



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

December 13, 2010

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler (Vice Chair), Eiref, Ferrick, Kadvany, O'Malley (Chair), Riggs

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Megan Fisher, Associate Planner; Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager; Kyle Perata, Planning Technician

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Update on Pending Planning Items.

- A. Council action on revisions to 1460 El Camino Real – tentatively scheduled for January 11, 2011

Planner Chow reported that the project at 1460 El Camino Real, commonly known as the Beltramo's Mixed-Use Project, would go before the City Council on January 11, 2011.

- B. Announcement that the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map have been updated to reflect the M-3 zoning district.

Planner Chow announced that the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map had been updated to reflect the M-3 zoning district changes effective with certification of Measure T (the Gateway Project) on December 7, 2010.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

1. Approval of minutes from the November 15, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

Chair O'Malley said he had changes to the minutes which he summarized. It was noted that other changes had been emailed to staff by Commissioners Kadvany and Riggs.

Commission Action: Unanimous consent to approve the minutes with the following modifications:

- Page 2, 4th paragraph, 2nd line: Replace "heard mentioned" with "heard that \$20,000 was mentioned" (O'Malley)
- Page 3, 3rd full paragraph, 3rd line: Replace "lonely" with "only" (emailed previous to meeting)

- Page 3, 3rd full paragraph, 4th line: Replace “door parking” with “door with parking”
- Page 4, 1st full paragraph, 2nd line: Replace “at least redwoods” with “at least three to four redwoods” (emailed previous to meeting)
- Page 4, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line: Replace “operations” with “operational” (O’Malley)
- Page 5, last paragraph, 1st line: Replace “made a reference to” with “mentioned” (emailed previous to meeting)
- Page 5, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line: Replace “Commissioner” with “Commission” (O’Malley)

Approval was 6-0.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/Julie Figliozi Wong/271 Hedge Road:** Request for a use permit for first- and second-story additions to an existing single-story structure that would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area, on a substandard lot with regard to lot area and width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed expansion is considered to be equivalent to a new structure. As part of the proposal, the applicant proposes to remove a multi-trunk, 25-inch diameter heritage curly willow tree (noted as tree #6 on plans) in good condition located near the front property line.

Planner Chow said staff had no additional comments at this time.

Commissioner Ferrick noted that the applicants were friends of hers but she did not own property within 500 feet of the applicants’ property. Commissioner Riggs said Mr. Wong was a member of an 80 member group that worked on Measure L, which he (Riggs) chaired.

Questions of Staff: Chair O’Malley said there was reference in the staff report to a condition 4.e, but there was no such condition. Planner Chow said that was a typographical error and should read condition 3.e.

Public Comment: Mr. Steve Wong, property owner, said they had planted a heritage tree that grew so well that its roots were impacting the sewer line. He said the tree’s appearance did not support the front renovation they were planning. He said they intended to plant two other trees as replacement if they were allowed to remove the one tree.

Commissioner Riggs asked if they had selected a species of tree replacement and a location. Mr. Wong said they liked the Red maple and replacement trees would be planted away from the sewer line and near the right front of the house with other trees to provide shade.

Commissioner Kadvany asked how much it would cost to move the sewer line. Mr. Wong said the estimate was from \$10,000 to \$20,000 to replace the sewer line to the street but he was waiting for the exact cost information from his contractor.

Commissioner Eiref asked when they had planted the heritage tree. Mr. Wong said in 2001. Commissioner Eiref asked if they wanted to remove the tree because of its appearance or because of the sewer line that was being impacted. He asked if the tree were not interfering with the sewer line whether they would still want to replace the tree. Mr. Wong said that they would prefer a different tree as this tree was messy and had grown somewhat crazily. Commissioner Eiref asked if they had considered replacing the sewer line using a method called

pipe bursting. Mr. Wong said sewer district staff had indicated that the district would not be able to maintain the sewer line if that method of replacement was used.

Chair O'Malley closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany said he had confirmed with an arborist that Willow trees have very invasive roots. Commissioner Riggs said he was protective of heritage trees but he was supportive of replacing the tree because of the roots invasion. He said usually the Commission asked for a five-foot setback on the second floor for two-story additions next to single-story homes. He said in this case the second story was very compact and was set back a few feet if not five feet.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion. Planner Chow noted that staff's recommendation did not include removal of the heritage tree. She said staff intended to further investigate the proposed tree removal but would note the Commission's support of the tree removal in the record of the action.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if there would be wood shingles on the second story. Planner Chow said the materials on the first floor would be a continuation of the existing horizontal siding and the materials for the second floor addition would be Hardy shingles.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the item per the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by John Packowski and Martin Clark, consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received December 1, 2010, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2010, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- e. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance. Prior to the building permit issuance, the applicant shall implement the tree protection and preservation measures identified in the arborist report.

