



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 29, 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 (arrived 7:04 p.m.), Ferrick, Kadvany, Keith, O'Malley (Vice chair) (departed 12:31 a.m.), Pagee, Riggs (Chair)

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Megan Fisher, Associate Planner

### A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

### B. CONSENT

There were no items on the consent calendar.

### C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Architectural Control, Heritage Tree Removal, Right-of-Way Abandonment, and Environmental Review/City of Menlo Park/501 Laurel Street and 600 Alma Street:** Proposal to demolish the existing 17,400-square-foot gymnasium and gymnastics building and construct a new 22,500-square-foot gymnastics facility (plus a 1,400-square-foot locker room expansion) at the location of the existing gymnasium and gymnastics building, a new 24,100-square-foot gymnasium in an area between the existing Recreation Center and Alma Street, and associated site improvements located at the Civic Center Complex in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. As a result of this proposal, three heritage trees would need to be removed, and Mielke Drive and a portion of Alma Street right-of-way between Ravenswood Avenue and Burgess Drive would need to be abandoned to accommodate the proposed gymnasium. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), architectural control for the proposed Burgess Gymnasium design, the three heritage tree removals, and consider whether the proposed right-of-way abandonments are consistent with the General Plan.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher said on page 4 of the staff report it was stated that the project would accomplish Platinum LEED certification based on the preliminary checklist; however, the architect's preliminary checklist indicated a Silver LEED rating. She said based on conversations with the architect that green features for the building would include operable windows, drought tolerant landscaping, construction materials, provisions for alternative transportation, and construction waste management.

Planner Fisher said since the publication of the staff report the Commission had received eight additional pieces of correspondence. She said Ms. Betty Meissner, Menlo Park, wrote that she believed the project was aesthetically out of scale; would create traffic congestion and competition for parking in Lot 6; and would create a parking situation that would be inconvenient for library patrons. Ms. Meissner expressed her desire that the broader scope of the gymnasium project be considered in the decision making process.

Ms. Aldora Lee, Menlo Park, wrote that she did not believe the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) had adequately addressed the access, traffic and parking concerns of the library lot and indicated that a traffic study of Lot 6 and Alma Street was warranted. Ms. Lee was also concerned with the scale of the building and said additional parking should be provided when buildings were added to the campus.

Mr. Donald Drury, Menlo Park, wrote that the new gym would create new traffic and congestion near Alma Street and Ravenswood Avenue, which would inconvenience the library users. He said that the gymnasium plan should be reconsidered as it was not appropriate to monitor the parking situation after construction.

Ms. Elizabeth Lasensky, Menlo Park, wrote about the library, its services and programs and posed questions about traffic flow, bicycle and pedestrian access, impacts on library users, high speed rail, and proposed mitigations.

Ms. Nancy Borgeson, Menlo Park, wrote that the gymnasium and gymnastics center should be in keeping with the City's environmental stewardship goals and incorporate green building features. She said that parking lot 5 was not within a reasonable walking distance of the library or gymnasium and that parking counts should be conducted in April, May or September.

Ms. Nancy Cox and Mr. Kevin Harris, Menlo Park, wrote that they opposed the construction of the gymnasium noting that there were other gymnasiums in the area and a new gymnasium at the Burgess campus was wasteful and unnecessary. They said that the library was a valuable community resource and the new gymnasium would take up library parking and adversely impact the library.

Ms. Joanne Goldberg, Menlo Park, a coach for the Burgess Basketball League, asked that the planning process for the gymnasium be prolonged to address concerns about the location of the gymnasium, traffic and parking. She suggested that the gymnasium

be built on the El Camino Real or that the project, if built at the Burgess campus, be a combined gymnasium, gymnastics center and recreation building. She suggested transportation improvements and said a multilevel parking structure was needed at the Burgess campus.

Mr. Verle Aebi, Menlo Park, wrote that there had been limited analysis of parking lot 6 in the draft EIR and the Response to Comments, and that more analysis was needed as parking lot 6 would at all times be utilized beyond its maximum capacity. Mr. Aebi provided a new method for parking analysis in his email and posed a question of what was a reasonable parking distance.

Planner Fisher said that Ms. Lisa Ekers, Engineering Services Manager, would make a presentation.

Ms. Ekers introduced Mr. Chip Taylor, Transportation Division Manager, and Ms. Shannon Allen, LSA Associates, the environmental consultant. She noted that Community Services Director Barbara George was not able to attend the Planning Commission meeting. She said staff would attempt to answer programming questions in Ms. George's absence.

Ms. Ekers said the project had its roots in the 1998 and 1999 Parks and Recreational Facilities Needs Assessment, which was a citywide assessment. This assessment informed the process in 2001 which resulted in putting the Parks and Recreation bond measure, Measure T, on the ballot, which received 70 percent approval of the Menlo Park citizens who voted. She noted that there were a number of projects initiated between 2001 and 2007. In January 2007 to February 2008, she said the City conducted a number of public input meetings to get information specifically about the needs and wishes of the community for the gymnasium and gymnastics center.

Chair Riggs asked if Measure T included a description of the gymnasium. Ms. Ekers said she would like to hold questions until the end of the presentation. She said however that the Measure T process included a list of many projects.

Ms. Ekers said in April 2007 that the Council prioritized a gymnasium and gymnastics center as the next major Measure T project. She said between 2007 and today, a programming study and conceptual design process occurred during which time Mr. John Arrillaga offered to design and construct the gymnasium and finance all but \$5 million of the construction. She said the Council approved the budget for the environmental review of the project and for limited design work by the City including the architectural documents presented with tonight's staff report. She noted the public outreach included six public participation meetings, three Planning Commission meetings (not counting this June 29 meeting), six City Council meetings, three Parks and Recreation Commission meetings, and two Library Commission Meetings. She said the City published eight notices in the Almanac, conducted direct mailings and emailed over 6500 residents. She said flyers were posted around the City and articles

were posted in City newsletters and in local newspapers. She said a project website was also developed.

Ms. Allen, LSA Associates, the City's environmental consultant, reviewed the CEQA process. She said first the project was defined and the criteria of significance were developed based on the checklist G in the appendix of the CEQA guidelines and the policies and standards. She said the Initial Study was drafted and the Notice of Preparation was circulated. A scoping session was held at the December 15, 2008 Planning Commission to get preliminary insights and thoughts on what information needed to be included in the Draft EIR and what the Commission and public wanted to have specifically studied. She said the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was circulated and comments received from April 9 through May 26 and that a public hearing on the Draft EIR was conducted at the May 4 Planning Commission meeting. She said the Draft EIR was focused on the topic of transportation and parking and included a discussion of alternatives. She said a Response to Comments document was then prepared responding to written comments received during the public comment period and verbal comments on the Draft EIR that were heard at the Planning Commission hearing. She said the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments document together were the Final EIR.

Mr. Chip Taylor, Transportation Division Manager, said he would address parking specifically. He noted that Mr. Mark Spencer, DKS Associates, the consultant that prepared the traffic study, was available to answer questions related to the traffic study. Mr. Taylor said for the parking analysis parking counts were conducted over four days, on Wednesday and Saturday during the summer, and on Wednesday and Saturday during the school year. He said they specifically sought to capture the children's story time program at the library, which takes place on Wednesdays. He said on those four days, a parking count was done every half hour in each parking lot on the Burgess campus. He said for the EIR analysis that the highest level of parking day and time were used to see if there would be a significant impact on the campus because of the proposed project. He said the analysis found that there was not a significant impact. He said however there were concerns about parking impacts. He showed slides of graphs with the number of cars parked during the parking count and the capacity of parking remaining. He noted that parking was less on the weekend day than on the weekday. He said parking lot 6 was the focus of most of the concerns about parking. He said they used the graphs and information about existing parking to determine the number of parking demands generated by the new facilities using the ITE Parking Generation Manual. He said the Manual looked at many sites throughout the country and counted the number of vehicles, the square footage and associated uses and calculated rates for parking demands for particular facilities. He said there was not specifically a rate for a gymnasium so they used the recreation center rate. He noted that such a facility had a higher intensity use than a gymnasium. He said it was a conservative approach to the parking demands expected to be generated by the new facilities. He said a need for 122 parking spaces was determined with 60 of those associated with the gym and 62 with the proposed gymnastics centers.

Mr. Taylor reviewed the parking lots on campus with the Commission. He said an issue of what was an acceptable walking distance was raised. He said the distances shown were actual distances along pathways. He said traveling from the library that it was a walking distance of 125 to 500 feet to parking lot 6. He said lot 1 and lot 2 have capacity throughout the day and both were fairly close to the library. He said lot 3 was a very highly used lot. He said lot 5 has the highest level of available space and the distance was about a quarter of a mile from most uses. He said lot 4 was a smaller lot near the pool and tennis court. He said lots 1 and 2 were not that close to the proposed gymnasium; he said lots 3 and 5 however were a reasonable distance to the gymnasium. He said to address concerns the City would implement a Transportation Demand Management Plan that would focus on providing information to the public on alternative ways to get to the campus such as walking, biking, or using the midday shuttle. He noted that the number of bike racks would be increased to encourage and facilitate biking to the site. He said that parking maps would be developed to help users understand where additional parking was available, noting for instance that lots 1 and 2 were not as visible as other lots and users were not aware of available parking in those lots. He said the parking map would be placed throughout the campus in kiosks, given to league users, and published in the activity guide. He said parking signage improvements would be done. He said staff was in discussions with SRI to potentially use SRI's parking lot for weekend and evening parking overflow. He said there would also be a Parking Management Plan that would analyze parking for two years after the gymnasium was built and occupied that would do additional parking counts throughout the campus and log complaints, if any, to see if there were recurring issues or issues related to specific or special events. He said that information would then be used to better distribute parking. He said for instance that parking for City employees might be designated in less utilized areas. He said time restrictions might also be placed on lot use. He noted that there would be additional handicapped parking in lot 6 as part of the project and that was greater than what was existing or what would be required.

Ms. Ekers showed a graphic of existing parking and how an addition of 13 new parking spacing was possible through the removal of some or all of the landscaped area and moving parking limits up by a couple of feet. She said that would require the removal of four trees in the parking area. She said this was not part of the scope of work when the project budget was presented to Council and approved, but something staff had started looking at since the Council's budget approval.

Ms. Ekers addressed the proposed abandonment of a portion of the Alma Street right-of-way and the entirety of the Mielke Drive right-of-way. She said the existing right-of-way as mapped was 100-feet wide and bisected parking lot 5, the basketball court, the skateboard park, and a portion of the proposed gymnasium. She said the right-of-way abandonment was not deemed necessary during the approval process of the skateboard park and basketball court. She said that the abandonment and reestablishment of the right-of-way was to enable the building permit process for the gymnasium to move forward. She said that Mielke Drive, including the right-of-way,

was closed during the reconfiguration of parking lot 3. She said resolving the right-of-way would enable the City to proceed with this project without having to address future issues related to possible vehicle conflicts with buildings in the right-of-way and to meet the current building requirements in the City. She said that all of the Mielke Drive right-of-way would be abandoned, but a public utility easement would be reserved for existing public utilities. She said the Alma Street right-of-way would be narrowed at one point to 36 feet increasing to 60 feet proceeding down Burgess Drive.

