

CITY OF MENLO PARK
PLANNING COMMISSION

RE: 389 EL CAMINO REAL,)
LLC PROJECT)
_____)

REGULAR MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2012

MENLO PARK CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

3 Katie Ferrick - Chairperson
John Kadwany - Vice Chairperson
4 Vince Bressler
Ben Eiref
5 John O'Malley
Henry Riggs
6 Peipei Yu

7 THE CITY STAFF:

8 Deanna Chow - Senior Planner
Jean Lin - Associate Planner
9 Kyle Perata - Assistant Planning
Leigh Prince - Assistant City Attorney

10

11 SUPPORT CONSULTANTS:

12 Adam Weinstein - LSA Associates
Carolyn Park - LSA Associates
13 Paul Stannis - DKS Associates

14

THE APPLICANT:

15

Matt Matteson

16

17 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
18 of the Meeting, and on March 19, 2012, 7:18 PM at the
19 Menlo Park City Council Chambers, 701 Laurel Street,
20 Menlo Park, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR
21 No. 5527, State of California, there commenced a Planning
22 Commission meeting under the provisions of the City of
23 Menlo Park.

24

---o0o---

25

1	MEETING DETAILS (re 389 El Camino Real LLC)	
2		Page
3	Presentation by Deanna Chow	4
4	Presentation by Adam Weinstein	8
5	Public Comments	22, 113
6	Commission Questions	35, 119
7	Commission Comments	69
8	Presentation by Matt Matteson	73
9	Adjourned	177

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Moving along, next
2 we're going to review and comment on the draft
3 Environmental Impact Report for the Use Permit,
4 Architectural Control, Major Subdivision, Below Market
5 Rate Housing Agreement and Environmental Review for 389
6 El Camino Real, which is right now a request to demolish
7 the existing single family house at 612 Partridge Avenue,
8 residential triplex at 603 to 607 College Avenue and
9 construct 26 residential units and associated site
10 improvements on the subject parcels in the C-4(ECR)
11 (General Commercial Applicable to El Camino) and the R-3
12 Zoning District.

13 The application included the following
14 requests: A Use Permit, Architectural Control, Major
15 Subdivision, Below Market Rate Housing Agreement and
16 Environmental Review.

17 Can I turn it over to staff for any additional
18 information? Oh, thank you for coming back, Commissioner
19 O'Malley. I forgot to summon you.

20 MS. CHOW: Thank you, Chair Ferrick and
21 members of the Planning Commission.

22 As you mentioned, the subject site of the
23 proposed project is commonly referred to as 389 El Camino
24 Real. The project site consists of parcels address 321
25 to 389 El Camino Real, 603 to 607 College Avenue and 612

1 Partridge Avenue and a zone C-4 General Commercial, R-3
2 Apartment District.

3 The applicant is proposing to demolish the
4 existing single family residence and triplex located at
5 612 Partridge Avenue from 603 to 608 College Avenue
6 respectively and construct 26 -- 26 residential units
7 consisting of a mix of attached, semi-attached and not
8 attached single family dwelling units.

9 The proposed project would require approval of
10 the following items with the Planning Commission serving
11 as the recommending body and the City Council is the
12 final decision-making body on the project.

13 The project applications are the following:
14 One, a Use Permit for construction of three or more units
15 in the R-3 Zoning District and new construction of
16 residential units in the C-4(ECR) Zoning District; two,
17 Architectural Control for design review of the new
18 buildings in the site improvements.

19 Three, a tentative map to merge seven lots
20 into two lots, abandon the public street easement for
21 Alto Lane and create 26 residential condominium units.

22 Four, a Below Market Rate Housing Agreement to
23 provide three onsite below market rate units in
24 accordance with the City's below market rate housing
25 program and the State Density Bonus Law.

1 Five, application with the State Density Bonus
2 Law so allow one incentive and six development standard
3 waivers; and six, environmental review to review the
4 proposed project for potential environmental impacts.

5 The purpose of tonight's Planning Commission
6 meeting on the project at 389 El Camino Real consists of
7 two components. No formal action on the project will be
8 taken this evening.

9 The first component is a public hearing on the
10 Draft Environmental Impact Report, also known as EIR.
11 During this part of the meeting, the Planning Commission
12 and the members of the public will have an opportunity to
13 provide comments on the Draft EIR.

14 Comments from this evening, as well as those
15 previously submitted in items submitted to the Planning
16 Division by 5:30 PM on Monday, April 2nd, will be
17 addressed as part of the Final EIR prepared for the
18 project.

19 The second component of tonight's meeting is a
20 study session on the proposed project, particularly
21 highlighting the changes since the last study session.

22 At this time, the Planning Commission and
23 members of the public will have an opportunity to comment
24 on the revised project.

25 Again, no action will be taken on this project

1 at tonight's meeting.

2 To help facilitate the meeting, Staff would
3 recommend that the Planning Commission follow the meeting
4 procedures as outlined on page 4 of the staff report.

5 Tonight's meeting would proceed with the
6 following: First, the EIR public hearing with
7 introductions by staff; then address the overview of the
8 Draft EIR presented by Adam Weinstein of LSA Associates,
9 who is the consulting firm that prepared the Draft EIR,
10 following by Planning Commission opening the public
11 hearing to receive comments from the public on the Draft
12 EIR.

13 Then Commission questions of staff, LSA and
14 the project sponsor on the document, and Commission
15 comments on the Draft EIR, and then close the public
16 hearing.

17 Following that, we would move on to the second
18 component of tonight's meeting, which will be the study
19 session on the project.

20 That would be -- there would be a presentation
21 by the project applicant and public comments on the
22 proposed project, Commission questions of staff and the
23 project sponsor on the proposed project, and then
24 Commissioner projects on the proposed project.

25 At this point, I would like to introduce other

1 staff members and consultants here to help present and
2 address questions. We have Jean Lin, also from Planning
3 Department, Leigh Prince from the City Attorney's office,
4 Adam Weinstein and Carolyn Park of LSA Associates and
5 Paul Stannis with DKS Associates, transportation
6 consultant.

7 The applicant, Matt Matteson and team are also
8 here tonight to present and address questions.

9 This concludes staff comments, and now I would
10 like to suggest that the Planning Commission have Mr.
11 Adam Weinstein of LSA provide us an overview of the Draft
12 EIR and the purpose of tonight's meeting.

13 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Without further adieu,
14 Mr. Weinstein.

15 MR. WEINSTEIN: Good evening, Chair Ferrick
16 and Commissioners. As Miss Chow mentioned, my name is
17 Adam Weinstein. I'm the EIR project manager. Pleased to
18 be here tonight to present the results of the Draft EIR.
19 I'll try to keep it short.

20 I just wanted to take a few minutes to provide
21 an overview of an environmental review process -- process
22 in California, talk about where we are at this point and
23 the environmental review process of this specific
24 project, and then just summarize very briefly the key
25 conclusions of the Draft EIR, and then also our project

1 alternatives analysis, which I know is a topic of
2 interest, and if you have any questions or want
3 clarification about anything, feel free to interrupt.

4 So CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act,
5 is often called the foundation of planning in California
6 in that it requires public agencies to A, evaluate the
7 environmental impacts of a project, and then -- then B,
8 decide whether to approve the project or plan based on
9 that environmental review.

10 And we can talk about CEQA for hours in all of
11 its complexity, but I just want to boil it down to a
12 couple of key points. Two key points, actually.

13 The first is that CEQA's purpose is to
14 disclose the environmental impacts of projects to
15 decision-makers and the public, and then also to provide
16 a public forum to mitigate impacts and then also identify
17 project alternatives.

18 So CEQA doesn't dictate approval or rejection
19 of a project. It doesn't actually dictate an outcome.
20 It only requires that a project's environmental impacts
21 be disclosed and presented to decision-makers so that
22 they can make an informed decision about the project. So
23 that's CEQA in about thirty seconds.

24 In terms of the EIR process for this project,
25 we should just take a quick look to see where we are in

1 that process.

2 The first -- the first step in the CEQA
3 process is that the project is initiated, the application
4 for the project is submitted, the so-called lead agency,
5 which in this case is the City of Menlo Park, then makes
6 a determination regarding what type of CEQA review is
7 needed, and in this case, that would be an EIR, and at
8 that point, also the City selected a consultant, LSA
9 Associates, us, to work with the City to prepare the EIR.

10 The EIR is the most comprehensive form of CEQA
11 documentation, and it's designed for projects that may
12 have what's called a significant environmental impact.

13 I should mention to you that we conducted
14 quite a bit of preliminary environmental review work in
15 determining the level of environmental review for this
16 project.

17 During those early stages of CEQA start-up, we
18 prepared several background technical reports for the
19 project site and reviewed a couple, as well, including a
20 hazardous materials report.

21 We performed an evaluation of buildings on the
22 site to determine whether they are considered historic
23 resources, and with that information in hand, we were
24 able to focus the EIR on several key environmental topics
25 of concern.

1 So as you've noticed probably in reading the
2 EIR, this EIR did not include the full slate of topics
3 that you often see and what you get in Environmental
4 Impact Reports.

5 It's intended to be a focused EIR that looks
6 only at issues that were a detailed analysis.

7 So after determining that the EIR was needed,
8 the City issued a Notice of Preparation which essentially
9 states that the lead agency is preparing the EIR for the
10 project and wants to hear from public and agencies their
11 thoughts on what topics should be analyzed in the EIR.

12 Next, there was a scoping of environmental
13 issues which helped determine what environmental topics
14 should be addressed in the EIR and then also what
15 alternatives should be evaluated in the EIR.

16 And at this point, in response to the comments
17 that you offered as a Planning Commission and also
18 comments from the public, we added a couple of new
19 environmental topics to the EIR that we weren't actually
20 going to analyze initially.

21 Those topics included public services and
22 utilities, aesthetics, air quality and noise. So we
23 listened to your comments and changed the scope of work
24 of the EIR accordingly.

25 We also added a senior housing alternative,

1 which was the recommendation that you made, as well, to
2 evaluate an EIR. It's all reflected in the first draft.

3 After the scoping session, collected your
4 comments, modified the scope of the EIR and then we
5 actually conducted the research and analysis to do the
6 EIR, drafted the document and then published the Draft
7 EIR.

8 The Draft EIR was then circulated for public
9 comment, and right now we're getting towards the end of
10 that 45-day public comment period when you can read the
11 EIR, submit comments on the adequacy of the document, and
12 that's really actually the purpose of the meeting
13 tonight.

14 But the first part of the meeting, anyway, is
15 for us to hear your comments and then not respond to them
16 tonight, but respond to them in the form of a response to
17 comments document will which will be released after the
18 end of that 45-day review period.

19 The response to comments document also will
20 include any revisions to the Draft EIR if any are
21 necessary in regard to the comments that we receive.

22 And then together, the Draft EIR which you
23 have in front of you and the response to comments
24 document will comprise what's called the Final EIR.
25 That's the document that you as decision-makers make

1 decisions on at the very end of the process.

2 So as that final step, you, the Commission and
3 the City Council will review and decide whether to
4 certify that Final EIR, and then as a separate action and
5 with the environmental review in hand, with that Final
6 EIR in hand, the Commission and the Council will then
7 decide whether to approve the project.

8 So certification of the EIR and project
9 approval of the project are two separate things in this
10 case.

11 So now I'll just briefly summarize the key
12 conclusions of the Draft EIR, and again for the sake of
13 time, I'll go through these pretty fast. There's
14 obviously a lot more detail in the EIR.

15 Land use and planning policy, the very first
16 topics that we analyzed. These are kind of the most
17 broad-based projects in the EIR where we look at things
18 like whether the project is consistent with applicable
19 General Plan policies and how the project will affect the
20 physical arrangement of the community.

21 And so in this analysis, we found that the
22 project would not divide an established community.
23 That's something that we have to look at in the EIR.

24 The existing residential sites -- the existing
25 residential units on the project would be demolished as

1 part of this proposal, but we didn't find that this
2 residential uses to be a community as traditionally
3 defined.

4 And then in addition, Alto Lane on the site is
5 currently used to provide access mainly to the existing
6 triplex on the site, and therefore the abandonment of
7 Alto Lane would not impair mobility within Menlo Park.

8 The project would also -- we found in the EIR
9 -- to be generally compatible with surrounding uses. The
10 intensity of the project would be appropriate from an
11 environmental review perspective, at least, along El
12 Camino Real.

13 So in -- in that urban context, the intensity
14 of the project seemed appropriate.

15 The auto repair shop and the gas station to
16 the south of the site have operational characteristics
17 that are obviously different than residential uses, but
18 these characteristics are not in our minds, at least,
19 basically incompatible with the proposed residential
20 uses.

21 We also found that the project would be
22 generally compatible with the General Plan and the Zoning
23 Ordinance, including policies that promote the
24 development of housing and the intensification of uses
25 along the El Camino Real.

1 We also as part of this analysis looked at the
2 project's consistency with the Draft El Camino Real
3 Downtown Specific Plan and found that the project would
4 actually not be consistent with the Specific Plan's
5 development standards and guidelines because it would not
6 be -- it would not include ground floor retail uses,
7 below residential uses.

8 However, because the Specific Plan is not yet
9 adopted, this potential inconsistency with the Specific
10 Plan does not rise to the level of a significant
11 environmental impact.

12 The Transportation Circulation and Parking
13 Analysis looks at the entire circulation -- the entire
14 circulation system to identify impacts on travel around
15 Menlo Park and the region using lots of different modes,
16 from bikes to walking to traveling by car.

17 As you know, the City has a very stringent
18 criteria of significance which are used to determine
19 whether a project would have significant impacts on
20 traffic volumes.

21 So even though this is a relatively small
22 project and would generate only about 155 daily trips and
23 a very small number of peak hour trips during the AM and
24 PM peak hours, it would result in significant impacts to
25 two roadway segments along University Drive and Middle

1 Avenue, and mitigating these impacts would require both
2 roadway widening and then that would also require
3 right-of-way acquisition.

4 Those things are not acceptable to the City,
5 and therefore this impact would be significant and
6 unavoidable.

7 Lastly, we found that the project would not
8 compromise bike, pedestrian or transit infrastructure in
9 the area, and obviously there's a lot more detail in the
10 EIR on those subjects.

11 In the related analysis, the air quality
12 analysis, we look at the effects of the project on air
13 pollution levels, primarily due to vehicle emissions, but
14 we also look at other things, as well, including
15 construction period emissions.

16 We found that the project would not generate
17 any Significant operational emissions, for instance for
18 people driving to and from work. Yeah, emissions
19 resulting from vehicles being driven around.

20 But we found that construction of the project
21 would generate dust and other pollutants, and these
22 pollutants could affect residents around the project
23 site.

24 Now this impact is primarily a function of the
25 proximity of proposed construction activities to

1 surrounding uses, not necessarily the scale of project
2 construction activities, because this is a relatively
3 small project site, and to mitigate that impact, we
4 proposed a measure that would require the construction
5 contractor to implement a variety of dust and emission
6 control measures on the site while the construction --
7 while construction activities are happening.

8 Another analysis that -- or another part of
9 the analysis that's related to traffic is the noise
10 analysis, and in that analysis, we look at the effects of
11 the existing noise environment on the project in addition
12 to the way that the project itself will affect community
13 noise levels around the project site, and we found that
14 the project would incrementally increase noise during the
15 construction period.

16 That would be a significant impact, and again
17 this is primarily a function of the proximity of
18 residential uses around the site for the project site,
19 and that impact would be mitigated through the
20 implementation of a noise reduction program for any
21 performance standards, very strict performance standards
22 are specified in the EIR.

23 Operational period noise impacts outside the
24 project site from vehicle traffic would not be
25 significant. No mitigation would be required for that.

1 However, the project buildings themselves
2 would need to be built with appropriate insulation to
3 reduce noise levels occurring from vehicle traffic on El
4 Camino Real, and that's a mitigation measure that's also
5 identified in the EIR.

6 The Public Services and Utilities Analysis,
7 that was another topic that we added in response to your
8 comments at the scoping session.

9 In that evaluation, we look at the potential
10 effects of the project on police, fire, schools and park
11 services, and as part of that analysis, we contact all
12 the affected agencies, including school districts, and
13 that correspondence comprised the really large part of
14 our analysis.

15 And just in summary, due to the relatively
16 modest population increases that we're looking at as part
17 of this project, the project would not result in
18 significant physical impacts on those services.

19 They would increase demand for those services,
20 but no physical environmental impacts would result, and
21 along the same lines, the project would generate demand
22 for water, wastewater treatment, waste disposal and
23 energy, but not such a great increase in demand that
24 environmental impacts would result.

25 In the aesthetics analysis, we look at how the

1 project will change the visual character of an area and
2 then also views around the development site, and in
3 response to your comments at the scoping session, we
4 added in an evaluation of how the project could change
5 shadow patterns around the project site.

6 So if you -- when you're reading through the
7 aesthetics analysis, you can see some diagrams that show
8 how shadow patterns on the site would change with the
9 project seasonally.

10 We found that the project would change the
11 visual character of the site by developing a vacant lot
12 and removing existing residential uses. You know, those
13 are kind of obvious visual changes.

14 However, because the project would develop new
15 residential uses that are similar in height that are
16 similar in type to those located to the west of the site,
17 the change in visual character would not be considered
18 significant or averse, particularly in the context of the
19 shadow analysis that we did and the -- the visual
20 simulation analysis that we did, as well.

21 We found that the project would cast new
22 shadow on residential properties across College Avenue
23 and El Camino Real. However, the new shadow generated by
24 the project would not fall on adjacent commercial and
25 residential buildings, and therefore would not be

1 considered significant from a CEQA perspective.

2 Last but not least, I'll talk really briefly
3 about alternatives. As you know, CEQA requires an EIR to
4 include an analysis of a range of alternatives to the
5 project, including alternatives that are specifically
6 designed to reduce environmental impacts.

7 So in this case, we looked at five
8 alternatives in detail in the EIR. The first is what's
9 required in CEQA, which is the no project alternative.

10 Under that alternative, the site would
11 essentially remain in its existing condition. So
12 residential uses and then a -- a vacant lot on most of
13 the site.

14 We looked at a baseline zoning alternative,
15 under which the site would be developed with three
16 residential units and about 23,000 square feet of
17 commercial space, and we looked at worked on a reduced
18 residential alternative, which is essentially a resi --
19 all residential project on the site were developed,
20 particularly to reduce the significant traffic impacts on
21 the project.

22 So the density of the project was reduced to
23 such an extent that no significant effects to the roadway
24 segments would result.

25 And then we also looked at the mixed use --

1 what we're calling the mixed use alternative, under which
2 the project would be developed with a single building
3 containing about 22 multi-family residential units and
4 13,400 square feet of commercial space, and this
5 alternative is similar to what could be developed under
6 the site -- on the site under the specific plan.

7 And then the senior housing alternative. This
8 is the one that you guys requested. The project would be
9 developed with -- the project site would developed with
10 26 senior residential units, and actually we found that
11 very last alternative, that senior housing alternative to
12 be what's called the environmentally superior
13 alternative.

14 It -- that's something that's required to be
15 identified in -- in the EIR. That alternative would
16 result in the least environmental impacts compared to the
17 all the other alternatives, and we found that senior
18 housing alternative to be the environmentally superior
19 one, namely because it would allow for a maximum amount
20 of residential development on the site, fulfilling the
21 need for housing in the area, while avoiding all of the
22 traffic impacts that would result from the project, and
23 that's primarily a function of very low trip generation
24 rates from a senior housing project.

25 People who live in senior housing projects

1 tend not to drive all that much.

2 So that's the -- the Draft EIR in kind of a
3 nutshell, and again the purpose of this hearing is really
4 for you to comment on the adequacy of the Draft EIR, for
5 us to take those comments and prepare a detailed response
6 to comments document with our technical staff.

7 But if you have any comments on actual matters
8 in the EIR, EIR procedural questions, I'm happy to answer
9 them, and we also have Carolyn Park, who's my colleague
10 at LSA, and then Paul Stannis from DKS who worked on the
11 traffic analysis, as well.

12 So thanks for your time.

13 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

14 So next up would be public comment on the
15 Draft E -- EIR. If you would like to comment on this
16 item, please complete a speaker card and we'd be happy to
17 take you all in succession up to the microphone.

18 I don't have any cards yet. Okay, there's
19 one, and then do you have any over there yet? Okay. And
20 actually if you could go that way, it will come up
21 through this direction and I'll just call you all in the
22 order in which the cards are received.

23 Public comment is typically limited to three
24 minutes, and it looks like we'll be able to easily fit
25 you all in. Don't get too comfortable over there. I'm

1 going to call one of you up here.

2 Let's go with Howie Dallmar first, please.

3 MR. DALLMAR: Good evening.

4 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Good evening.

5 MR. DALLMAR: How are you guys doing? I'm
6 Howie Dallmar. I live at 1390 Garden Lane in Menlo Park.
7 I grew up in Menlo Park in the late '50s and '60s and
8 '70s and went away to college and then came back in the
9 mid-'80s with my family and I've lived here since then.

10 So Menlo Park's been a great place to raise
11 our family. I really love the town, and -- and I've
12 known the Matteson family for about 25 years.

13 The Matteson family live in Menlo Park, and
14 they're really quality people that have a great
15 reputation for building excellent developments in
16 Northern California.

17 So I am here on behalf of myself, actually, to
18 say that I -- I support this project. I think it's going
19 to be a great project. I think it's been well thought
20 out. It's a responsible development.