Note: The Commission supported the removal of the heritage Willow tree with the replacement of Red Maple.

Motion carried 6-0.

- 2. **Use Permit/Christian Hilty for Geron Corporation/200 Constitution Drive:** Request for a use permit for a diesel generator, associated with a biopharmaceutical company that develops products for the treatment of cancer and other chronic degenerative diseases. The proposed generator would be located behind an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. In addition, as part of this application, the applicant is requesting approval for outside storage of hazardous materials, associated with an existing, approved chemical inventory. The applicant is also requesting a use permit for temporary outside storage of storage containers for non-hazardous materials.

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Perata said staff had no additional comments.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs asked if there were requirements of the noise ordinance specific to an R&D area and surrounding commercial properties to protect workers in that area. Planner Chow said there were no strict noise guidelines for commercial properties next to other commercial properties. She said rooftop mechanical equipment was required to be no greater than 50 decibel at 50 feet. She said however that generators were an exception in that there was no noise limit in an industrial area.

Mr. Christian Hilty, Facilities Manager, Geron Corporation, responding to a question of staff said they used 17-foot containers to store large items for which there was not enough room inside their building noting HVAC filters and other nonessential HVAC equipment.

Chair O'Malley closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany asked the applicant whether the generator would be secured. Mr. Hilty said there was a locked fence at the rear of the property and that the storage containers, hazardous materials storage, and diesel generator would be completely fenced and locked. Commissioner Ferrick asked if there was fencing over the top of the generator. Mr. Hilty said that the Fire District did not want a roof over the generator. Commissioner Ferrick asked how they selected 4:30 p.m. on Friday for testing. Mr. Hilty said that was a place holder and testing typically would be done after business hours. He said it could be done early in the morning. Commissioner Ferrick asked if the generator use during the day would be audible to workers and neighboring workers. Mr. Hilty said that Route 84 was

noisier than the generator. Commissioner Eiref asked if there was an existing generator and whether it was being replaced. Mr. Hilty said that was correct.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Bressler seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs said that people in adjacent neighborhoods under certain weather conditions hear what happens in an M-2 zone in the early morning when the air is very still. He said he would approve as recommended but wanted the 4:30 p.m. testing time. Commissioner Riggs said the staff report had indicated the applicant had investigated noise containment but it was found to be cost prohibitive. He noted a generator enclosure he designed located in a very sensitive area. He said that the first thing was to have a sound attenuated enclosure with the generator set but noted that the City has not codified any requirement to reduce noise in the M-2.

Chair O'Malley said Geron Corporation was a good neighbor and complied with the City's ordinance and regulations.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Bressler to approve the item per the staff report

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Hitech Construction Management and Design, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received December 6, 2010, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2010 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, 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. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.

- e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
 - f. If the business discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire unless a new business submits a new hazardous materials business plan to the Planning Division for review by the applicable agencies to determine whether the new hazardous materials business plan is in substantial compliance with the use permit.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. The outside storage (shipping) containers of nonhazardous materials shall be removed by July 31, 2012, coinciding with the end of Geron's current lease.

Motion carried 6-0.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. **Architectural Control and Environmental Review/City of Menlo Park/700 Alma Street:** Request for architectural control for exterior modifications and construction of an approximately 1,200-square-foot addition to the existing 14,900-square-foot recreation center and associated site improvements located at the Civic Center Complex in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. The Planning Commission will also be reviewing the Burgess Gymnasium and Gymnastics Center Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum that compares the potential environmental impacts of the recreation center addition proposal with the previously analyzed environmental impacts discussed in the certified EIR to confirm that the impacts would remain unchanged and that no new environmental impacts would result from the completion of the proposed project.

Planner Fisher said the agenda stated "1,200-square-foot addition" but that should be amended to read "800-square-foot addition." She introduced Mr. Matt Oscamou, Menlo Park Engineering Division, who was the staff person presenting the project.