Ms. Ekers said the application also included a request for the removal of up to three heritage trees. She said more recently the consulting arborist had determined that the bottlebrush tree was not a heritage tree. She said the two elm trees were heritage trees, but were in poor health. She said there was a replacement planting plan that would occur after construction of the gymnasium.

Ms. Ekers said the architectural control application consisted of the renderings and floor plan for the conceptual plan approved by the Council. She said the style was similar to other civic buildings. She showed renderings with elevations from the perspective of Alma Street and parking lot 6. She said a change to the plans since the last time the Commission had seen them was the addition of a firewall to separate the existing recreation center from the gymnasium. She said the City's Building Official had indicated there might be smaller alternatives possible to meet this requirement, but this treatment was added by the architect to create the legal separation needed between the two buildings. She said there was also one change to the floor plans and that was to add one additional toilet in the women's locker room to accommodate occupancy of the building.

Ms. Ekers outlined green elements of the proposed building including solar photovoltaic panels, low flow plumbing, clerestory windows for light and ventilation and potentially, energy-saving water heater devices. She said the patio area between the Recreation Center and the proposed gymnasium would be demolished and rebuilt with landscaping to handle the storm water requirements for the project.

Ms. Ekers said that Council would be the deciding body on the proposed project. She said to date the Parks and Recreation Commission had approved the concept; the Council approved the concept and directed staff to proceed with the donor's offer to design and build the new gymnasium; the Planning Commission conducted the EIR scoping session; the public hearing was conducted at the Council for the Notice of Intent to Abandon the Right-of-Way; the next step was the Planning Commission's recommendations to the Council; and the final step was the Council's certification of the EIR, approval of the conditions of approval, architectural control, heritage tree removal, and the right-of-way abandonment applications.

Ms. Ekers said the Commission was being asked this evening to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the findings and conditions of approval related to the EIR and adoption of the Mitigation and Monitoring report prepared for the

project; findings related to heritage tree removal; findings and conditions of approval related to the architectural control; and to adopt a resolution recommending to the City Council abandonment of portions of the public right-of-way along Alma Street and Mielke Drive.

Ms. Ekers returned to the question posed by Chair Riggs as to whether the gymnasium was listed or addressed in the Measure T campaign materials distributed in 2001. She said staff's research indicated that the gymnasium was mentioned. She said they might hear from members of the public who had received Measure T notices or mailers. She said if any of the public still had a copy of those mailers, staff would like to review the information as the City's records did not contain any of the campaign materials that were distributed. She said that the gymnasium was mentioned among many other facilities citywide as one of the financing needs. She said when the Council considered moving forward with the bond proposal that they considered upgrades to the gymnasium, Burgess Park, the Onetta Harris Center, and the Children's Center. She said through a public vetting process that Phase 1 of the Measure T funding was used for improvements to the Onetta Harris and Children's Centers and Burgess Park. She said the gymnasium and gymnastics center were moved to a Phase II of the Measure T projects.

Chair Riggs noted that Commissioner Bressler had arrived near the beginning of Ms. Ekers' comments.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if the project's LEED goal had been downgraded from platinum to silver and whether there was consideration to seek platinum rating. Planner Fisher said that the staff report was incorrect when it stated there was a Platinum LEED rating goal; she said the checklist prepared indicated a Silver LEED rating.

Commissioner O'Malley said with the new facility it appeared that people who normally parked in lots 6 and 4 would at times not be able to park there because of activities at the gymnasium. Mr. Taylor said there was a higher parking demand for lot 6 and that could be challenging sometimes but that difficulty would not occur regularly. Commissioner O'Malley said that staff had some ideas for parking improvements; he suggested making those improvements now rather than waiting for two years of study to elapse. He questioned the mitigation fees noting that it appeared the City would be charging itself; he asked if the \$5 million required of the City included what the City would need to pay in mitigation fees. Ms. Ekers said that it did not. She said the donor's offer was to fund all the design and construction less a \$5 million cost share. She said the remaining costs of the approval processes and staff's time to accomplish that and to set up testing and inspection during the construction phase were being funded through the project budget which was approved by Council in 2009 as \$5.8 million. She said the \$.8 million included \$200,000 for staff time; \$600,000 for various things such as the proposed contribution to traffic improvements, a mitigation listed under the EIR; and for all the fees associated with the planning and building processes.

Commission O'Malley said \$25,000 was indicated for a dedicated northbound turn lane off El Camino Real; he said that was not enough funding to accomplish that improvement. Ms. Taylor said the turn lane would be substantially more than \$25,000. He said the project itself generated a minimal impact to the intersection and other projects in the area would be looked at to share improvement costs at that intersection. He noted with future projects paying into such a fund that it was possible the intersection improvement might be fully funded at some time in the future.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if staff could provide working assumptions for working with the donor's proposal, noting there was a lot of folk knowledge about the proposal. He said he had the 1998 Burgess Master Plan and a 1999 follow up to that plan, and there was a comment in those to limit new buildings to an increase of 10,000 square feet, and asked how the current proposals fit with that.

Ms. Ekers said the document he was referring to was the Cultural and Recreation Master Plan of 1999. She said the document had a specific set of planning goals and goal statements that the Council gave to a steering committee to look into various improvements to facilities, with the hoped for outcomes of building size limit and parking ratio. She said through that process the steering committee elected not to come to any conclusions on the Burgess site in particular. She said they did come to conclusions on other project locations. She said the 1999 document became a guidance document and was reconsidered by the Council in 2002. She said between 1999 and 2002 an additional master plan was developed, through oral discussions, that provided some guiding principles to developing facilities around the Burgess site to supplement the Master Plan. She said both of those items were considered in concept and approved in concept by the Council in 2002 and formed the basis to proceed with a mitigated negative declaration for the skate park, the evolution of parking lot 3, and a number of smaller improvements, including the swimming pool, on the Burgess campus.

Ms. Ekers said the point in time when Mr. Arrillaga offered to construct a gymnasium was during a Parks and Recreation Commission's consideration of a variety of potential gymnasium schemes that had been narrowed down to three preferred schemes. She said the donor ultimately offered to design and construct a gymnasium inclusive of itself. She said the improvements around the gymnasium necessitated by the project such as the sidewalk along Alma Street, the rehabilitation of the landscaped patio area between the existing recreation center and the proposed gymnasium, and installing fire sprinklers in the recreation center to address fire code requirements remained the City's responsibility. She said the donor did offer to construct the gymnasium as he presented it and as shown in the conceptual plans the Commission had seen.

Commissioner Kadvany confirmed that the two full size basketball courts and the associated footprint were the constraint on the donor's offer. Ms. Ekers said the donor's original offer was for a bigger facility and that was scaled down to high school sized courts, so the footprint was scaled down from the donor's original offer.



Commissioner Pagee asked if the sprinkler upgrade for the recreation center was included in the \$5.8 million budget. Ms. Ekers said it was included in the cost estimate and staff estimated the cost for that upgrade as approximately \$150,000.

Commissioner Pagee asked how many square feet the recreation center was. Ms. Ekers said she did not know but could obtain the answer this evening.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if the determined number of parking spaces for the gymnasium and gymnastic centers took into account spectators at sporting events or if it was just based on the people playing the sports. Mr. Taylor said the recreation center use from the ITE Parking Generation Manual that the City used to determine parking need included gymnasiums that would have some level of spectators. He said since the recreation use that was analyzed in the report included many other activities in addition to a gymnasium that it was a much more intense use than just a gymnasium use and that the parking number determined was fairly conservative and captured the sports events associated with the gymnasium.

Commissioner O'Malley noted the showers and changing rooms associated with the proposed gymnasium and asked if those facilities would be open to the public. Ms. Ekers said her understanding was those facilities were available to users of that facility or other City recreational programs which created a need for those facilities, but that staff would be assigned at the lobby entrance of the gymnasium to provide oversight of access to those facilities and actual use.

Commissioner Keith, noting the volume of written correspondence expressing concerns about parking, asked whether underground parking or a multilevel parking structure was being considered. Ms. Ekers said staff had received numerous questions and comments from the Commission and the public expressing the desire for underground parking or a multilevel parking structure. She said the gymnasium project did not contemplate a parking garage either aboveground or underground. She said the cost for such structures equated to \$50,000 to \$70,000 per parking space. She noted that since the EIR did not find a significant impact to parking for this project when the budget was presented to the Council they had not considered a parking structure. She said at some point in the future the City might consider a parking structure on the campus. Commissioner Keith asked whether the cost quoted by Ms. Ekers was for underground parking. Ms. Ekers said that figure was the value staff used to estimate the cost of any parking facility.

Commissioner Bressler asked how much funding Mr. Arrillaga would be providing to accomplish the proposed design. Ms. Ekers said that staff did not have an actual cost estimate from Mr. Arrillaga, but the cost estimates being used for the conceptual designs considered before his offer put the cost of a new gymnasium at \$15 to \$20 million. She said the cost estimate might possibly be higher now because of the change in the size of the building; she noted however that there were construction cost savings on projects currently because of the market. She said if the City were to proceed with the project that the total cost would be \$15 to \$20 million. She said Mr. Arrillaga had

accomplished a number of projects utilizing particular construction companies and architectural firms with whom he has a good working relationship and was able to streamline projects where the City could not. Commissioner Bressler asked why Mr. Arrillaga could streamline projects and do them less expensively. He asked why the City could not do what Mr. Arrillaga does. He said he would really like to understand the actual contribution that would be made by Mr. Arrillaga and he wanted to explore whether underground parking could be done without increasing the City's cost. Ms. Ekers asked if the project architect might address the construction process and how it might differ from the City's process.

Mr. Richard Campbell, Hoover Associates, said that his firm was the designer of the project. Commissioner Bressler asked how much it would cost to build the project as currently designed. Mr. Campbell said the cost estimate provided by Ms. Ekers was a good number. He said his firm had built a number of gymnasiums with Mr. Arrillaga. He said Mr. Arrillaga had provided his company with a lot of work over the past 20 years and that was represented in the cost for the work they provide him. Commissioner Bressler asked if Mr. Campbell could be more specific than the estimate of \$15 to \$20 million for the project. Mr. Campbell said that based on the square footage and cost per square foot he thought the numbers were safe. Commissioner Bressler asked Mr. Campbell if he agreed with a \$50,000 cost estimate per parking stall. Mr. Campbell said they were doing aboveground parking stalls at Bishop Ranch and those were coming in at \$35,000 per stall. He noted however that those were very large parking lots and five-level structures. He said economy of scale also worked into the calculation. He said he thought the \$50,000 was good estimate for aboveground parking stall cost but that underground structures would have a higher cost per parking stall because of waterproofing and other treatments needed. He said if someone would say exactly what the garage would be that he could provide a better cost estimate.