21 The Mattesons went to the neighbors in the
22 area, listened to their concerns and have made
23 concessions limiting the house -- the size of the houses.

24 This development provides needed housing to
25 Menlo Park as well as providing below market homes, too.

1 The homes fit the character of the
2 neighborhood. They're attractive with nice finishes,
3 open areas and I think there'll be a nice amenity.
4 Amenities will be provided, too.

5 This is a project that I think we all can be
6 proud of. There are too many vacant buildings and empty
7 lots on El Camino Real. It's really been an eyesore for
8 the City of Menlo Park and it's gone on for years.

9 I think this project will be a vast
10 improvement. I think there's a need for it, and I urge
11 you to vote for this project.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Mr. Dallmar.
14 Up next, we have Deborah Fitz.

15 MS. FITZ: Hi, everyone. I'm Deborah Fitz.
16 I live at 299 Menlo Oaks Drive, and I'm here also in
17 support of this project and to urge you to vote in favor
18 when -- or to urge you to whatever action you take in
19 support of the project, and I offer you two perspectives.

20 The first perspective is that of having been
21 on the School Board for the Menlo Park City School
22 District for 2006 to 2010, and, you know, as a result of
23 that, I think I understand the challenges that a growing
24 enrollment in our local public schools has -- has
25 presented to this community.

1 That being said, I've also looked at the
2 student genera -- student generation rates that this
3 project suggests, and from what I can tell, it's really a
4 de minimis effect on enrollment in the local public
5 schools.

6 And I actually also am not aware of and
7 checked with the current board of any objections from the
8 current school board to this project.

9 The second perspective I offer you is just as
10 a resident, and I would echo a lot of what Mr. Dallmar
11 just -- just said.

12 I, too, have known the Mattesons for many,
13 many years and I know Matt has been -- has lived here his
14 whole life, attended the Menlo Park schools, has been an
15 active supporter of this community and has worked really
16 hard over the past several years to build consensus
17 around this project.

18 I, too, think that it would really improve our
19 city and the look of our city and provide needed housing.
20 So I -- I am here in support of the project tonight.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Miss Fitz.

23 And next we'll have David Roisz. Sorry if I'm
24 mispronouncing it. Just to be sure everyone knows, we're
25 commenting on the EIR tonight. We won't be taking any

1 action tonight.

2 MR. ROYCE: My name's Dave Roisz. I live at
3 1016 Creek Drive in Allied Arts. I'm a relatively close
4 neighbor to the project, and I have a couple comments
5 just on sort of the general project, and then a final
6 comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
7 maybe a question about that.

8 And I'm here actually to -- to voice my
9 disappointment with the design and the fact that it's
10 inconsistent with the Draft El Camino Downtown Specific
11 Plan.

12 I would very much prefer having some sort of
13 mixed use retail/residential development in the area.

14 I'm very much in favor of alternative
15 transportation, and I think this design is basically
16 going to continue the use -- the requirement that people
17 who live there use cars for pretty much every trip.

18 A huge amount of space is devoted to parking,
19 which I realize is something that needs to be included,
20 but I was hoping that -- that parking could be put
21 underground as much as possible, which doesn't seem to be
22 the case here.

23 I just wanted to read from the -- the Specific
24 Plan a couple points -- sorry. From the Environmental
25 Impact Statement.

1 "Although the project will be located in close
2 proximity to transit, it is not designed in a way that is
3 oriented to transit." I agree with that.

4 "From a design perspective, the project would
5 not encourage the use of public transportation even
6 though it would be located within walking distance of the
7 Menlo Park Caltrans station and near samTrans bus stops.
8 A relatively large number of parking spaces on the
9 subject tends to increase the use of private motor for
10 transportation instead of alternative forms of
11 transportation, including walking, bicycling and
12 transit."

13 And then finally "the project would not be
14 consistent with the development standards and guidelines
15 for the draft plan. It seems to encourage development of
16 multi-story residential buildings and ground floor retail
17 uses" and so forth.

18 "The proposed project characterized by more
19 suburban style urban form along El Camino could impede
20 the goals of the Draft Specific Plans as they relate to
21 walkability and the development of higher mixed use
22 development along the corridor.

23 So I'd just like to highlight those points
24 because I think -- you know, looking at the traffic, it's
25 something that could have been built in the Southeast.

1 It's nice that you designed in a way, but
2 there's a lot of cars and a lot of parking.

3 And I guess my question about the EIR
4 specifically is why the impact of Sand Hill Road
5 intersection with El Camino wasn't considered?

6 I realize that's become a long shot, but we
7 live on Creek Drive and it's very difficult to get out of
8 Creek Drive on El Camino. I find it surprising that that
9 wouldn't have been an intersection that should be
10 considered since the cars back up during commute hours
11 twice a day certainly past Creek Drive and a lot of times
12 past -- what is the next street? Almost all the way to
13 Cambridge.

14 So I would hope that they would address that
15 question.

16 Thanks.

17 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Mr. Royce.

18 And just for the record, did Mr. -- Mr.
19 Weinstein, did you get -- or whoever's taking notes --
20 the specific address or the intersection that they would
21 like to have addressed in the EIR, which was Creek and El
22 Camino?

23 MR. WEINSTEIN: Sand Hill Road.

24 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

25 Next up we have Pete Colby. Good evening,

1 Mr. Colby.

2 MR. COLBY: I wrote a letter in earlier on
3 and I don't know if I'm a great typist, so I just wanted
4 to express that I've walked past the property for about
5 thirty years and I knew it as a gas station most of the
6 time I've been living here, and I -- I just have a
7 concern about the way traffic flows through town because
8 I've seen bicyclists that are -- that are struck by cars
9 along that change in -- in the alignment of El Camino.

10 It moves off to the right, and it's not going
11 to be a possibility to realign El Camino for this
12 project.

13 So I think -- I'm just hoping that the
14 developer considers what I've proposed in my letter that
15 maybe they could slim it down to eliminate one or two --
16 two or four, actually is what I'm hoping for, the central
17 street side units to allow for the kind of traffic escape
18 route, I call it.

19 It's like a buffer from the speed of the
20 normal flow of traffic, because as I expressed in my
21 letter, I've been in front of the chamber before where
22 they discussed the million dollars in contracts to
23 coordinate street lights and get the flow of traffic
24 through town, principally to keep the pollution low and
25 let people get on their way if they don't have business

1 here.

2 And I think if you had a way to give more of
3 landscaping and more of a place for a staging area is
4 what I think of it is.

5 If you imagine the construction people coming
6 in and trying to get this place built, they need a place
7 to sweep out of El Camino gracefully, and I think you can
8 understand my point and, you know, I -- I respect the
9 fact that people think that some of these developers are
10 working really hard.

11 I've worked with really hard working people
12 most of my life, and the garbage collection is going to
13 be real problem.

14 They are hard working people. You have think
15 of Recology trying to service the new units and having a
16 place to do that without causing so much noise down in
17 our neighborhood.

18 I don't mind hearing and knowing what it is,
19 but there's this 24-hour Safeway and you just have to
20 give traffic a place to -- to sort of get off the road
21 gently and not have to stop all the traffic behind them
22 to wait for somebody else to get out and then go in or --
23 you know, I really think they need a place.

24 Anybody that has to show up on that property,
25 they could make it into kind of a little village right

1 there and have a place where people visit there, but
2 don't really come in, you know, and they could have more
3 trees and more creation there.

4 If you had a place with more land. I mean,
5 they're asking people to pay a million dollars to get in
6 a box and hear that noise all night. They have to crack
7 the windows. They have to have fresh air.

8 That's all I had to say.

9 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Mr. Colby.
10 Next up we have Karl Hutter.

11 MR. HUTTER: Good evening. I'm Karl Hutter
12 and live at 1221 Hobart Street in Menlo Park.

13 I -- I support this project. I've lived in
14 Menlo Park about twenty years and have seen El Camino --
15 I used to take my car to the GMC dealership.

16 That's probably been closed eight or ten years
17 now, but that whole area of El Camino has become, you
18 know, just not what we want to represent Menlo Park.

19 Just go look at Laurel street in San Carlos or
20 Sequoia Station in Redwood City. It's the regeneration
21 of a downtown area.

22 This is a relatively minor project relative to
23 that whole area there, but it's time that we got going
24 and do something for this neighborhood.

25 The Yogurt Stop -- I'm a big fan of the Yogurt

1 Stop. You can probably tell right here. I should spend
2 less time at the Yogurt Stop.

3 You know, maybe there's going to be a little
4 longer lines there because the businesses are going to be
5 ben -- benefitting from the increased, you know, flow
6 through there, but it's a -- you know, it's time for us
7 to really change the look of Menlo Park.

8 I had some friends here, some business
9 colleagues a couple weeks ago from Madrid and I drove
10 them -- after being around Stanford and walking around
11 Stanford in the shopping center and such, driving back
12 down El Camino, and they said in broken English "what is
13 going on here? Why is there -- why is there asphalt?
14 Why is there just vacancy? This is the Silicon Valley,"
15 and that just says it all.

16 It just told me that we can do better, and I
17 think we need to take a step forward, and this is that
18 step forward.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Mr. Hutter.

21 All right. Margie Roginski is my last card.
22 If anyone else wants to speak on this issue, if you can
23 fill out a card and hand it over to our able Planning
24 staff, that would be great.

25 MS. ROGINSKI: Hi. I'm Margie Roginski. I

1 live at 761 College Avenue, and I -- I have been a member
2 of the task force, but I'm speaking on my own here and
3 not on behalf of the task force. By fast "task force," I
4 mean a group of neighborhood folks that have worked with
5 Matteson on this project.

6 So -- so I will say that we had a number of
7 meetings with Matteson and he did make a number of
8 concessions in terms of the look and feel of the
9 development. I think it looks much nicer now than it
10 originally did.

11 I personally, however, feel that it never
12 really came down enough in height or density for me. I
13 have pretty grave concerns over the traffic increase that
14 we're going to see on University Ave, on Middle Ave,
15 which is just constantly backed up.

16 I already observe many cars that cut off at
17 Middle, so as they're coming down Middle going to El
18 Camino, it's backed up there at the Safeway and they cut
19 over and they do come down College Avenue.

20 I've monitored this. I see it all the time.
21 In fact, a great deal of our traffic on College during
22 the 3:00 to 6:00 PM time frame, which is when I've
23 watched, is due to those folks cutting over on to
24 College.

25 So I have big concerns about the traffic on El

1 Camino, as well.

2 I'm also not in favor of the three-story
3 height along College Avenue. I over and over requested
4 in the meetings that we bring that down.

5 I just think it's a massive three-story wall
6 on College Avenue that doesn't really fit at all with the
7 neighboring houses, but that was something that they
8 just -- they continually said they could not make
9 concessions on.

10 And I also finally want to say that I do
11 encourage the development of the project as a senior
12 housing development. I think this would cause some
13 changes that would basically improve some of the things
14 that I'm bothered by, in particular the traffic and the
15 impact on our school system, as well.

16 I think making it into a senior housing
17 project development would really have a very good overall
18 effect, and it would also benefit Menlo Park, because my
19 impression is that that's the type of housing that we
20 actually need.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you so much.

23 And just so anyone else in the public knows,
24 there is a second option for public comment later on
25 during our study session on this same item.

1 That's the last of the cards I have at the
2 moment. Anyone else?

3 All right. Great. So we'll move on, then, to
4 Commission questions to staff, consultant, project
5 sponsor on the Draft EIR.

6 So this is not on -- we'll have another chance
7 on the study session later to comment more on specifics
8 of the project, but this is on the Environmental Impact
9 Report.

10 Anyone? Commissioner Bressler.

11 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Okay. Why was an EIR
12 required for this project? What were the real -- was it
13 traffic mostly?

14 MS. CHOW: Yeah. It's basically traffic
15 started is probably the biggest impact. You can see
16 there are significant unavoidable impacts that
17 necessitated the need to prepare an Environmental Impact
18 Report, and then as Mr. Weinstein noted earlier during
19 the scoping session, there was another items that the
20 Commission wanted to see put into the document so the
21 scope of the project expanded to other sections.

22 But it is considered somewhat of a focused EIR
23 in that not all of the items have been considered -- all
24 of the items have been considered, but not to the fullest
25 extent in the EIR.

1 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: I heard mentioned the
2 difference between this and the Specific Plan.

3 Is that really an EIR issue or not?

4 MS. CHOW: It -- it could be from a land use
5 perspective, but really the Specific Plan in this
6 document was more for reference because it is -- the
7 project was deemed complete prior to the adoption of the
8 Specific Plan.

9 It's not subject to the Specific Plan. It's
10 more of a reference tool, but it's not anything that
11 should be raised for an environmental impact or even for
12 review of the project, it shouldn't be used to review the
13 project for consistency.

14 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Thanks.

15 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Sorry. I'm new at
16 this. I think -- you had your light on, but not anymore.
17 Commissioner Yu.

18 COMMISSIONER YU: I wonder if you could
19 explain the numbers that were used to determine whether
20 the schools were impacted.

21 MS. CHOW: The schools are discussed in the
22 public facilities section, and that is starting on page
23 160.

24 And so these numbers are based upon student
25 generation rates in which you received from the school

1 district, and so depending upon the type of unit and
2 student generation rate, it included a -- a number of
3 students, and so that is what is used in this document.

4 The mitigation measure for school impacts is
5 the payment of a school impact fee, and so as long as the
6 applicant is paying the school impact fee, there is not
7 an environmental impact at the school and the school
8 impact fee is to be determined by the school district.

9 COMMISSIONER YU: So when you say that, does
10 that mean, for instance, on the staff report on page 12,
11 there's a chart that provides unit information.

12 So I guess I'm trying to understand in
13 layman's terms. Does that mean that for any -- for any
14 unit that's three or four bedrooms, then you would assume
15 like a one point whatever number of students per unit?

16 I'm trying to understand, because I remember
17 for a different project, the number came out very low
18 just based on my intuition, so I'm just kind of curious
19 to hear like how you determine students based on a per
20 unit basis.

21 MR. WEINSTEIN: Adam Weinstein again from
22 LSA. Just to answer your question, Commissioner Yu. So
23 what we did is we called the school districts up directly
24 and they provided us with student generation rates.

25 So for the Menlo Park City School District,

1 they recommended use of a rate that varied from 0.28 to
2 0.39 elementary and middle school students per single
3 family residence unit.

4 Now they don't -- those aren't -- those rates
5 aren't differentiated based on the number of bedrooms per
6 residential unit. They're based on this kind of loose
7 definition that the school district uses based on high or
8 low value of homes.

9 So it's a range that they don't really have
10 defined all that well.

11 And then the Sequoia High School District has
12 used generation rates that's flat, 0.2 high school
13 districts per residential unit.

14 So for the Menlo Park City School District, we
15 used the higher of the rates, 0.39 to calculate the
16 number of students that we generated from the project,
17 and then we use the 0.2 rate from that from the Sequoia
18 High School District.

19 When we applied those rates to the project, we
20 get up to fifteen school-aged all together.

21 COMMISSIONER YU: And you provided that per
22 unit, then?

23 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. We've applied 0.39.
24 The 0.39 rate for elementary and middle school students
25 and then 0.2 rate for high school students.

1 COMMISSIONER YU: Okay. You're counting both
2 high school and elementary. So you're almost double
3 counting those units.

4 MR. WEINSTEIN: Essentially, yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER YU: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Kadvany.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Thank you.

8 I think this is a question -- question for
9 Adam again. Good evening.

10 Could you just say a little bit quickly about
11 the trip generation rates? I -- they seemed a little --
12 a tad low to me. It might be just because they're
13 quoting hourly rates.

14 Like for the senior option, I think it said
15 one in and one out at the peak, peak hour. People are
16 sleeping in late or something, not too much action going
17 on there in the morning.

18 MR. WEINSTEIN: I might call on Jan to talk
19 about this, but I'm just really generally speaking.
20 These are -- these are kind of average rates that are
21 applied for different land uses that we get from a
22 collection of trip generation rates produced by the
23 Institute of Transportation Engineers.

24 So these are those kinds of rates, and there's
25 not really great localized data for trip generation, so

1 we have kind of aggregated data, so it comes from the
2 transportation engineers.

3 It averages out among senior residential uses,
4 in this case in lots of different places. Because we
5 don't have really great data -- really great trip
6 generation data for senior residential uses in Menlo
7 Park.

8 So again, this us aggregate data. It may not
9 be exactly precise.

10 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Still, for example,
11 you could have a couple visitors. It would be typical.

12 MR. WEINSTEIN: These are average, again. I
13 think what you're probably looking at, too, is -- is peak
14 hour trip generation, as well.

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yes.

16 MR. WEINSTEIN: Because a lot of these uses,
17 including senior residential uses, don't necessarily peak
18 at the conventional AM/PM peak period.

19 Because their work schedules are there. Their
20 entertainment schedules might not be an exactly 9:00 to
21 5:00 schedule that we use to evaluate typical peak hour
22 trips.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So -- so there's some
24 uncertainty in using those rates.

25 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. They're the best --

1 they're the best data that we have.

2 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

3 MR. WEINSTEIN: We use those.

4 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: A question on the
5 retail -- on the retail alternative. That assumed 13,400
6 square feet of retail space.

7 Now, suppose you had smaller amounts of retail
8 space. Could you roughly scale that downward just
9 proportionately? So if you had 6,000 square feet, 3,000
10 square feet or something, would that be a fair assumption
11 to make to get a reasonable estimate of the --

12 MR. WEINSTEIN: I think I'll refer that
13 question to Paul. He's a transportation engineer.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: All right.

15 MR. WEINSTEIN: I'll butcher that, actually.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Thank you.

17 MR. STANNIS: Good evening. I'm Paul Stannis
18 from DKS Associates.

19 To your question, that's an accurate
20 statement. In some cases, there is an equation that goes
21 to this calculation, but generally speaking, and given
22 the size of this portion of this development, that would
23 be an accurate statement.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Right.

25 MR. STANNIS: So you could scale it back

1 proportionately.

2 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Even down to as low as
3 something as 3,000 square feet?

4 MR. STANNIS: Yes, you could.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: There may be an
6 Adam -- well, maybe it's for both of you. I'll ask the
7 question.

8 So here -- so a lot of these, the traffic
9 counts are for streets with no -- you know, no sidewalks
10 or no sidewalks on considerable sections of them. So
11 that includes University, Partridge, Cambridge and
12 College.

13 Does the -- do you all take account of that?
14 I mean, because it really, you know -- you know, even a
15 car every ten minutes in Allied Arts is a lot different
16 from a car, you know, every ten minutes in other -- other
17 streets.

18 It doesn't sound like much, but maybe you
19 would notice this, but if this happened with another
20 project, I mean, we may be much closer to limits of
21 sustainability for what these types of streets can
22 handle.

23 I mean, if for no other reason than for safety
24 reason. You have people walking in the streets here you
25 don't typically have elsewhere.

1 So I'm wondering if that's at all taken into
2 account here in your --

3 MR. STANNIS: Are you asking if pedestrian
4 counts are taken?

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: No. The -- it's sort
6 of the -- the disutility of an additional vehicle trip on
7 these -- on these roads as opposed to other -- other
8 roads.

9 I mean -- I mean, I guess these are just based
10 on the capacity -- I mean, whether or not we hit a
11 unmitigatable impact or depend simply on the capacity of
12 these roadways, right?

13 It has nothing to do with the fact that there
14 are no sidewalks there.

15 MR. STANNIS: That's correct.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Right?

17 So that's, you know -- I guess that's
18 something for us all to think about.

19 Okay. Another traffic question. Given that
20 there -- we've got some numbers, like 68 additional
21 vehicles on University, 32 on College, College does
22 filter down.

23 As one of the commenters said there is
24 traffic, you know, cut-through traffic in this area.

25 Would it be possible for you to estimate --

1 not that it would make a big difference, but just to know
2 what the residual increase is lower -- lower on College
3 Avenue below to the west of University?

4 I ask that because once you come past
5 University, there are two intersections which are T
6 intersections with no stop signs.

7 So again, a situation with just few extra cars
8 is worth paying attention to, because it's a riskier
9 situ -- situation, and there is cut-through. People zoom
10 through there already.

11 Can we -- is that possible to easily get that
12 estimate from your model or would it be a total --

13 MR. STANNIS: No. That -- that's possible.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Just so it's like
15 another one of these light gray reports.

16 MR. STANNIS: And you're asking for College
17 west of University.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: West of University to
19 Arbor, to include those and the intersections.

20 Okay. That's great. That's wonderful.

21 So this may be -- this is definitely an Adam
22 question.

23 One of the -- one of the project goals that's
24 listed -- and this reflects on one of the comments that
25 came earlier -- says, you know, one of the project goals

1 is to allow for a vibrant mix of land uses.

2 You know, often in the EIR, there's a
3 discussion of well, does an alternative meet the project
4 objectives or not.

5 So I'm wondering, you know, if we're -- we
6 have an idea of whether this -- the proposed project
7 meets that project objective.

8 So on page 21, it's mentioned, for example.
9 It's one -- I think that's one of the bullet points
10 there. Maybe this is something we'll discuss later when
11 we get to the project.

12 But it is part of the EIR. The EIR does
13 mention project goals. Encourage infill development in
14 the City and allow for a more vibrant mix of density of
15 land uses.

16 So it's much -- I guess that's maybe a more
17 judgmental question, but I thought it would be nice to
18 have you weigh in on that.