Mr. Oscamou said that over the past year and a half with the support of Mr. John Arrillaga, the City built a now fully functioning gymnasium and was in the process of developing a gymnastics center. He said more recently that Mr. Arrillaga had offered support to improve the City's existing recreation center. He said that working with Mr. Arrillaga, the City would do an addition and complete interior remodel of the recreation center. He said there would be more mid-sized to large spaces in the Center by combining smaller rooms. He said the addition would be modest and would not change the appearance dramatically nor change the use significantly.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Bressler asked if there was asbestos. Mr. Oscamou said that Mr. Vance Brown, the contractor for the gymnasium, had inspected the building and the only asbestos was wrapped around pipes which would not be touched. Commissioner Bressler asked if there was analysis done related to the recreation center as to whether to expand or replace it. Mr. Oscamou said a 1999 Master Plan was adopted by the Parks and Recreation

Commission that included an analysis of the recreation center. He said the primary recommendations for the Center were to improve accessibility and bring noncompliant features to code. He said that it had looked at replacement in situ as well as a tear down and expansion. He said this building was well built and had served the City well and the preferred alternative was a modest addition and renovation of the interior as there was not a tremendous need for additional square footage and funding was a major issue.

Chair O'Malley said the cost of refurbishing per square foot was significantly less than replacing the building in the same footprint. Mr. Oscamou said that was correct.

Commissioner Eiref asked about the entrance. Mr. Oscamou said the existing end hallway which was an entry for people dropping off from parking lot 6 would be changed and they would combine the two rooms there into one room. He said there would be a new entrance created toward the gymnastics area which also had a drop-off area. He said the west end would only be used for an emergency exit.

Commissioner Kadvany said that the plan appeared to replace the existing windows and asked if analysis had been done to see whether there might be a benefit from additional light. Mr. Oscamou said they did not want to tear up walls unless otherwise necessary. He said the building fits well on the campus and they did not want to make exterior changes. Commissioner Kadvany asked if the windows would be operational. Mr. Oscamou said there was a preference for operational windows. Commissioner Kadvany asked what was being done to enhance energy efficiency. Mr. Oscamou said the walls on which work would be done and the roof area would have new insulation installed. He said the lighting would be brought to current standards which would reduce the energy demand. He said a new heating and air conditioning system would efficiently distribute heat and cool air.

Commissioner Riggs said this appeared to be a \$3 million project. Mr. Oscamou said it was \$3.175 million for design, construction and patio renovations. Commissioner Riggs asked if the construction costs would be \$2.5 million. Mr. Oscamou said they calculated \$100 per square foot for renovation, \$500 per square foot for the addition, \$600,000 for the renovation of the larger patio and \$250,000 for the renovation of the smaller patio. Design budgeted 6-8 percent of the construction cost number. Commissioner Riggs asked if the bathrooms would be upgraded. Mr. Oscamou said each restroom would have an ADA stall with new finishes and water saving features.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if this project exhausted Measure T funds. Mr. Oscamou said this would use Measure T funds. He said they had to reorganize funding. He said the Kelly Park improvements were to be funded by redevelopment and recreation in-lieu funds, which was adjusted to just use redevelopment funds. He said they used recreation in-lieu funds for the gymnastics center which freed up Measure T funds to be used for the recreation center as well as some general fund.

Commissioner Eiref asked about the \$600,000 for the patio upgrade. Mr. Oscamou said that the City did not have any nice outdoor sites for weddings and other outside functions and the design would include pavers, stone, elevated stage, a water wall fountain, and arbor. He said Vance Brown would build this and that Mr. Arrillaga might be providing more input into the design. He said this area would bring in revenue. Commissioner Eiref asked about the gymnastics center progress. Mr. Oscamou said the gymnastics center building plans were due

this week. He said work would start first on the recreation center and then in March on the gymnastics center.

Commissioner Ferrick asked if other Commissions such as the Library Commission had weighed in on this project. Mr. Ocamou said they asked the Library Services Director to alert the Library Commission and that the Parks and Recreation Commission had considered and approved it.

Commissioner Ferrick said the community was so fortunate to have the support of Mr. Arrillaga. She said the Foster City Community Center was very attractive and brought revenue to that City; she said the use would increase however. She said she agreed with the larger rooms and the modest changes to the existing recreation center.

Commissioner Riggs moved to recommend an approval to the City Council. Planner Fisher said there was a typographical error in the report that indicated the Commission would make a recommendation to the Council, but in fact the Commission would take the final action.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings and approve the architectural control and conditions as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Eiref seconded the motion.