Commissioner Pagee asked in the current economy if there was a public benefit to sole sourcing to one general contractor as opposed to going out to bid for the project. Mr. Campbell said in the current market that they were seeing better pricing, but regarding sole sourcing that Mr. Arrillaga has always gone to Mr. Vance Brown's general contracting firm and gotten very good numbers. He said Mr. Brown would go out to bid for components of the project such as the mechanical and electrical and the project construction was the only sole source related to the general contractor. Commissioner Pagee noted that there were mechanical rooms indicated on the plans and asked what was being planned. Mr. Campbell said there was a flat roof area and the air handling equipment would be placed on the roof on the side away from Alma Street. He said the mechanical rooms were for the condensers and chillers.

Commissioner Keith said people were concerned that lot 6 would not be sufficient to handle the parking for the project and asked if there was a way to orient the entrance to a different lot. Mr. Campbell said they could look at that with staff and there was discussion about a second entrance oriented toward a lot closer to City Hall.

Commissioner Keith said people were asking about high speed rail and potential impact on the project, and asked staff to address. Mr. Taylor said based on the Program Level EIR and the information available that the right-of-way requirement was 85 feet and in the area adjacent to the gymnasium Caltrain would have that area in the current right-of-way. He said based on the information received there would be no impact related to land or the gymnasium. He said Caltrain still needed to do a Project Level EIR to address aesthetics, noise, vibration and other potential impacts.

Commissioner O'Malley said that the City intended to provide two additional ADA spaces more than what was required by law and asked if the City had actually studied those spaces. Mr. Taylor said the City did not have specific data on the use of the handicapped parking spaces. He said staff thought it would be beneficial in the after-study to look at the usage of those spaces as that was one of the mitigations they thought would help parking needs. He said the City did not want to install the handicapped parking spaces at this time, but that additional handicapped parking spaces could be readily made throughout the project itself if necessary.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if City employees were able to park in any lot. Mr. Taylor said there were no restrictions on parking for City employees.

Chair Riggs asked Mr. Taylor to show the graphs for parking lot 6. He said on the week days there seemed to be a peak at 5 p.m. He said Community Services staff confirmed with him that during the school year the gymnasium was booked most of the afternoon with league play in both courts during basketball season from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, and on Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to approximately 6:00 p.m. He said during volleyball season the courts were used three days a week from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. He said league use of the project was fairly significant and asked if the parking analysis had that information. Mr. Taylor said that they had some of that information. He said they heard from the Community Services Division that many of the youth league participants are dropped off and picked up at the site. He said parents may come 10 minutes before the end of practice and park to watch the last part of the practice. He said related to the youth leagues that there were not necessarily a large number of spectators or participants who were using parking for the entire time of the practices or tournaments.

Chair Riggs opened the public hearing and requested that speakers limit their comments to three minutes.

Public Comment: Mr. Verle Aebi, Menlo Park, said he had sent a suggested method for parking analysis in his email. He said he was disappointed with the analysis done by the City. He said he would like someone to address what was considered a reasonable distance to walk to get to a facility. He said over the past week he went to lot 6 and counted the number of cars in the lot. He noted the parking analysis report did not indicate the number of cars parked. He did his count on weeknights when the library was open, around 8 p.m. and counted 75 cars parked. He said that was 65 percent

higher than the City's count from last summer. He said that more study was needed on the usage of lot 6 to really understand if it would be over capacity. He said you could take the data in the report and using a reasonableness metric make a finding that lot 6 would be over-parked most of the time as he thought most people would park the closest to their destination whether it was the gymnasium or library. He said using the analysis in the Final EIR he came up with an over-demand of 8 vehicles for lot 6 for the week. He suggested before-parking studies rather than an after-parking study.

Ms. Elizabeth Lasensky, Menlo Park, said she had additional comments to the written comments she had sent. She said the Library Commission was brought into the discussion late in the process. She said that the Transportation and Bicycle Commissions had not been brought into the discussion and she thought those Commissions should have had some say in the discussion on such things as traffic flow and how bicycles would access the site. She said the report was underplaying how traffic would get in and out of this area.

The next speaker, Ms. Ava Jones, indicated she donated her time to someone else.

Ms. Betty Meissner, Menlo Park, said the library's summer children reading program has 600 children enrolled. She said the library offers entertainment performance programs and at the two most recent events, there were 500 people and 600 people respectively. She said many of those people drove and some had to park further away than lot 6. She said the days were beautiful and those people probably did not mind as it would have been a pleasurable walk. She said as a counterpoint she has considered walking in the dark or in the rain from a more distant parking lot than lot 6 to get to the library, gym or recreation center. She said people come to the park for pleasurable and fun things. She said she did not want people to get discouraged from these pursuits because they were not able to easily and safely get to their destinations on campus. She said whichever gym plan was implemented that she hoped the City would mitigate any detrimental impacts on the traffic and parking and allow the citizens of Menlo Park to use all of the Burgess Park resources without having second thoughts about coming.

Mr. **Tim Goode**, Friend of the Library, said it was clear to him through the process that there was no understanding that the library community's major concern was not the gym but with anything that would interfere with attractiveness of the library. He said the issues had been stated. He said the City had not taken into account that from the very beginning of this project's development the library community and commission were not aware of what was happening. He said with the gym facing the library and the flow to and from it that there would not only be parking problems but congestion problems as well. He said he goes to the gym for gymnastics and for the games played. He said for the games two parents attend and come from work in separate cars to see their children play. He said with grandparents and others there was usually standing room only on both side of the gym. He said traffic flow would be a problem. He said the library supporters in the community were very active and provide 38 percent of the library's

annual budget. He said that community should have had input before the decision was made to build the gymnasium.

Mr. Morris Brown, Menlo Park, said he was looking forward to the construction of a new gymnasium. He said that the library was an entirely different order of priority than a gymnasium, and the library should continue to come first. He said that any impact to the library had to be mitigated. He said a parking structure was the only solution. He said he had heard that street parking was being counted for this project as part of the parking requirement. He said during the Derry Project that his citizen's group had asked the City Attorney whether street parking had ever been counted toward the parking requirement for a project and were told that had never occurred. He said if street parking was being counted toward the parking requirement for this project that it should be removed. He said that there had not been any fiscal impact analysis and noted that Measure T anticipated a gym but not one of this size. He said that for a structure this size there would either need to be more income from users or funding from the City. He said similar to concerns about the pool being used for meets and generating traffic that the gym should not be the tournament center for the whole county.

Mr. Tom McDonough, Menlo Park, asked that staff put up the slide of all the parking lots. He said that there were parking spaces in the area where the Schwab building and the Jeffrey's Burgers were located. He said that Ms. Susan Holmer, the Interim Director of Community Services, had twice suggested during meetings that since the City owned those properties that parking could be made available there. He said that was not in the report and asked if that suggestion could be captured now. He said at night there were 90 to 100 people in the library now and with the additional gym users the parking lot would be really full. He said that there was a 15 percent growth predicted in the school population over the next five years and that was not reflected in programs, traffic or parking. He said as a library commissioner he was very concerned that library patrons would not be able to get to the library easily; he said he was concerned especially for impacts on families and the elderly. He suggested that the parking lot could be changed to 45 degree angled stalls and the medians removed to create more parking spaces. He said the NOP had said there would be significant impact on parking and traffic; he said he did not understand why they were not significant now. He said he would like to see more inclusive dialogue with all of the relevant Commissions.

Ms. Nancy Cox, Menlo Park, said the impact of traffic to the library had to be studied more closely. She said she and her family were frequent users of the gym facilities and when there were meets that lot 3 was overflowing and it was difficult to find parking. She said parents stay for the games and there were huge impacts on parking when there were games. She said the time of year the games were played coincided with the rainy season, which was when the parking at the library was needed the most. She said moving the parking for the gym to lot 6 would impact the library parking and it should be addressed.

Mr. Don Brawner, Menlo Park, said Mr. Frank Carney had contributed his speaking time to him. He provided copies of pages from the EIR to the Commission. He said he thought the EIR and traffic analysis were well done but he thought the findings were shocking. He said he reviewed the EIR and found that the project objectives of the EIR were to better accommodate 1,400 gymnastics participants and hosting of gymnastics meets and that the facility should accommodate 126 youth basketball teams, 54 adult basketball teams, and 56 girl volleyball teams. He asked what accommodations and capacities were available now for these participants and teams and where the groups and individuals were coming from to the City. He asked if Menlo Park was providing sports facilities for Woodside, Portola Valley, Atherton, Palo Alto, and Redwood City. He said one of the problems with the project proposal was that CEQA was shortchanged in the limited focus on traffic, circulation and parking. He said there was no concern indicated about noise and impact before, during and after construction. He said there was no consideration of public services such as power, water and waste as to the choice, quantity and use. He said the proposal was lacking in specificity. He said the gymnastics center had not been finalized at all, yet it was plugged into the environmental review to try to give a better idea of how much the traffic would affect the neighborhood if each of the facilities were about 25,000 square feet each. He said page 45 of the EIR discussed impacts and mitigation measures. He said the project would generate 840 more cars and noted that Willow Road, Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Street, and Alma Street were already at F capacity. He said on page 78 it stated "To reduce all significant unavoidable impacts, development onsite cannot expand beyond replacement of the existing 17,400 square feet gym and gymnastics center." He suggested that the City's best path was to say "no" to an oversized gym on Alma Street and move it to another location to the west such as on Sand Hill Road or El Camino Real.

Chair Riggs closed the public hearing. The Commission recessed at 8:40 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 8:51 p.m.

Commission Comments: Chair Riggs said the library was the community's asset and he did not want any impacts to its use. He said lot 6 was well-used and occasionally at capacity with existing uses. He said the proposed gymnasium would face lot 6 with drop off at lot 6. He asked the architect to address the design process and if they were aware of the relationship between the library and lot 6. Mr. Campbell said they were aware of that relationship and they would be willing to restudy the entrance with the staff. Chair Riggs said that lot 3 was almost as impacted as lot 6. He said dropping off from lot 6 as currently designed would require the vehicle to then proceed through the entire parking lot to exit. He asked about the cost of the skate park. Ms. Ekers said the skate park was constructed in 2004 at a total cost of \$400,000. She said regarding the orientation of the building that when the conceptual designs were being considered by the Parks and Recreation Commission process one of the reasons to have the access to lot 6 was the connectivity to the rest of the uses including the parking lot. She said comments staff received from the public, including from the library commission,

indicated that there was some preference in the community to have the access at the lot 6 location so that users who wanted to use both the library and gym would not have to walk farther around the building to access either one. She said in addition there were some staffing and operating considerations of the Parks and Recreation Division in that they would have to staff the lobby area of the gymnasium separately from the recreation center and from the gymnastics center. She said those considerations led to the current configuration with the only access at the lot 6 location. She said that they were asking for the Commission to recommend conditions of approval and as Mr. Campbell indicated there could certainly be additional analysis of the entry configuration.

