



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Regular Meeting
April 2, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025**

CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 p.m.

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

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Planning Commissioner Recruitment

Planner Rogers said that Commissioner Yu's term of office had been extended by the City Council until August 2012 at which time there would be a recruitment. He noted the August 2012 recruitment would include Commissioners Ferrick and Kadvany's positions as well.

2. Update on Pending Planning Items

A. Facebook Campus Project Review of Development Agreement Term Sheet – April 17, 2012 City Council Meeting

Planner Rogers said the City Council would consider the development agreement term sheet for the Facebook Campus Project at its April 17 meeting and noted that public comment would be received and the Council would provide direction.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Commissioner Riggs asked that the minutes for the February 27, 2012 Planning Commission meeting be pulled from the consent agenda.

Commissioner Riggs noted on page 6, paragraph 5, in "Commission Action" it was stated that the project was approved with modifications but those modifications. He said that should have included application of an in-lieu fee and retroactively. He said on page 7, 1st line, that rather than "parking sites" the architect was talking about "parking spaces." He said on page 9, middle of the second paragraph, the reference was to daylight but was indicated in the minutes as "lights in the building." He said in the same paragraph that there was a reference to "trimming potted plants to 12-feet" but should read "trimming trees to 12-feet."

1. Approval of minutes from the February 27, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.

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

- Page 6, paragraph 5, under Commission Action, add conditions to require the payment of an in-lieu fee and to do so retroactively.
- Page 7, 1st line, replace “parking sites” with “parking spaces.”
- Page 9, paragraph 2, “lights in the building” should be changed to indicate availability of daylight.
- Page 9, paragraph 2, replace “trimming potted plants to 12-feet” with “trimming trees to 12 feet.”

Action carried 6-0 with Commissioner Bressler absent.

2. Approval of minutes from the March 5, 2012 Planning Commission meeting

Commission Action: Unanimous consent to approve the minutes as submitted.

Action carried 6-0 with Commissioner Bressler absent.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/South County Community Health Center, Inc./110 Terminal Avenue:** Request for a use permit to allow a health and social services facility (Ravenswood Family Health Center at Belle Haven) to operate within an existing building (Menlo Park Senior Center) located in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Chow said staff had no additions at the staff report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Eiref noted the Health Center was already operating, and questioned the delay on the application for a use permit. Planner Chow said the Center was previously operated by the County of San Mateo and as such did not need a formal use permit. She said when the County transferred operation of the Center to a non-profit organization there had been no application for a use permit. She said that came to light when the rent structure was reviewed.

Public Comment: Ms. Luisa Buada, CEO of the Ravenswood Family Health Center, said that the site at Belle Haven was a satellite center and the main center was in East Palo Alto. She said her organization took over operation of the Center in 2006 noting the County had been operating the Center for 20 years or so. She said the County had truncated operations to only provide services to seniors but her organization has expanded services to offer comprehensive health care for all ages.

Commissioner Riggs asked if service was limited to the immediate community of Belle Haven. Ms. Buada said it was not and that this was a public facility.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** condition:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects and Engineers, consisting of 4 plan sheets, dated received March 26, 2012, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 2, 2012, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Bressler absent.

2. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Kenneth Rodrigues and Partners/4085

Campbell Avenue: Request for a use permit and architectural control to an existing building, totaling 60,024 square feet, currently addressed 40 Scott Drive and 4085 Campbell Avenue in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. The existing private recreation facility and general office/manufacturing buildings would be replaced with a new 54,768-square foot, two-story office and research and development (R&D) building. The entire property would be readdressed to 4085 Campbell Avenue. Two heritage tree removals are proposed as part of the project: a 15-inch liquidambar street tree in fair health located on Scott Drive approximately 270 feet from the intersection of Scott Drive and Campbell Avenue, and a 23-inch liquidambar street tree in fair health located on Scott Drive approximately 240 feet from the intersection of Scott Drive and Campbell Avenue.

Staff Comment: Planner Grossman said in addition to the staff report and the presentation there had been correspondence earlier in the day between Commissioner Riggs and the City's Arborist related to tree type selection to confirm that Red Oak and Autumn Blaze Red Maple would be the type of trees used.