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

1. Make a finding that the Addendum to the Certified Environmental Impact Report for the Burgess Gymnasium and Gymnastics Center provides adequate environmental documentation of the proposed Recreation Center Renovation and Addition project.
2. 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.
3. Approve the architectural control 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 six plan sheets, dated December 9, 2010, and recommended by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2010, 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, Recology 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. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit proposed landscape and irrigation documentation as required by Chapter 12.44 (Water-Efficient Landscaping) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. If required, the applicant shall submit all parts of the landscape project application as listed in section 12.44.040 of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The landscaping shall be installed and inspected prior to final inspection of the building.
4. Approve the architectural control subject to the following ***project-specific*** conditions:
- a. 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)
- b. 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)
- c. 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. The Planning and Engineering Divisions shall review and approve the grading and drainage plan prior to building permit issuance. (MM HYD-1b)
- d. 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 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).
- e. 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)
- f. 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)
- g. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF).

Motion carried 6-0.

F. STUDY SESSION

1. **Study Session/Tyco Electronics/300 Constitution Drive:** Study Session for a proposal to upgrade the 58-acre Tyco Electronics campus. The campus has over one million square feet of existing building area. As part of the upgrade, up to 10,000 square feet of building area would be added to the campus, the building facades would be updated with new architectural treatments, the parking lots would be reconfigured, new landscaping and recreation areas would be installed, and new signage would be installed. The applicant is considering the addition of a right-turn-only truck and emergency vehicle exit on Chilco Street. The proposal would require a master use permit for the addition of square footage, nonconforming parking, and the use and storage of hazardous materials and architectural control for the exterior building modifications and additions in the M-2 (General Industrial) and M-2-X (General Industrial, Conditional Development) zoning districts.

Planner Fisher said the applicant would make a presentation. Commissioner Riggs asked about the parking at the site. Planner Fisher said over the past several years she had visited the site multiple times and parking had never been a problem.

Ms. Susan Eschweiler, DES Architects & Engineers, principal architect, introduced Mr. Alex Bolandes, project manager, and Naomi Mishimoto, landscape architect. She said that the site had been developed for the prior owner "Raychem" and that the campus was dated. She said Tyco wanted to make this their R&D innovation center. She said towards that goal the company wanted to revitalize the campus and buildings with landscaping, exterior enhancements, interior improvements, and added amenities for the employees.

Ms. Eschweiler provided a visual presentation noting:

- Campus was about 58 acres
- Entrance was at the end of Constitution Drive but comes off Chilco Street
- A variety of different types of buildings on the campus
- Campus has over one million square feet of buildings
- Site is at .41 FAR which is below the limit for the M-2 zone.
- 1,997 parking stalls
- 800 Tyco employees and 200 tenant employees
- 1970s architecture
- Over 600 trees on site – some healthy and some in poor condition
- Some buildings are very exposed, plain and not welcoming.

Ms. Eschweiler said the new Master Plan included:

- More formalized driveway into the site
- Estate-type walls leading to the entry gates
- New Tyco signage
- A visitors center or other to create a "front door" for the site
- Redo common area to create outdoor collaborative spaces
- Rework parking and add landscaping
- Develop the area between buildings 305 and 307 as a field for recreation and meeting space such as an all employee meeting

- Considering gated driveway onto Chilco that would allow trucks to turn out and go to Bayfront Expressway and allow for emergency access
- Median and two-lane driveway for traffic control
- Bike lane and paved walkway to create connectivity from one building to rest
- Considering cafeteria in main common area with outside eating space
- Covered walkways, solar panels, display space
- Redevelopment of the R&D building - open up labs and refurbish entire building, add amenities such as cafeteria, food preparation, truck dock, fitness center, shower and lockers and third floor yoga studio
- Manufacturing building – new canopy and entry and green space
- Add column covers to buildings with concrete block columns and add roof details such as an integral gutter and new architectural character

Commissioner Riggs asked if the proposed 120 seat cafeteria was adequate for 1,000 employees. Mr. Bolandes, Facilities Manager, said the current café was a “grab and go” facility and they wanted to provide the employees with a place where they could sit down and eat. He said some of their bigger campuses on the east coast had about the same size cafeteria. He noted that employees worked different shifts. He said the cafeteria facility would do catering and also supply different kiosks around the campus with food. Commissioner Riggs asked if they had shuttle service to Redwood City or Menlo Park for employees to use to go out to lunch. Mr. Bolandes said the only shuttle service was the City’s to and from the train station.