Chair Riggs asked if the staffing advantage was the single lobby or facing lot 6. Ms. Ekers said it was related to having a secondary access point available on the eastern end of the building closest to the skate park. She said that would place the entrance more or less behind the skate park or along Alma Street, which staff agreed was not ideal as it was not desirable to generate drop off/pickup parking along Alma Street. Chair Riggs asked if there was existing landscaping between the skate park and the existing fields. Ms. Ekers said that was correct.

Chair Riggs said lot 6 would have about 115 spaces and about 50 more spaces were needed. He asked for an estimate of cost for the City to deck one-half of the parking lot with a ramp. He said he did not think a single-level ramp was as expensive on a per space basis as a multi-level or subterranean structure. He said he had heard that a three-level parking structure cost about \$35,000 to \$40,000 per space; he asked if a single-level deck parking structure could be built for less than that. Mr. Campbell said one thing they had discovered was that in a two-level parking garage in which there was one elevated level that the garage was considered half elevated and when the garage went to three levels it was two-thirds elevated. He said his experience was that the cost was greater per space the greater the number of levels built. Chair Riggs said that a decked lot was not necessarily as expensive as some reference points for cost provided this evening. Mr. Campbell said he would agree.

Commissioner O'Malley said he thought the parking lost about 17 spaces through the proposed project and that would leave 100 spaces. He asked how many spaces were needed in lot 6 to ease the capacity need. He said Chair Riggs came up with 50 spaces and asked how that was derived. Chair Riggs said it was based on comments from the Chair of the Library Commission and the finding in the EIR which found that 127 was the highest parking load, which he divided in half. He thought that the 14 parking spaces along Alma Street would be needed. He said they had to give acknowledgement to the Parking Management Plan and other proposals that staff had made, but speakers were not convinced that those adjustments would make up for the impact and that additional parking should perhaps be addressed now rather than later.

Commissioner Ferrick said that Mr. Taylor had indicated a need of 60 spaces. Mr. Taylor said that was the need for new spaces determined for the gymnasium. Commissioner O'Malley said 17 spaces would be lost in lot 6. Mr. Taylor said that was

correct but there were currently 135 spaces in that lot so the 117 spaces was the lowered number.

Commissioner Pagee said that would be enough parking for now, but questioned future parking needs noting the increase in kindergarten sizes. Chair Riggs said it was a fair assumption that the library would have more patrons in the future and there would be spillover from the gym to the library. He said that he expected that general improvements to the library would be made at some point using some type of measure funds, which would lead to more use. He said a simple deck over part of the parking lot would help to conceivably solve parking with the possibility to cover all of the lot later. He said for a \$5 million project that a \$1.7 million parking garage was not an easy argument but this project was \$15 million to \$10 million. He said the issue was having the Planning Commission expand what the donor thought was the scope, noting that the Commissioners wanted to respect the donor's intention.

Commissioner Bressler said there was room for about 100 parking spaces under the footprint of the gym and estimated that would cost about \$5 million to build. He said he calculated that if the gym construction cost \$15 million that was \$622 per square foot and if it cost \$20 million that was \$935 per square foot. He said he thought the current building cost would be less than even the cost of \$15 million. He said the ideal solution was to put the 100 spaces under the gym which would solve immediate and future parking needs and would be aesthetically pleasing. He noted that construction costs had come down since the project was first proposed.

Commissioner Kadvany said Commissioner Bressler's idea was interesting but noted that an underground parking structure would need another foundation at grade, which would have cost implications. He said he was not sure that parking structures were appropriate to a modest sized City park and campus. He said underground would be preferable but he was not sure the experience of exiting from a dark place to go to the library or a gym was desirable.

Commissioner Pagee said the Response to Comments document misinterpreted her comments and thus did not respond to her comments. She said she had questioned the connectivity from west Menlo Park to the facility for bicyclists and had noted that it was much easier for bicyclists from east Menlo Park to get to the facility. She said coming from the west that a bicyclist would travel Ravenswood Avenue, make a right onto Alma Street, and then wait to make a left into the parking lot. She said that the minutes for the meeting where she made those comments must not have been clear. She said it was also a problem for drivers coming from west Menlo Park to the facility. She said the Response to Comments did not address her comments and concern. She said leaving the facility or library to return to west Menlo Park in the evening was also an issue as there is a restricted right turn from Alma Street onto Ravenswood Avenue in the later afternoon/early evening. She said the other choice was to make a left on Alma Street, left on Burgess Drive, left on Laurel Drive (where drivers leaving the gymnastics center tended to do u-turns) and then a left on Ravenswood Avenue.



Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Taylor said there was an analysis of trip generation and distribution onto Alma Street and Burgess and Laurel Drives. He said there was a restricted right-hand turn from Alma Street to Ravenswood Avenue from 4 to 6 p.m. He said that restriction would be added for peak traffic morning hours as well. He said drivers turn right on Ravenswood Avenue, then left on Laurel Drive, and then left on Oak Grove Avenue to head to west Menlo Park; or drivers may make a left on Alma Street as described by Commissioner Pagee. He said the traffic analysis found there would be significant impacts on Ravenswood Avenue, Alma Street and Burgess and Laurel Drives.

Commissioner Pagee asked about bicyclists. Mr. Taylor said as noted that there was better connectivity from the east for bicyclists as there were more neighborhood streets and lower traffic volumes and some bike lanes. He said bicyclists traveling from west Menlo Park would cross El Camino Real to Ravenswood Avenue, which has bicycle lanes, make a right on Alma Street, and then wait to make a left into the parking lot or walk their bicycle into the campus. He said that there were discussions currently about the creation of a bicycle/pedestrian underpass, which was also in the bicycle development plan. Commissioner Pagee said the bicycle lanes past the railroad tracks on Ravenswood Avenue were not clearly defined as bicycle lanes. She said asking a kid to walk a bike was not going to happen.

Commissioner Pagee said she had asked about repositioning the gym so that the entrance was from the east side and would face the skate park and playing fields. She said the Response to Comments said that there would not be handicapped accessible parking if that entry configuration was used, but she had located handicapped accessible parking next to Alma Street using the architect's drawing. Mr. Campbell said it was possible to reconfigure the entrance. He said that would have to be discussed with staff, noting some of Ms. Ekers' comments about staffing the lobby. He said lot 6 was a very logical entrance to the facility but working with staff they could do some quick studies for a different entrance.

Commissioner Keith said she noticed many meeting and break rooms in the design of the gym. Mr. Campbell said that those were program spaces and were influenced by Mr. Arrillaga. Commissioner Keith asked what the reasoning was for the spaces. Mr. Campbell said his firm had worked on a number of gymnasiums with Mr. Arrillaga such as the one at the Pinewood School and that gym also had those spaces but on a smaller scale. Ms. Ekers said that Mr. Arrillaga's offer came after the City's consultant had prepared numerous conceptual schemes for a gym, which at that point in time had been narrowed down to three preferred schemes. She said the design originally presented to the Planning Commission by Hoover Associates on Mr. Arrillaga's behalf mirrored one of those three preferred schemes. She said it was her understanding that the preferred schemes and concept drawings were shown to Mr. Arrillaga and those were incorporated into the design developed by Hoover Associates. She noted that if the Planning Commission in its decision-making process made any changes to the

building design such as reconfiguring the entrance, adding to the facility, or adding a parking structure that those redesigns would be at the City's cost.

Commissioner Keith said Attachment L indicated that 15 additional parking spaces could be created by removing landscaping, and asked how much parking that would create in total. Ms. Ekers said that would be 128 spaces.

Commissioner Keith asked where the bicycle racks would be and how many of them there would be. Planner Fisher said the latest set of plans, Attachment B-6, showed the racks at the front of the facility. Commissioner Keith noted there were 18 racks shown. She said the Improvement Measures indicated an increased number of bike racks and asked if that would be in addition to the 18 racks shown. Mr. Taylor said that typically there were nine to 10 bike racks and this was in addition to the existing 18 bike racks. He said more bike racks could be installed at other locations including at the gymnastics center. Commissioner Keith said that she thought there should be more bike racks.

Commissioner Keith said staff had indicated they were discussing parking with SRI. Ms. Ekers said that they were continuing those discussions, but had not formalized the terms. She said the discussions involved availability of the SRI parking lot on the weekends and before 8 a.m. or after 6 p.m. during the week. Commissioner Keith asked how many City employees parked on the campus. Ms. Ekers said there was not an exact figure as employees work 24-hour rotation schedules and part-time. She said taking the total number of employees and deducting the number of employees participating in alternative transportation programs that they estimated 150 to 175 employees might be parking on the campus while working.

Commissioner Keith asked what the capacity of the SRI parking lot was and if their parking was full during the day or whether it was possible that some spaces could be used by City employees. Ms. Ekers said she has a view of SRI's parking lot from her office window and knows that their usage had increased over the past year. Mr. Taylor said there were 110 spaces in that lot. Ms. Ekers said they could discuss Commissioner Keith's idea with SRI.

Commissioner Keith said a speaker indicated the City owned property behind Big 5 and Jeffrey's Burgers, and asked if parking was a possibility at that location. Ms. Ekers said the City was the property owner of the Cornerstone parcel but the property was leased and the lessee needed to provide parking for the tenants. Commissioner Keith asked when the lease would expire. Mr. Taylor said he thought it was 2029. Commissioner Keith asked if the City had discussed with the lessee parking arrangements similar to those with SRI. Ms. Ekers said that staff had not but they could discuss to see if there was any interest.

Commissioner Keith said one of the speakers indicated that by angling parking at 45 degrees there could be more parking spaces. Ms. Ekers said staff had done a quick analysis and if the lot was restriped at a 45 degree angle as it was currently configured

that spaces would be lost. She said if the lot were completely reconfigured and redesigned with all medians, landscaping and trees removed, the parking could be increased as the aisles could be narrowed. She said staff had recently completed a conceptual design for Parking Plaza II and had looked at different parking alignments. She said 45-degree angled spaces were not necessarily ideal and that they found 60-75-degree angle spaces were more accommodating and usable with narrow aisles. She said she did not know exactly how many spaces or what the cost would be to reconfigure the lot. Commissioner Keith asked if just the medians would need to be removed. Ms. Ekers said that they would look at the lot with everything removed to see how many spaces would fit and then how many spaces would be lost if heritage trees and other improvements were preserved.

Chair Riggs said that a City lot was recently reconfigured from angled parking to perpendicular parking to gain spaces. He said if aisles cannot be narrowed sufficiently to add an additional row of parking that there was no gain. Mr. Taylor said that just angling spaces would not create a gain. He said as Ms. Ekers noted that they would have to look at redoing the lot, take out landscaping and try to preserve trees to see what the gain would be. He said loss of landscape raised other issues such as impacts of impervious surfaces, runoff and impacts to the storm water system. Chair Riggs said there were presently five rows of parking and if it were possible to add another row that would only be a 20 percent increase in parking with a maximum of 21 additional spaces and the removal of all of the trees.