19 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes. These objectives were
20 crafted with us and City Staff and then the applicant
21 also had input, as well, because it's their project after
22 all.

23 I think this particular objective was crafted
24 in mind to an overall mix of land uses along El Camino
25 Real in the project area, not necessarily the project

1 site.

2 So this project is intended to create a
3 greater mix of land uses, including residential uses that
4 would fit in with the commercial uses and other uses on
5 El Camino Real.

6 So I think this objective is meant to be used
7 more of a bird's eye view on El Camino Real than just
8 kind of focused on the project site.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, I guess that
10 bird -- that bird has sharp vision and can see that
11 vibrant mix.

12 Anyways, okay. We can talk about that later.

13 I -- let's see. Oh, this is the last -- this
14 may be another traffic question. This is my last -- last
15 question.

16 When you come out -- if you're driving along
17 College, for example -- College coming out to El Camino
18 and you want to turn right on to El Camino, which is the
19 only thing you can do this there, the visibility is
20 pretty bad when there are cars parked there in front of
21 the yogurt shop, and yet you got to make a right turn and
22 you got to inch out and cars are coming by pretty
23 quickly. That's kind of a -- you know, a parking issue
24 here.

25 Another parking issue is as -- so the question

1 is: Are there any plans for any red parking zones in
2 front of the driveways to facilitate turning in off of El
3 Camino?

4 I mean, so I just mention the fact that
5 turning off College can be a problem and I'm wondering,
6 you know, is there -- has consideration being given to
7 what it's going to be like to drive into those driveways
8 from El Camino when there's pretty fast traffic?

9 And if you have parking all the way, it can
10 include where the driveway is, somebody slows down even
11 more. Whatever you guys have to offer on that would be
12 great.

13 MR. STANNIS: Well, I believe that in the
14 areas where there is parking along El Camino, that would
15 remain.

16 So we wouldn't be removing any parking spaces
17 along the western side of El Camino, except for where
18 the -- the driveway is to be located.

19 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. So as far as
20 you're concerned, there's no safety -- safety issue?

21 MR. STANNIS: There's something we can take
22 under consideration.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

24 MS. CHOW: Through the Chair.

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: All right.

1 MS. CHOW: On El Camino Real, I think there
2 will be any parking permitted. I think that's still
3 being worked out with the Fire District to obtain access
4 into the site.

5 It may be no parking on El Camino along the
6 project site, and in terms of College Avenue, the only
7 driveway would be where the one single family resident
8 that has the garage access fee.

9 Other townhome units that are facing College
10 take access from the internal road.

11 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Oh, okay. Yeah. I
12 know, I was thinking completely about El Camino Real.

13 So no parking at all in front of the whole --

14 MS. CHOW: That is what's being discussed
15 with the Fire District right now.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So follow-up question.
17 Is the loss of those spaces included -- counted
18 somewhere? Should that be part of the EIR that's going
19 to occur or where do we count that?

20 MS. CHOW: All required parking for this
21 project is to be onsite. So that's how it's going be to
22 be used.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah, but it's loss of
24 public parking spaces; correct? I mean, there's parking.

25 You can park there now, right? Park all along

1 that.

2 So if you work on College -- you know, any of
3 those streets, if you work on, you know -- the bike shop,
4 wherever, you can walk there or walk across the street to
5 Tesla or whatever. Anyway, that's a question we can find
6 out about.

7 Okay. Thanks very much.

8 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Ben. Go ahead.

9 COMMISSIONER EIREF: This is for Adam. This
10 is at aesthetic question. This came up actually at the
11 original working session, which is the very, very small
12 setbacks on the back of the property.

13 I know in the -- in the R-3 zoning, I think
14 normally they proposed three in commercial -- it looks
15 like roughly or a third or half of that, the length of
16 the project back and then the commercial -- it's actually
17 zero feet, I think.

18 But at least in the R-3 zoning segment where
19 you're kind of -- kind of maxing out the height of this
20 building very dramatically into what normally would be a
21 setback, how does that impact aesthetics?

22 MR. WEINSTEIN: So we look at that issue from
23 a couple of different perspectives. We look at -- again,
24 we're focused here on physical impacts, not necessarily
25 on the design of the project.

1 For design reasons, we're looking at how the
2 design of the project impacts things like light, use,
3 just the overall character of the project site. We look
4 at all three of those things.

5 You look at is the building site going to
6 block scenic views on the site. There aren't really that
7 many available scenic views. You know, it's a developed
8 area. There are lots of trees, lots of buildings.

9 So the building height, although it might not
10 be in exact conformance with the zoning requirements, is
11 not -- it's not going to actually obstruct a view.

12 We look at the overall visual character, how
13 the project is changing the visual character of the site.
14 And again, in the context of -- this is -- this is a more
15 dense project than the residential neighborhood generally
16 speaking to the west of the project site.

17 Is that a significant adverse change to the
18 visual character of the area?

19 We didn't think it was, actually. We felt
20 yes, it is more intense, but it's not compromising the
21 overall control qualities of the area, because it's
22 primarily a residential neighborhood fronting on the El
23 Camino Real.

24 And lastly we look at shadow patterns, how --
25 how are those building heights affecting shadow patterns,

1 and we saw -- looking at these diagrams that were
2 generated using -- you know, as part of our modeling
3 effort that the shadow would generally speaking not be
4 cast over the residential uses to the west of the site or
5 even the commercial uses to the north of the site.

6 The shadow is -- new shadow would be generated
7 by these taller buildings would generally fall on -- on
8 parking areas or streets, and therefore we also did not
9 think that that was a significant impact, as well.

10 So we kind of explore the issue of height
11 through the prism of -- of physical impacts.

12 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. I mean, to me,
13 aesthetics include in if I'm sitting in my backyard, I
14 don't know exactly what's there, but perception of a
15 mask.

16 It's a huge aesthetic parameter I would think
17 for people. Maybe even more so than light, although
18 light's important, too.

19 But anyway, thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner Riggs.

21 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Adam, we're going to
22 keep you moving back and forth, so you might just -- I
23 think this would be for you.

24 In the back of my mind is the possibility that
25 the applicant may choose either now or subsequently to

1 replace one of the units with maybe a coffee shop or a
2 convenience store.

3 Is the fact that the EIR looked at mixed use
4 with retail, albeit with significantly more retail,
5 25,000 square feet, a larger version, 15,000, does that
6 cover -- does that cover the project in terms of having
7 done its CEQA diligence.

8 MR. WEINSTEIN: So on a typical process for
9 something like that where there's a change to the
10 project, and let's say this happened after certification
11 of the EIR or -- yeah. Let's just say it happened after
12 certification of the EIR for the sake of answering this
13 question.

14 What would generally be done is that we'd have
15 to look at -- we'd have to figure out what changes in
16 impact there would be resulting from that specific
17 development scenario compared to the project, and if
18 there weren't any new impacts -- if that analysis found
19 there would not be any new or significant environmental
20 impacts beyond the ones that we identified in this EIR,
21 then no supplemental environmental review would be
22 required.

23 We could essentially rely on this EIR with
24 that additional analysis that elaborates on impacts of
25 that scenario.

1 If that scenario would result in new impacts
2 beyond what we have in here, then there would be need to
3 be something, a supplemental or subsequent EIR, that
4 would again go out for public review, because it would be
5 considered a substantial change to the project that
6 people would need to comment on.

7 So it would require another round of CEQA
8 review.

9 Does that answer your question?

10 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I think so.

11 You're saying the alternatives are here for
12 conference, but they aren't being studied.

13 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. I mean, they're --
14 they're evaluated at a lower level of detail than the
15 project, and if, you know, the Commission, the applicant
16 and the City Council were to decide to go with one of
17 those alternatives, there would likely be at least an
18 additional amount of analysis to be done to kind of flush
19 out some of the details in the analysis.

20 But, you know, depending on what the actual
21 impacts of that alternative was, there might not have to
22 be a ton more analysis. We could rely on, you know, the
23 work that was in the EIR to the extent feasible.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: For example, we have
25 maybe a twelve or 1,500 square foot coffee shop in

1 another neighborhood. It appears to do okay with three
2 parking spaces because most people walk there.

3 Would that kind of coffee shop and that kind
4 of use be consistent, then, or would it -- or would it
5 trigger a traffic concern because somebody from Middle
6 Avenue might drive down for coffee?

7 MR. WEINSTEIN: I think that in that case, if
8 we put like a 3,000 square foot coffee shop on there,
9 we'd have to actually look at the traffic patterns, the
10 vehicle patterns generated by that specific coffee shop.

11 Every use has a unique trip generation
12 pattern. So we'd have to really look -- you know, we'd
13 have to have a customized analysis looking at that
14 specific use.

15 But again, I mean, there's lots -- there's
16 lots we can rely on in the EIR, but for that specific
17 thing, we need to look at that separately.

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So it would be
19 supplemental.

20 MR. WEINSTEIN: Mm-hmm.

21 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: All right. I have a
23 couple questions for you.

24 Looking back to the school impacts on page 163
25 of the EIR, the last paragraph of that page talks about

1 that "the project applicant can either negotiate directly
2 with the affected school districts or pay a school impact
3 fee of \$2.97 per square feet of residential unit.

4 Do you know what this applicant plans to do in
5 that regard?

6 MR. WEINSTEIN: I don't know actually in that
7 regard.

8 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: And does the
9 Environmental Impact Report -- I know you're just -- I
10 know you're not in control of what that per square foot
11 fee is, but complete rough math, I'm thinking if there's
12 about 40,000 square foot of residential, that's around
13 \$120,000.

14 Is that roughly accurate?

15 MR. WEINSTEIN: We -- we didn't actually
16 calculate the overall payment. It's something that's
17 dictated -- you know, it's something that's developed
18 independently of any given project and I suppose a
19 universally special fee is negotiated. So --

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: That was apparently,
21 according to this bill, construct new facilities. So I'm
22 just -- I had thought that construction costs for a
23 classroom was significantly higher than \$120,000.

24 So I was wondering if -- you know, just if
25 there's approximately three-quarters of a classroom's

1 worth of kids expected to be generated from here. I'd
2 like to get a little deeper into the financial impacts of
3 the school districts that are impacted by this.

4 MR. WEINSTEIN: I think there -- I think
5 there's a fiscal analysis. Miss Chow, correct me if I'm
6 wrong, but I believe there's a fiscal analysis that's
7 being currently prepared that will look at that exact
8 question.

9 MS. CHOW: That is correct. There is a
10 fiscal impact analysis that is being prepared for this
11 project looking at school districts as well as other
12 facilities that should be available for release within
13 the next couple of weeks, and we will make that available
14 to the Planning Commission and members of the public and
15 it will be available at the library, available online.
16 So we will make that definitely available.

17 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. Great.

18 And then another one that is also just based
19 on the -- I know that the figures were provided by the
20 school district as far as their calculation, but do you
21 just know if the -- if that's calculated from -- the .28
22 to .39 is based on single family housing across the City
23 and that's the generation rate across the City or is that
24 new residential building?

25 I'm thinking of like -- you know how

1 neighborhoods and the lifecycle of our city, you know,
2 there is -- it kind of just ebbs and flows, but right
3 now, we're at a growth period for younger families, and
4 there's of course sometimes a contraction.

5 So I'm trying to figure out how they came up
6 with that, that as a figure. So I guess that would be
7 something I'd be curious about to address in the Final
8 EIR.

9 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. I mean, again, these
10 numbers come from the school district, and yeah, based on
11 our experience working in other cities, other places,
12 these generation rates are pretty consistent with ones
13 that we've seen elsewhere.

14 I believe they are collected from empirical
15 data. I believe that that empirical data is generally
16 focused on new residential development in places as
17 opposed to existing residential development.

18 But we can try to get more information from
19 the district.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Great. And to also be
21 curious, I'm wondering if it's possible to figure out how
22 many students have been generated from the newish
23 development off of Linfield Drive. Because those homes
24 are approximately the same size and square footage as
25 many of these units are, and they were -- it would just

1 be a good data point to have for the Final EIR as far as
2 the student generation rate.

3 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. We can try to get more
4 data from the district.

5 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. Thank you.

6 Commissioner Yu. Go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER YU: I just wanted to comment
8 that with regards to that neighborhood, I have several
9 friends there and it might be hard to get that. It might
10 be a future to be looking for.

11 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Got it. Commissioner
12 Bressler.

13 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: I just had a follow-
14 up on something.

15 Deanna, you were talking about the fiscal
16 impact report. I don't remember ever seeing a fiscal
17 impact report that talked about things like how many
18 school rooms would actually need to be built as a result
19 of this development.

20 It seems like they always talk about ongoing
21 per capita per year expenses, not capital expenses.

22 Is that -- I mean -- would that be addressed?

23 MS. CHOW: The fiscal impact analysis should
24 be looking at what are the cost implications for the --
25 for this development on the school district, not

1 necessarily projecting how many new classrooms are going
2 to be required and what are the financial impacts.

3 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Let's just be
4 specific. What you're saying, I think, is how many new
5 teachers would need to be hired, what fraction of a new
6 teacher would need to be hired as a result of this and
7 what the incremental cost of that is, but not capital
8 costs.

9 MS. CHOW: I don't think it gets to that
10 level. How many new teachers need to be hired I think
11 is -- it's more broad-based on --

12 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: There's -- there's a
13 distinction here, though. It doesn't matter. I'm just
14 trying to be a little more specific.

15 It's -- it's a rate, not a capital outlay to
16 increase capacity that is analyzed by these --

17 MS. CHOW: Right. It does not describe
18 capital improvements.

19 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: I don't think we're
20 going to get an answer to that question.

21 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Well --

22 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: We do have -- that's
23 one of the things you wanted to get at and the answer was
24 will be in there or won't it.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: You know, actually to

1 your point, on page 163 in the school impacts, it says:
2 "The project would have a significant impact on school
3 services if it would require construction of new
4 facilities in order to maintain acceptable service
5 ratios." So I read that to mean -- to mean, in fact,
6 capital improvement.

7 It's not saying it has that. I'm saying that
8 that's what this Environmental Impact Report is looking
9 at, not the ongoing operating costs of the, you know,
10 accumulated costs over many years.

11 MS. CHOW: I mean, this doc -- the EIR is
12 stating that this amount of students that are being
13 generated would not create the need for an additional
14 capital improvement, so therefore, it would not have a
15 physical impact.

16 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. Commissioner --
17 do you know who put your light on first down that way?

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I actually was the first
19 one before.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Oh, sorry about that.
21 Commissioner Riggs, go right ahead.

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: One second. Oh, first I
23 just wanted to observe that if I understand it from
24 having spoken to -- he just retired from Sequoia, but
25 that -- I believe when you ask the school district, they

1 give you the net number without your having to know how
2 many roles of toilet paper were bought, if you know what
3 I mean, so -- as opposed to how much is capital
4 improvement, how much is teacher salary, how much is more
5 air conditioning and so forth.

6 I also wanted to just go back to a response to
7 your question, and Adam, we'll get you up again.

8 The conclusion from what you said was that
9 there would be fifteen school-aged children as a result
10 of this project.

11 Is that actually the conclusion or is it that
12 fifteen school-aged units were used for analyzing the
13 impact?

14 MR. WEINSTEIN: Um, it's the -- it's the
15 former, that fifteen school-aged students would be
16 generated from the project.

17 And just to clarify here just how we did the
18 impact, to elaborate a bit on what Miss Chow said. We're
19 not necessarily only looking at whether the project is
20 going to result in new capital improvements or going to
21 require new capital improvements, but whether if those
22 capital improvements would even be required, whether
23 those would result in secondary impacts, environmental
24 impacts like the development of a wetland or the removal
25 of a historic building.

1 So it's thresholds for significant impacts for
2 school facilities is very, very high.

3 If we were dealing with a new community out in
4 the Central Valley somewhere maybe where there are lots
5 of greenfield sites and lots of wetlands and ag --
6 productive farmland and a project was resulting in lots
7 of new students that would require a new school
8 facilities, then school facilities might be built on
9 farmland, for instance.

10 In the case of Menlo Park, which is a largely
11 built out community, a very urbanized community, there
12 are limited development sites for school facilities, and
13 the likely places that new facilities will be built are
14 generally ones that are not going to have a significant
15 environmental impact.

16 They're on existing school sites there.
17 They're not historic buildings that will be demolished as
18 part of those projects likely.

19 So that's kind of the threshold that we're
20 looking at, and again, we're only dealing with fifteen
21 new school students in this case. It's unlikely that
22 just those fifteen students would result in new
23 facilities that would have an significant effects.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. We're
25 dutifully reminded that this is about the environment,

1 not about the school district. All right.

2 MR. WEINSTEIN: Sorry to keep bringing that
3 up.

4 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That's all right.
5 Somebody needs to. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner O'Malley.
7 Go ahead.

8 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I'm back to the
9 schools thing. I'm curious about how these numbers get
10 generated.

11 To give you an example, the street on which I
12 live has twelve homes and they're reasonably large homes,
13 and over the years, we've had a maximum of twelve
14 children in school -- that's at all grades -- and a
15 minimum of three. Right now, we have three.

16 So basically when you're looking at a new
17 project and saying to yourself only younger people with
18 families will move in, or do you get that number by
19 averaging out the years as people grow and as changes
20 take place to the neighborhood?

21 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. As I mentioned, in
22 regard to Commissioner Ferrick's question, we'll try to
23 get more data on how the school district's actually
24 crafted these generation rates.

25 But my understanding of them, based on

1 discussions we've had at LSA with the school districts,
2 is that this is not a snapshot in time. These are
3 average numbers within lots of new developments within
4 any school district.

5 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: But over a period of
6 time or just at a point in time is what I'm saying.

7 MR. WEINSTEIN: I think the sense that at
8 any -- any given time, this project could -- that people
9 who are living in this project would have fifteen
10 students enrolled in the public schools in the area on
11 average.

12 Yes, some -- there might be a couple of
13 residents that don't have any students at any given time,
14 and then ten years later, they might have students.

15 But just for this kind of an average, this is
16 an average understanding of the students that are
17 generated at any given point in time.

18 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: See, the reason I ask
19 is just from my experience, I think the number that
20 you've generated is probably on the high side rather than
21 on the low side, and that's why I was asking.

22 MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner Yu.

24 COMMISSIONER YU: This is a question I think
25 for staff.

1 Where -- where do we look at aggregate
2 impacts, whether they be schools or environmental?
3 Obviously specifically schools, but generally where do we
4 look at aggregate impacts of projects that are happening
5 in close proximity to each other? Could you help on
6 that?

7 Is there a menu for that where we kind of look
8 at EIR visits or is the next project, Linfield Oaks
9 versus here? Is there a place where we do that?

10 MS. CHOW: So the document does look at
11 cumulative impacts at the back of the document. So that
12 kind of gives you an overall picture of what projects are
13 -- have been approved or are in the queue.

14 So for example, traffic. We look at projects
15 and take into consideration projects that are in the
16 pipeline. So that it is cumulative, that does look
17 citywide.

18 So like in other -- in other sections, we do
19 look at a cumulative approach. So it does address that
20 in the document.

21 COMMISSIONER YU: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Any other ques --
23 Commissioner Kadvany.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: One last question to
25 Adam, please. About project construction. Some EIR,

1 there's some look at that, noise levels and so on.

2 From our discussion of parking, I thought
3 well, there -- I don't think -- there's no room on
4 College and probably not on Partridge for additional
5 parking during the construction project.

6 In fact, it gets very -- could be very
7 congested there because of the Yogurt Stop and so on.
8 It's quite unserved, the parking.

9 Is -- is it assumed that this pro -- it's an
10 acre and a quarter site.

11 Is it assumed it can be completely staged
12 internally so everybody comes into the site and kind of
13 builds this thing outward?

14 Kind of what -- did you all think about what
15 were the assumptions here for basically how the local
16 streets would deal with the construction project for the
17 impact?

18 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. This may actually be a
19 better question for City Staff, but, you know, my
20 understanding is that the City has established a protocol
21 for dealing with construction period, traffic patterns.

22 Is that --

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. That will be
24 great. Is there any assumptions in place that the
25 neighbors can know about?

1 MS. CHOW: We haven't established that yet,
2 but there should -- as part of project conditions
3 approval, there can be a construction staging plan that
4 would need to be approved and approved by the Building
5 Division and our Transportation Department to make sure
6 that it is not blocking traffic, but there is a plan to
7 accommodate new vehicles on site?

8 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Is there such a
9 concept like I made -- kind of made up here of kind of
10 internal staging where you tend to build outward?

11 I mean, it is a pretty constrained site with
12 El Camino on one side -- this very busy road on one side
13 and then to -- two roads that are also congested with
14 parking and a very quiet road.

15 MS. CHOW: I haven't had that conversation
16 with the applicant, but I'm sure he wants to make his
17 construction as efficient as possible, as well, and
18 however it -- it moves around the site or move your
19 construction trailer, move your trucks to -- to build it,
20 I think that will become more evident as we get through
21 the phasing plan and a detailed construction staging
22 plan.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, the construction
24 impacts are part of the EIR. This could be a significant
25 one, so --

1 MR. WEINSTEIN: Just to answer that question
2 in particular, generally speaking, we do look at -- we do
3 look at construction period impacts across all the topics
4 that we analyze in the EIR. It's primarily -- it's
5 primarily an air qual -- construction period impacts are
6 primarily air quality or noise impacts.