Mr. James Sebring, Belle Haven, said he was concerned with the project as there was contaminated soil on top of the groundwater, hazardous waste, hazardous waste pollution, and noise pollution. He said a vent on top of building C and other obvious pumps and motors were very noisy. He said this project should be considered within the Dumbarton Rail Project. He said he would like the Chilco Corridor to be improved for bicyclists and their safety.

Mr. Matt Henry, Belle Haven, said he was pleased that the campus would be improved. He said Tyco had hosted a neighborhood meeting the previous week and had agreed that in the event of some kind of incident with hazardous waste or fire, their emergency procedures would include contacting the Belle Haven and Beechwood Schools and the Community and Senior Centers. He said that Tyco’s hazardous waste has diminished over time. He said they have groundwater monitoring wells that they installed. He said he was concerned with trucks exiting onto Chilco because of visibility and whether the truck would need to go into the opposing lane to make the turn. He said the Belle Haven Association had asked the City to line the Chilco corridor with trees on both sides. He said if Tyco could do so on the one side that would be great. He said they were suggesting Italian Cypress as those grow well and they would help reduce the noise coming from the Tyco campus. He suggested that an exhaust fan on the roof of 305B be turned 90 degrees so it no longer pointed directly to the houses in Belle Haven. He said in the past, their Association received a Tyco newsletter which listed the monitoring reports on groundwater, which findings did not cause the Association any concern.

Commissioner Bressler asked when the applicant would bring the project to the Commission for approval. Ms. Eschweiler said she expected in spring 2011. She said there was some interior work that could occur prior to obtaining the master use building permit. Commissioner Bressler asked how long it would take to build. (Gentleman answered but did not use mike.) Commissioner Bressler asked if the funding was in place. (Gentleman answered but did not use mike.)

Commissioner Eiref asked if there would be a shift in use. Mr. Bolandes said the majority of R&D was back east in Pennsylvania and on the west coast, they have been manufacturing the tubing, noting that building was 250,000 square feet. He said they wanted to return to R&D as the core of their business on the west coast and wanted to attract the best and brightest. Commissioner Eiref said he was surprised at the small number of employees and the large site. Mr. Bolandes said there had been employee downsizing. He said they hoped to increase the number of employees to 1,400-1,500 people over the next few years. Commissioner Eiref asked if they would be leasing to any other companies. Mr. Bolandes said they were not.

Commissioner Ferrick said she was happy to see the improvement to the entry way. She said she liked the landscaping plan but wanted their input on the truck exit onto Chilco. Ms. Eschweiler said they were working with a civil engineer on how to create a wide-throated driveway, which would have a right turn with a lane off the street from which the truck would then merge onto the street. She said they agreed with Mr. Henry that this was a crucial area to consider. She said they also realized that they would need to do landscaping that would not impair the sight line. Commissioner Ferrick asked about the vent. Ms. Bolandes said they would look into that. He noted that they were not increasing manufacturing and there would be no increase in hazardous materials or traffic. Commissioner Ferrick asked if there was information on the infiltration on the GM property. Mr. Bolandes said the numbers were so low that it looked like they would be able to cap the wells in a few years.

Chair O'Malley asked about City parking requirements and projected needs. Ms. Eschweiler said that if they were building a new project of one million square feet they would need to provide 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet which would equal 3,300 cars. She said with less than 1,000 people they did not need those many spaces. She said when the project was originally built it was under prior regulations which was 1.5 employees per parking space. Chair O'Malley confirmed that they would keep that amount of parking and asked if it was excessive. Ms. Eschweiler said the additional spaces had been used for other purposes such as disaster training. Commissioner Bressler said landscape reserve was a possibility for unneeded parking spaces that could be easily reconverted to parking if needed. Ms. Eschweiler said if the Commission was supportive they would look at such use.

Commissioner Kadvany said there was a lot of land around the perimeter for landscaping and along Chilco Street and Bayfront Expressway. Ms. Eschweiler said there was a Caltrans fence along Bayfront Expressway which was remaining but they would remove unhealthy plantings on the Tyco property and plant more. Commissioner Kadvany asked who owned the property on the on the west side of Chilco Street. Ms. Eschweiler showed a map which showed the City's right-of-way on Chilco, beyond that the Caltrain right-of-way, then the Fire Station, Beechwood School, Community and Senior Center, and Hamilton Park. Commissioner Kadvany said there was an opportunity to improve the general area of this site with landscaping as it overlaps with the surrounding community.