Commissioner O'Malley said he estimated that 20 of the City employees park in lot 6 and he had noted five to six City vehicles that were parked in lot 6. He said parking the City vehicles elsewhere and not allowing City employees to park in that lot would increase parking capacity. He said that additionally reconfiguration might increase the number of spaces. He said that more evaluation was needed to provide parking for library patrons in lot 6.

Commissioner Ferrick said she recalled that the gymnasium rose to the top of the Measure T priority list after the playing fields were built. Ms. Ekers said that the gym was prioritized as part of the process to determine the Phase II Measure T project's list. Commissioner Ferrick said school population was increasing and there were more youth coming into the community and she thought it was a great combination to have both a physical fitness facility and a literacy facility. She said it appeared that if as proposed by staff 12 parking spaces were added to what were now landscaped areas and employee parking was moved to a different lot that there would be an acceptable level of parking at peak times in lot 6. Mr. Taylor said there were city vehicles that could be easily moved to other lots, employees could park elsewhere, and the 12 spaces could be added, all of which could be implemented pretty quickly. Commissioner Ferrick said parking in lot 6 increased from 2 to 3:30 p.m. with an increase to almost 100 vehicles at 4 p.m., which seemed to coincide with youth programs at the library. She said she thought that it would be the basketball players for whom parking might be

an issue as they tended to come later in the afternoon. Mr. Taylor said that was an accurate way to portray the parking scenario in lot 6.

Commissioner Pagee said the existing gym was depressed into its site to lessen the impact of the building and asked why this building had to be 50 feet high and what the height of City Hall was. Ms. Ekers said in response to an earlier question of Commissioner Pagee's that the recreation center was 15,170 square feet. She asked Mr. Campbell to address the question of height. Mr. Campbell said he did not know the height of the existing City Hall. He said the height of the building was determined by the requirement to have 26 feet of clearance above all portions of a basketball court and the four and 12 roof slope that matched other roof slopes on campus. He said that depressing the building into the ground would raise issues of handicapped access and waterproofing problems, none of which were insurmountable problems but were fairly good reasons to not depress the building. Commissioner Pagee said to meet the 26-foot clear requirement that the building could be 30 feet high. Mr. Campbell said that was correct if the building had a flat roof. Commissioner Pagee confirmed with Mr. Campbell that solar panels could be used on a flat roof.

Commissioner Pagee said the Planning Commission was brought into a project already designed and was not able to make any changes because it would have to go through this process again. She questioned what the Commission's role was than other to comment on parking.

Ms. Ekers said if she implied that the Planning Commission was not able to make changes to the conditions of approval she regretted that implication. She said she wanted it to be clear to the Planning Commission that any changes to the design would be at the City's cost. She said related to depressing the building into the ground that there were constraints related to the depth of the main sanitary sewer line in Alma Street and slope of the sewer laterals from the new building to that main. She said if they were to depress the building it would probably be necessary to construct a new main sewer in Alma Street for West Bay Sanitary District. Commissioner Pagee said that if an underground parking structure were built that would also impact sewer lines. Ms. Ekers said the building site was clear of sewer lines and an underground parking structure would not need sewer lines. She said there were also issues with an underground parking structure related to the foundation of the existing recreation center.

Commissioner Pagee commented that there should have been study sessions on the project so the Commission and public could have provided input to be considered in the design of the facility rather than waiting until after the design was done for that input.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the role of the parking analysis in the EIR. He said there was a significant impact on the parking but the EIR said there was no significant impact. He said they were discussing mitigation now which could have found its way into the EIR but it had not. He said there were many possibilities related to parking management. Ms. Ekers said the process that staff conducted and brought to the

Commission was strictly regulated under CEQA and the questions required to answer were in the Initial Study. She said those were answered from the data collected and best professional judgment and the project was looked at as a development for which the finding was no significant impact on parking. She said the EIR looked at the overall available parking of the campus and trip generation. She said the City does not have a trigger for a level of significance for parking. She said there was a perceived future inconvenience for parking but that was outside the analysis of CEQA. She said that the potential for parking inconvenience was important to the City, which was why staff had developed a Parking Management Plan. She said that they should not design to the maximum possible parking usage but should design with an understanding of peak parking periods. She said staff has considered that increased coordination or at the least communication between the library and the Community Services Division was needed related to the scheduling of events.

Commissioner Kadvany said it was staff's choice to count overall parking but not the public's view. He said that choice was not forced onto the City by CEQA. He said in the December meeting the concern about parking evaluation was raised. He said this was an example of dysfunctional civic process as the needs and desires of the public were not being recognized. He said he did not agree with the analysis and would have a problem recommending certification of the Final EIR.

Ms. Allen said that frequently she received comments that CEQA is an imperfect tool for the analysis of projects or taking in all of the public's comments. She said CEQA was very rigid and that the criterion of significance for many issue topics were black and white while for some others they were subjective. She said her firm meets CEQA demands and requirements and tries to respond to comments that are on the edge of CEQA. She said agencies have a wide range of perspectives on parking priorities and whether the demands of a project could be met.

Commissioner Kadvany said he disagreed with Ms. Ekers' characterization of the public's view of parking as perceived. He said that it was the public's estimation of parking need, was based on their experience and intuition, and was probably a very good assessment. He said he was waiting for acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the public's parking concerns.

Chair Riggs said CEQA and the EIR require projects to pass some basic tests. He said in his opinion the EIR showed the project passed the test and made some qualifications related to traffic. He said the EIR looked at parking campus-wide but the community had a higher standard for parking than the EIR.

Commissioner Kadvany said the Parking Management Plan could work but asked why there was not more detail and some near worst case analysis, more rigorous analysis to show feasibility. He said for example that other drop off points might be built in other locations to reduce impacts on lot 6. Commissioner Pagee asked if he was looking for more studies related to the programming at the gym and the number of users.

Commissioner Kadvany said he thought there was a reticence to state numbers, but it was essential to prioritize elements of the Parking Management Plan as he would not want lot 6 torn up to be reconfigured. Commissioner Ferrick said she thought she had heard in the staff presentation that the study had looked at programming and youth participation. Chair Riggs said that staff used a national rate for parking ratio and agreed with others that having staff from Parks and Recreation available this evening to provide information on programming and attendance would have been helpful for the Commission.

Commissioner Bressler said there was a comment in the EIR about traveling up Laurel Drive and turning left onto Ravenswood Avenue. He said that was a very dangerous intersection and needed a dedicated left hand turn signal. He said there were circulation issues at Middlefield Road and Ravenswood Avenue that needed to be solved for people wanting to turn left onto Ravenswood Avenue. He said because it was a long wait to take that action, people continued on Willow Road to get to the campus, which was not desirable. He said it was not unreasonable to request underground parking for a facility that would generate more parking and that a second level on parking lot 6 would result in the removal of trees. He said part of the Commission's recommendation to the Council should include resolution of these issues.

Commission Kadvany said that there was a condition related to the donor's offer in the Statement of Overriding Considerations which he did not think was a valid condition.

Chair Riggs asked the architect if the Commission wanted to approve the architecture this evening whether they could so with the building flipped to face the east and the entry oriented to lot 5. Mr. Campbell said the decision to flip the building would have to come from the staff or the donor. Chair Riggs said that it would ultimately be the Council's decision particularly if it would cost the City. Mr. Campbell said it was possible but the ability to have a drop off close to the building would be lost. Chair Riggs said that changes to the skate park and the related cost of those were favorable, considering the entire skate park project had cost \$400,000 as compared to \$1.7 million for decking half of lot 6 or \$5 million for underground parking for 100 spaces.

Commissioner Ferrick said if the building was flipped that there would be an unsafe drop off from Alma Street. She asked where the drop off would be located. Chair Riggs said part of the skate park could be removed to create a turnaround. Commissioner Ferrick said she thought that at least half of the skate park would have to be removed to do that because of the outdoor basketball court. Chair Riggs said that the location of the facility as proposed was ideal except for the parking. Commissioner Ferrick said she thought the public would really question the City flipping the building around away from a parking lot.

Commissioner Keith said she had requested functional windows on the east elevation of the building and asked if those were shown on the plans. Mr. Campbell said he was not sure as the designer was not present this evening; he said there could be windows on

the east elevation. He said there were operable clerestory windows and a monitor on the roof. Planner Fisher said looking at the December and May materials that there were two windows on the east elevation between the roof lines, but she did not know whether those would be operable because they were so high. Chair Riggs said that the design was not at a working level yet and he thought the Commission could insist on natural ventilation.

Commissioner Keith asked if staff had the numbers for the SRI parking lot. Mr. Taylor said staff has information on the utilization of the lot but not with them this evening.

Chair Riggs requested that the Commission consider a motion on the Final EIR certification, numbered 1 on the recommendation.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to make the findings for certification of the Final EIR. Chair Riggs seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bressler said he would like to include the two mitigations he mentioned for a dedicated left hand turn signal from Laurel Drive onto Ravenswood Avenue and improvement of the circulation from Middlefield Road onto Ravenswood Avenue. Planner Fisher said that Commissioner Bressler's recommendations would be better included as conditions of approval for the project and not as part of the EIR. Ms. Allen agreed.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if the Commission were to finesse the Transportation and Parking Management plan whether that would go into the EIR. Ms. Allen said the Plan was strategically categorized as an improvement measure and did not change the language of EIR as there were no findings of significant impacts on parking. She said the Plan was placed in the Mitigation and Monitoring Report Program (MMRP) table as a check for the agency to see that those measures were implemented. Commissioner Kadvany asked about recommendations to the MMRP. Ms. Allen said she has not had Commissions expand the program with improvement measures but it was staff's decision. Planner Fisher said it would be better to have recommendations related to the Plan placed in the conditions of approval, in paragraph 7 of the recommended conditions of approval, which were the project-specific conditions of approval.

Chair Riggs said he thought the motion on the table could include both items 1 and 2 of the recommendation. Commissioner Bressler said he could not support the motion if it included both items as that would make a statement that the project was worth doing without any traffic mitigations. Ms. Allen said the certification of the EIR looked at whether the document complied with CEQA. She said the second question was whether the City could make the statement that there were unavoidable impacts for which there were overriding considerations of benefit for the City. Commissioner Ferrick said her motion only included making the findings for the certification of the EIR.

Chair Riggs asked if the Statement of Overriding Considerations should be moved to architectural control. Ms. Allen said the Commission could certify the EIR and consider the Statement separately. Planner Fisher said that the Statement should not be moved to architectural control.