7 Transportation changes in the short-term,
8 generally speaking, construction period traffic generated
9 during a -- by a project during a construction period is
10 generally A, very short. It doesn't result in any health
11 related impacts similar to air quality or air pollutant
12 emissions, and typically, especially for a project of
13 this size, the volumes of construction period traffic,
14 even though they might increase by a lot during the
15 construction period are not such that they would result
16 in, you know, substantial periods of congestion or areas
17 of congestion on city streets.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. I understand.
19 So it's not really a CEQA topic. It's a building
20 department topic.

21 MR. WEINSTEIN: Exactly.

22 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: That clarifies it.
23 Okay. Great.

24 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Great. I don't see any
25 other lights. So that will include the Commissioner

1 questions.

2 I think we incorporated Commissioner comments
3 with that. So --

4 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Through the chair, I
5 withheld my comments until you asked for them.

6 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: All right. Well, let's
7 open Commissioner comments on the Draft EIR.

8 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I just wanted to make
9 some observations so far. We may get back more.

10 So I wanted to -- I wanted to start by just
11 confirming that we will have had additional roadway
12 segment that was requested by a speaker. I see a nodded
13 of yes, and I thought that was a great idea from the
14 chair to ask about the school impact from the recent
15 construction on Linfield and on Willow.

16 I assume you want to include on Willow, and I
17 wondered if we could also include -- except that I can't
18 remember the name of it. Is it Menlo Station? Is that
19 the condos that are above --

20 MS. CHOW: I believe that's Menlo Square.

21 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Menlo Square. Thank
22 you. I still won't get them right. Ask me next week.

23 If we could also check Menlo Square. They
24 have I think less landscaping than this project, but then
25 the Linfield and Willow projects have more landscaping.

1 So it might be a good balance.

2 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: It might be, but they
3 do have less density because they adhered to the
4 requirements of the City of 18.5.

5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right, but I mean in
6 children per unit. Although it's such a small project,
7 it may be somewhere between zero and three on that one
8 and a scientific value of zero.

9 Yes. Regarding impacts on El Camino Real, and
10 particularly traffic since this is the focused concern,
11 I'm not particularly thrilled with that because I've been
12 stuck in traffic on El Camino morning, lunchtime and
13 evening.

14 That's what happens when you have three lanes
15 of traffic going through two lanes, so it's not as if I'm
16 surprised.

17 On the other hand, if we were going to
18 concentrate development and have impacts, I think they
19 are more manageable on El Camino than they are, say,
20 on -- on smaller streets throughout Menlo Park.

21 Also, I think prompted by this EIR is the
22 observation that the provision of parking sixty spaces
23 would discourage people from walking through town. I
24 think that's something we might discuss in the next --
25 next item.

1 I did also want to just observe -- I think
2 there was concern about entering and exiting traffic,
3 which I'm very sensitive to partly because I don't want
4 to delay the traffic behind me and then also I don't
5 particularly want to get hit by the traffic behind me,
6 and I just wanted to observe that the driveways on this
7 project are quite wide and that you don't turn into a
8 driveway and have a parking space in play immediately as
9 you get in, which of course is what goes on at Trader
10 Joe's, and that this compares very well in getting in and
11 out of Oasis, for example.

12 I would say these driveways are at least twice
13 as wide or at least they appear to be.

14 So my overall feeling is that while traffic is
15 not ideal with regard to this project, at 26 units and
16 the way it's designed for the flow in and out of the two
17 driveways respectively, that this looks like a relatively
18 low impact project.

19 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Commissioner
20 Riggs.

21 Anyone else want further comments on this?

22 I will. I -- I also had a few that I was
23 tucking away.

24 I just wanted to comment that I really
25 preferred the senior housing alternative. We do indeed

1 have a housing shortage in Menlo Park, but the -- I don't
2 believe we have a single family 2,000 square foot plus
3 housing shortage in Menlo Park.

4 So that would be my strong preference based on
5 the EIR findings. There's no traffic impacts with the
6 senior housing. It satisfies the need for senior housing
7 or it wouldn't satisfy it, but it would make good
8 progress on it.

9 And then -- and it's -- it's good to see that
10 the EIR in general doesn't have terribly significant
11 impacts like we -- like Commissioner Riggs had just noted
12 on, you know, too many items, and I look forward to
13 seeing the numbers that we discussed earlier when the
14 Final EIR's prepared.

15 Commissioner Bressler?

16 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: I like the senior
17 housing alternative, also. I'd like to see some retail
18 on this site. So, anyway.

19 I -- I don't -- I don't really like the look
20 of these kind of houses on El Camino. I see them in Palo
21 Alto. It's not our vision for the downtown.

22 It may not be relevant to our discussion here,
23 but I think it's going to be pretty important to how this
24 goes down.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: All right. Seeing no

1 further comments, I'm going to move us along to the next
2 little stage here. Closing this public hearing on the
3 EIR, however, don't get up just yet because we're going
4 to move on to this project proposal study session and
5 we'll have a project overview presentation by the project
6 sponsor.

7 So before that, Deanna, do we have any staff
8 reporting of any items that you need to?

9 MS. CHOW: We may want to take a break. I
10 know the applicant has a presentation and would like to
11 set up some boards, and then I will be passing around the
12 color material boards for the Commission, as well.

13 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Great. Thank you.

14 We'll take just about four to five minutes at
15 the most. If you want to see those colorful
16 presentation, don't leave.

17 Oh, just as a point of information, we will be
18 holding public comments on the proposal after the
19 presentation.

20 (Recess taken).

21 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Go ahead. Mr.
22 Matteson.

23 MR. MATTESON: I'm Matt Matteson. First of
24 all, thank you for the time you took to review and get
25 ready for tonight. I know that takes a while, and thank

1 you for the time we're going to take tonight and for the
2 subsequent hearings. You're here as volunteers, so I
3 thank you.

4 I also want to say a thanks to Deanna Chow and
5 City Staff. They put in a lot of months of work helping
6 us analyze all of this and get to this point, and I want
7 to thank the neighborhood task force, all of them for
8 their time.

9 They really did act as a positive contribute
10 for the for the project and gave us a lot of suggestions,
11 and they spent time away from their work. So I want to
12 thank them.

13 My goal tonight so highlight for you the
14 changes that have happened to the project since we were
15 last before you.

16 I think the EIR and the staff report do a lot
17 of good job of summarizing a lot of things, but some
18 things very clearly be highlighted, and some of that also
19 deals with process.

20 I was also asked tonight to cover a little bit
21 of the project's evolution, particularly for some
22 Planning Commissioners who may not have been involved six
23 years and -- and more.

24 So let me do that. I'm going to go as quickly
25 as I can, and -- but it's perfectly okay to interrupt me

1 if you want to ask a question. We don't have to wait to
2 the end. Whatever makes sense for you.

3 The project in our mind began six years ago,
4 and it -- it came forth under different economic
5 conditions and different political conditions in Menlo
6 Park.

7 It started out as a 48 unit, what we call a
8 stacked flat development, which would be condominiums
9 over a -- an underground garage, three and four stories
10 with -- with what you would call sort of common services
11 in the sense of common garbage dumpsters, common parking
12 areas, some of those types of things.

13 That was brought forth, as I said, different
14 economic environment, different -- a different political
15 one. We -- we brought it to a Council study session and
16 to some neighborhood meetings and it was clear at the
17 time that both our neighbors and -- and the City favored
18 a less dense project.

19 This was buttressed by what happened to
20 everybody in 2008 and that -- that type of project really
21 vanished from viability.

22 We went back to the drawing board, and after
23 really significant analysis, it took a while to figure
24 out how to reformulate the project on this site.

25 We came up with what I would call the first

1 version of what we're seeing tonight, a townhouse and --
2 and small single lot -- home development containing 26
3 homes.

4 It was always our intention to have the small
5 lot single family homes on the rear of the project
6 abutting our neighbors with the townhome component
7 focused closer to El Camino Real.

8 The project brought forth then, utilized the
9 existing zoning and made use, as the current project
10 does, of the State Density Bonus Law.

11 This was the project that was the June 28,
12 2010 study session with the Planning Commission. So when
13 we talk about that -- that study session, that was the
14 project at that time.

15 You want to go to the -- go down a couple,
16 Paula. There you go. We're on the next page. There we
17 go.

18 Okay. When we came to the study session, we
19 were really looking for the first time at this project
20 together, and the initial reaction from the Commission
21 and the neighbors was -- was twofold.

22 One, it was we were on the right track. We
23 liked this a whole lot better than the 48 unit flat stack
24 four-story version, but we have a lot of things that we
25 want to -- we want to work on.

1 Some of the issues that we talked about at
2 that -- at that study session were density. We talked
3 about open space. We talked about the project
4 architecture. We talked about the College Avenue
5 elevation, setbacks. We got into height, single family
6 homes, which at that time were three stories along the
7 back row.

8 We talked about marketability to seniors and
9 to handicapped, how many kids would be going to school
10 there, as we have tonight. We talked about a site layout
11 and access. We talked about landscaping. We talked
12 about parking. I mean, these are all issues you would
13 expect we would get into.

14 One of the things that clear -- clearly
15 evolved from that study session was the Planning
16 Commissioners were not very familiar with the State
17 Density Bonus Law and its application, and in hindsight,
18 we wish that we had had time to either do a study session
19 on that first or have the City Attorney representatives
20 there at that meeting to help us get through that,
21 because that was not really our place to educate the
22 Commission on the State Density Bonus Law.

23 And so I think it actually made that study
24 session somewhat challenging, but we kind of cured that
25 when -- when the City Attorney did a study session on

1 65915. My suspicion is that will be helpful knowledge at
2 other sides of the City. It's good to have knowledge
3 about it. And we don't have to get into all the nuances
4 about that tonight, but that happened then.

5 So we had our study session and we -- and we
6 got feedback from Planning Commissioners and what got
7 feedback from -- from residents. What did we do?

8 Really the first thing that we came away with
9 was -- and I think a clear direction of the Planning
10 Commission was go meet with your neighbors. Go talk to
11 your neighbors. Go see if you all can -- can come up
12 with -- change the project that makes sense for you and
13 for them.

14 We also met with City Staff regularly and
15 fairly frequently to have them give us feedback from city
16 departments, other city officials, their ideas and other
17 suggestions from the community.

18 And finally, we did significant work with our
19 project architects, our engineers, our landscape
20 consultants and we also worked with city departments.

21 We had to spend a fair amount of time with --
22 with the Fire Department. We had to spend a fair amount
23 of time with Public Works on all kinds of things, making
24 sure that if we were going to make change to the project,
25 we didn't screw up the site facilities and the fire

1 trucks could still come and go, and interestingly, there
2 was a comment, I think, by Commissioner Riggs about our
3 wide driveways.

4 They're a key lead-out from our Fire
5 Department, because we can accommodate the longest,
6 largest ladder truck in this site.

7 Even though we don't have buildings tall
8 enough to need it, were told that at times that's the
9 only truck available, so it's got to be able to come and
10 go. So our project can accommodate that.

11 So we worked with neighbors, we worked with
12 City Staff, we worked with the departments and then we
13 worked with our own team.

14 What were some of the requests that came out
15 of that set of meetings with the City, set of meetings
16 with the neighbors.

17 First of all, shift height and mass from --
18 toward El Camino Real and away from the neighbors. I
19 mean, that was number one, number one, number one.

20 Can we get rid of three stories along the back
21 property line? Can we move that toward El Camino? We
22 don't want to have three stories staring in at us.

23 It might seem like an easy thing to do, but
24 when you're trying to accommodate parking, you're trying
25 to accommodate the -- the great rooms, the living rooms,

1 the kitchens and the bedrooms and do it all in a confined
2 space, lopping a story off is rather challenging. So it
3 took us a while. That was one key thing.

4 Reduce the number of curb cuts on El Camino
5 Real. The project as submitted in the first study
6 session had three curb cuts.

7 You know, sometimes these things just evolve.
8 That's the design that your designers come up with, and
9 you look at it for weeks and don't realize that you don't
10 need three and why is there three, and it takes somebody
11 finally looking at you in a meeting and going, "You know,
12 we don't need three."

13 Well, beautiful, because when we took out the
14 third curb cut, we got huge open space and landscape
15 amenities that we didn't have. So fortunately that
16 request came through.

17 Pretty exciting amenities for project
18 residents and for the neighborhood. Everyone was looking
19 for gee, how do we make this a better place to live and
20 how do we create opportunities for Partridge and College
21 Avenue neighbors to -- to be happy and do that, too.

22 Reorient some of the -- the units to face El
23 Camino. There had always been, I think, a desire on the
24 City Staff's part, less so from the neighbors, but the
25 City Staff really wanted the project to engage more with

1 El Camino.

2 And so we looked at that and thought okay.

3 Well, rather than turning our side to El Camino, maybe we
4 can turn our front to El Camino. And so we looked at
5 that issue.

6 Increase the setbacks from El Camino Real and
7 College Avenue. Clearly there's a desire to provide more
8 landscape buffer, wider sidewalks, get the -- get the
9 buildings back from the street, and -- and clearly as the
10 project continues, College Avenue up to El Camino, moving
11 those buildings back was -- was a key focus of the
12 neighbors.

13 Increase the size and amenities in the College
14 pocket park. The College pocket park I'll go into a
15 little bit more on a future slide. We have some boards
16 for you to see, too. You can come up and see afterward.
17 I hope you will.

18 We have a large tall heritage tree on College.
19 It's a tall redwood, and around that tree, which we're
20 reserving, we had placed what we call the pocket park.

21 It's a green space. It's not allocable to any
22 particular unit. It's just for all to enjoy.

23 The residents were asking for us to include
24 more amenities there, so it could actually be a place
25 they could come and not just a place to walk past.

1 Provide elevator access and ADA features for
2 some of the units. Clearly we're looking at a time in
3 Menlo Park when a number of empty nesters are trying to
4 exit large homes.

5 This is part of the Downtown Plan visioning.
6 They want to be down in areas where they can access
7 public services, shopping and transportation, and we
8 found this particularly true at a project we just
9 finished in San Carlos on Laurel street, ninety
10 condominium units.

11 Our original marketing staff told us we
12 wouldn't have any empty nesters. 45 percent of the
13 project was empty nesters. These were all people from
14 the San Carlos/Belmont/redwood City area, sold their
15 homes, moved down walking distance to shops and
16 restaurants.

17 So the theory works. This does happen, but in
18 this case, having units that are desirable for them was a
19 key of -- of revising some of the units.

20 Revised project architecture to avoid
21 uniformity and to blend more appropriately with the
22 neighborhood.

23 I think our first -- our first foray in
24 architecture on the project missed the mark. It was --
25 it was not reminiscent enough of Allied Arts. It was not

1 reminiscent enough of the quality projects that have come
2 to Menlo Park, and that comment came through loud and
3 clear.

4 Along that line, we were asked to take style and
5 material variety cues from the nearby Clarewin, Linfield
6 and Summerhill Developments. Summerhill, both down on
7 Willow Road as well as the Summerhill project south of
8 Forest in Palo Alto.

9 Our neighbors actually provided us photographs
10 of another pro -- a number of projects around town that
11 they had taken.

12 The funny thing was we showed up at a -- at a
13 meeting and we had done the same thing, and our boards
14 looked almost identical. We had taken pictures of a lot
15 of the same projects that we -- now that we realize we
16 needed to address the issue.

17 And finally, both City Staff and our -- our
18 neighbors said higher quality materials, higher quality
19 finishes. They wanted stone. They wanted copper
20 gutters. They wanted stylized railings. They wanted
21 articulation on the buildings.

22 They wanted them not to look like monolithic
23 buildings, but -- but actually more higher quality
24 residences reminiscent of some of the developments we
25 talked about.

1 So that was a long list, and it took us a
2 number of months to figure out how to -- how to do that.

3 As I mentioned before, the hardest, as you see
4 in the top of the slide, third story eliminated from the
5 single family residences and the heights of the townhomes
6 reduced.

7 We worked long and hard and week after week to
8 find out how we could do this, but we ultimately came up
9 with a plan, and we took all of the homes on the rear
10 property line, the nine single family homes and took them
11 from three stories to two.

12 That made them completely compatible in height
13 with all of the other neighbors in the neighborhood. In
14 fact, our two immediate neighbors on College both are
15 two-story homes.

16 We also brought down the height of the
17 townhomes themselves. So everything dropped, but the
18 rear homes dropped the most.

19 College Avenue home. The -- the home on the
20 end that faces College Avenue next to the pocket park,
21 and again I'll get to that on the site plan soon, went
22 from five bedrooms to four and was significantly reduced
23 in size, both in height as well as in -- in size.

24 Overall, the project as a whole shrunk by
25 almost the size of one home, 1,500 feet. Setbacks were

1 dramatically increased. College Avenue setbacks went
2 from five feet in the C-4, we took them to twenty. Big,
3 big, big change.

4 Setbacks from El Camino Real went from very
5 little, almost near the sidewalk to now they range from
6 nine to 24 feet, plus the sidewalk plus the planting
7 strip between the sidewalk and El Camino.

8 So the homes are now really set back from El
9 Camino, we provides for a lot of landscaping, porches,
10 things that we were looking to achieve.

11 The center drive aisle on El Camino was
12 eliminated. That was a -- a watershed moment for the
13 project, I think, because we got new common space on El
14 Camino.

15 It's a great amenity for homeowners and
16 neighbors and city residents. We have now a fountain on
17 El Camino with a trellis and stone structure that's going
18 to have seating and a place to really sit and enjoy being
19 there.

20 Behind that is a large green lawn with
21 barbecues and a lot of flowering trees and shrubs and
22 more seating.

23 So great project amenity, facing El Camino,
24 open to El Camino. In fact, it's highlighted to be very
25 visible from El Camino and it's possible by eliminating

1 what was going to be asphalt, so we're -- we're thrilled.

2 The size of the College Avenue pocket park we
3 increased as we were requested to do, and we also added
4 seating and trellises over there.

5 So now it is a place to come sit, read.
6 College Avenue neighbors, Partridge Avenue neighbors well
7 welcome to do that. It's not a place to walk by. You
8 actually can stop and sit.

9 We were asked to orient some units toward El
10 Camino Real, so we actually took four unit entrances and
11 now they and their porches face El Camino Real.

12 And finally, in response to the need to try
13 and accommodate empty nesters and those who are
14 handicapped, we included elevator shafts in five of the
15 nine homes on the rear of the project.

16 These are pretty ingenious design. The shafts
17 are built into the home when it's constructed. The
18 resident can elect to install the elevator equipment
19 then, or the electrical and everything is stubbed in.

20 They can turn the ground floor shaft into a
21 pantry and the second floor shaft into a large closet,
22 and then later they can add the elevator when they want.
23 They don't have to do it first.

24 But it provides a really wonderful option for
25 five of those homes. And so we -- we got that done, as

1 well.

2 Turning real quick to aesthetic modifications.
3 We spent quite a bit of time on that, and I won't spend a
4 lot of time on it now because I think pictures say a
5 thousand words, but all the exterior elevations changed.
6 New architecture, more articulation. It just -- it
7 completely redid them all, stem to stern.

8 We upgraded the exterior finishes on the all
9 the homes, and again, you'll see a list in a moment.

10 The College Avenue home -- and I call it the
11 College Avenue home. You have townhouses starting at El
12 Camino up to the pocket park. Then we have the pocket
13 park and then there's one home before we meet our
14 neighbors.

15 That home we changed to a stand-alone design.
16 It doesn't look like anything else in the garage. It's a
17 craftsman home. It's a two-story craftsman home.

18 Like a lot of other homes in that
19 neighborhood, it blends now with that architecture and
20 it's specifically made not to look like part of the
21 project.

22 And finally, on a similar vein, we have a
23 single family home on Partridge which has its driveway
24 facing Partridge, and we too -- I'm delighted with this.
25 We took photographs throughout the Allied Arts

1 development itself, the -- the Spanish style architecture
2 of Allied Arts, and that's the architecture for the
3 Partridge home.

4 And finally, we -- we put in enhanced layer of
5 landscaping throughout. We really went nuts on that. We
6 had a lot of specific photographs the neighbors gave us.
7 We had taken some of our own, as well.

8 We set our landscape designers on it, and I
9 think what they came up with was great.

10 So that's an overview textually. Let's look
11 at some pictures, and I think this will help bring it all
12 to light.

13 First of all, this is 389 El Camino Real
14 today. The largest portion of it is a vacant auto lot.
15 The triplex you see in the lower left-hand corner of the
16 site entering off of College, and there's a home that is
17 kind of wedged in behind that, Planet Auto.

18 As you can see from the staff's report, Alto
19 Lane basically disappears into the triplex parking area.
20 So that's kind of where it has ended for years.

21 Fun trick of technology. We had our architect
22 superimpose the project site plan over that aerial photo.
23 I think the actual site plan we have is a little easier
24 to use, but this gives you a little bit of an
25 orientation.

1 What you can see from the slide there, you can
2 see the big new project amenity at the center facing El
3 Camino. That's the green and the fountain you see up
4 near the sidewalk.

5 You see a lot of the tree screen and
6 landscaping that we added along College along the
7 townhouse buildings on the left corner of College and --
8 and El Camino.

9 You see another great green patch past the
10 large redwood, and that's the front yard setback of the
11 College Avenue home, and one other thing to note from
12 there -- we'll get into that a little bit further -- is
13 we have designed in a row of -- of large mature screen
14 trees all on the back fence line with the neighbors, and
15 that's another thing we had talked with them about in
16 our -- in our meetings, and those would be planted.