Public Comment: Mr. Ken Rodrigues, project applicant, said they tried to incorporate the key elements from the last study session with the Planning Commission. He said the first: "provide visual interest and break up the massing of the structure" was accomplished by adding different height elements, and creating additional pop-outs in the structure. He showed the Commission revised elevations showing a glass canopy, balcony and recessed windows that were added. He said the Commission also suggested the use of large canopy trees throughout the project site, as well as a water efficient landscape palette. He thanked Commission Riggs for clarification on the tree types. He said they were asked to provide a parapet wall that screened all roof mounted equipment and the elevator shaft which they have done. He said the

Commission asked that there be sufficient employee gathering spaces, abundant landscaping and a welcoming pedestrian environment and noted that there were employee patio areas and balcony spaces as well as improved pedestrian access to the site.

Commissioner Kadvany said the articulation on three sides was interesting but created cavities around windows. Mr. Rodrigues said that in those areas they were creating little garden areas in the landscaping. He said those varied from 20 to 48 feet in length. He said there was visual interest created by this when looking out into the landscaped areas from the building as well as from the outside. Commissioner Kadvany asked about the second floor view. Mr. Rodrigues said that the view from the second floor would be directly on the landscaped area and would allow for lighting and energy efficiency.

Chair Ferrick asked if there was public comment. There being none, she closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Eiref how this project would fit in the broader ecosystem of office space in Menlo Park and who the tenants would be. Mr. Rodrigues said they were waiting for approval of the project after which he leasing team was prepared to market the project.

Commissioner Riggs said that the finished aluminum panels seemed to be painted in two shades of white. Mr. Rodrigues said that was correct. Commissioner Riggs said the rendering seemed to indicate the parapet might be a different shade than the wall below. Mr. Rodrigues said there was a variation. Commissioner Riggs asked if the panels on the roof screen were the same as the building panels. Mr. Rodrigues said they would be the same panels but different colors and would be pre-finished. Commissioner Riggs said the rendering showed more traditional elements in the courtyard area. He asked whether the fountain would be circular as shown. Mr. Rodrigues said they were thinking about a more geometric fountain.

Commissioner O'Malley asked about the difference in the colors noting that they looked different on the rendering but seemed closer in value on the colors and materials board. Mr. Rodrigues said that the sun and shade would highlight differences in the color.

Chair Ferrick asked if the landscaping at the recess windows saved any energy. Mr. Rodrigues said that was the added bonus of the landscaping. Chair Ferrick said that birds could present a problem. Mr. Rodrigues said that was a technical solution noting that aluminum panels could be cleaned. He said the panels have a 30-year guaranteed finish.

Commissioner Kadvany said he hoped that they would not use spike and balls to prevent birds from landing in those areas. Mr. Rodrigues said that method was outlawed and they would use some type of treatment to aid in the prevention of that problem but not that particular method.

Commissioner Eiref moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Yu noted that Google and other quirky companies like to use outdoor space for their own installations such as statues, and suggested they consider saving some of the outdoor space for that potentiality. She seconded the motion.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 32 (Section 15301, "In-fill Development Project") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
4. Approve the Below Market Rate Housing In Lieu Fee Agreement, recommended by the Housing Commission on March 7, 2012.
5. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Kenneth Rodrigues & Partners, Inc., consisting of 17 plan sheets, dated received March 22, 2012, except as modified by the conditions contained herein subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, Recology, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Group that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to demolition permit and building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 12.48 (Salvaging and Recycling of Construction and Demolition Debris) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, and is subject to review and approval by the Engineering and Building Divisions.
 - e. Prior to demolition permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) dust control, 3) erosion and sedimentation control, 4) tree protection fencing, and 5) construction vehicle parking. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by

the Building and Engineering Divisions prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The fences and erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing demolition.