Commissioner Kadvany said it was easy to satisfy CEQA requirements but that was not sufficient for any project. He said at a minimum the Commission should state that although the EIR met the requirements CEQA that the Mitigation and Monitoring Report Program does not meet the needs of mitigation for parking. Chair Riggs said they could certify the EIR and provide higher standards of mitigation to be required by the City than required by the EIR. Commissioner Kadvany said he could not support the EIR as a document of record.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Riggs to adopt the findings for Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.

1. Adopt the Findings for Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.

Motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Kadvany opposed.

Planner Chow, recognized by the Chair, noted the time was 10:30 p.m. and suggested if the Commission wanted to take a vote to exceed the 11:30 p.m. timeframe that it was the appropriate time to do so.

It was a majority consensus of the Commission to extend the meeting past 11:30 p.m.

Chair Riggs suggested the Commission consider items that could be quickly dealt with such as the abandonment. Planner Fisher said the language for the adoption of a resolution relating to the abandonment was not written correctly in the staff recommendation section and should read: "Adopt a Resolution stating that the Planning Commission has determined that the said public right-of-way abandonment of Mielke Drive and a portion of Alma Street are consistent with the General Plan."

Commissioner Pagee asked why the abandonment was not done at the time of the remodel of the skate park. Community Development Services Director Heineck said that it was not deemed necessary for that project, but it was required for the construction of certain structures.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/O'Malley to adopt a Resolution stating that the Planning Commission has determined that the said public right-of-way abandonment of Mielke Drive and a portion of Alma Street are consistent with the General Plan."



3. Adopt a Resolution stating that the Planning Commission has Determined that the said public right-of-way abandonment of Mielke Drive and a portion of Alma Street is consistent with the General Plan

Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Keith noted a typographical error in the second “whereas” of the resolution.

Chair Riggs said he had reviewed the request for approval of the Heritage Tree Removal listed as item 4 in the recommendation and could make the findings.

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

4. Adopt findings, as per Chapter 13.24 of the Municipal Code regarding Heritage tree removal and approve the Heritage Tree Removal permit:
  - a. The trees proposed for removal conflict with the proposed construction.
  - b. The proposed landscaping plan includes trees that range in size and variety. The heritage trees would be replaced at a two-to-one ratio.

Motion carried 7-0.

Chair Riggs asked if the MMRP was the fine tuning of the specifics of the TDM monitoring and reporting. Planner Fisher said the MMRP took all of the mitigation measures resulting from the Initial Study and EIR and included them. Chair Riggs asked if this was the appropriate place to include the suggestions related to traffic improvements as suggested by Commissioner Bressler. Planner Fisher said that those would be best added to the architectural control. Commissioner Bressler said that he was not sure what the recommendation for traffic improvements had to do with the architectural control. He said the Statement of Overriding Considerations should include these traffic mitigations.

Chair Riggs said the traffic study studied the flows through the two intersections noted by Commissioner Bressler. Mr. Taylor said both intersections were analyzed and were included in the EIR with information regarding traffic volumes and impacts. Commissioner Bressler said in the MMRP that they would get corroboration of those estimates. Mr. Taylor said that was not part of the MMRP to monitor those two intersections but to monitor mitigations included in the report. He said there were no specific mitigations for those two intersections other than traffic impact fees and the TDM. Commissioner Bressler said that the traffic improvements should be in a section

of the MMRP as that would tie them to monitoring. Chair Riggs said this project was not sufficient to take the actions Commissioner Bressler was requesting as the modifications of those intersections would not be done rather that contributions were being made to a traffic impact fund. He said the Commission might make a separate recommendation to Council to not just accept \$20,000 but to commit to improving those intersections.

Ms. Heineck said mitigations were contained within the MMRP specifically linked to the EIR directly. She said that the project had conditions of architectural control approval to which additions might be made, or the Commission might make additional recommendations to Council such as to accomplish longer term roadway improvements. Commissioner Bressler said his hope was for these intersections to be improved and this project would only make the traffic situations worse. Chair Riggs said he would support making a separate recommendation to Council or if the majority desired to add to the conditions under 7 in the recommendation. Ms. Heineck said it would probably be more appropriate to stand as a separate recommendation.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification of the turn lane at Laurel Drive onto Ravenswood Avenue. Commissioner Bressler said that a left-turn signal was needed for safety and circulation. Mr. Taylor asked about the intersection at Ravenswood Avenue and Middlefield Road. Commissioner Bressler said the traffic signal configuration at Middlefield Road through Ringwood Avenue intersection to the left hand turn at Ravenswood Avenue were timed poorly creating a wait which discouraged travelers to use that route. He said people instead would travel on Willow Road across Middlefield Road and cut off through the residential streets, which was not preferred.

Chair Riggs asked the Commission to consider item 2 of staff's recommendations related to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Commissioner Kadvany asked if that would include the Traffic Management Plan. Chair Riggs indicated it would. Commissioner Kadvany said he thought it should include more about the library impacts.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program with modifications to restrict City employees from parking at lot 6 except for light duty at the library and gym and the requirement of coordination and communication between the library and gym programming staff. Ms. Heineck said the modifications proposed would be more appropriate under the architectural control conditions of approval. Motion died for the lack of a second.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Commissioner Bressler seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Bressler to adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

2. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the project (Attachment D).

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Kadvany abstaining.

Commissioner Kadvany noted that there was nothing in the MMRP that would come back to the Planning Commission.

Chair Riggs suggested that the Commission begin discussion of the architectural control. He said he had raised the idea with the architect to change the entry to the other side and that it was feasible but with details that would have to be worked out and that change would still allow the Planning Commission's recommendation to move on to the City Council.

Commissioner O'Malley said that flipping the building would not solve the parking problems. Chair Riggs said if the front door of the gym and the front door of the library were on a single 115 space lot as proposed that there would be conflicts in parking. He said flipping the building would encourage gym users to use lots 3 and 5. Commissioner O'Malley said that those users might then leave those lots and park in lot 6. He said flipping the building might help but would not solve the parking problems. Commissioner Keith said she was not interested in the idea of flipping the building. She said the architect had indicated they could look at a second entrance. Commissioner Kadvany said he would prefer to see a Traffic and Parking Management Plan that worked rather than flipping the building. Commissioner Ferrick said she agreed.

Chair Riggs said that an option was to put a parking deck on lot 6. Commissioner Ferrick said she did not think the studies supported that option right now. She said adding the 12 spaces was more feasible and that left the potential in the future to try for a parking deck.

Commissioner Bressler said that parking needed to be dealt with and raised the possibility of underground parking. Chair Riggs said that was estimated to be a \$5 million project and this would look to the future growth of the gym, library, and recreation center. Commissioner Kadvany said the Commission would be recommending for the City to do a study on the feasibility of this project addition and questioned how much that would cost. Chair Riggs said the plan and design would cost at least tens of thousands of dollars. He said the City would have to pay the cost of construction. Commissioner Kadvany said there might be other design changes desired and suggested listing them all and then looking at what the Commission most wanted to propose.

Chair Riggs asked if there was support to investigate underground parking.

Commissioner O'Malley said two important points would be to prohibit employee parking in lot 6 immediately and prohibit the parking of city vehicles in that lot. He said if

they were going to recommend investigation of underground parking that they also recommend flipping the building and removing the skate park for parking. He said that another location for the skate park would have to be found. He said that could be accomplished for \$500,000 as opposed to \$5 million. He said underground parking would be great as it would support growth in the City but he suggested the building design flip as another possibility. Chair Riggs asked if the Commission wanted to accept the design of the building with site planning to be reviewed with a condition regarding employee parking and city vehicle parking, a condition for the 14 additional parking remodel and a recommendation to Council to investigate the two parking possibilities. Commissioner Kadvany said suggesting to remove the skate park would cause backlash from the community. Chair Riggs said they suggested relocating the skate park rather than taking it away. Commissioner Kadvany said he did not think it was right for the Commission to tell the City employees where they might park. He suggested packaging ideas regarding parking improvements for the Council's consideration. Commissioner Ferrick said that they wanted to spread the parking over the campus as it was shown that the campus parking would support both of the facilities but not just all in lot 6. Commissioner Kadvany said that the management of where employees parked should be left up to the City. Chair Riggs said it was a recommended option in the Parking Management Plan. Chair Riggs asked about the idea to investigate underground parking. Commissioner Bressler said that was acceptable to him but he did not think they should recommend removing the skate park. Chair Riggs said the recommendation was to relocate the skate park. Commissioner O'Malley said these were just suggestions. Chair Riggs asked if the building was sited as proposed with the addition of parking at the skate park whether that would help. Mr. Taylor said in that case parking would be in close proximity to the gym, but it would be a challenge to find a place to relocate the skate park.

Commissioner Keith recommended looking at SRI for parking for employees. Ms. Ekers said that could be investigated. Chair Riggs asked about parking located at the back of the administration building and whether parking could be rearranged to get two lots. Mr. Taylor said the lot was secured and he would have to look at the space to see if there was increased potential for two lots. Commissioner Bressler said even if there was possible parking in that space it would not be in close proximity to the gym. Mr. Taylor said the secured lot was slightly underground. Commissioner Pagee said if it was possible to relocate the skate park that it would help if the entry was changed on the gym. She questioned the need for the outside basketball half court. Commissioner Kadvany suggested looking at potential cutouts around the campus for drop offs. Mr. Taylor said there was a drop off area in lot 3 near the recreation center and that people might choose to use that area for the gym as it had easy access and drop off. Mr. Kadvany said it would be preferable to keep drop offs outside the campus. Commissioner Pagee said parents would want to see their children enter buildings after being dropped off, particularly with younger children. Commissioner Ferrick suggested a second corner entrance for participants and to have a roving shuttle van around campus when there were multiple larger type activities. Mr. Taylor noted that the City has a mid-day shuttle around town and indicated a shuttle for the campus could be

investigated. He noted that some options would not be up to staff if budget was needed as that would be a Council decision.

Commissioner Keith said that mitigation measures for parking were listed in D5 related to a parking management plan and removal of landscape spaces to provide parking. She said those measures could be implemented immediately. She asked what the statement meant that as part of architectural control review, staff shall further analyze the parking. Mr. Taylor said that there would be additional parking counts after construction and occupancy and that a log complaint would be kept. Commissioner Keith said those items were already included in the Parking Management Plan. Mr. Taylor said that might be a redundant sentence. Chair Riggs pointed out that the gymnastics center was included in the EIR and was also under the mitigation measures.

Chair Riggs suggested requiring that public events and tournaments not be held during library peak times until new parking was constructed. Commissioner Bressler said that was too restrictive. Chair Riggs suggested applying some restrictions to protect library parking during such events, some type of system to reserve spaces close to the library to serve the elderly and people with small children. Commissioner Kadvany said it would be easy to define high activity scenarios based upon current usage of library, the gym, gymnastics and recreation centers. He said it appeared that if the building went forward that there would be times when library patrons would not be able to park. Commissioner O'Malley said the Commission had an obligation to respond to people's concerns about library parking. He said they should make suggestions to get the 50 or 60 parking spaces needed and he had no problem recommending that City employees park somewhere other than in lot 6. Commissioner Keith moved to require the mitigations be implemented immediately rather than after construction because the library was important to the community. She said those recommended improvements were designated staff parking, designated library parking, parking time restrictions, coordination of events around campus and removal of landscaping to create additional parking. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion.