17 Regardless of what other landscaping the
18 owners of those homes want to put in, those trees will go
19 in as part of our original construction.

20 This is the site plan from, you know, more
21 sterile look, and again, I think this is probably best
22 viewed in your packets when you want to look for details.

23 One of the things that -- you note on there
24 and you'll be able to see is noted on there are the five
25 homes that have elevator options. We note the floor

1 plans and you can see the new site ingress and egress.

2 We now have two entrances off of El Camino.

3 You can come in and out either one. You don't just have
4 to make the loop in and out the other. You can come in
5 the south entrance if your home was near to that.

6 Very wide mouth entrances on to El Camino. It
7 can accommodate all the emergency vehicles. Full, full
8 widths on all the drive aisles.

9 We've used what we call pervious paving
10 whenever possible, which is -- enables percolation of
11 water and reduces storm drain-off. And we've
12 incorporated more parking into the site.

13 Every home on the site has a two-car garage
14 and there's visitor parking. I want to stop there for a
15 minute and talk about parking.

16 This is one of those areas where current what
17 you would call transit oriented housing and planning
18 vernacular runs right into your neighbors and they're in
19 complete conflict.

20 The way a project these days tends to be
21 called transit oriented is if you get parking so low that
22 people have to ride the bus.

23 That was exactly the opposite of what our
24 neighbors wanted us to do. They took one look at us and
25 they said, "We can't care what you -- you know, what you

1 think about transit orientation. These people will have
2 cars. They will need to park them somewhere, and if they
3 can't park them in their own garage, they're going to
4 come down our street and park them on our street, and
5 that's not where we want them." That's what they said
6 strongly and in great numbers.

7 So the project may not technically be called
8 transit oriented in the EIR because we did not drop
9 parking well below where you would normally want it. We
10 did that in deference to our neighbors who said more
11 parking, more parking, more parking, more parking.

12 So every unit has a two-car garage no matter
13 its size, plus we have ten visitor spaces on top of that.
14 That's intentional. That's more than the State Density
15 Bonus Law requires and it's certainly more than what the
16 Downtown El Camino Plan is going to require by -- I think
17 it's 49 spaces there. We have 62.

18 That's intentional. Even if we can't be
19 called transit oriented, we're going to provide enough
20 parking onsite so we don't have spillover effects to our
21 neighbors. Very critical and important to us.

22 Next slide.

23 Now you get to look real quick at what it used
24 to look like. Don't look long. It's not going to be
25 there.

1 Next slide.

2 This is -- these are looks at El Camino under
3 the June 2010 plan. Very different architecture now.
4 Stop. This is the way we look today. Why don't you go
5 back a slide.

6 That was the prior version. New slide. Lower
7 profile, completely different finishes. Much higher
8 level of quality from our point of view and from our
9 neighbors. This is precisely tracking what they were
10 looking to see.

11 Why don't we go to the next slide. We have
12 some before and after views. This is kind of fun stuff
13 here. This is the way it looks today with nothing on it,
14 and this is the way it looks with the townhouse
15 buildings.

16 That's facing south. You're probably --
17 you're across the street. The overage stop is on the
18 right of the slide.

19 Next slide.

20 Looking north, Planet Auto's on your left and
21 there it is with the project.

22 By the way, these street trees that you see in
23 these renderings are not fake. These are actual
24 photographs taken of the actual street trees and they
25 will stay. So we've just superimposed the buildings

1 behind them.

2 Go ahead. Next slide.

3 This is an interesting slide. This shows the
4 stand-alone home on College Avenue, the craftsman style
5 home. You'll note it's right next to another new two-
6 story building that was built in the last couple of years
7 on College Avenue, and it's designed to again not look
8 like a townhouse buildings, but more blend right with the
9 neighborhood.

10 Okay. Let's talk a little bit about the
11 changes. First change. The house on the left is the
12 College Avenue house that you just saw, and the house on
13 the right is the Partridge house. Those two houses don't
14 look anything like the rest of the project.

15 Go ahead, next slide, Paula.

16 This is take Partridge house. Balcony
17 details, door archways, the doors themself, red tile
18 roof, chimney details, everything from Allied Arts. They
19 were mimicked straight out of there.

20 Okay. Next one.

21 This is the College Avenue house. Interesting
22 thing here. You're looking at the side of the house.
23 The entrance actually opens from our central driveway
24 because it's a -- it's a -- a house in a row of houses
25 that are all similar, but its architecture, trim and

1 details are different, and its garage, instead of being
2 oriented into our center drive is actually oriented
3 toward College.

4 So the outside appearance of the house has
5 been designed to appear as if this is the front of the
6 house, fronting on College with its driveway. The front
7 door's actually around the corner on the left.

8 The front yard on -- on this home is
9 significant. Twenty foot setback from the sidewalk,
10 again another about five to eight feet setback from the
11 street, and the yard in front of this home will be fully
12 landscaped by us and maintained by the HOA.

13 That was a request of the homeowners, so we
14 could be sure we can assure them that it would be high
15 quality and -- and maintained well no matter who owned
16 the house.

17 Okay. Next slide.

18 This slide shows you the architecture on the
19 townhouse buildings. A little hard to read for
20 everybody, but we also have this on a board, as well.

21 Noted on the slide, copper gutters and
22 downspouts, lowered roofs. We added decorative corporals
23 and braces, what we call spider railings. Those are the
24 railings with the concentric design on them, very high
25 end. You see those a bit in Palo Alto.

1 A lot of additional stone were added to the
2 base of the buildings to both unify the buildings and to
3 create again that -- that high quality feel.

4 Tapered columns, lowered roof lines, divided
5 light windows and shingle siding. Again, these were --
6 were brought into play with tremendous feedback from the
7 neighbors and City Staff.

8 Next slide.

9 This shows the homes in addition to the two on
10 the end that we just dealt with that are the
11 stand-alones. These seven homes went from three stories
12 to two.

13 One interesting impact of this -- and we'll
14 talk about this a little later because it feeds directly
15 into a couple of the development standard waivers that we
16 need.

17 When you go from three stories to two and
18 you're still trying to incorporate most of the same
19 features in the home, including a garage, living room,
20 dining area, kitchen and bedrooms, the footprint of the
21 houses got a little bigger when they shrunk from three
22 stories to two.

23 As a result, in the R-3 zone only, and that's
24 the left zone, the three houses that you see on the left
25 of that row plus the single family home facing Partridge,

1 though -- that area is the R-3 zoning area. The rest of
2 it's all C-4.

3 In that R-3 area we're slightly under on our
4 landscaped area and we're slightly over on our lot
5 coverage. Both solvable if we take those seven homes
6 back to three stories.

7 We've committed to the neighbors that we don't
8 want to do that. We don't think that's appropriate. In
9 fact, we think it's appropriate that we commit to the
10 neighborhood that those be two-story homes.

11 The small impact is our lot coverage is
12 slightly higher and our landscaping area is slightly
13 lower. We think the tradeoff's appropriate and that's
14 why we've done it this way.

15 Next slide.

16 Elevators. This is a slide that in your book
17 and for those who want to see the board later and can see
18 this, we've pointed out five locations in five homes
19 where -- where those elevator shafts are.

20 Next slide.

21 This talks a little bit about our landscaping.
22 Again, a lot of detailed layers. We started the sidewalk
23 between the street and the sidewalk with -- with low
24 grasses and low flowering ground cover. Higher shrubs
25 and hedges, small trees, large trees.

1 The layering is all intended to create a lush
2 look and to mimic what's -- what's present all throughout
3 this very lush neighborhood behind us. So that's a look
4 there.

5 Next slide.

6 Four entrances, there you see them facing El
7 Camino as requested. Those four units have enough
8 setback for us to incorporate a porch and their walk from
9 the sidewalk on El Camino.

10 So we were pleased to do that. Didn't have
11 quite enough room on the far right unit, but we did get
12 those four units to have their entries facing and their
13 direction facing El Camino.

14 Next slide.

15 We talked about increased setbacks. You see
16 it on the left, College in front of the home there,
17 that's gone now from five to twenty feet, and then
18 increased setbacks all along El Camino where we had --
19 where we had indicated.

20 There is -- before we go to the next slide, do
21 you want to go back to that one? There was some
22 confusion, I think, in the presentation or the discussion
23 earlier about setbacks.

24 I think it was Commissioner Eiref, but I may
25 not be pronouncing your name right, but you were

1 concerned about setbacks and you were worried about three
2 foot setback. I'm going to show you where that is.

3 It doesn't adjoin the neighbors. It adjoins
4 two of our own homes, and the neigh -- the setbacks along
5 the rear property line are all fifteen feet, and it's a
6 minimum of five feet on the other side of the fence
7 between their houses and the fence.

8 Some have more than that, but they can build
9 up to five feet -- up to within five feet.

10 So the minimum distance between the rear of
11 our home and the homes behind us is twenty feet. So we
12 fully respected that. In fact, have adhered to it.

13 Some of the lost, the four on the left in the
14 R-3 zone actually is the larger setback than fifteen.
15 Just the way the land works, and there's a little jog in
16 the fence line there. So I wanted to clear that up.

17 I'll show you where the three foot setback is.
18 It's in an odd place.

19 This is the -- the new amenity on El Camino
20 which we talked about before.

21 Let's go to the next slide.

22 That's the tree screen I talked about on the
23 back, and then this is the area where we really poured on
24 the coals with the -- with the landscape enhancements
25 along College to really mimic Allied Arts.

1 So some of the Allied Arts are just drop dead
2 beautiful landscaping and we're trying to really make
3 sure that there's no falloff when you get to our project.

4 Okay. Next slide.

5 Okay. This is a site plan view. This shows
6 the site plan of the project now with all of the
7 landscaping on it.

8 I'd probably invite you to have a look in your
9 book and have a look at the board up here that we have,
10 but key elements we talked about, the heritage Redwood
11 City on the left side on College that we're preserving.

12 Very enhanced landscaping all along that, big
13 setbacks. We added the tree screen in the back, the big
14 side amenity up front and then a lot of landscaping on El
15 Camino as we set back a bit per the City Staff and
16 neighbors' requests.

17 The three-story portion of the project on the
18 townhomes along El Camino, I know a comment was made
19 earlier about, you know, where this begins.

20 And so just so you're clear, we are two
21 stories all along the bottom part of this, and where we
22 abut residential neighbors, either next to us or across
23 the street, we're two stories or we're a park.

24 The three-story townhouse building on the left
25 on College on the corner faces directly over the Yogurt

1 Stop. It does not face the neighbors. That's really
2 pretty key.

3 We tried to keep the three-story portion only
4 next to the commercial uses and not next to the
5 residential ones.

6 Next slide.

7 This slide just shows you a little bit more
8 detail. You can see on the top left, there is the
9 fountain near El Camino and the turf area, trellis area
10 seating toward the bottom of that area below the lawn
11 next to the handicapped parking area there is barbecues
12 and some seating.

13 To the right, in the middle of the slide is
14 the pocket park around the redwood tree with -- with
15 seating and trellis, and then to the right of that is the
16 driveway for the College Avenue home and to the right of
17 that is its landscaped front yard.

18 Again, all of that area to the right and left
19 of that driveway are going to be maintained by the
20 homeowners's association.

21 Next slide.

22 Talk a minute about development standard
23 waivers. I know this is going to come up, so let's talk
24 about it briefly.

25 What they are is a reality that the state

1 realized when it said, "We're going to give you bonus
2 density if you provide affordable housing."

3 To add more units into a site that are
4 affordable, you're not -- you're not going to be
5 necessarily get that in and still conform to everything
6 that the local jurisdiction needs you to conform to.

7 So we need to -- to say to a local
8 jurisdiction a developer who's providing this housing may
9 ask for development standard waivers which would be
10 height, setbacks, FAR, open space, et cetera, these types
11 of things that -- that are necessary in order to -- to
12 basically allow for the increased density that you're
13 putting in.

14 So in this case, in our project, it's three
15 affordable units and five total additional units, and --
16 and that's why development standard waivers come into
17 play.

18 One of the biggest things we did during the --
19 the year and nine months since we were last before you
20 was reduce the number of development standard waivers we
21 need.

22 We worked really hard at this.

23 Now, the staff report I think says twelve to
24 six. Our slide here says thirteen to five. There's a
25 little confusion in that in a couple of places, the

1 development standard waiver is counted twice because you
2 need it in the R-3 zone and the C-4 zone.

3 So we apologize for that seeming inconsistent,
4 but we dramatically reduced them, and our architects
5 worked very hard. We met the setbacks. We met roof
6 height. We met all kinds of things that we weren't able
7 to do in the first go-round.

8 So there were thirteen on our chart here in
9 first go-round, and those we cut to five, and -- and let
10 me tell you a little bit about those.

11 So first, before we go to the next slide, in
12 the middle of the site plan, you see it says: "Rear yard
13 setback for R-3."

14 Commissioner Eiref, this is the three foot
15 issue, and it is between our four homes on the left and
16 our five homes on the right.

17 The five homes on the right are in the C-4
18 district. The four homes on the left are in the R-3.

19 There's three feet between the home on the
20 left and -- and the boundary of the R-3, and there's
21 three feet to the right of that line between the home and
22 the right on the boundary of the C-4.

23 There's six feet between those three homes,
24 but because there's only three feet between each of them
25 and zoning district line, it's called a rear setback of

1 three feet.

2 It impacts our two homes and not the
3 neighbors, and that's why we didn't feel it was -- it's
4 the same distance between all the homes, but because
5 that's the artificial place where the R-3 and C-4 lines
6 get drawn between those two homes, we end up with what's
7 called a three foot setback. So I wanted to be sure you
8 understood that point.

9 So that's one of the development standard
10 waivers that remains.

11 Let's go to the next slide.

12 Okay. So we just talked about that. Rear
13 setback issues between the R-3 and the C-4 does not
14 impact the project neighbors.

15 Next item, the building coverage waiver.
16 Again, I mentioned this before when. We took the rear
17 homes from three stories to two. We got a little bigger
18 on our footprint.

19 The building coverage waivers for the R-3 zone
20 only. So again, we took back a bit, Paula? There you
21 go.

22 It's -- this only affects the four homes in
23 the lower left corner of the project, this development
24 standard waiver. It doesn't affect any of the rest of
25 the site, and what it says there is that our building

1 coverage would ideally be thirty. It's 44.

2 We can solve it by taking the homes back to
3 three stories, but we and our neighbors want to, and so
4 we've put in a lot of landscaped area in the back behind
5 the homes and on College, and the site overall meets its
6 landscape coverage when you combine it with the C-4.
7 It's just in that one area.

8 Okay, Paula. Let's go. Yeah. Let's get to
9 the third point. There we go.

10 The landscaped area waiver again is for that
11 R-3 zone only. It doesn't impact the C-4 zone. Again,
12 we can have a little bit more landscaped area if those
13 homes became taller and they had a -- had a slimmer
14 footprint, but we still hit almost 43 percent landscaped
15 area versus the target of fifty.

16 So we felt the tradeoff again by giving the
17 neighbors two-story houses instead of three, it was
18 better to go this route, and -- and we think the impact
19 is really negligible. And again, it's only in that small
20 R-3 area of the project.

21 I should clarify here. Height is not the
22 issue. We can do the rear nine homes in three stories
23 and be within the height limit of the city and not need a
24 development standard waiver. They could be three
25 stories.

1 We're asking for them to be two, and I think
2 that's an important point.

3 Next slide.

4 All right. Let's talk about the last
5 development standard waiver, which I think is -- is one
6 that's very intuitive, but it's helpful to talk about a
7 little bit.

8 FAR, by the way, on our list of five
9 development standard waivers, it's listed as two because
10 you need it in the C-4 and the R-3 zone.

11 So I kind of think of it as one and I kind of
12 think of the development standard waivers as four, but
13 anyway, it's listed twice.

14 FAR is the one development standard waiver
15 that is really the most directly linked to the -- to the
16 State Density Bonus.

17 If you stop and think about the fact that you
18 design a project with a zoning that accommodates 21
19 units, and because you providing three of those units or
20 you're providing three units at low income levels, the
21 State Density Bonus Law says you're entitled to -- to
22 build five additional units, not just the three.

23 So you're able to go to -- well, in this case,
24 you're actually able to go six more to 27. We're going
25 to 26, so it's important to note that we're one unit

1 below what the State Density Bonus Law would -- would
2 give us permission to do.

3 If you're going to have 26 homes or 21 homes,
4 you obviously need additional FAR in order to accommodate
5 the five additional homes, the three that are affordable
6 plus the other two that you get as bonus.

7 So this is really the one development standard
8 waiver that virtually every project needs. We -- go
9 ahead to the next point.

10 We aren't asking for development standard
11 waivers for height, perimeters, setbacks, paving, lot are
12 width, depth or parking. It really is an FAR issue.

13 And interestingly, when we get into a look at
14 what the Downtown El Camino Plan looks like, we are lower
15 density than what that would call for.

16 Next slide.

17 A word about traffic. We talked a lot about
18 traffic before in the EIR part. I want to talk about
19 traffic for a minute.

20 This issue was even brought up I think by a
21 couple of Commissioners. Really the focus here in Menlo
22 Park is that the way Menlo Park defines significant, it
23 does it differently than other communities.

24 It is the most hair trigger standard of any of
25 the communities we develop in on the Peninsula. Just so

1 you're aware, and I think a lot of people are.

2 The one -- the one street in what we call the
3 near-term condition plus the project, which is the
4 project plus whatever's kind of being developed right
5 now, the one place we go over the -- over the -- the
6 significant standard is on University Drive between
7 Cambridge and Middle, and that's a 68 additional trips
8 per day standard -- no. It's 68 additional trips
9 generated. The actual threshold's 25 cars a day.

10 So next point there.

11 Important to note. Our EIR was done on 27
12 units 'cause we didn't know for certain when we started
13 the process whether we'd be at 27 or 26.

14 So we're going to be less than 68 additional
15 trips per day. I'm not a traffic consultant, but I just
16 did the math and it's about a four percent reduction if
17 every unit generates the same traffic. Maybe they won't,
18 but we'll be less than 68.

19 But let's use 68 for -- for all purposes here.
20 If we take those 68 trips, we know they're in a 24-hour
21 period, but let's say we know that likely they're going
22 to be in the 12-hour period between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

23 I mean, 7:00 AM and 7:00 AM, the wee hours of
24 the night and people are out driving around.

25 Let's say the averages they're going to be in

1 that 12-hour period. That's going to be six per hour.

2 It's going to be one trip every ten minutes.

3 Now I'm not here to say that's nothing, but I
4 am here to say there's almost nothing you can put on this
5 site that's not going to generate a car every ten
6 minutes, and -- and if we're going to redevelop El Camino
7 and we're going to do it with economically viable uses,
8 it's very difficult to do that in a way that doesn't have
9 at least a car every ten minutes or so.

10 Frankly, if you look at retail uses on this
11 site, as we have and as the traffic study does in detail,
12 far more. Far more.

13 So we are the lowest traffic generator of any
14 of the alternatives except senior housing, which we'll
15 talk about in a minute, no project or downzone by half,
16 and that's kind of a reality.

17 So let's go to the next slide.

18 Helpful to compare this to the Draft El Camino
19 Real plan. We're not subject to it. We've been in for
20 six years doing this and we had this project application
21 complete and we're still I know working through the El
22 Camino plan, but it keeps coming up.

23 In fact, we had a resident comment about it
24 tonight, actually wanting more density and more retail
25 and -- and -- and taller buildings.

1 And I told you all that after a year and a
2 half of meetings with College and Partridge neighbors,
3 that's not going to sit with them.

4 So we can all talk about gee, we should be
5 denser and taller, and, you know, as a developer, I
6 should love that, but I -- but I've got -- I've got an
7 agreement with my neighbors and I'm not thinking this is
8 where we want to head.

9 But let's look at what the comparison would
10 be. So first of all, FAR, overall FAR on the project's
11 87 percent.

12 What does the El Camino Plan do? 110, and it
13 may be up to 150 if you add public benefits. So we're
14 certainly less dense on a -- on an FAR basis than what
15 the draft plan would to do.

16 Next item. 21.2 units per acre density on our
17 site. Downtown Plan, 25 units per acre density may be
18 increased up to 40 units per acre.

19 So again, we're certainly less than -- than
20 the Draft El Camino Plan.

21 Next item. Let's look at heights. We're now
22 28 to thirty foot throughout the project. Downtown Plan,
23 heights up to 38 feet.

24 Yeah, there's some setbacks and step-ups to
25 that, but they'll let you go to 38. Okay.

1 Next -- parking 62 spaces. Again, Downtown
2 Plan wants you to be transit oriented, so 49 spaces. So
3 I guess we put more heighth, more units, more FAR and we
4 park fewer cars, and that's exactly what the Partridge
5 Avenue and College Avenue neighbors didn't like.

6 Let me point out something that I think is
7 really important. Our site is not on the east side of El
8 Camino. We abut Allied Arts and we abut two residential
9 streets.

10 I'm not for a minute going to say that these
11 FAR and density and -- and parking things might not be
12 just great across between the railroad tracks and El
13 Camino.

14 You can probably do building heights there.
15 You don't have neighbors. You got a railroad track for a
16 neighbor. You got El Camino for a neighbor. You got a
17 hotel on one end and who knows what on the other.

18 West side of El Camino Real is just different,
19 and on all those parcels on the west side, it's going to
20 be different and you're going to have neighbors behind
21 who care what goes there.