- f. Prior to demolition permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a heritage tree preservation plan, detailing the location of and methods for all tree protection measures, as described in the arborist report. The project arborist shall submit a letter confirming adequate installation of the tree protection measures. The project sponsor shall retain an arborist throughout the term of the project, and the project arborist shall submit periodic inspection reports to the Building Division. The heritage tree preservation plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
- g. Prior to demolition permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a truck route plan and permit to be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Senior Engineer.
- h. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations, dimensions, and colors of all meters, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes. The utility plans shall also show backflow and Double Check Detector Assembly (DCDA) devices.
- i. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval by the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be prepared based on the City's Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist and the Project Applicant Checklist for the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Requirements. The erosion and sediment control plans shall be attached to the Grading and Drainage plans and may be similar to the erosion control plan provided for the demolition permit. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to or concurrent with the issuance of a building permit.
- j. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, a design-level geotechnical investigation report shall be submitted the Building Division for review and confirmation that the proposed development fully complies with the California Building Code. The report shall determine the project site's surface geotechnical conditions and address potential seismic hazards. The report shall identify building techniques appropriate to minimize seismic damage.
- k. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall enter into and record a "Stormwater Treatment Measures Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement" with the City subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division. With the executed agreement, the property owner is responsible for the operation and maintenance of stormwater treatment measures for the project. The agreement shall run with the land and shall be recorded by the applicant with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office.

6. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall execute the Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay the in lieu fee of approximately \$194,398.08) in accordance with the BMR Housing Agreement (as of July 1, 2011). The BMR Housing Agreement shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. The BMR fee rate is subject to change annually on July 1 and the final fee will be calculated at the time of fee payment.
 - b. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application for construction of the new building, the applicant shall submit a completed and approved work plan to remediate the on-site contaminants. The site remediation plan is required to be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to submittal to the City and is subject to the review and approval of the Building Division.
 - c. Prior to final inspection for the building permit issued for construction of the new building, the applicant shall provide written confirmation from the Regional Water Quality Control Board that remediation has been completed consistent with the approved remediation work plan. This written confirmation shall be subject to the review and approval of the Building Division.
 - d. A complete building permit application will be required for any remediation work that requires a building permit. No remediation work that requires approval of a building permit shall be initiated until the applicant has received building permit approvals for that work. All building permit applications are subject to the review and approval of the Building Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Bressler absent.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. **2012-13 Capital Improvement Program/General Plan Consistency**: Consideration of consistency of the 2012-2013 projects of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan with the General Plan.

Staff Comment: Mr. Matt Oscamou, Engineering Services Manager, said the Council had approved the project listing concept. He said the Commission was asked to consider whether all the FY 2012-2013 projects of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan were consistent with the General Plan.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kadvany asked about the energy audits of City buildings. Mr. Oscamou said that the City had considered square footage and the kilowatt usage per square foot for buildings. He said he believed the referenced project evolved from the City's Climate Action Plan. He said the City's administration building used a significant amount of electricity particularly in comparison with some of the newer facilities such as the Arrillaga Gymnasium, noting that structure was also one of the few buildings on campus with its own

meter system. He said staff has had discussions with PG&E as to how to curb usage in the Administration and Police buildings in the long term.

Commissioner Kadvany said he was also interested in discussing the Housing Element and Sidewalk Expansion Plan.

Commissioner O'Malley confirmed with staff that the Commission's task was to determine whether or not the projects identified by the City Council for FY 2012-2013 of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan were consistent with the City's General Plan and that although the Commission could ask questions to understand projects it was not the Commission's task to discuss or debate the merits of the individual projects.

Mr. Oscamou said the draft Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan was presented to all the Commissions previously for input and that information had been provided to the City Council. He said after the City Council determined its fiscal year projects for capital improvements the Planning Commission was then tasked with making a determination on the consistency of the proposed improvements with the General Plan, and upon that determination the Council then would adopt the Capital Improvement Plan.

Chair Ferrick asked for public comment. There being none, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany said that he recalled Commission discussion about folding in considerations to streamline residential development within the framework of the development of the Housing Element. Planner Rogers said he recalled that Planner Chow had indicated something like that but he was not clear on the specifics. He said he did not know if Council had given direction on that but all of the Planning Commission's recommendations on the Capital Improvement Program had been transmitted to Council. Commissioner Kadvany asked whether residential zoning requirements the Commission had identified as potential elements to be modified [to streamline residential development while protecting neighboring properties] could be included in the Housing Element Update. Planner Rogers said they could be discussed. He said the Housing Element looked at encouraging the provision of housing and more often involved things such as changing commercial zoning to residential zoning and making secondary dwelling units on single-family residential lots more feasible. He said the Housing Element was mostly about increasing the net availability of housing.