Commissioner Ferrick said one of the speakers had raised the idea of a bike path and asked if that could be extended around the Chilco Street side of the campus. Ms. Eschweiler said that they would evaluate that.

Commissioner Riggs said this was a great project. He said he was pleased to hear there would be onsite amenities and improvements such as a bike path. He said extensive landscaping would be a boon to the community.

Commissioner Eiref said he was pleased to see them investing in an existing property and he liked the concept of use of the outdoor space.

Chair O'Malley suggested keeping Belle Haven citizens involved particularly related to the second exit. He said even though the contamination was on a nearby property that it would be good to keep the neighbors informed about the monitoring results. He said he was supportive of the project moving ahead.

Summary of Comments;

- Consider utilizing landscape reserve parking
- Ensure that trucks will not be crossing both lanes of traffic when exiting the site from the proposed right turn onto Chilco Street and that they will have sufficient sight distance
- Consider changing the direction of the exhaust fans to help attenuate noise
- Consider the presentation/appearance of your site to the adjacent properties and roadways
- Investigate the ability to add a bicycle path on Chilco Street
- Continue to work with the Belle Haven neighborhood during the process
- Generally supportive of the proposed upgrades to the site

G. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Consideration of and potential creation of a Planning Commission subcommittee for the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Amendment proposal in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district related to the use and storage of hazardous materials, roof-mounted equipment, and sign area.
2. Consideration of and potential creation of a Planning Commission subcommittee to prepare for a future discussion on the pros and cons of freestanding parking structures.

Commissioner Ferrick said a Planning Commission subcommittee made sense for the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Amendment proposal in the M-2 zoning district. She said it did not make sense to have a free standing parking structure subcommittee yet.

Commissioner Eiref asked how it had arisen that the Planning Commission might establish a subcommittee for the freestanding parking structures. Planner Chow said this was a placeholder that came out of Planning Commission discussion to look at freestanding parking structures. Commissioner Eiref asked if the Commission had a subcommittee for priority project lists. Planner Chow said that in previous years the Commission has considered a priority project list but starting the prior year a five year capital improvement project plan was established with input from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Bressler said he did not think they should break the parking structure discussion out of the El Camino Plan process. Commissioner Kadvany said he had read the August parking study and noted it was essential to the Specific Plan. Commissioner Bressler said it should be investigated but would be better done in public and if needed with follow up work on a subcommittee level. Commissioner Riggs said this came out of the GFA discussion and had to do with the Gateway Project and having a freestanding parking structure that did not count toward square footage. He said it was not too soon to have this discussion related to the

Downtown Plan. He said the options for parking structures might not be well vetted. He said that this might be work a subcommittee could do and present to Council. Commissioner Ferrick said if there was a desire to have a subcommittee on parking structures that it should not purposely be associated with the Downtown Plan and should be independent of a position. Commissioner Kadvany said it was difficult to consider freestanding parking structures generally but he was not certain they should focus on downtown at this point in the process. Commissioner Bressler said this had arisen because of the exclusion from gross floor area of the parking structure in the Bohannon project and it was not urgent in the context of the downtown specific plan. He said these discussions needed to be done in a public forum. Commissioner Kadvany said the Specific Plan has a very detailed parking strategy for the downtown but not for El Camino Real. He said that El Camino Real was supposed to be transit-oriented but things were moving in the opposite direction.

At Chair O'Malley's suggestion, Commissioner Kadvany will review the Downtown Parking Study and supporting parking studies and summarize the information at a future Planning Commission meeting. Planner Chow said she would work with Commissioner Kadvany to get additional parking studies and documentation desired.

Chair O'Malley asked if there were Commissioners interested in serving on a subcommittee related to the zoning ordinance amendment for the M-2 district. Commissioner Ferrick said she was very supportive and it would help make the process better. Development Services Manager Murphy said staff would look at changing the threshold for projects with hazardous materials and storage and wanted to get the Commission's input on that. Commissioner Ferrick asked why it would not be on the Planning Commission for everyone's discussion. Development Services Manager Murphy said eventually it would be but that it was very useful to do some of the initial work with a subcommittee.

Commissioners Bressler, Kadvany, and Ferrick volunteered to be on the subcommittee to consider an upcoming Zoning Ordinance Amendment proposal in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district related to the use and storage of hazardous materials, roof-mounted equipment, and sign area.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by Planning Commission on January 24, 2011