22 So by all measures, we're -- we're less dense
23 and less intensive and less impactful than the Downtown
24 Plan.

25 All right. Next slide.

1 And the end. You know what? I missed the
2 last thing.

3 Open space on our project's 33 and a half and
4 Downtown Plan calls for thirty. So we're also higher on
5 open space.

6 I think they're really contemplating taller
7 denser projects than ours.

8 So conclusions. The first conclusion. We
9 spent considerable efforts to achieve project consensus
10 with neighbors and City Staff. We have. We've worked
11 hard.

12 We took lists that we thought we couldn't
13 accommodate even half of and we got them done and we
14 traded off and the neighbors came up with great
15 suggestions, and somehow our architects found a way to do
16 it.

17 You know, we had -- we had a lot of requests
18 that oftentimes were inconsistent, but what we did was
19 just keep the dialogue going and we kept our consultants
20 coming and taking notes and listening.

21 I hope everybody understands this is the way
22 this all needs to work and that the City Staff really
23 helped facilitate our working with the neighbors, but the
24 neighbors really grabbed the bull by the horns, too.

25 And finally, you know, it's important the

1 project meet the criteria under State Density Bonus Law,
2 but it also is doing things the City Staff and the
3 neighbors wanted done, too.

4 So there was a way to accommodate all three,
5 and so my conclusion really is -- and it's the last
6 point -- time to make this the reality. It's time to
7 move forward.

8 We're happy to be before you. I want to
9 answer your questions. I certainly have some thoughts
10 about senior housing, which I know sounds attractive.

11 It came up with the EIR, gosh, it's low
12 impact. I wish I could tell you I thought it was your
13 panacea, and I actually have personal experience with it.

14 But for now I'm going to stop and open it to
15 questions. I hope you found this summary helpful. We
16 tried to highlight with change and what we come out with.

17 So I thank you for your patience.

18 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you so much.
19 That was very comprehensive. So thank you.

20 Actually, before we go to our questions,
21 though, the next item that -- if we're adhering to this
22 would be the public comments on the project, so I'm going
23 to take it out to the audience first.

24 If anyone would like to comment on this
25 project proposal separate from the EIR -- so you can

1 comment again if that's your preference because it's not
2 on the same agenda item -- please feel free to fill out a
3 speaker card and make your way up to the staff table and
4 I'll call your name.

5 I can't see over the signs. Sorry. Is anyone
6 moving in this direction?

7 We have one coming up. Do you mind going
8 first? You can come right on up to the front. You can
9 come right up to the podium

10 Okay.

11 MR. COOK: So good evening. My name's Peter
12 Cook. I live at 620 Partridge Avenue, also own it, four
13 houses down from El Camino.

14 First of all, I'd just like to say I'm really
15 impressed with the presentation we just saw and all the
16 hard work that's obviously gone into this. I hate to say
17 it, but I'm impressed.

18 And also, to those members of my neighborhood
19 and the task force, I hope what I say -- you know, it's
20 just my personal opinion and I appreciate all the work
21 that you guys have done towards minimizing and making
22 this project a part potentially of our community.

23 So I've lived in Menlo Park and grew up at 628
24 Partridge for 35 years. I grew up than on Oasis
25 cheeseburgers, so I appreciate the ability to go down and

1 take advantage of the commercial opportunities there,
2 whether it's the Yogurt Stop or the O or what not.

3 I guess I have two major things to talk about
4 here. I understand a lot of my neighbors are against
5 retail being put in -- into the project.

6 I think that's almost asking a leopard to
7 change its spots. El Camino is a commercial thoroughfare
8 and it's gotten busier and busier over the 35 years that
9 I've lived there, and I think, you know, there used to be
10 a gas station there, so apparently -- I don't know what
11 kind of impact that used to have to College.

12 Obviously not much of one to Partridge, but I
13 think that it's unrealistic to expect there not to be
14 retail on -- on El Camino.

15 And so originally when I got up here, I was
16 going to say, you know, that I would like the project to
17 be inclusive of retail, but like I said, it was a good
18 presentation.

19 So I'm a little more ambivalent, but I guess
20 what the main point that I want to get to was that I
21 believe that -- that the intent of all the documentation,
22 the Draft Plan, the General Plan is that we maintain the
23 village -- village smalltown community feel of Menlo
24 Park, and there's just something that rubs me wrong about
25 extending a neighborhood into a commercial zone.

1 I don't think it's safe or a good environment
2 for children, which these are all single family homes,
3 and, you know, to that point, I don't think it's safe for
4 seniors, and -- but I have to say that I think there have
5 been great strides made for it, but I think just in
6 general, I have a problem with that, and I think they're
7 selling Allied Arts, but they're selling it twenty feet
8 from El Camino, and I think that that's a little
9 concerning to me.

10 The other point I'd like to make is just on
11 driving and thinking about how people move around.

12 I know that there will be a lot of cars coming
13 out of this and, you know, I'm not a traffic consultant,
14 but just from personal experience, you come out. If you
15 want to go to Safeway, if you want to go to Hillview or
16 Oak Knoll, the first thing you're going to do, unless you
17 want to go all the way across and go down El Camino, you
18 it's kind of slow. You're going to turn down Partridge
19 and head back to the western part of the city.

20 And I suppose the same effect would happen if
21 you wanted to get there, you go down College and make a
22 right and turn back in.

23 So if there's a way to creatively address
24 those issues -- because I think that would be something
25 to really address and, you know, I'd even thought of

1 making them one-way streets to kind of avert that
2 circulation of traffic.

3 So the residents of this project do have to
4 use El Camino as the main thoroughfare and Middle when
5 they're working back there rather than coming down
6 University and then being able to circulate and get to
7 there.

8 So that's just my comment. Thank you very
9 much.

10 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

11 Anyone else? Great. Thanks.

12 And if anyone else has a desire to speak,
13 you're welcome to fill out a card and turn it in. You
14 don't have to wait until all the speakers are done.

15 MS. BERLIN: I'm Annie Berlin. I live at 657
16 College Avenue, and I had the kind of unintended pleasure
17 of representing the task force on this project.

18 So tonight I have a couple thank-yous and a
19 couple maybe forward looking statements.

20 Thank you, number one, to all the people that
21 participated on the task force. It took much longer than
22 we thought, and maybe -- maybe they thought we were going
23 to go away. We just kind of didn't, and I really want to
24 thank Matt and his team because they really -- they
25 really did come to the party and they really did help us

1 look at this in a real critical fashion, and I also want
2 to thank the City, and the City really facilitated most
3 of the initial meetings until the task force started
4 meeting together.

5 So those are my thank-yous.

6 Next, I'd like for us to think about, number
7 one, let's support this project. Let's get it done, and
8 I'm going to ask the City's help on construction
9 mitigation as we look forward to completing the project.

10 And then lastly, I think I'd like to leave you
11 with -- you know, if this is a model that works, and I
12 think it is, I don't think that this project is going to
13 be our challenge.

14 I think we have to look across the street,
15 because I think that part of El Camino is really going to
16 be the challenge for all of us together.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you so much.

19 Did any other cards come in that I missed?

20 MR. COLBY: I'd like to just say one more
21 thing.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Oh, sure. Come up.

23 MR. COLBY: Peter Colby again.

24 I just don't think anything has been mentioned
25 about what he's planning to do to the business of the

1 Planet Auto Auto Shop. They may have taken advantage for
2 a while of his generosity for having so many cars
3 squeezed in, but the reality is we're going to put
4 somebody out of business. That's just one consideration.

5 And I did go out of my way to try to show that
6 I thought it should be reduced in the number of units
7 because I think people walking -- you know, pedestrians
8 is the alternative transportation sometimes, especially
9 for seniors, and if you're walking along, you know, he's
10 saying he's trying to increase it to twenty feet way down
11 by the Yogurt Stop, but you could consider having him
12 modify it the way I showed you and have a couple of
13 middle units reduced so that you can look out into the
14 area of it like an amphitheater like Christ might have
15 done with the amphitheaters of Rome and see the trees and
16 the sky, whatever it is.

17 He's saying he's putting landscaping in, but
18 all you're hearing on the other side of you is all the
19 traffic's going by you as you walk.

20 So our -- our city did a great things with the
21 trees, though, on El Camino, and McKinney -- Mr.
22 Kinney -- Kinney, sorry. The Councilmember had a great
23 idea to have trees all ago the sidewalks, and I think
24 that's great.

25 But I don't see why we have to bow to the

1 greed of buying an old gas station that's trying to
2 maximize the profits from using State Density Laws and,
3 you know, putting people that are desperate to live near
4 here, to put them in a -- in a compound.

5 I mean, it's pretty, but you could do more
6 with the space if you were really generous and you
7 thought you'd be satisfied with the profits from the real
8 estate value. You could open it up more.

9 That was my -- my problem.

10 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you so much.

11 MR. COLBY: Thanks for your time.

12 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Anyone else?

13 All right. I'm going to close public comment
14 for this item and bring it back up here to Commission
15 questions for staff or project sponsor on the project
16 proposal.

17 Commissioner Bressler.

18 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: This question is for
19 staff. The FAR of 110 percent, these kind of numbers
20 that we've been hearing, does that actually apply to that
21 area or is that across the street that they're talking
22 about?

23 25 units per acre, et cetera. I mean, that
24 sounds like the train station area.

25 Is this actually the parcel that this thing is

1 being built on where these numbers come from?

2 MS. CHOW: Right. Those figures are for the
3 El Camino southwest. It would be this side of the
4 street.

5 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: It would be this
6 side. Would it be actually this parcel?

7 MS. CHOW: Yes. It would be applicable to
8 this parcel.

9 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: This parcel.
10 Okay. The -- the five additional units and
11 the three affordable, is this in addition to BMR
12 requirements and what not? How does that come together?

13 MS. CHOW: So the State Density Bonus Law
14 exceeds the BMR requirements of the City. So it's not in
15 addition to what the applicant would be entitled to the
16 State Density Bonus Law.

17 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Okay. So we already
18 have BMR, but -- and this is a little more than what the
19 BMR would be.

20 MS. CHOW: It would be a little bit more than
21 what the BMR --

22 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: A little bit more.

23 MS. CHOW: Right. For BMR, for a project of
24 this size, it would be required -- I need to look at
25 my -- 52 percent of the number of units that would be

1 required for the BMR units.

2 MS. PRINCE: If I could jump in really
3 quickly. So what would be required on the BMR would be
4 three moderate income units and what they're offering is
5 three low income units.

6 So by offering the lower level of
7 affordability, that's how they're exceeding the BMR
8 ordinance.

9 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Can we quantify that?

10 MS. PRINCE: What do you mean by quantify?

11 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Well, you used two
12 terms and I'd like a definition for those terms.

13 MS. PRINCE: So moderate income -- and I'm
14 going to forget the exact. I think it's like 110 percent
15 of area median income, and area median income is
16 something that the county publishes annually.

17 And then a low income unit, I believe, is --
18 if I'm remembering correctly -- eighty percent of area
19 median income.

20 So the target person who's going to purchase
21 the low income unit as opposed to a moderate income unit
22 makes less.

23 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Okay. So what we're
24 getting for the -- for the five additional units is a
25 change from 110 percent median on the three to eighty

1 percent median on the three. That's if one actually does
2 the delta.

3 MS. PRINCE: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Okay. Thanks.

5 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Can I just follow up
6 before you move to you, John?

7 What -- do you know what our median income is?

8 MS. PRINCE: I haven't looked in a while, so
9 I can't speak to that exactly, but it is available on a
10 county -- San Mateo County website.

11 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. Do you know,
12 Mr. Matteson? It doesn't have to be the dollar, but is
13 it eighty? Is it sixty, is it 110?

14 MR. MATTESON: It's defined by size of
15 family, so it would -- it would change depending on
16 whether you were a family of one, two, three or four, and
17 I think the eighty percent's correct in terms of the --
18 of the median.

19 But it changes every year, so like, for
20 example, what it was in 2011 --

21 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Different.

22 MR. MATTESON: -- will be different in 2012.
23 They publish the figures.

24 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Do you have an
25 approximate? I won't hold you to it.

1 MR. MATTESON: I wish I could -- I don't want
2 to jump out with a dollar figure, but it's tough for a
3 family of four to live on it.

4 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Great. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Madam Chair, I can give
6 you an approximation if you want.

7 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Please.

8 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: A family of four, median
9 income in our area was -- it fell somewhat below a
10 hundred thousand over the last four years. It was
11 previously right about a hundred thousand.

12 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

13 MS. PRINCE: So our environmental consultant
14 just handed me a note saying 86,500 is median income for
15 a family of four.

16 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you. Got it.
17 Okay. Thanks.

18 MR. MATTESON: So you would be taking eighty
19 percent of that.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thanks. That helps me
21 just put it into context, and before I go on to my
22 questions, Commissioner Kadvany.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Thank you.

24 Mr. Matteson, I have a couple -- I have a
25 couple questions. I think I have a lot of questions, but

1 I'll try to keep it to two.

2 MR. MATTESON: Go ahead. I'm used to
3 answering questions.

4 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: The first question is
5 a little -- maybe you covered this in the history, but
6 how did the retail -- how is the retail component dealt
7 with? How was it completely dropped out of the project?
8 Were there --

9 MR. MATTESON: Why did it drop out?

10 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: How? Why?

11 MR. MATTESON: It dropped out the minute we
12 dropped the stack flat plan.

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Because?

14 MR. MATTESON: The neighbors were incensed.

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

16 MR. MATTESON: And that's a lot of neighbors.

17 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: And why? What was the
18 problem with retail?

19 MR. MATTESON: Traffic, parking, delivery
20 trucks, garbage trucks, all the things that they
21 experience with the retail from Yogurt Stop, Safeway and
22 others.

23 They -- it was -- it was -- it was a real
24 threshold issue for them.

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So not retail, per se,

1 but any volume, a certain volume of the side-effects of
2 certain types of retail shopping; right? Because --

3 MR. MATTESON: Well, you're nuancing --
4 you're nuancing a discussion that wasn't nuanced. So,
5 you know, they didn't talk about gee, we'd like a little
6 or a lot. It was, "We don't want it."

7 I have to tell you, I'm a major skeptic of the
8 Pendleton style retail where you got a stand-alone store,
9 you know.

10 We do a lot of retail investing in our
11 industry and my sense is that they want to be in grocery
12 anchored centers where there's a lot of traffic.

13 So this notion of this stand-alone retail
14 piece making real economic sense is a tough sell for a
15 lot of people, but the neighbors understand the impact of
16 the retail on the traffic and the parking and the noise
17 and they were adamant that we eliminate retail.

18 And that's -- so we want to go talk about
19 putting retail back in, I'll turn it back over the Annie.

20 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, you're here now.

21 MR. MATTESON: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Everything you're
23 saying has to do with certain impacts having to do with
24 the type and scale of the retail; correct?

25 If you have a one hundred square foot retail,

1 you know, not -- just to exaggerate it -- wouldn't the
2 impacts be considerably less?

3 MR. MATTESON: Sure, but I don't know any
4 one hundred -- that's a ten-by-ten room.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Just to be clear --

6 MR. MATTESON: Sure.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: -- about the
8 outcome since we're talking about the outcomes and that
9 there are -- there are differences -- there's zero retail
10 and there's 13,000 square feet, too. There's a lot --

11 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. We didn't have 3,000
12 feet in the original proposal. I think it was around
13 three, and it was a big reaction.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Three?

15 MR. MATTESON: Thousand feet.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: 3,000 square feet.

17 MR. MATTESON: Because that's what staff
18 told us we had to put in there.

19 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well --

20 MR. MATTESON: That was a prior staff, prior
21 Council, prior Commission, prior economy. I mean, you
22 know, like I said, we're six years ago.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. But again,
24 it's -- we're only talking about, for example, traffic
25 impacts or the garbage truck noise or whatever it is.

1 It's not -- there's not something wrong with retail, per
2 se. It's there a place for retail.

3 MR. MATTESON: Well, when you live next to
4 retail, it can be the wrong place for retail.

5 I mean, you have to understand. I've been
6 involved in a lot of mixed use developments, so I get
7 this.

8 I mean, I've got one in San Carlos and we have
9 one in El Cerrito and, you know, it sounds magical. It's
10 wonderful. Gee, it will be like Europe or San Francisco
11 and we'll have stacked flats over this great ground floor
12 retail for starters.

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I'm not saying that.
14 Please don't put those words in my mouth.

15 MR. MATTESON: Okay. That's what's been
16 discussed in the context of the project.

17 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I'm going to make it
18 clear. I'm trying to make clear that, you know, we
19 shouldn't deal in stereotyped exaggerations, please. You
20 know, or indirect -- what --

21 MR. MATTESON: That's fine. And a hundred
22 square foot retail is also -- you know, I don't know a
23 hundred square foot retail.

24 So I'll talk -- I'll talk to whatever point
25 you'd like me to talk to.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. All right. I
2 was just trying to get --

3 MR. MATTESON: The neighbors were adamant
4 about no retail. We didn't get into nuances about how
5 big or how little. They just didn't want it.

6 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: You know, it's really
7 not a nuanced detail between a couple thousand square
8 feet and 13,000 square feet. That's not a nuance.
9 That's a huge difference.

10 In fact, it's comparable to when we look right
11 on the next block where we have the Yogurt Stop and UPS
12 store and Menlo Velo, which are all very lovely
13 neighborhood shops, okay.

14 Does it add up to 13,000 square feet, those
15 three places? I don't know. I don't think so.

16 Let's drop it for that -- drop that.

17 Second question. So what you -- you said in
18 the neighborhood discussion that the -- the idea was --
19 your argument was no matter what, people would have to --
20 you know, their cars and end up parking on the streets,
21 right?

22 MR. MATTESON: Well, the way the College
23 Avenue neighbors in particular presented it, they have a
24 permit parking system in their neighborhood already.
25 They -- They consider that they're underparked on their

1 street. That they don't have enough off-street parking
2 on their street already.

3 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Please, really. I
4 just want to clarify that's what you -- how you saw it.

5 MR. MATTESON: So they wanted -- they wanted
6 the most parking possible.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. But we don't
8 have overnight parking in Menlo Park, right?

9 MR. MATTESON: I think they do on College.
10 No. You got to be off street?

11 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: You know, I live on --
12 I live on College -- I'm a College Avenue resident myself
13 and I live a little west of University. I've gotten a
14 lot of \$40 tickets.

15 MR. MATTESON: Okay. I guess they can't
16 park at night, but they're permitted during the day, too.

17 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So did anyone bring up
18 the fact in these discussions that there is no overnight
19 parking in all of Allied Arts?

20 MR. MATTESON: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: And then -- so how do
22 people get these extra cars on to -- was this brought up?
23 I mean, I don't understand the logic of it.

24 MR. MATTESON: The logic of?

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Where are these cars

1 going to go at nighttime?

2 MR. MATTESON: Which cars are these?

3 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: The cars that people
4 have if they don't have you know, their two-car garages.
5 You said they're going to park the car on the street that
6 they own.

7 MR. MATTESON: No, no. What I said was we
8 needed to accommodate them on the site rather than reduce
9 parking to create what people might consider a more
10 transient -- transit oriented situation.

11 If you talk to the consultants, they consider
12 this project not transit oriented because we have too
13 much parking, too much.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well --

15 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Can I clarify, John?

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah. Please do.

17 MR. MATTESON: I don't understand the
18 question.

19 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I don't -- I don't
20 understand what the logic is for the additional parking
21 spaces. Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: So I think -- tell me
23 if I'm wrong, John, but I think you're trying to find out
24 what the neighbors' fear was that the parking could spill
25 out on to their street when it's not allowed to park

1 overnight.

2 MR. MATTESON: It might not be overnight.

3 It might just be during the day.

4 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: I see. Okay.

5 MR. MATTESON: They have permit parking
6 during the day on their street. They have to have
7 permits to park. You can't just park there as just an
8 average person from what I'm told.

9 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: It's still confusing,
11 then, because, I mean, the garage parking, it's kind of
12 hard to use garage parking for just kind of incidental
13 parking for people who are visiting.

14 MR. MATTESON: No. If you have a two-car
15 garage and you're only using one space and you have a
16 visitor, they park in there.

17 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah. I guess so. So
18 it's visitor parking.

19 MR. MATTESON: We have ten visitor spaces
20 and every unit has a two-car garage whether they need to
21 -- whether they have two cars or not, they're going to
22 have a two-car garage.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So visitors -- well,
24 okay. I mean, I'm sorry to belabor this, but I really
25 just -- I really just don't quite understand the

1 connection between the number of -- the garage spaces and
2 West Menlo, because there is no overnight parking.

3 You can't have -- you can't have an extra car.
4 That's what I thought I heard you -- heard you say.

5 MR. MATTESON: No.

6 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: You can't park it on
7 the street. You cannot do that.

8 MR. MATTESON: I understand.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So I don't --

10 MR. MATTESON: But you could do it -- you
11 could do it between 6:00 PM and 1:00 in the morning. The
12 ordinance takes effect at 2:00.

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, sure.

14 MR. MATTESON: So you have a dinner party.

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: People are allowed to
16 park on the streets, always, but --

17 MR. MATTESON: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: -- to have -- you
19 couldn't have an extra car --

20 MR. MATTESON: No. I didn't say anything
21 about having an extra car.

22 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Whose cars are we
23 talking about?

24 MR. MATTESON: It's all visitors, I'm sure.

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So -- visitors. So

1 we're imagining visitors will be parking in extra
2 garages.