Commissioner Kadvany said in reference to the Sidewalk Master Plan that his neighbors expressed unsolicited concern to him that the City would impose sidewalks in their community where there were none now. Mr. Oscamou said the City Council adopted the Sidewalk Master Plan, which identified areas throughout the City that were candidates for sidewalk improvements. He said they were currently beginning construction on the Woodland Avenue Sidewalk Project. He said there was an extensive public process for sidewalk projects, noting it was not easy to even get consensus. Commissioner Kadvany said it appeared that \$100,000 was budgeted for this work for the next five years. He asked if a neighborhood protested having sidewalks if those funds could be used for landscaping or some other amenity in that neighborhood. Mr. Oscamou said he was not sure what the funding source was for the sidewalk projects and that there might be restraints on how funds might be used.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Yu to adopt a finding that the Planning Commission has reviewed the 5-Year CIP and found that the projects for FY 2012/13 are consistent with the City's General Plan.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Bressler absent.

F. STUDY SESSION

- 1. Study Session/Jason Chang for CS Bio/1 and 20 Kelly Court:** Request for a study session for the demolition of the existing building located on 1 Kelly Court and a partial demolition of the building located at 20 Kelly Court. The proposed project would include a merger of the two lots to create one building. The existing parcels contain two detached buildings with a total gross floor area of 31,266 square feet. The project would result in the demolition of 17,766 square feet of gross floor area, and the construction of 24,157 square feet of gross floor area for a total gross floor area of 37,657, which is a net increase of 6,391 square feet of gross floor area. Both parcels are located in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district and the project would require a rezoning from M-2 (General Industrial) to M-2 (X) (General Industrial, Conditional Development) to exceed the maximum height limit of 35 feet. The Hetch Hetchy right-of-way to the rear of the property would be utilized for required parking spaces. The proposed project would also include an increase in the quantities of hazardous materials from the previously approved use permit due to the increase in production activities, associated with the development and manufacturing of instruments for the biotech industry.

Staff Comment: Planner Perata said staff had no additional comments to the staff report.

Public Comment: Mr. Jason Chang, Director of Operations, CS Bio, said the company was a peptide-based biotech company that serviced pharmaceutical companies worldwide. He said they wanted to expand their production capabilities to service various clinical trials their clients were doing. He said they had gone through two expansions on 20 Kelly Court.

Ms. Susan Eschweiler, Principal with DES Architects, introduced her colleague Mr. Kenneth Huang. She said the project site was at the end of Kelly Court off of O'Brien Drive, and that CS Bio was currently in 20 Kelly Court. She said this facility was a total of 17,500 square feet that had been built in two sections and that part of the Hetch Hetchy right of way has been used for parking. She said the company was in the process of acquiring 1 Kelly Court, which had a 13,500 square foot building. She said the plan was to demolish that building and build next to the other building at 20 Kelly Court but remove a portion of the rear Butler metal building. She said that would be a phased construction project and the lots would be merged. She said they were also negotiating with SFPUC to use Hetch Hetchy right-of-way in the rear for parking. She said the new building would be two-story with a roof deck on the third level. She said there would be two driveways for access so that the building could be ringed which was important to the Fire District.

Commissioner O'Malley said there was a building shown with a flat roof and asked which building that was and if that would remain. Ms Eschweiler said that it was the 20 Kelly Court building. She said that portion of the building and roof would be maintained noting there would not be views from the new building at 1 Kelly Court of that roof.

Commissioner Eiref said the roof deck seemed constrained in width. Ms. Eschweiler said that the mechanical equipment had to stay and there had to be two ways to access and leave the area. Chair Ferrick asked how many square feet the area was and if it would accommodate an all staff gathering. Mr. Huang said the area was 30-foot by 30-foot. Ms. Eschweiler said they would look at maximizing the amount of space for employee use.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the height of the new building. Ms. Eschweiler said the total height was 40 feet noting they needed interstitial height for the GMP suites.

Chair Ferrick confirmed that there was no public comment on the project.

Commissioner Yu said there seemed to be a number of competing visual elements proposed and she did not see geometric cohesion between the two buildings.

Commissioner Riggs said he liked the massing and the height of the tower. He indicated he would be comfortable with a height of up to 48-feet. He said M-2 was strictly horizontal now and vertical elements were needed. He said entering from the cul-de-sac that the existing building needed to be more than a flat surface. Ms. Eschweiler said the constraints were a very large tree and that the building was close to the property line. Commissioner Riggs suggested adding some element of visual interest but acknowledged the architects were aware of the challenge. He suggested it would be helpful to have a visual at eye level of the building from the cul de sac.

