



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 9, 2009

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler, Ferrick, Kadvany, Keith, O'Malley (Vice chair), Pagee, Riggs (Chair)

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner, Arlinda Heineck, Community Development Director.

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Fran Dehn, the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce, indicated that the Chamber of Commerce had submitted a letter to the Commission that day in support of the blanket use permit at 800-830 Menlo Avenue, but she could not stay to address the Commission during the item later in the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

B. CONSENT

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/O'Malley to approve the consent calendar (the January 26 and February 9, 2009 minutes with the modifications previously submitted and shown here).

1. **Approval of minutes from the January 26, 2009, Planning Commission meeting.**

(Item continued from the meeting of February 23, 2009)

- Page 5, 3rd paragraph, line 9; add a comma after the word "building."
- Page 6, 1st paragraph, line 8: replace the phrase "if they would not want to demolish part of..." with "if they had considered demolishing part of ..."
- Page 6, 1st paragraph, line 12: replace the phrase "asked how much the new alarm and sprinklers system" with "noted that the staff report stated the City would be responsible for paying for an updated/new alarm and sprinkler system and asked how much this would cost."
- Page 6, 1st paragraph, line 14: replace the sentence "Commissioner Keith asked about the elevation on Alma Street looking north and asked about the wall on the back with no windows and asked whether there could be windows to break up the wall." with "Commissioner Keith referred to the elevation on Alma Street looking north. She asked if the wall on the back without windows could include windows to break up the massing of the wall."
- Page 7, line 2, insert "to be" after the phrase "said it would have."

- Page 8, last paragraph, last sentence: add the word “new” before the word “basketball” and replace the word “court” with “gymnasium.”
- Page 9, 3rd paragraph, line 6: add the word “not” after the word “could.”
- Page 9, 3rd paragraph, 4th line from bottom: change the word “Willow Road Park” to “Willow Oaks Park.”
- Page 10, 1st paragraph: change “\$5 million” to \$2 million.”
- Page 16, last sentence next to the last paragraph: replace “Commission” with “Commission’s opinion.”
- Page 17, 1st paragraph: replace the sentence “He continued later that he would like to augment fees and make sure parking was realistic.” with “He continued later that he also was in agreement with Commissioner Bressler with his statements on parking and fees. Furthermore, he stated that he would like to augment fees for the sake of the City and to make sure that parking was realistic. Parking guidelines were developed nationally and applied regionally, and were beyond the Commission.”

2. **Approval of minutes from the February 9, 2009, Planning Commission meeting.**

- Page 5, 3rd paragraph, 4th line: replace the word “glazed” with “obscured.”
- Page 7, 2nd paragraph: replace “days” with “evenings.”
- Page 21: replace “other things” with “other air pollutants mentioned in the Draft report.”
- Page 22, 5th paragraph: change the word “COD” to “CO2e” and replace “task” with “task of completing the report;” last sentence replace the word “economical” with “economic.”
- Page 22, last paragraph: add “emphasize the need for a local transit loop” as the fifth item on Summary of Commission comments.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Pagee abstaining.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/Andrew Young/441 El Camino Real:** Use permit request to allow optical sales at an existing tenant space in a commercial building that is nonconforming with regard to parking in the C-4 (General Commercial - Applicable to El Camino Real) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Chow said an email from Ms. Sheila Rose, 620 College Avenue, had been distributed to the Commission. Ms. Rose recommended that a new sign for the back of the building be limited in height so that it was at two feet above the door; she also was concerned with new signage for customer-only parking and suggested that it be placed on a low wall shared by this property and the neighboring Shell station property.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley asked where in the staff report signage was discussed. Planner Chow said it was stated on page 3 of the staff report in the second full paragraph that new signage would be reviewed under a separate permit process. She confirmed staff had relayed that information to Ms. Rose.

Public Comment: Mr. Andrew Young, project architect, said the parking had been a concern with this space. He said he understood there was one condition about a two year review period, which concerned him. Planner Chow said there was no condition to limit the use permit. Chair Riggs said he thought the staff report had indicated that the permit be tied to the five-year lease. Planner Chow said that was an option presented for the Commission to consider.