Planner Fisher said those improvements were listed on page 18 of the staff report under condition 7.n and suggested reworking that language. Commissioner Keith said the condition should read "Prior to occupancy of the gymnasium improvements should be made." She said those improvements were listed. Planner Fisher confirmed that the language would keep the actions of parking counts and a complaint log with occupancy. Commissioner Kadvany asked if they knew what the landscaping removal would be. Planner Fisher said it was shown in attachment L.1. Commissioner Kadvany said he saw a benefit in having the flexibility to make changes only if they were necessitated. Chair Riggs said that the testimony the Commission heard this evening clearly indicated the necessity of addressing the issue. Commissioner Kadvany said that this would be a hardscape change and he hoped people would like it after it was done.

Commissioner Bressler said he would like underground parking included. Chair Riggs suggested that be a separate recommendation.

Chair Riggs noted for architectural control review that the City conducted a needs assessment through the Parks and Recreation Commission and a gym was a priority of that process. He said the Parks and Recreation Commission had considered the preferred siting of the gym, and the Council had looked at alternative sites and methods of delivering this building. He said in his point of view the architecture fit the site and was an attractive building. He said the scale was appropriate for Alma Street, the eaves were relatively low, and that the height of the building had minimum impact because of where it would be located, facing Alma Street. He said that other Commissioners had requested a design emphasis on natural ventilation and a friendly environment for bicycle users. Commissioner Keith said she had requested windows on the east elevation. Chair Riggs noted that there were two windows between the roof lines. Commissioner Keith said that she would want those windows to be operable. She said she had also suggested an additional entrance. Chair Riggs suggested making that a recommendation; Commissioner Keith concurred.

Planner Fisher asked if the emphasis on natural ventilation and friendly bike environment would be part of the architectural control or separate recommendations. Chair Riggs asked the Commission whether these elements should be conditions or recommendations. Commissioner Kadvany said he would like the building to have the greatest energy efficiency possible. Chair Riggs said that the project would have a Silver LEED rating. Commissioner Pagee said that rating did not mean the building was necessarily as energy efficient as it might be and noted that on the checklist it only received two points for energy efficiency out of a possible 10 points. Commissioner Kadvany said the greatest environmental impact from the facility would be the long-term energy consumption; he said the City had an opportunity with this new building to do significant energy-efficiency design. Commissioner Pagee said she would like to recommend that Platinum LEED rating be the goal of the project. Commissioner Kadvany observed that the building would basically be a big box and would need significant air conditioning despite operable windows. Chair Riggs suggested making energy-efficiency a recommendation.

Commissioner Kadvany said the scale of the building was large relative to the park and surrounding buildings. He said that a letter from an architect expressed concern that the building would appear overwhelming when built. He said too that it was not clear what the visual impact of the firewall would be. He said the building was massive with too many planes that lacked detail or articulation. Commissioner Pagee agreed with Commissioner Kadvany on the massiveness of the building on the campus; she said the peak would be 50 feet high and the side walls were 19 feet. She said she would prefer a building that was not so tall. She said this building only replicated other buildings on the campus and she thought the City was missing the opportunity to build something nicer than the existing buildings on the campus.

Commissioner Keith said there were very small windows on the front right elevation facing Alma Street. She said she would like to see more windows and for all the windows to be operable.

Commissioner O'Malley said he had no issues with the architecture of the proposed building. He noted that it would face a railroad and was not impacting residential views.

Commissioner Ferrick said she had stated previously and concurred with others that the building would replicate existing architecture on the campus but would not advance the architectural appearance of the campus.

Chair Riggs confirmed with Commissioner Keith, the maker of the motion, and Commissioner Ferrick, the maker of the second that their motion was the approval of item 5 related to architectural control with the modification previously stated. He asked if there were any other changes to the motion. Commissioner Ferrick noted that the parking improvements as modified were under item 7. Chair Riggs clarified that the motion would be on items 5, 6 and 7 with a modification to 7. Commissioner O'Malley said that item 5 indicated adequate parking. Commissioner Ferrick said with the modification to 7.n that the statement in 5.d would be accurate. Chair Riggs suggested a cross reference in item 5.d to 7.n. Planner Fisher said that language was not necessary in item 5, which was making findings, because of the language in 7.n. The Commission concurred after a short discussion.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Ferrick to make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval and approve the architectural control subject to the standard and project specific conditions of approval with modification.

5. Make 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.
6. Approve the architectural control and environmental review subject to the following **standard** conditions:

- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Hoover Associates, consisting of 15 plan sheets, dated received June 23, 2009, and recommended by the Planning Commission on June 29, 2009, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, Allied Waste, 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. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall also submit a heritage tree preservation report and plan from the project arborist, detailing the location of and methods for all tree protection measures. The project arborist shall submit a letter to the Building Division confirming adequate installation of the tree protection measures prior to construction commencing. The applicant shall retain an arborist throughout the term of the project, and the project arborist shall submit monthly inspection reports to the Building Division. The heritage tree preservation report and plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.
- e. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a plan for 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) tree protection fencing, and 3) construction vehicle parking and staging. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building Division prior to building permit issuance. The construction safety and tree protection fences shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing construction.
- f. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a truck route plan and permit to be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Manager. The truck route plan and permit shall be approved prior to building permit issuance.



- g. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. Utilities shall be placed underground. 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, dimensions, and colors of all meters, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes. The utility plans shall also show backflow and Double Check Detector Assembly (DCDA) devices. The utility plan shall be approved by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions prior to building permit issuance.
  - h. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall enter into and record a "Stormwater Treatment Measures Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement" subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. With the executed agreement, the property owner is responsible for the operation and maintenance of stormwater treatment measures for the project. The agreement shall run with the land and shall be recorded by the applicant with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office.
  - i. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit, based upon the improvement plans, for work within the public right-of-way. Additional requirements, such as insurance, licensing, and preparation of detailed traffic control plans shall apply and be submitted at the time of the encroachment permit application.
  - j. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a detailed landscape and irrigation plan demonstrating compliance with Chapter 12.44 (Water-Efficient Landscaping) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. The comprehensive landscape plan shall contain information regarding the size, species, location, and quantity of trees, shrubs, and plants, along with plant materials for the vegetated swale. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The landscaping shall be installed prior to final inspection of the building.
7. Approve the architectural control and environmental review subject to The following **project-specific** conditions:

- a. Prior to building permit issuance, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program shall be prepared. The TDM program shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Transportation Divisions and shall be implemented prior to occupancy. (MM TRANS 1-a)
- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) that is based on the type and size of the proposed land uses and the existing land uses to be replaced. Based on the current rates, the fee would be approximately \$51,520. (MM TRANS 1-b)
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the project applicant shall pay a fee as a contribution toward future improvements to the intersection of El Camino Real and Ravenswood in the amount of \$20,000. If after five years from the date of project approval the City has determined not to construct improvements at the intersection or an encroachment permit has not been issued by Caltrans, the contribution of \$20,000 can be used for other transportation improvements in the City. (MM TRANS 1-c)
- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the project applicant shall pay a fee as a contribution toward adaptive signal timing improvements to the Middlefield corridor in the amount of \$20,000. If after five years from the date of project approval the adaptive signal timing project has not moved forward, the contribution of \$20,000 can be used for other transportation improvements in the City. (MM TRANS 3-c)
- e. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit submittal, the applicant shall provide a dust control plan that is consistent with guidance from the BAAQMD and shows that the following controls shall be implemented at the construction site. The dust control plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Building Division prior to building permit issuance.
  - Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods; active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers to control dust;
  - Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;
  - Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites;

- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; water sweepers shall vacuum up excess water to avoid runoff-related impacts to water quality;
  - Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;
  - Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas;
  - Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
  - Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
  - Install erosion control measures per the approved erosion and sediment control plan to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
  - Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible;
  - On-site idling of construction equipment shall be minimized as much as feasible (no more than 5 minutes maximum);
  - All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and fitted with manufacturer's standard level exhaust controls;
  - Contractors shall consider using alternative powered construction equipment (i.e., hybrid, compressed natural gas, biodiesel, electric) when feasible;
  - Contractors shall use add-on control devices such as diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters when feasible; and
  - All contractors shall use equipment that meets California Air Resources Board's (ARB) most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines. (MM AIR-1)
- f. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, a design-level geotechnical investigation shall be prepared and submitted to the Building Division for review and confirmation that the proposed development fully complies with the California Building Code. The report shall determine the project site's surface geotechnical conditions and address potential seismic hazards such as liquefaction and subsidence. The report shall identify building techniques appropriate to minimize seismic damage, and shall be approved by the Building Division prior to building permit issuance. In addition, the following requirement for the geotechnical and soils report shall be achieved:

- The analysis presented in the geotechnical report shall conform to the California Division of Mines and Geology recommendations presented in the Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California. All mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report shall be implemented as a condition of project approval.
  - In locations underlain by expansive soils and/or non-engineered fill, the designers of proposed building foundations and improvements (including sidewalks, roads, driveways, parking areas, and utilities) shall consider these conditions and design the project to prevent associated damage. The design-level geotechnical investigation shall include measures to ensure that potential damage related to expansive soils and non-uniformly compacted fill is minimized. All mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report shall be implemented. (MM GEO-1 and GEO-2)
- g. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality through the construction period of the project. The SWPPP shall be maintained on-site and made available to Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) staff upon request. The SWPPP shall include specific and detailed Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to mitigate construction-related pollutants. To educate on-site personnel and maintain awareness of the importance of storm water quality protection, site supervisors shall conduct regular tailgate meetings to discuss pollution prevention. The frequency of the meetings and required personnel attendance list shall be specified in the SWPPP.