3 MR. MATTESON: Well, certainly the residents
4 themselves won't be parking in the ten visitor spaces
5 onsite if they already have a two-car garage.

6 That's part of why we did not shrink the
7 parking down. The State Density Bonus Law provided a
8 lower amount, and in order to be transit oriented and
9 under the Draft El Camino Plan, we could have met a lower
10 parking standard.

11 We decided to meet the highest standard we
12 could and we have extra spaces, so I'm not sure what
13 issue we're covering here.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Well, I really
15 don't -- I really don't understand the logic of the
16 relationship between the number of parking garages that
17 you guys have in the project -- not of course visitor
18 parking, but the number of garage spaces and basically
19 preventing overflow into the streets, because there's
20 permitted -- permitted parking there locally and there's
21 not any overnight parking.

22 MR. MATTESON: Well, if we had one-car
23 garages, and most residents -- many residents have two,
24 then we instantly create a parking problem, because
25 somebody's got to put that second car somewhere.

1 And so what they do is they'll use the visitor
2 parking until all the visitor spaces are gone and then
3 visitors will show up and they have nowhere to go.

4 So -- but the notion was we accommodated every
5 house with a two-car garage, even the smallest floor
6 plans.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I really find it
8 implausible that a project like this could not manage the
9 use of visitor parking by residents. I really don't
10 think that's plausible. I beg your pardon.

11 MR. MATTESON: They won't have management
12 staff onsite.

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I'm going to stop.
14 I'm going to stop. I'm going to stop because, you know,
15 maybe you don't understand me or I don't understand you,
16 but we'll leave it at that. We'll maybe come back to it.

17 MR. MATTESON: All right.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: But, you know, I don't
19 think -- you know, I think whatever this decision was, I
20 think it was based more perhaps on some perceptions and
21 concerns of unusual scenarios rather than the way things
22 work in Menlo Park generally with pretty restrictive
23 parking on our streets, and speaking as a College Avenue
24 resident.

25 MR. MATTESON: Well, it would be wonderful

1 if you want to talk to Annie about it. She was part of
2 all the discussions. So maybe she'll do a better job
3 than I have.

4 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, I don't know
5 what the nature of a neighborhood task force was. This
6 was basically a -- nobody on the west side of College
7 Avenue was told about it, and it wouldn't have been
8 appropriate for me as a Planning Commissioner, anyways,
9 but that's fine.

10 So let's go on, please.

11 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner Riggs, go
12 ahead.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I don't know. I think
14 we should get Matt a cup of tea first before we move on.

15 Sorry. We have good parks, and I'm going to
16 ask you a couple park questions, too, though I hope what
17 I ask you won't require the task force background to
18 answer.

19 But I share John's interest in having an
20 element of retail.

21 I -- I happen to accept the concept that mixed
22 use doesn't all have to happen stacked within one
23 property line, that it can be sideways and next to you
24 can be a retail, and when it's on the next block to you,
25 then that is mixed use. I think that's what we called

1 bird's eye view earlier.

2 But on the other hand, you do have a full
3 block there, and I can't help but wonder about in
4 building A-1, unit 5, I think that's a plan C, it's the
5 closest one to El Camino that doesn't leave its first
6 floor for garage only. It actually has living space on
7 the first floor.

8 And how do you see that filling someone's
9 needs or being a -- a choice that a future resident would
10 make?

11 MR. MATTESON: Let me grab my book, if I
12 might.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: And I think it's sheet
14 A-3.1 -- no, sorry. A-2.1A.

15 MR. MATTESON: Okay. So you're to the right
16 of the landscaped area, to the left of the side driveway.
17 Am I right?

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Looking at it from this
19 plan orientation, it's not right of the landscaped area,
20 left of the south driveway.

21 MR. MATTESON: Right. Okay. Now I'm sorry.
22 I'm with you now, so your question.

23 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. So that's the
24 only plan that has live space on the first floor, and yet
25 it's within a dozen feet of the El Camino curb.

1 MR. MATTESON: Well, where the -- to the
2 right where it comes off the south driveway, that's
3 garage.

4 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right, and the other
5 half, although it's a somewhat smaller half because of
6 the shape of the unit is -- I don't know whether it's a
7 great room --

8 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. That's a great room,
9 that's correct. That's a porch area as it surrounds from
10 El Camino and wraps to the green space.

11 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yeah.

12 MR. MATTESON: And that is the kitchen --
13 no. I'm sorry, no. That's a bonus room. Am I right,
14 Glenn? Is that a bonus room? Bonus room.

15 It's like a den, family room --

16

17 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right.

18 MR. MATTESON: -- on that ground floor level,
19 and then the great room is on second level.

20 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So that's 200 square
21 feet of sort of semi-programmed space.

22 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. Call it family
23 room/den, TV room, media room, you know, kid's room,
24 whatever. Play room. Because on the second floor is
25 where the living room and the kitchen is.

1 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. So that will be
2 less a family gathering place and more a -- I guess if
3 you think of it as a -- as a basement that has ground
4 level, that may be a part of it.

5 What was tempting was to ask could plan 1-C
6 become a two-bedroom walkup where the first floor is a
7 small retail space like something that would serve this
8 area, which you don't have enough demand probably to do
9 more than a coffee shop.

10 But is there any interest in doing that? And
11 I'll just ask that question and it's probably something
12 you'd want to think about before you'd answer that,
13 anyway.

14 MR. MATTESON: Well, if it's -- if it's
15 something we need to explore, we can explore it. It --
16 it sort of by its nature changes the nature of the
17 development because at least according to current city
18 regulations, we'd have to incorporate parking for it.

19 We'd have to invite the public to it, and I
20 don't really know what all the other ramifications would
21 be, but it would require site modifications.

22 So in order to comment, but I can't.

23 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: But your parking is
24 covered in terms of the City because you're parked beyond
25 what the City requires.

1 MR. MATTESON: Well, but it's not configured
2 on the site to where it would need to be to accommodate
3 retail there.

4 With a clear path of travel and handicap that
5 they have to provide there, so -- but as I said, if it's
6 something I have to consider, I have to look at it, but
7 at this point, it would require site modifications and
8 some study.

9 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. Well, it's
10 something I wanted to ask about. So fair answers.

11 We've sort of danced around the issue a little
12 bit, and I'm going to actually borrow this from having
13 spoken to Commissioner Yu the other day who asked who --
14 gee, I wonder who the target customer is for this
15 complex, and I would say in particular for the townhouse
16 units.

17 MR. MATTESON: Well, you have townhouse
18 units kind of all over Sharon Heights. You've got them
19 up by Safeway in Sharon. You've got them in a number of
20 locations throughout town.

21 I mean, the same type of demographic that
22 you'd have in townhouse units there is what would be
23 here.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: But a townhouse unit
25 surrounded by a dozen acres of landscaping is different

1 from a townhouse unit on El Camino, so --

2 MR. MATTESON: I'm also referring to the
3 townhouse units. There's things developed like in around
4 Draeger's, which is in a neighborhood near the downtown.

5 They're also over north of -- north of
6 Valparaiso on the east side of El Camino over in that
7 area.

8 So, I mean, I see the demographic as somewhat
9 similar.

10 And then I'm looking at the young couples.
11 Some of them are going to be doctors who work at Stanford
12 and need to be close. Some of them are going to be a
13 couple of teachers who are married and -- and team up in
14 housing, maybe starting a small family before they move
15 to a larger home.

16 You'll have empty nesters who want to stay in
17 Menlo Park. You'll have families who've lived in Menlo
18 Park for years who -- who try and get their 30-something
19 kids to move back here and help them buy something.

20 We see all kinds of different people in the
21 townhouses in particular.

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That is very
23 enlightening. That was what I was hoping to hear.

24 Not that we -- not that we control it, but
25 it's nice for us to at least have a clearer picture of

1 who the people are. Otherwise, we just make guesses that
2 aren't always very good.

3 You've included a lot of four bedrooms. Is
4 that part of the market of empty nesters, some doctors
5 and young couples and what you buy your kids?

6 MR. MATTESON: Well, in terms of the four
7 bedrooms, which primarily are contained in the -- in the
8 rear homes, what you find is that a lot of people
9 automatically take a bedroom as an office, particularly
10 today.

11 There's a lot of people working out of their
12 homes and telecommuting. What that tends to leave people
13 is with three, and one's a master, so the owner of the
14 house lives in one, and then they've got two others, and
15 they may have a couple of high school kids. They may
16 have kids in college who come back to visit. They may
17 have a need for a guest room and they still have another
18 relative living with them.

19 But we find often that one room -- one room
20 either goes to an office or it goes to a TV room, because
21 not everybody wants their main living room to be where
22 they watch TV.

23 And so we find that in a four-bedroom plan,
24 three bedrooms are getting used as bedrooms and one is
25 typically used for something else.

1 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That happens to me with
2 my older brother and sister-in-law.

3 And then just a couple of material questions.
4 It says in your copper downspouts. You're not really
5 going to make your downspouts out of copper. You're
6 going to give them a copper coating?

7 MR. MATTESON: Well, you know what? I
8 haven't gotten to that point of -- of detail. They're
9 either going to have copper or they'll be patina'd
10 copper.

11 They're clearly not going to be your basic
12 sheet metal gutters and downspouts.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay.

14 MR. MATTESON: Fairly artistic.

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: And again, we're
16 probably not at that level, but you may have heard we've
17 got this obsession up here with real divided lights.

18

19 MR. MATTESON: I've heard about that early
20 on.

21 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That and oak trees.

22 They probably know about us in Sacramento on that one.

23 And then this -- others up here may not agree
24 with me, but I -- I -- well, I'll first say that I very
25 much like the materials and the architecture, and this

1 isn't the first time Dahlin Group has done a design
2 that's impressed. I don't think it will be the last
3 time.

4 I am not terribly thrilled personally with dry
5 stack stone on the exterior of a building. I think it's
6 very trendy, which means that it will be out of style in
7 ten or fifteen years.

8 It also does not stay clean very well,
9 particularly on the north side of the building. It
10 collects real greeny growy stuff and then they drool.

11 I would just recommend something a little bit
12 more flush and traditional grout for those two reasons.

13 MR. MATTESON: Duly noted.

14 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. Now getting
15 back to more serious planning issues. Something that
16 John sort of touched on.

17 When I saw you have visitor parking, I thought
18 that is great in concept, but most every development that
19 I have visited, the visitor parking is taken. It's taken
20 by the person who decides oh, what the heck. I'll keep
21 Jason's car even while he's away at college and just park
22 in the visitor's spot for the next four years.

23 It's taken when you buy a new car and you
24 haven't decided what to do with the old car for a year or
25 two, and it's taken when you just never got around to

1 cleaning out your garage after the movers were here and
2 you park in the visitor's spot.

3 So will you potentially have or ask the
4 homeowner's association to have some kind of limitation
5 on that? I think that might --

6 MR. MATTESON: We do. We do, and we put it
7 in the CC&Rs. One of the things we've typically done in
8 CC&Rs is prohibit garages from being storage spaces.

9 In other words, you can't store your boat or
10 your -- whatever it is in your garage. It's for cars.

11 We create regulations about visitor spaces
12 like that that's not for use by -- for permanent use by
13 existing residents.

14 There's always a policing issue, but typically
15 developments like this hire a -- a -- a management
16 company that helps them run the development in terms of
17 things like making sure that all the landscaping's done
18 right and what not, and they come up with systems, but it
19 requires them to police each other.

20 I do think you kind of have a sense when your
21 neighbor has parked his third car in the visitor space.
22 But yeah, they're there for visitor use and -- and people
23 will have to police themselves.

24 But we think people do generally a pretty good
25 job of that.

1 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Neighbors tend to be
2 shy, but if it's in the CC&Rs, that helps a whole lot.

3 MR. MATTESON: Yeah, and it helps to have
4 the management company be the cop.

5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Matt, that gives me a
6 good sense or it also confirms the details in which
7 you've looked at these things.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.
10 Commissioner Yu?

11 COMMISSIONER YU: Hi.

12 MR. MATTESON: Hi.

13 COMMISSIONER YU: I have a question. I will
14 say thank you for the presentation. It was very clear
15 and thorough.

16 I really appreciate what you're trying to do,
17 which is activate El Camino, and I'm wondering what
18 considerations you guys have made about keeping it open
19 and also protected for young children.

20 So I imagine there may be a number of young
21 children who live here and they want to use that space,
22 and so I don't -- I mean, I certainly wouldn't want to
23 create something that was a gated community.

24 MR. MATTESON: Right.

25 COMMISSIONER YU: But when I first saw that

1 being the mother of a young child who listens to me
2 whenever she please he, the first I thought of her is
3 getting on her little whatever, trike or whatever little
4 whatever and just going straight into the street and have
5 no concerns, you know.

6 And so I do think it's great to activate El
7 Camino. I do think it's great to invite more people in
8 and out, but I think I'm worried about safety.

9 MR. MATTESON: Well, clearly, you know,
10 parents are the -- the key to the whole thing, but one of
11 the things that we have done sometimes -- and we gave
12 some thought to this -- is you can make some things a
13 little less than easy.

14 For example, your -- your paving stones and
15 things right near El Camino may not be conducive to
16 trikes. We might make it a little more bumpy. So it
17 will take you longer to get there.

18 Putting landscaping kind of low level in
19 between them and the street. So they've got to go around
20 in order to get there. They can't do a B line going
21 straight, but we don't interrupt the sight lines off of
22 El Camino. We keep things low.

23 But for a toddler, it's still a barrier. So
24 we tend to try to use that sort of thing.

25 I think what you see now is a concept plan,

1 and as we get into the real details, up close, planning
2 exactly what's going to be in exactly five or six foot
3 period, I take the comment to heart and safety's a good
4 reason to think about that.

5 But we want -- we want the project to -- to be
6 viewed from El Camino as open. We want the fountain to
7 be visible, but that doesn't mean there can't be two or
8 three foot high hedges and things that make it tough for
9 a toddler to make a B line for the bus route.

10 COMMISSIONER YU: Great, yeah. I would
11 definitely -- I would support taking consideration in
12 ways to create barriers that make it to like not only
13 condense on El Camino, but now a gated community there,
14 you know.

15 And I do think -- I will note that, you know,
16 I think aesthetically this is certainly higher quality
17 and better than the previous version, which to me, I
18 thought a little bit more fabricated and Disney.

19 This one felt -- feels a little more upscale.
20 So I feel the change and I appreciate that.

21 But I do want to ask about building E.
22 Where -- what is the inspiration for the wall? The
23 facade feels a little bit massive to me.

24 MR. MATTESON: I'm sorry. For what?

25 COMMISSIONER YU: Building E.

1 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: The Partridge.

2 MR. MATTESON: The Partridge home?

3 COMMISSIONER YU: Yeah. The Partridge home.

4 MR. MATTESON: Okay. So tell me what your
5 concern is.

6 COMMISSIONER YU: I know there's a lot of
7 elements for Allied Arts. Even for a Spanish villa, the
8 front is so massive because the villa's so small. So I
9 wonder if the intention was to have ivy crawl up the
10 wall. Maybe that was meant.

11 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. You know what? It
12 was. It was bougainvillea, but it didn't translate to
13 this rendering.

14 But yeah, they're supposed to -- you can see a
15 little of it to the left of the garage near the window.
16 That was sort of an attempt of a wisteria vine, I think.

17 But the idea -- that wrought iron would be
18 wrapped with flowers and be more inviting in that regard.

19 I think the windows are dictated by what the
20 floor plans are on the inside, but we have a -- we have a
21 fairly narrow window on -- on Partridge.

22 You know, you have Planet Auto here and you
23 have another house right here. So we have a fairly
24 narrow window.

25 So that's why we kind of have everything out

1 there right in the front. But we tried to really give it
2 a flare architecturally, and it is intended to be more
3 landscaped in terms of vines, because we don't have a lot
4 of yard there, either, to work with.

5 COMMISSIONER YU: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Vince, go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: I have a couple
8 questions.

9 MR. MATTESON: Sure.

10 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: First I want to say
11 is I appreciate you working with the neighbors. I can
12 see the effort that went into that, and I do acknowledge
13 that.

14 One question I had was -- well, when we --
15 when this was last presented to us, I don't believe you
16 were here. There was somebody else, and is this a
17 project that you picked up in the last couple of years?

18 MR. MATTESON: No. There was another
19 partner here who presented last time.

20 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Okay.

21 MR. MATTESON: So Now you have me.

22 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Yeah.

23 MR. MATTESON: Yeah.

24 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: The real
25 disappointment for me here is just -- because this is a

1 function of this being a product of the process with the
2 neighborhood group, obviously, and, you know, that's a
3 big part of what we want to do is make the neighbors
4 happy.

5 On the other hand, doesn't -- this is not --
6 this isn't retail facing El Camino at all, and, I mean, I
7 don't really see any reconciliation to that, and I think
8 we're just going to have to see how that plays out.

9 But it really is bringing -- bringing these
10 condos right up to El Camino. I do see it other places
11 on El Camino and it's definitely something that I was
12 hoping that we could avoid with the Specific Plan.

13 Of course this predates the Specific Plan, but
14 the Specific Plan hasn't been approved yet or anything
15 like that, but I guess the other -- these sort of half
16 measures about turning one or two of these units into
17 retail doesn't work for me.

18 And that's -- I'm kind of stuck with it, you
19 know. I just kind of want to get that out. I don't know
20 what else is going to come out of this process.

21 But if you want to say anything about it.

22 MR. MATTESON: I'm not unsympathetic. From
23 my perspective now -- and I've said, I've been at this
24 now for a long time, and during the last couple of years,
25 we've been listening to a lot of people.

1 The -- a push for retail hasn't been part of
2 that message. So that's not been coming from staff and
3 it's not been coming from neighbors.

4 And so as a result, we've been focusing on
5 making the project otherwise the absolute best we can.

6 Yes, this is part of the process and that's
7 why we're here tonight, and -- you know, so I -- you
8 know, I take the comments to heart.

9 I'm a little chagrined because I'm so long
10 into this planning, and if I'd heard this six months ago,
11 I might be in a better position to react to you tonight,
12 but it's noted and, you know, I -- I don't know what else
13 to say other than I -- I hear ya.

14 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Yeah. I've kind of
15 had the feeling that's about where we're at. I
16 appreciate it.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Before you go, Ben,
19 Jack is not feeling so hot and he wants to get a few
20 comments.

21 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I'm having a little
22 trouble, a little stiffness in the leg.

23 I had comments, not questions, okay. First of
24 all, I appreciate very much the time you've taken to meet
25 with the neighbors and the negotiations that have taken

1 place which has led to so many changes into this new --
2 new project. Essentially it's a completely different
3 project than the old one.

4 I do not have the feeling that you need to
5 have a retail space. Some of the other members of the
6 commissioners do. I do not.

7 But I like the project. I think it's fine,
8 and I tend to agree that we should move with this as
9 quickly as possible.

10 I'm tired of looking at that space for many,
11 many years, and I can see us if we delay something as
12 nice as this waiting many, many more years before we have
13 something there. So I'm supportive of your project.

14 I think your presentation was excellent, one
15 of the best I've seen in the years I've been up here, and
16 I thank you.

17 And that's -- that's my speech.

18 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you, Jack.
19 Thanks for staying for that. You need to go, of course.

20 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I have to go, yeah.
21 Thank you.

22 MS. CHOW: It's 10:30. If we want to extend
23 past 11:30, we should take a vote of the Commission now
24 or if there's consensus that we're going to end by 11:30.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: I would like to start

1 some consensus. In fact, I'm hoping to wrap it up by
2 11:00.

3 Does that sound good? Okay.

4 All right. Moving along, Commissioner Eiref.

5 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yes. With regard to
6 this whole retail, I have to say I -- I feel like we're
7 opening up a -- we're going to kind of an area that
8 nobody wishes.

9 When I look up at like Burlingame, for
10 example, I don't know whether that was planned that way,
11 but they have mile long stretches of El Camino with no
12 retail fronts of anything like that.

13 I don't think we're going there, by the way,
14 in Menlo Park, but it does open up the question of where
15 we're going to go, what is the goal ultimately, was it to
16 have lots of retail and more hotels, things like that.

17 Having said that, I think it's up to us as
18 Planning Commissioners that as future projects come up,
19 think about it with that in mind, not necessarily
20 encumber one project with the collective vision.

21 I thought the presentation was excellent. I
22 think the -- the whole dynamic for me personally was
23 completely different than it was a year or two ago, and
24 it really does seem like you have a tremendous number of
25 changes, so I appreciate that. I feel good about it. I

1 think it's really solid.

2 And I kind of share Jack's position, actually.
3 we should kind of encourage moving ahead on this with the
4 notion that there are some -- you know, there are some
5 concerns that we have in terms of things that aren't
6 there.

7 I think it was a peer, a former resident made
8 the statement. We're extending Allied Arts right up to
9 El Camino. That's kind of an odd concept, but it is what
10 it is. It's a solid looking plan, with that in mind.

11 So that's my opinion.

12 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: So I guess we've moved
13 into the comment period.

14 So I haven't asked a couple questions yet. I
15 have a couple questions for you.

16 MR. MATTESON: Okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Your San Carlos
18 project, is that 400 Laurel?

19 MR. MATTESON: 1001 Laurel. It's between --
20 it's on Laurel/El Camino and the cross street is Morse.

21 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Yeah. I've seen that,
22 both in person and some of the units online.