Commissioner Keith said that page 3 of the staff report indicated other buildings in the area that have nonconforming parking. Planner Chow said that 417 and 425 College Avenue have nonconforming parking in the rear. Commissioner Keith said that it appeared nonconforming parking was not unusual in this area. Planner Chow said that was correct.

Commissioner Ferrick asked how customers would know it was permissible to park behind parked vehicles. Planner Chow said that condition 4.a required the use of signage and striping to show that such parking was allowed. Commissioner Ferrick asked why this optical store would want a space with such limited parking. Mr. Young said that Mr. Brian Kelly, the landlord of this property, had done a survey of other optical stores in Menlo Park. Mr. Kelly said the tenants for this property were well aware of the parking limit, though it was sufficient, and would do appointments only to control use. He said that he visited four of the five other optical stores along Santa Cruz Avenue at different times (10 a.m., 12 p.m., 4 p.m.) and that at those times two of the stores had no customers, one had one customer, and the fourth had eight customers.

Chair Riggs closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Pagee moved to approve the application as recommended in the staff report. She said the Planning Commission had previously approved a furniture store some years prior with limited parking and that this business was still in operation. Commissioner Keith seconded the motion and noted that other businesses in the area have nonconforming parking.

Commissioner Bressler asked about what was desired in this area in the future after El Camino Real was redone. He suggested that a five-year review might be appropriate. Commissioner Ferrick said a five-year review would be appropriate as the El Camino Real visioning plan proceeded.

Commissioner Kadvany said that however the new visioning plan was done it would have to be done equitably and he did not think it was fair to impose a restriction on this application.

Commissioner O'Malley said that a review in five years would not be a hardship and would perhaps give property owners different options because of the visioning plan.

Commissioner Bressler asked about the other tenants. Mr. Kelly said there were two separate buildings on one lot. He said the lease for the bike store was up for review at the end of 2010 with possibly an option to renew but he would have to double check the terms. He said the optical store would take what was now a vacant space.

Chair Riggs said it was not uncommon to have a review period. He said should zoning change in the future that the building owner would be in a position to make a decision as to whether to have a tenant continue or to make a change, and that the Commission needed very strong reasons to deny requests to renew use permits.

Chair Riggs made a friendly amendment to require a five-year review of the use permit. He noted also that a landscape planter was not being maintained well, and he would like to require its maintenance as part of the approval.

Commissioner Pagee said as the maker of the motion that a five-year review was fine. She said she thought the lease agreement would address maintenance of the landscape planter, but she also would accept that condition. Commissioner Keith asked why staff had not recommended a time limit on the use permit on page 4 of the staff report. Planner Chow said that was based on the hours of operation, the type of business, tandem parking, and signage. She said should a downtown plan get implemented that this use permit would not prohibit development by the owner. Commissioner Keith said she was okay with the five-year review and required maintenance of the landscape planter.

Commissioner Kadvany said he was uncomfortable with the five-year review, and suggested that such a limit, to be equitable, might have to be applied to all future use permits in areas under consideration in the visioning plan.

Commissioner Ferrick said the City's zoning ordinance required 20 spaces for this property and use, and felt that there should be a review in five years of the use permit. Commissioner Kadvany said the parking incongruities were a problem created by the ordinance and not by this proposed use. He said this was a very difficult space on El Camino Real for businesses to fill and he thought it was important to have this business there to create vitality in that part of El Camino Real. Chair Riggs said this building might end up being significantly undeveloped as the visioning plan proceeded and that a request for a renewal of the use permit ensured that the building owner did not have to create a lease with two automatic renewals. He said he thought having a five-year review was an advantage to all, and he did not see a clear disadvantage to the applicant.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (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 Borlik, consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received February 26, 2009, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 9, 2009, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **ongoing, project-specific** conditions:
 - a. As part of a complete building permit application submittal, the applicant shall appropriately identify through the use of, or a combination of, striping, signage and/or varying materials that the two tandem parking spaces are for employee parking only and the two spaces located behind them are available for customer use, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. During weekday hours between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m., service shall be provided by appointments only. Client appointments shall be scheduled with a minimum 10 minute gap between the start of a new appointment and the end of the previous appointment, and no more than four clients shall be at the subject tenant space at any one time during these hours. Drop-ins and appointments are permitted during all other operating hours.
 - c. ***The use permit shall expire on March 9, 2014 unless extended through a use permit revision, subject to review and approval of the Planning Commission.***
 - d. ***Landscape planter shall be maintained.***

Motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Kadvany opposed.

2. **Use Permit Revision/Roger Burnell/800-830 Menlo Avenue:** Request to eliminate an existing condition of approval for an expiration date of April 6, 2013 for a blanket use permit to allow professional, executive, administrative and general office uses as permitted uses in a two-story building where such uses are either administratively permitted or conditional uses in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Chow said that the Chamber of Commerce had submitted a letter of support for the project.

Public Comment: Mr. Roger Burnell, project applicant, noted the letter provided by him that was attached to the staff report, which he said explained his request well. He said that there was a desire in the City for more retail but there were some fallacies in the idea of replacing an existing high-end office building with tenants with retail in that the amount of sales tax revenue could well not be as much as the property tax revenue of the existing office building. He said also the cost of demolishing a building and constructing a new building had to be considered. He said empty retail spaces did not produce any revenue. He said that his lender was requiring a window of time sufficient to that lender to assure that the property for which the loan was being made would continue in the use as the loan was applied for, which was why he was requesting a blanket use permit. He provided handouts to staff for the Commission which was a petition of support from tenants and neighbors for the blanket use permit.

Commissioner Bressler asked if Mr. Burnell was the owner of the building, and how long. Mr. Burnell said he had owned the building for 12 years. Commissioner Bressler asked for more information about Mr. Burnell's loan. Mr. Burnell said he was finalizing a new 10-year mortgage with a lender. Commissioner Bressler asked about the proposed lot merger and whether that would cause a reassessment of property taxes. Mr. Burnell said he had just gotten confirmation from the County that the property would not be reassessed upon this lot merger.

Commissioner O'Malley confirmed that the improvements to the orthodontic office had cost \$250,000. He said that with the economic downturn that there were a number of businesses vacant and more vacancies were expected. He said he did not necessarily feel there was a need for more retail in Santa Cruz Avenue area.

Commissioner Kadvany said he was uncomfortable making a decision based on financial matters and not on planning matters with this applicant. Mr. Burnell said that his lender required that the zoning of the property had to support the existing use and that there was no threat of zone changes throughout the course of the loan.

Commissioner Ferrick said it was beneficial to have a professional building downtown as it brought visitors from outside of the community.

Ms. Joyce Schmidt, a psychotherapist and tenant at 830 Menlo Avenue, said she loved her office and its location. She said that in a comparison of retail tax and property tax

that the city and its schools received more from property taxes, noting that a good chunk of sales tax revenue went to the state.

Dr. Kathleen Tavaréz, orthodontist and tenant, said she recently moved to the site and made a large investment in her office improvements. She said that her business brought in clients from outside of Menlo Park. She said many of the parents drop their children off for their appointments and spend that time shopping or getting food or drink in downtown Menlo Park.

Chair Riggs closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick clarified with staff that the square footage on the first floor for medical use was for Dr. Tavaréz' office. Planner Chow noted that this square footage could also be used as medical office for any future tenant as well.

Commissioner Bressler said he had concerns that this building was at 200 percent FAR because it had been grandfathered in after zoning ordinance amendments related to gross floor area. He said an in-lieu fee would be extremely appropriate in exchange for continuation of this use. He questioned the effect of grandfathered properties to give some advantage other others and in perpetuity.