Commissioner Yu said the materials shown in the rendering on page 16 would help with the existing building. She noted that there were different size rectangles and squares, and that those with the long and narrow railings seemed jarring to her. She suggested that using the same shape in different scales of size rather than mixed shapes might work better. Ms. Eschweiler said they were trying to use a variety of materials and finishes to create interest and it sounded like Commissioner Yu would like a simpler look. Commissioner Yu noted the railings and the windows on the tower that wrapped around the sides but was not an element found elsewhere.

Chair Ferrick said she would like entrance definition, and asked about signage. Ms. Eschweiler said there would be company signage but the location had not yet been determined. Chair Ferrick asked what would happen if the SFPUC did not agree to allow the use of the Hetch Hetchy right-of-way for parking. Mr. Chang said they were looking at the use of other properties as well for parking. Chair Ferrick said that even if the SFPUC agreed to the use they could revoke that permission in the future. Ms. Eschweiler said if that happened some portion of the building would have to be removed or an arrangement would have to be made with a neighboring property for parking. She said that in Mr. Chang's discussions with the SFPUC that they had agreed to restore the parking area after completion of the water line replacement project in that area.

Chair Ferrick asked what the maximum allowable number of employees would be. Mr. Chang there were currently 42 employees and they had parking capacity to have up to 65 employees.

Commissioner O'Malley said that the rear of the existing building after the removal of the one portion should be enhanced in appearance and he thought that something more was needed to tie the new and old buildings together.

Commissioner Eiref asked about the use of the different buildings. Mr. Chang said the existing building would be R&D and some manufacturing and the first floor of the new building would be entirely manufacturing. Commissioner Eiref noted that during the draft Specific Plan discussions there had been expressed support of tower features, and suggested the proposed tower element could be further enhanced.

Chair Ferrick asked about energy efficient features. Ms. Eschweiler said the buildings would need to meet CalGreen. She said because the use was laboratory and GMP that the efficacy and efficiency of those systems needed to meet FDA regulations for those types of facilities. She said they would design the building to be energy efficient but would not go for LEED certification. Chair Ferrick asked about the large asphalt parking surface. Ms. Eschweiler said they were discussing the site drainage with a civil engineer noting the County's C3 requirements and how to filter the water. She said they had discussed planter boxes on the roof to filter the roof drainage, trees on the side and storm water treatment areas. Chair Ferrick said that she had seen gravel planting strips in parking areas to drain water. Ms. Eschweiler noted there were restrictions on some types of plantings such as trees near the Hetch Hetchy water line. Chair Ferrick suggested potted plants and anything that would reduce heat from the parking lot.

Commissioner Riggs said an option for the building at 20 Kelly Court was to change the texture of the materials.

Commissioner O'Malley noted that there did not seem to be any windows at 20 Kelly Court and from his experience R&D employees usually liked some windows. Mr. Chang noted there were windows on that building. Commissioner O'Malley said he would like 20 Kelly Court to look as good as the new building. Ms. Eschweiler said that they had not yet done the elevations but were primarily looking at massing and height, and would bring more detail back for the elevations. Chair Ferrick said that the part of 20 Kelly Court facing the cul de sac would do well with some enhancement to its appearance and noted windows as an example.

Commissioner Yu said the tower concept needed more articulation and she would like to see less in the rest of the design.

Commissioner Kadvany said the rendering on page 16 was very attractive. He said he agreed with LEED certification that they should look for outcomes and not certification. He said there was a clear need for the height. He asked for staff to comment on height. Planner Perata said in the M2 zone that heights greater than 35 feet were allowed through the conditional development permit process but noted there was still a floor area ratio cap.

Summary of Commission Comments:

- General support of the phased construction concept, proposed height, and the tower feature of the new building
- Suggestion to look at increasing the usable space on the roof deck of the new building

- Consider elements to make the entrance and front of the building more attractive from the cul de sac
- Suggestion to simplify the number and size of geometric elements
- General concern about tying the new building to the existing building in a way that was cohesive and attractive
- Use green and energy efficient design elements

COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on April 30, 2012