Additionally, the SWPPP shall specify a monitoring program to be implemented by the construction site supervisor, and shall include both dry and wet weather inspections. In accordance with State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 2001-046, monitoring shall be required during the construction period for pollutants that may be present in the runoff that are "not visually detectable in runoff." The applicant shall conduct weekly inspections and provide written monthly reports for City permit files to ensure compliance with the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions prior to building permit issuance. Additionally, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board prior to building permit issuance. (MM HYD-1a)

- h. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall prepare a grading and drainage plan that fully complies with the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP), which maintains compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Discharge Permit. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be prepared based on the City's Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist and the Project Applicant Checklist for the NPDES Permit Requirements. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to, designing BMPs into the project features and operation to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality associated with operation of the project. These features shall be included in the project drainage plan and final development drawings. Specifically, the final design shall include measures designed to mitigate potential water quality degradation of runoff from all portions of the completed development. As outlined in the SWPPP prepared for the project, measures for site design, source control and treatment control would be incorporated into the proposed project. The Planning and Engineering Divisions shall review and approve the grading and drainage plan prior to building permit issuance. (MM HYD-1b)
- i. Prior to building permit issuance, a plan shall be provided that details that all on-site permanent stationary noise sources for building operations shall comply with the standards listed in Section 08.06.030 of the City's Noise Ordinance. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Building and Planning Divisions. Additionally, the project shall comply with the following noise reduction measures:

- General construction activities shall be allowed only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays.
  - All heavy construction equipment used on the project site shall be maintained in good operating condition, with all internal combustion, engine-driven equipment fitted with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition.
  - All stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far away as possible from neighboring property lines.  
Post signs prohibiting unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. (MM NOISE -1)
- j. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan, providing the location, architectural details and specifications for all exterior lighting subject to review and approval by the Planning Division. The lighting plan shall include a photometric study and shall minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent properties and the public right-of-way. The lighting plan shall be approved prior to building permit issuance (MM AES-1).
- k. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans detailing all changes to the public right-of-way, frontage improvements for the site, and alterations to parking lot 6. These plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions prior to building permit issuance.
- l. Prior to building permit issuance, documentation of the recordation of the abandonment of Mielke Drive and a portion of Alma Street shall be provided to the Building and Planning Divisions.
- m. Prior to occupancy of the gymnasium, the City shall implement the following parking improvement measures, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Transportation Divisions:
- **Parking Map.** A parking map depicting the parking lots on the campus shall be created and included in future Activity Guides for the campus, handed out to individuals and groups that use the facilities, added to the City's website, and included in the various kiosks throughout campus.

- **Parking Signage.** A parking signage plan shall be implemented. The signage will be developed as part of the project and placed at various locations throughout the campus with the intent of helping users better understand where parking is located on campus and distribute parking throughout the campus. (IM PRK-1)
- n. ***Prior to occupancy of the proposed gymnasium, the City shall implement a Parking Management Plan. Parking improvements shall include designated employee parking areas, designated library parking, parking time restrictions, coordination of events throughout the campus, and the removal of landscaping to add parking stalls in lot 6 as shown in Attachment L.*** Following occupancy of the gymnasium, the City shall implement a Parking Management Plan. The City will monitor the parking on campus after the construction of the Gymnasium by conducting two parking counts per year (one during the summer and one while school is in session) for a period of two years after the building is occupied. Additionally, the Transportation Division will keep a log of complaints regarding inadequate parking, and will evaluate whether the complaints are the result of a chronic parking shortage or an atypical incident due to multiple events simultaneously occurring on the campus. The parking counts and complaint log will be used to better assess the parking conditions on campus and determine if improvements are necessary. ~~Improvements could include designated employee parking areas, designated library parking, parking time restrictions, coordination of events throughout the campus, and the removal of landscaping to add additional parking stalls in lot 6.~~ As part of the architectural control review for the gymnastics center, staff shall further analyze the parking situation on the campus. (IM PRK-1)

Motion carried 4-3 with Commissioners Bressler, Kadvany and Pagee opposed.

Chair Riggs asked the Commission to consider the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Statement of Certification as approval item 1.a.

Chair Riggs said that dominant to the Statement of Overriding Considerations was the statement of the need for gym facilities that the Council and Parks and Recreation had been trying to fill for many years, and this facility fulfilled that need. Commissioner Bressler said he would vote approval as the City needed the gym. He said he supported the gym and the City would figure out how to solve problems as best as was possible. He said he did not vote for the architectural control as he did not think problems were solved. He said he would vote in favor of this so the project was not killed. Commissioner Pagee said she agreed with Commissioner Bressler. She said

that more of the City's commissions should have been involved earlier. Commissioner Kadvany said the Statement was not particularly reflective of the tradeoff. He said the EIR found significant unavoidable traffic impacts of traffic, but constituents' greatest concern was parking. He said he did not like the impression this statement made and felt like he was being asked to sign something that he did not want to sign.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Riggs to adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Statement of Certification.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Kadvany abstaining.

Chair Riggs moved to discussion of recommendations. Commissioner Bressler said his recommendation was for a left-turn signal turning west on Ravenswood Avenue from Laurel Drive. He said his second recommendation was improved circulation when turning left onto Ravenswood Avenue from Middlefield Road. Chair Riggs said left-hand turn arrows inhibit traffic flow. Commissioner Bressler said this was a very unsafe intersection. Commissioner Pagee said that since Ravenswood Avenue was also a bike route that she agreed with Commissioner Bressler's recommendation.

Planner Fisher asked if the request was for City Council to add these improvements or investigate the improvements. Commissioner Bressler said his recommendation was that these improvements at the intersection be done in conjunction with the development of the project. He said he recommended improving the safety turning left from Laurel Drive onto Ravenswood Avenue. Commissioner Kadvany said perhaps there were other solutions such as one-way traffic around Burgess Park; he said the strongest recommendation was to look at safety and circulation issues in the broader area such as the two intersections mentioned by Commissioner Bressler. Chair Riggs suggested addressing the safety of left-hand turns from Laurel Drive onto Ravenswood Avenue and address traffic circulation from Middlefield Road to Ravenswood Avenue.

Commission Action: M/S Bressler/Kadvany to recommend that the City Council implement improvements to two intersections in conjunction with the project by 1) addressing left turn safety (potentially by adding a left turn signal) from Laurel Street onto Ravenswood Avenue and 2) address improved circulation (associated with the signal timing) for the left turn onto Ravenswood Avenue from Middlefield Road.

Motion carried 7-0.

Chair Riggs said the next recommendation was to create a second entry to the building that would be oriented to either parking lot 3 or 5.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Ferrick to recommend that the City Council direct the architect to add a second entrance to the building that would be oriented to either parking lot 3 or 5.



Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner O'Malley left the meeting at 12:31 a.m.

Chair Riggs said the next recommendation was to maximize natural ventilation. He asked if Commissioner Pagee wanted to fold in energy efficiency in with this recommendation. Commissioner Pagee said that natural ventilation was the best measure for energy efficiency noting however that the height of the building did not lend itself to energy efficiency. Commissioner Kadvany said he thought the recommendation should be strengthened to investigate the greatest amount that could be done to maximize energy efficiency and heating and ventilation subject to reasonable cost restraints. Commissioner Pagee said that ultimately the residents would pay for the energy costs associated with this building's operation. She asked if there was insulation. Mr. Campbell said it would be fully insulated as required by Title 24. Commissioner Pagee said Title 24 would require R19 in the roof; she said the recommendation might be for R30 instead, which meant less cooling and heating. Commissioner Keith asked the architect if they had gotten LEED certification on the other gym projects they had done. Mr. Campbell said they had gotten Silver LEED rating but did not get certification because of the expense of filing. Commissioner Pagee asked if they had filed the certification. Mr. Campbell said they had not. Commissioner Pagee said that the checklist for this project was an old one and there was a new checklist. Commissioner Keith said she would like to see the project complete LEED certification.

Commissioner Kadvany asked the architect what could be done with the gym to reduce the HVAC requirements. Mr. Campbell said there were photovoltaic cells that would generate power, which was dramatic. He said they normally bring a LEED expert on board whether the project was certified or not. He said they have done projects with photovoltaic cells and using package fan units which were more efficient. He said that a project they did in the East Bay had energy modeling which received eight points for energy efficiency. Chair Riggs said that there was consensus for natural ventilation and asked for a motion.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Riggs to recommend that the City Council direct the architect to maximize natural ventilation in the gymnasium.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley no longer in attendance.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Ferrick to recommend that the City Council consider requiring the project to complete the LEED certification process for the gymnasium.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley no longer in attendance.

Commissioner Pagee said that there might be a recommendation such as suggested by Commissioner Kadvany to do a model of intensity of use related to activities and events.

Commissioner Kadvany said the model would look at the intensity of usage and implied parking needs. Chair Riggs asked staff to comment on the scope. Mr. Taylor said the more information they wanted to model the higher the cost would be. He said if the modeling was done on a smaller scope that it would be easier to accommodate. Chair Riggs suggested the model be done on lot 6 and lot 3. Commissioner Kadvany said that the modeling did not have to be algebraic or terribly complex but could be a simpler accounting model of flows. Commissioner Pagee said the model would look at class schedules, buildings, number of participants and the anticipated lots where they would park and add in new uses and predict parking conflicts in lots 3 and 6. Chair Riggs said perhaps the recommendation should be that the departments responsible for the library, recreation center, existing gym and new gym, and ball fields provide usage calendars to staff for study and conclusion about impacts on lot 6 and lot 3. Commissioner Pagee said that no one from Park and Recreation had been present this evening and hoped they would at the Council meeting to talk about their schedules and activities. Commissioner Ferrick said that Parks and Recreation should manage the uses appropriately for capacity. She said it was going to require a coordinated effort among the high intensity uses for lot 6 to forestall problems with parking. Mr. Taylor said coordination of events was called out under condition 7.n.

Commissioner Bressler said he would like to see a recommendation for underground parking.

Commission Action: M/S Bressler/Pagee to recommend that the City Council investigate underground parking level beneath the proposed gymnasium.

Motion carried 4-1 with Commissioner Riggs opposed, Commissioner Ferrick abstaining, and Commissioner O'Malley not in attendance.

Chair Riggs said that Commissioner O'Malley had made a recommendation to relocate the skate park to provide parking to meet parking demand adjacent to the new gym.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Pagee to investigate relocating the skate park to provide parking to meet parking demand adjacent to the new gym.

Motion carried 4-1 with Commissioner Ferrick opposed, Commissioner Kadvany abstaining, and Commissioner O'Malley not in attendance.

Commissioner Bressler said he thought that too much was being loaded onto the City Council. Chair Riggs said that a preferred way would have been to have a design study session for the project.

Commission Action: M/S Kadvany/Riggs to recommend that the City Council direct the architect to investigate design modifications to minimize energy usage within the gymnasium subject to reasonable cost and design constraints.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley not in attendance.

Commissioner Kadvany said he would like a recommendation to address massing and scale.

Commission Action: M/S Kadvany/Keith to recommend the City Council reexamine the architecture and consider altering the design to mitigate the massing and boxiness, introduce articulation to limit unbroken planes, add glasswork and windows, and create a more welcoming entry.

Ms. Heineck said this motion was potentially in conflict with the approval of the architectural control and that it was appropriate for Commissioner Kadvany to explain why he was opposed to architectural control. Commissioner Pagee said that there was nothing in the architectural control approval that indicated the Commission liked the design.

Motion failed 3-3 with Commissioners Bressler, Ferrick and Riggs opposed.

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

There was no regular business.

#### **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 were 150 people in attendance at the June 18 community workshop. She said there would be a third session with the consultants and Planning Commission on July 13, 2009.

#### **F. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:58 a.m.