, nine inches at the center of the parcel. The variance will not constitute a special privilege.
  - c. The residence will limit the areas of two-story living space conflict and will comply with all other R-3 zoning district development regulations and as a result will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent properties.
  - d. Because the variance request is primarily based upon the specific and unique placement of the adjacent structure, the location of the existing heritage trees, and the narrow width of the subject parcel, it is not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
4. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Kohler Associates Architects, consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received August 7, 2008, and approved by the Planning Commission on August 25, 2008, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.

- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
- 5. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following ***project-specific*** conditions:
  - a. Simultaneous to submittal of a complete building permit, the applicant shall submit a draft access easement for the driveway and motor court area on 1070 Pine Street, subject to review and approval of the City Attorney and Planning Division. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit recorded documentation of the shared access easement, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan relocating the replacement cork oak outside of the canopy line of the adjacent rear eucalyptus tree and specifying a minimum 24-inch box size, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - c. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan including one additional screening tree with a minimum 24-inch box size, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 7-0.

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

There was none.

#### **E. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- 1. Review of planning items on City Council agendas.
  - A. Downtown/El Camino Real Specific Plan Request for Proposals scheduled for August 26, 2008.

Planner Rogers said that the Council would review the draft request for proposals for Phase 2 of the El Camino Real/Downtown Visioning Plan. He said the time line had the proposals coming back in September. He said a review committee would review consultants. The results would go to Council in October. He said that two

Commissioners could serve on that review committee which would be agendized on September 8.

B. Discussion on potential projects for Environmental Quality Commission Awards.

Commissioner Pagee said the Commission was in the position to see the really good projects. She suggested that either now or next year the Commission might identify potential projects for nomination for the Environmental Quality Commission awards.

Commissioner Keith said there was a project on Woodlands that was very beautiful and well designed. Chair Deziel asked what the requirements were for the nominations. Planner Chow read the different categories. She read the qualities for the Architectural/Residential category.

Commissioner Pagee asked about 68 Willow Road as a possible project to nominate. Chair Deziel said that there was so much to consider in determining how green projects were related to how materials were produced. He said that clearly reuse was green. Commissioner Bressler said that he would nominate 68 Willow Road because of the reuse. It was noted that factors for the nomination for this category included reuse and creating an appearance that was compatible with the neighborhood and enhanced the appeal of the building.

Commission Action: M/S Bressler/Pagee to nominate 68 Willow Road for the Architectural/Commercial category.

Motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner O'Malley abstaining.

Commissioner Riggs said that 321 Middlefield Road had been painted and re-landscaped and it was a remodel, thus a reuse. Chair Deziel said they could have torn the building down and expanded lot coverage.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Keith to nominate 321 Middlefield Road for the Architectural/Commercial category.

Motion carried 5-0-2 with Commissioners Bressler and O'Malley abstaining.

There was discussion to shortlist 250 Middlefield Road for the next year's nominations.

There was discussion about the completion of the nomination forms.

Commissioner Pagee suggested perhaps they should consider the residential property on Woodlands Avenue for the Architectural/Residential category. The Commission discussed whether that project fit the requirements of the category. No conclusion was reached. Commissioner Pagee is to complete the nomination papers.

## **F. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Keith said that as this might be her last meeting she wanted to say how much she had enjoyed working with the Commission. Chair Deziel echoed her sentiments. He noted that Commissioner Bims would no longer serve on the Commission and thanked him for eight years of service. The other Commissioners expressed their appreciation of Commissioner Bims' thoughtful contribution to the Commission.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved on October 6, 2008.