23 What -- it seemed like those were much smaller
24 units. What is the kind of average or predominant unit
25 size and bedroom counts and square footage?

1 MR. MATTESON: Those units were -- the
2 majority of the units were two-bedroom flats that were
3 around 1,100 feet. There were some threes and there were
4 some ones.

5 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. Yeah. That's
6 what I thought. So that kind of makes more sense with
7 the demographic that ended up locating there.

8 And also just curiosity, not -- because I
9 didn't know, but what effect, if any, homes property
10 value in this type of development would there be if you
11 were on the R-3 side versus the C-4 side? Is there --

12 MR. MATTESON: None.

13 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: None. Okay.

14 MR. MATTESON: The reason why we distinguish
15 still is because there are two separate zoning districts
16 that bisect our site, and the process to unwind that is
17 worse than just working with it.

18 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Got it. All right.
19 And then what -- if you had 27 units that were
20 predominantly one and two bedroom, so 1,100 to 1,200
21 square feet, would you name that FAR waiver, that FAR
22 increase?

23 MR. MATTESON: Well, I couldn't make the
24 project work with 27 units of 1,100 feet.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Oh, financially?

1 MR. MATTESON: Right.

2 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Got it. So it's a
3 financial reason? It's not really the -- I mean, you can
4 get the density bonus and have smaller units.

5 MR. MATTESON: But the state -- but the
6 State Density Bonus Law's really clear. The court
7 decision's been that you're not -- you have a project and
8 you -- you get your density bonus of similar units.

9 You're not -- in order to get the additional
10 affordable units and the density bonus, you're not
11 required to make them all studios. Just so you can
12 get -- get the increased units.

13 You're allowed units similar to what you have.
14 Follow me?

15 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Yes.

16 But it's not --

17 MR. MATTESON: We don't shrink them to get
18 the extra ones. Otherwise, we're basically defeating the
19 purpose, because we're not actually providing the
20 affordable units like what we're providing everybody
21 else.

22 We're actually saying, okay. Everybody's
23 going to shrink to a studio so we can provide some
24 affordable units.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Well, no. Absolutely.

1 I know the BMR can't be different than the other units,
2 but I'm just saying of your 1001 Laurel, I think your
3 affordable units are still in the 600 to 700,000 range?

4 MR. MATTESON: No. They were 200.

5 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Oh.

6 MR. MATTESON: Yeah, they were. My one
7 bedrooms were in the 200s. My twos were in the fours.
8 Affordable, yeah.

9 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Then what -- do you
10 have the units, like which size units are going to be in
11 in this project that would be designated affordable?

12 MR. MATTESON: What we picked on the
13 affordables was the most predominant floor plan, which is
14 a three-bedroom, three-bath townhouse.

15 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: And what price range do
16 you think that will fall into?

17 MR. MATTESON: You know, I haven't done the
18 density -- the affordable housing calculation because it
19 involves picking which size family and then what are the
20 income limits.

21 So I haven't gotten that far. I don't have a
22 price for you, but it's dramatic. It's dramatically less
23 than what it would sell for.

24 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Well, yeah. If
25 you're going for the low, then it would be --

1 MR. MATTESON: It's huge.

2 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: If 86,000 is their
3 income level and a calculation based on that.

4 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. You should look upon
5 it as the subsidy for -- in other words, the loss on
6 those units, what it cost to build them versus what
7 you're going to sell them for is probably half a million
8 each.

9 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay.

10 MR. MATTESON: Yeah. It's really huge.

11 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Yeah. So I guess
12 that's also -- I was trying to determine. It still seems
13 that it must be offset okay, though, because that could
14 beg the question why not just two all two-bedroom 1,100
15 square feet.

16 MR. MATTESON: Right. You have to have some
17 bigger homes to offset that one to two-million-dollar
18 subsidy that you're providing for the -- for the low
19 income housing.

20 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Okay. And then since
21 we're beyond questions now, I'll have -- I do have some
22 comments.

23 Go ahead. Commissioner Yu.

24 COMMISSIONER YU: I was wondering if -- if
25 you could tell us how much these units would go for on

1 the market, not the -- not the below market ones.

2 MR. MATTESON: You know, it's hard to say.
3 I think the best way to look at that is if you look
4 around, you look around town when you get your local
5 paper or what not and you see what some of these other
6 units are selling for.

7 We expect to be comparable, but I don't know
8 exactly yet because we'll be the first one on El Camino.

9 So we have -- you know, we're going to have
10 to -- to work with some marketing folks to help us know
11 exactly where we'll be on that.

12 But we'd expect to make them as nice as the
13 ones that were built up by Draeger's. There's four right
14 on University Drive there across from Draeger's. There's
15 another one up on Fremont right next to Santa Cruz Avenue
16 with black trim that was really well done.

17 I mean, we want to make them that nice, but
18 what they'll sell for, I don't know yet.

19 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Those were two million
20 up on Fremont, right?

21 MR. MATTESON: Did they really?

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I don't know what they
23 sold for, but --

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: 1.8.

25 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner Kadvany.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I wanted to agree
2 with -- with David and others that the difference between
3 this version and the last is considerable.

4 The aesthetics are excellent, and I had some
5 discussions with Henry about the materials and so on, you
6 know. There's a lot of good stuff here.

7 About -- I mean, my -- my mindset this evening
8 is really in terms of people living there. This is where
9 they're going to be, living on El Camino.

10 So one question I have is -- it sounded like
11 from the staff report, it's hard to tell from the plans,
12 no change to the El Camino Real sidewalk from this
13 project.

14 MR. MATTESON: If anything, they've gotten
15 wider, but --

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I thought the staff
17 report said there was no change to the sidewalks.

18 MR. MATTESON: How wide are they, the El
19 Camino sidewalks? Give the architect a movement. He's
20 sitting in the second row.

21 While he's doing that, I'll -- I'll tell you
22 exactly, but we tried to make them what the City wanted,
23 what staff wanted and increase the landscaping on other
24 side of them.

25 They're five. The sidewalk is five.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Staff, help me out
2 here.

3 MS. CHOW: That is correct. I do not believe
4 that the configuration of the sidewalk is changing along
5 El Camino Real.

6 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Right.

7 MR. MATTESON: We have those street trees
8 that wer --

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: The project will
10 maintain the existing sidewalk, per se.

11 MR. MATTESON: They may get repoured, but
12 they're going to be in the same size.

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

14 MR. MATTESON: Yeah.

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Walking El Camino --
16 you know, the Specific Plan -- we talked about the
17 Specific Plan a lot. To my mind, it's not rules and
18 regs, numbers -- numbers to be just hard guys in the
19 City.

20 MR. MATTESON: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: It's because they're
22 principles and ideas, and the idea of El Camino is on the
23 east side, it's going to be very wide and on the west
24 side, wider enough -- not as wide as on the east side,
25 but wider enough to make it really adequate for sort of

1 really easement pedestrian -- pedestrian traffic, and
2 wider -- you know, wider than it is now.

3 If you try to go like on a wheelchair going,
4 you know, along there, pretty scary even if it's smooth.

5 MR. MATTESON: That's absolutely doable.
6 Because we have added landscape area.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: The width matters. So
8 if people going out of here -- the reason it matters is
9 because if El Camino -- if sidewalk's going to be there.
10 There's no retail there. Their route out into the
11 neighborhood is going to be by El Camino or Alto, Alto
12 Lane.

13 If it's on El Camino and it's still that
14 pretty narrow sidewalk.

15 The Specific Plan is not a crazy, you know,
16 wild eyed, you know, giant boulevard there. It's trying
17 to be -- just trying to make it better.

18 So I think that's --

19 MR. MATTESON: Do we have a width that --
20 that we think what we're looking for, Deanna?

21 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, it's
22 complicated. It's complicated, because of the setbacks.

23 MR. MATTESON: We can explore that.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. It gets into --
25 I mean, partly why -- this is why retail can work better

1 on -- you know, on the frontage because retail can do --
2 can deal with that somewhat better, I think, than -- at
3 least some can, you know, than a home. But forgetting
4 that.

5 The -- when you brought in the open space and
6 the fountain, that was really nice that you were able to
7 do that. It's beautifully done, lots of nice selections
8 of plants and everything.

9 I was just wondering. Did you have
10 discussions about the siting there right on El Camino of
11 the fountain and seating area and having that open space
12 there?

13 It's pretty much on El Camino as opposed to
14 being back inside the project, kind of a backyard.

15 MR. MATTESON: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: You're -- not to put a
17 fine point on it, but if you're sitting at that fountain,
18 you're kind of buffeted by El Camino Real, and I'd be a
19 little concerned about it being kind of a dead zone there
20 because of that.

21 MR. MATTESON: Well, I think there's three
22 ways we look at it.

23 One was that we were consistently
24 encouraged -- at our last Council study session, we were
25 encouraged to try and open the project more to El Camino,

1 to have not it not feel like it was a gated off behind
2 big walls and, you know, the buses zoom by and no one can
3 see inside. Open it to El Camino.

4 So that was one -- one need we were focusing
5 on.

6 Secondly, we were -- we were delighted with
7 the fact that the two buildings, A and A-2 that were in
8 the middle of the project that face that green area now,
9 and they were going to be close to El Camino and they
10 weren't going to have an amenity next to them.

11 So, you know, they were going to face driveway
12 and on the end El Camino, and -- and now instead, the
13 buildings closest to El Camino have the nicest green
14 space next to them.

15 So at least their porches and their balconies
16 and what not look out over that lawn area. It was great
17 to have that aspect of it.

18 And then I think finally, it -- it was going
19 to serve well as a gathering spot, because the rest of
20 the drive aisles really accommodate the garage doors, but
21 this is the one place where the project itself, the
22 residents can gather, which is why we add the barbecues
23 and the tables and things.

24 I'm hopeful that it will not only the project
25 residents will gather, but College/ partridge residents

1 will come.

2 I know El Camino's there, but I think we're
3 going to make it lovely enough. People gather at Barone
4 and El Camino's there. Keppler's, you know, people do
5 sit out there.

6 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Sure enough, and
7 that's exactly my point. Barone has a giant setback. So
8 if you equate it, that that means you're got a useful
9 area, it really kind of starts back to where people feel
10 comfortable because they've got a buffer.

11 MR. MATTESON: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: My concern is that
13 that front area, its main function is just going to be as
14 buffer rather than useful, useful space.

15 MR. MATTESON: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Just -- my -- you
17 know, my -- if I knew -- if I was designing this project
18 from scratch and I knew I could have that much contiguous
19 open space, I would really like to get it as far away
20 from El Camino and really more -- I'm going to differ
21 with Council.

22

23

24

25

1 I don't think they understand how -- I walked
2 the site today and went behind the gate on Alto and I
3 checked it out.

4 It makes a big difference what kind of
5 shielding you have in front of you.

6 One of the most pleasant places is walking on
7 Alto Lane toward the gas station. You have so many
8 buildings in front of you. The buildings help on El
9 Camino because they buffer El Camino.

10 My feeling is I'd be a lot -- the comfort of a
11 quiet zone on that noisy, noisy street, big difference,
12 and again, I'm just speaking as someone -- I'm thinking
13 about if I was living there.

14 MR. MATTESON: And that's --

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

16 MR. MATTESON: -- one of the reasons why I
17 insisted on a fountain, because fountains -- fountains
18 wash car noise.

19 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: A little bit.

20 MR. MATTESON: The bigger they are, the
21 bitter they are at that, but that's one of the reasons
22 why you put them in.

23 The noise issue's one where we were saying
24 also to the folks behind us. These buildings are going
25 to shield the neighbors who now basically have a vacant

1 car lot between them and El Camino.

2 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Well, just --
3 that's my opinion on that, on that.

4 MR. MATTESON: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: On that interior --
6 interior space. I wish -- you know, I wish it could be
7 elsewhere.

8 In terms of -- you know, on this retail
9 thing -- this is kind of a comment question. My sense
10 again, as someone who's living there, suppose there's
11 nothing there, no cafe, no nothing and I want to go out.
12 I want to be with -- be with people, I have two choices.

13 I walk out to El Camino and walk down. Not
14 great right now because of the narrow sidewalk and
15 generally not that great of walk, or I walk down -- I
16 walk down Alto Lane.

17 If I do that, I'm probably going to keep going
18 through the alley behind the -- all the way past the
19 karate store, karate studio, gas station and maybe
20 jaywalk across Middle Avenue and zip into Peet's.

21 It's a quick walk. I think a bunch of people
22 would do that. I checked out that alley today. It's
23 pretty smooth. You can put a cart -- you know, a baby
24 cart through there.

25 I'm not sure we want, you know, not to have

1 incentives for people to do other stuff like stay -- kind
2 of be able to stay kind of where they are.

3 That's what I see the retail as providing
4 in -- in the project is some reason -- you know, like a
5 concierge dry cleaning, small cafe, maybe even a place
6 where you can get a quart of milk, you know, just small
7 stuff, and also stuff that provides another reason for
8 people to be together.

9 If you're living there -- you're living there
10 and your kid comes home and they -- after school and they
11 forgot their key. Where do they go?

12 Well, they might go to the neighbor, but it
13 would be great if there's like kind of an anchor spot
14 they go to where the barrista is there and some tiny
15 little cafe, they can go there, a place where a package
16 is left off.

17 You know, that's what I -- what I care about.
18 I don't see it as being -- you know, it's really for
19 people there, and also because as I said, I think the
20 services that are there on the next part of the street,
21 the small services help the neighborhood behind quite --
22 quite a bit.

23 I don't know if we want to get -- I'm just
24 going to mention this, and we don't need to talk about
25 it, because other people should talk.

1 There is this kind of funky thing going on with
2 the trusses between buildings D-1, 2, 3 and 4, I think to
3 unify them definitionally as a single building.

4 MR. MATTESON: Mm-hmm.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: And it does something
6 with the setbacks. I don't know. I'm not sure how
7 that's going to look.

8 The breaks between those buildings are only
9 something like three-feet-six inches if I read that
10 right.

11 MR. MATTESON: It's six feet, but I
12 believe -- I believe, but --

13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah.

14 MR. MATTESON: The reason why we do that is
15 twofold. One, they are close together. There is no
16 common wall, but there's -- there is a structural
17 connection, and the reason is is because they are
18 condominiums and the whole site's going to be
19 condominiums basically because of the way the site lays
20 out and because the way R-3 and C-4 ends up.

21 And by structurally unifying those, basically
22 then -- it actually prevents having to move them even
23 further apart.

24 You move them further apart, then you're
25 coping with normal setbacks.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I guessed that.

2 Another alternative would be to bring them together as
3 unified buildings.

4 MR. MATTESON: We could. We could have done
5 that. I think we were attempting to -- you know, to put
6 some space between them. It's a healthful slides. Side
7 yards are where people put things like recycling and
8 trash, those types of things.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I just want to throw
10 one fast idea out and then let others talk here.
11 Parking, our favorite issue. My thought is parking, for
12 all the parking you have, what I would -- what I would
13 like to see is -- one of the speakers, you know, asked
14 why aren't we doing something transit or -- how would you
15 make this transit oriented.

16 Well, you could have more units if you could
17 fit them in where people have one car and you could
18 get your more -- you'd get more units.

19 MR. MATTESON: Mm-hmm.

20 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I have no problem with
21 people. I like having people. Density per se doesn't
22 mean anything to me if we can keep the cars down.

23 That's the whole idea of the Specific Plan.
24 Bring people in but, but keep the cars down. To me, that
25 seems sound, and I really wish we could do something like

1 that here.

2 You know, the underground -- the underground
3 parking thing is partly to consolidate cars and just make
4 it more efficient to have cars.

5 You don't have wasted walls and stuff, and
6 we'd get more bang for the buck.

7 MR. MATTESON: I wish it was cheap enough. I
8 agree with you.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

10 MR. MATTESON: I wish I could do it.

11 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So we've got above-
12 ground parking here, fine. I -- I just don't understand
13 why we're re-creating basically this kind of a suburban
14 cul-de-sac with parking where everybody has two-car
15 garages.

16 That's kind of -- it's nowhere near infill
17 that I think people would recognize. What's your model
18 here? How are you managing the people and the cars?
19 You're -- you're -- you know, you're taking away from
20 Peter to pay Paul.

21 Anyways, that's what -- the answer could be
22 keep the parking, consolidate, maybe have more units.
23 So -- thanks.

24 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Commissioner Yu.

25 COMMISSIONER YU: I just want to make a

1 comment. No questions.

2 I think when I first read this, I felt
3 conflicted because I remember when we were talking about
4 five years, but just what we've been doing with
5 Commissioners, I felt good because I imagined that this
6 would be a spot where maybe people would be excited to
7 live by Caltrain because they can walk to work, they can
8 bike to work, they can hop on the train, come back, get
9 in the car.

10 And so I felt conflicted because I had this
11 vision and I was so excited by it and I still think it's
12 possible.

13 But I thought I would try to keep an open
14 mind. I wanted to have an open mind here to applicant,
15 as well, and I felt bad the neighbors' desires.

16 I think you can't prescribe what people want.
17 I can't tell you that's not right, but balance that
18 again, I feel the real need for housing. Looking at
19 houses, you know, schools, and it concerns me that the
20 school -- everybody has the same idea. All right. I
21 can't be selfish. There's a real need, more young
22 professionals for various reasons.

23 And, you know, I think lastly, we have like a
24 real project that's going to address an area of blight,
25 you know. Aesthetically it might not be exactly my

1 personal taste, but I think I can objectively say high
2 quality, beautiful.

3 They've really transformed it from, you know,
4 previous iterations. They've done a great job of
5 reaching out to the community, and I think most
6 importantly it's real and it's here and the Downtown Plan
7 isn't.

8 So I -- I was conflicted, I kept an open mind
9 and I think I feel more certain as to how I would vote,
10 but I just wanted to comment on that because I did feel
11 very conflicted when I opened this up.

12 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

13 And I guess I'll go last with my comments.

14 I wanted to note that --

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Unless you want to get
16 me out of the way.

17 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: I didn't see your light
18 on, Henry.

19 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: It's the hardest one to
20 see.

21 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Yeah, okay. Please.

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I know there's value to
23 being last, and I just had three quick things to say,
24 really.

25 There are a lot of specifics that you've heard

1 tonight, but overall, I see a project that -- I see a
2 project process that's been responsive to the
3 neighborhood, responsive to the Planning Commission from
4 fifteen months ago, twenty months ago, and responsive to
5 Council, and to actually do those three is a bit of a
6 challenge, as you have found.

7 This is a project that actually has BMRs in
8 it. We get BMR funds all the time. We don't get BMRs,
9 and for this kind of project, their density is
10 intentional and it's necessary to make it fly.

11 This is very attractive and it has especially
12 attractive elements. So I'm very pleased where this is
13 going.

14 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Thank you.

15 All right. I'll just wrap it up real quick.
16 I wanted to note your presentation was -- and
17 particularly the waiver analysis part was really laid out
18 and explained, and I appreciated pointing out on the
19 schematics all the different things.

20 Like the one Commissioner Eiref had brought
21 up, that was really, really helpful, and I know it took a
22 long time to work with the neighbors, but I think we all
23 will get a much better product as a result, and so I
24 think it's well worth it.

25 I think it's -- we can all look around at

1 other communities that are so friendly, you know,
2 quotation marks, but we get better projects, and so thank
3 you for sticking with it.

4 So -- and then regarding the retail question,
5 in general, yes, I'd love to see retail along El Camino,
6 but I also that there will be a mix of frontage types
7 with El Camino.

8 So residential with a fountain and a small
9 green space, I think it will be a nice break from all the
10 commercial.

11 So I actually think it's nice if you're out
12 for an El Camino stroll going from shop to shop to maybe
13 pop into the fountain area and eat your sandwich. So I
14 don't mind that part at all.

15 And that's -- that's all I was going to say.
16 Everyone else -- and I wanted to note -- concur with
17 Commissioner Riggs that it is really exciting to see
18 actual BMR units and not money going into a fund and no
19 units in sight.

20 Thank you. Oh, sure.

21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: One quick last comment,
22 and John made a lot of great comments. The one I
23 resonated with was the sidewalks. I thought about and
24 forgot to mention.

25 Yeah, if we could look at the sidewalk. I

1 have spent the last three and a half years with my son
2 now 3 and a half walking, weaving around the trees and
3 over the curbs and through the cracks of the sidewalk
4 down there, just even trying to get a Bob stroller, which
5 is not exactly the worlds's largest stroller through
6 there.

7 MR. MATTESON: You have room. You can do
8 it.

9 COMMISSIONER EIREF: That would be fantastic.

10 CHAIRPERSON FERRICK: Great public amenity,
11 too.

12 I think that would conclude our study session
13 for this evening, and my, it was thorough.

14 So I will close public hearing on the -- let's
15 see. I want to say this correctly. The study session
16 for 389 El Camino Real and move along to item F,
17 Commission business, none.

18 So I will -- unless anyone has any objections,
19 I'll move to adjourn this meeting.

20 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Second.

21 All right. Adjourned.

22 (The meeting concluded at 10:57 PM).

23 ---o0o---

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the

5

6 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the

7

8 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a

9

10 full, true and complete record of said matter.

11

12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or

13

14 attorney for either or any of the parties in the

15

16 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way

17

18 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said

19

20 action.

21

22

23

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have

24

hereunto set my hand this

25

_____day of _____,

26

2012.

27

28

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

29

30

31

32

33

1

2