Commissioner Kadvany asked staff to summarize parking assessment given the grandfathering, and some options for parking considerations. Planner Chow said that page 3 of the staff report stated that parking in the C-3 zoning district was provided for up to 100 percent FAR through the Parking Assessment District. She said this building was built prior to 1986 and prior to the adoption of the zoning ordinance amendment establishing a gross floor area limit. She said because of that this property was not nonconforming related to gross floor area nor for parking.

Chair Riggs asked comparably whether a restaurant on Santa Cruz Avenue that backed on a parking plaza would have its parking requirements fulfilled by that parking plaza. Planner Chow said assuming that the property paid into the Parking Assessment District it would have its first 100 percent FAR covered through the parking plaza. Chair Riggs asked how parking ratios compared between restaurant use and office building use. Planner Chow noted that in the C-3 zoning district that there was only one parking requirement regardless of use, but in general office use would have a lower parking ratio than restaurants.

Chair Riggs, noting the 2,100 square feet of medical office and the condition that less than 10 percent of building might be medical, said the Commission has frequently heard objections to medical office use in Menlo Park, and asked if those objections were based on parking and traffic. Planner Chow said that was correct. Chair Riggs asked if one looked at national standards for building use and parking needs, whether medical office use was comparable to a restaurant or an office building or somewhere in between. Planner Chow said it would depend upon what type of restaurant. Chair

Riggs said the City allowed restaurant use on property that was part of the parking assessment district. Planner Chow said that restaurant use was a permitted use in the C-3 zoning district and did not require discretionary review by the Planning Commission. Chair Riggs asked if parking requirements for a bistro/coffee shop restaurant based on national standards would be more or less than six spaces per 1,000 square feet. Planner Chow said that generally there was a requirement of six spaces per 1,000 square feet for restaurants but not in the C-3 district.

Chair Riggs said he agreed with Commissioner Ferrick's observation that the City had room for a well-established office building in its downtown in that it assured a variety of space and use. He said this building's success and its continued success were important to Menlo Park.

Commissioner Bressler said this application raise the question of fairness as it would allow this building to have twice as much square footage as other development in the area and continuing unlimitedly in the future. He said another side issue was whether future planning change would affect this, and whether there should be a limit set. He said however it was in the interest of the City to keep the building occupied.

Commissioner Ferrick said the building was originally developed as an office building. She said usually the Chamber desired an in-lieu fee for non-retail uses downtown, but did not with this application. She said the zoning did not prevent retail renters in the building.

Commissioner Kadvany asked what the parking assessment was. Planner Chow said this assessment was paid at the time of building and was not an annual fee. Chair Riggs said that when the parking district was formed that it was an investment made by owners who demolished existing buildings and redeveloped.

Commissioner O'Malley moved to approve the application as recommended in the staff report. Chair Riggs noted that staff's recommendation did not place a time limit on the use permit. Commissioner Ferrick said that condition numbered 4 referred to "ongoing project specific conditions" and asked if that meant future new development on this property would mean the use permit was no longer valid. Planner Chow confirmed that if there was new development on this property that architectural control review and a use permit application would be needed. Commissioner Bressler commented that he thought that would guarantee that this building would never be replaced as new development could not be given the existing 200 percent FAR. He said that was an objection to approving a blanket use permit as this would continue forever. He said his assumptions were that the City would not allow future development at this location at a 200 percent FAR, so there was no incentive for the building to be remodeled. Chair Riggs said that 200 percent FAR could become available under certain conditions such as Planning Commission review. He said the specific plan to come out of the visioning process should determine the rules for the future, and that the Commission should not second guess the outcome of that process on a case by case basis at this time. Commissioner Ferrick said the project specific conditions allowed her to wholeheartedly

support this approval, and she said in the future, the building would age. Chair Riggs noted that older buildings tended to eventually fall out of favor with tenants and become less and less attractive. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion made by Commissioner O'Malley.

Commissioner Kadvany said he would like a 10-year limitation placed on the use permit. Commissioners O'Malley and Ferrick, as the maker of the motion and second, did not accept Commissioner Kadvany's friendly amendment.

Chair Riggs asked whether other properties that were nonconforming in Menlo Park had use permits that did not need to be renewed. Planner Chow said there were use permits for other offices downtown that were not subject to an expiration date.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Ferrick to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit revision subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by JMH Weiss, Inc., consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received March 2, 2009, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 9, 2009, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
4. Approve the use permit revision subject to the following **ongoing, project-specific** conditions:
 - a. Non-medical office uses shall be permitted on the first and second floors of the building, and, as such, excludes for the purposes of this building, facilities for physicians, dentists and chiropractors where the primary purpose of the space is to provide diagnoses and outpatient care on a daily basis.
 - b. Up to 2,100 square feet of gross floor area can be used for medical office uses (including physicians, dentists and chiropractors). All other medical offices would require a separate review and approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission.

- c. Within 45 days of approval of the use permit revision, the applicant shall file a complete application with the City of Menlo Park for a lot merger to combine the five existing parcels into one parcel, subject to review and approval of the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The approved lot merger shall be recorded at the San Mateo County Recorder's Office within 15 days of approval of the lot merger.

Motion carried 4-2-1 with Commissioners Bressler and Kadvany opposed and Commissioner Keith abstaining.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan

Planner Rogers said the adoption of the visioning plan in 2008 set 12 broad goals for commercial and mixed use areas. He said Phase II of the visioning would include the preparation of a specific plan and associated environmental impact report. He said that environmental and fiscal review would be integrated into this process, so that potential benefits (such as tax revenue) and impacts (such as traffic) of different scenarios would be considered as the community develops the long-term plan, and that the completed specific plan would contain detailed land use regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure plans, and implementation measures. He introduced the representatives of Perkins+Will, the consulting firm for Phase II of the visioning plan, and said Community Development Director Heineck and he were available for questions.

Mr. Prakash Pinto, Perkins+Will, said he was a principal with the consulting firm. He said that they were in the beginning of process and were talking to the various stakeholders and commissions about the priorities of Phase I of the visioning plan to establish a foundation for future Phase II work. He said that they would return four more times to the Commission and would have more to present in the future.

Mr. Mark Hoffheimer, Perkins+Will, said he was the project manager for this project. He posed three questions for Commissioner comment: 1) In your view, what are the three most important goals of the Phase I Vision Plan for the El Camino Real/Downtown project area? 2) What are the greatest challenges to achieving the goals (from a community, political, economic, planning and/or physical perspective)? 3) What should the priorities of the consultant team be at this time? What areas should the consultant team focus on to bring clarity, discussion and agreement to the Specific Plan planning effort?

Commissioner Kadvany's comments: 1) to look at building integral to land use, transit and financing (taxes and developer costs). Well defined transit options would make better buildings; to not let the perfect be the enemy of good. 2) Questioned to what extent could the City reinvent the El Camino Real (ECR) to a walkable and bikeable boulevard the City could be proud of? He said that would require working with Caltrans and other commuters using ECR corridor. 3) For consultants to give participants tools

to quickly build models. The City responds well to concrete alternatives. A model that is an urban planning model and city decision model would get the project going.

Commissioner Keith's comments: 1) Agreed with Commissioner Kadvany, noting that it was disappointing to see money spent on processes that left no funds for implementation and she wanted to see action on this project. 2) Focus on ECR and get businesses up and running so that new businesses come into town and become an asset. She said projects such as the proposed Derry project with higher density near the train were important – to make high density/transit a priority, and make the area more attractive to biking.

Commissioner O'Malley's comments: 1) ECR was the major focus and included transit, housing, and vacant and unutilized portions of ECR. 2) Finding balance between retail and other commercial uses and housing and do so by obtaining support of the majority of the population rather than that of vocal minority groups. To make sure action occurred quickly once recommendations were developed.

Chair Riggs' comments: 1) Vibrancy as that encompassed the bottom line of what was wanted. The necessity for future plans to be economically sustainable and environmentally sustainable and to support alternatives to auto 2) Challenges were working with Caltrans and how the City would deal with high speed rail; Council to make firm reply to those whose positions were entrenched in limiting positions.

Commissioner Pagee's comments: 1) Projects approved on ECR that may or may not fall within goals was a concern. Should set goal for a walkable, bikeable, and accessible downtown along pedestrian ways and into stores. Create a zoning ordinance to allow for a mix of businesses that nourish each other and flexible enough to allow changes. Determine size of building based upon thought of open spaces so people can mingle downtown. 2) Buy-in from property owners and residents as to what zoning will be and its benefits. 3) Bringing a model to show people – open areas relative to other spaces, parking, walkability.

Commissioner Bressler's comments: 1) East-west connectivity made bikeable and walkable; related to vacant and underutilized parcels along ECR how to make model that could be implemented; open space and public amenities – if allowing upzoning then to have more open space and amenities in other areas. To get political buy-in these opportunities needed to be presented. 2) Challenge – at a political and economic inflexion point – revenue and business models breaking down – smart people in the community and needed to leverage that. Parcels vacant a long time – and parties such as Stanford who want to upzone – difficult to get property owners to do what City wants to do. 3) To present to public what the public benefits were in what would be allowed.

Commissioner Ferrick's comments: 1) East-west connectivity; ECR parcels and dealing with ECR circulation; identify tradeoffs of development for community 2) get buy-in from stakeholders; things out of the City's control such as the condition of the train track. 3) Determining the value and dollars of upzoning ECR and downtown parcels and

tradeoffs to negotiate with property owners; to define what will create vibrancy – a road map to vibrancy.

Mr. Hoffheimer thanked the Commission for their comments. He said they would hold a community workshop in April to share analyses and begin educating all involved on potential tradeoffs. He said it was helpful to understand the sensitivities of the community both politically and physically.

Chair Riggs asked if there was any public comment. No member of the public spoke on the item. Chair Riggs closed public comment.

Mr. Pinto said the comments received were wonderful and the concept of a roadmap to vibrancy was embedded in other Commissioners' comments. He said his firm works very visually and that helps constituents to see photo montages and models. He said his firm sought work that advanced from the planning phase to implementation.

Commissioner O'Malley said that the City has a population of about 30,000 and he did not think there were enough people to create the type of economic base future retail development would need; would the plan be developed to only the realistic economic base, or was there a plan to draw people from other communities into Menlo Park for shopping and other activities. Mr. Pinto said that Commissioner O'Malley's questions could not be answered at this point. He said his firm was coming into this analysis with no preconceptions. He said they would do a market survey and study, look at land use, look at competing towns and cities, and do an analysis of retail and housing in Menlo Park to formulate what was in the realm of possibility and to develop a vision that was implementable.

Mr. Hoffheimer said that this would be a long-term plan that would and set the framework for development in the future. He said better economic times would come and the question was what that would look like. He said he liked the idea of flexible zoning posed by Commissioner Pagee.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Review of planning items on City Council agendas.

A. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Phase II) Process

Planner Chow said there would be a community workshop on April 16.

Planner Chow noted that Commissioner Kadvany attended a community meeting on 1706 ECR, February 26. She said that was the fourth community meeting for the project. She said the Planning Commission had held a study session on the project last November, and since then the traffic report for the revised plan had been developed, identifying traffic Impacts and potential mitigations and describing environmental analysis review. She said the neighbors at this community meeting did not support mitigations to reduce the traffic impacts to less than significant. She said the applicant would pursue a Council determination as to whether the potential traffic impacts were considered less than significant at the April 26 meeting.

Commissioner Kadvany said that the significant impact related to making a left turn from Buckthorn Way and Spruce Avenue onto El Camino Real. He said that there was already delay for making these turns now so any increased delay was considered significant according to EIR traffic impact criteria. Additionally, with no southbound left turn possible, the driver's choice would be to first drive north, following a right turn, and then make a u-turn southward.

Study Session on March 30, 2009 is cancelled

F. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett