



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Regular Meeting
June 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025**

CALL TO ORDER – 7:01 p.m.

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

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Momoko Ishijima, Planner; Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner, Leigh Prince, City Attorney

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Update on Pending Planning Items

a. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan

Planner Rogers said the City Council on June 12 reviewed the ordinance reading for the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance Amendment and approved them. He noted that there was a 30 day wait before these changes would become effective.

b. Housing Element

Planner Rogers said the first meeting of the Steering Committee for the Housing Element would take place on June 26. He said the Steering Committee would review specific topics including the settlement agreement, housing requirements, background on the City's housing needs allocation, preliminary criteria for the evaluation of potential housing sites and review of other Housing Element update related material.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Chair Ferrick asked if anyone wanted to pull the minutes of the May 21 meeting.

Commissioner Riggs asked that the minutes be pulled from the consent agenda.

1. Approval of minutes from the May 21, 2012 Planning Commission meeting

Commissioner Riggs noted he had discussed the finding for the Lee Drive project with staff that was found on page 14, paragraph 2 of the minutes. He said the third line used the phrase: "would be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood." He said this was given as the basis the Commission had used to deny the project. He said he has asked, noting his first request was in 2005, that this wording be changed noting as a Commissioner he was uncomfortable making the judgment that a project would be detrimental to the health, safety, morals and general welfare of persons in the neighborhood.

Planner Rogers said since his employment with the City that the City has been consistent with its Planning Commission actions for including that exact wording and that it was noted in the zoning ordinance. He said as denials were less common actions that there was the possibility of adding nuances to that language. He said staff had suggested to Commissioner Riggs that if the full Commission agreed with it, that staff could be requested to explore either changing the word "and" in the sentence to "or," or alternately whether individual items in the sentence might be struck for this particular action. He said this would have to be reviewed with the City Attorney. He said if for any reason such a change would create a legal risk then the change would not proceed but if it was possible to change, staff would make the change for finalizing the minutes and the actions.

Commissioner Riggs asked the Commission to request staff to pursue changing the referenced wording so the Commission was not in the position of judging the morals of either the applicant or the project. Planner Rogers noted that the requested change to the wording would be contingent upon legal review and approval.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Kadvany to approve the minutes with the following changes including modifications previously provided to staff and a proposed change to wording on page 14, finding #2, 3rd line.

- Page 9, 5th paragraph, 3rd line: Replace "Wal-Mart's" with "Wal-Mart"
- Page 9, last paragraph, 1st line: Replace "Commissioner Kadvany..." with "Referring to comments by Mr. Kerns, Commissioner Kadvany..."
- Page 10, 1st paragraph, 1st line: Replace "lot" with "lots"
- Page 14, 3rd paragraph, 1st line: Replace "Commission Kadvany said the commons in this instance..." with "Referring to an overhead slide shown by a Lee Drive resident, Commission Kadvany said the "commons" in this instance..."

- Page 16, 1st full paragraph, 1st line: Replace “Commissioner Perata” with “Assistant Planner Perata”
- Direct staff to review with the City Attorney the potential to modify denial finding language to remove Commission commentary on safety and/or morals [*post-meeting action- Page 14, Finding #2, 3rd line: Delete "safety and morals" between the words "health" and "comfort"*]

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Yu abstaining.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Use Permit/Shahram Zomorodi/2025 Santa Cruz Avenue:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and a detached garage, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Ishijima said there were no additions to the staff report.

Public Comment: Mr. Shahram Zomorodi, property owner and applicant, distributed a handout to the Commission and staff. He said the proposed project was to construct a 2,800 square foot two-story home with a two-car garage, four bedrooms, and three and a half bathrooms. He said the design was chosen to be harmonious with the other houses in the neighborhood. He said he incorporated different suggestions made by Planning staff related to window placement and a lower roof pitch. He said he contacted his immediate and more distant neighbors and personally visited with the immediate neighbors to share the plan. He said two of the neighbors had written in support of the plan. He said a neighbor four residences from his property raised a concern about the size of the proposed home in relation to the lot size. He noted the handout was research he had done on similarly sized two-story homes on similarly sized lots in the area. He pointed out that page 1 of the handout, which was Santa Cruz Avenue, showed that about 50% of the homes were two storied. He said page two of the handout showed the concerned neighbor's property and noted that the three immediate homes from her property have the same style and square footage project he was proposing on even smaller lots than his.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the applicant would have preferred to have a more modern exterior. Mr. Zomorodi said he preferred the exterior design style he was proposing.

Commissioner Kadvany said that the design indicated keeping the second story side wall in line with the first floor side wall, and that the second story was not recessed on the side. Mr. Zomorodi said he had reduced the roof pitch. Commissioner Kadvany said usually with second-story residences developed in Menlo Park that the second story was set back.

Mr. Francis Kuhn said he had helped Mr. Zomorodi prepare the plans and design. He said they tried in numerous sketches to set back the second story from the first floor wall to minimize a wall facing the neighbors. He said that however caused the bedrooms to be an undesirable small size. He said they would use architectural features too minimize the impact of the side wall.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if the applicant was developing the property for his own residence or to sell. Mr. Zomorodi said it was for his family.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said the applicant made a good case that there were two-story residences common to the neighborhood. He said that second story setbacks were done commonly for two-story homes on 50-foot wide lots in Menlo Park. He said the project proposal had maximum building coverage, maximum FAL, and minimum side setbacks. He said the design of other homes on the street although not exemplary in their design appeared balanced. He said this proposed plan was not balanced nor did the design have a historical context.

Commissioner Bressler noted that other two-story residences did not have second-story setbacks. He said he wanted to point that out although he agreed with Commissioner Riggs' comments.

Commissioner Yu said she was going to point out the same thing. She said while it would be more ideal to have greater setbacks that what was being proposed was consistent with other residences in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kadvany said some of the homes shown in the handout were not in the City but within County of San Mateo.

Planner Ishijima said the homes shown in the photos were all within the County's jurisdiction. She said however there was a neighborhood context to be considered.

Commissioner O'Malley moved to accept staff's recommendation and approve. Commissioner Yu seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kadvany said there were other buildings on the same side of the street as this property with vertical side walls but which had siding rather than stucco.

Commissioner Yu said she thought that staff's recommendation to use stone on all sides would be expensive, and she felt the applicant had done a good job trying to accommodate staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Riggs said he would like to recognize the applicant's efforts too. He said at some point the Commission might want to consider requesting that staff recommend a higher quality of architectural design.

Chair Ferrick said the applicant had clearly made every effort to comply with all of the rules. She said as the Commission has discussed the City does not have design guidelines and she was inclined to support the project.

Commissioner O'Malley said half of the street was Menlo Park and half of the street was the County. He said this house was in keeping with the neighborhood.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current CEQA guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Atelier Designs, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received June 4, 2012, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 25, 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, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval 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 of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

- e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance. Prior to the building permit issuance, the applicant shall implement the tree protection plan and technique recommendations in the Arborist Report for all applicable heritage trees.

Motion carried 5-2 with Commissioners Kadvany and Riggs dissenting.

2. Use Permit and Variance/Young and Borlik Architects/742 Live Oak

Avenue: Request for a use permit to demolish a single-story, single family residence and to construct two, single-family dwelling units and associated site improvements, on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot width, located in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The project includes a request for variances to build covered parking spaces that would encroach up to four feet into the required side yard setback. As part of this proposal, two heritage size trees (30-inch diameter oak and 25-inch diameter cherry) in poor condition are proposed to be removed. In addition, the two heritage size liquidambar street trees (19.5 and 18.7 inches in diameter), in fair condition, are proposed to be removed.

Staff Comment: Planner Perata said staff received correspondence that day, which had been distributed to the Commission at the dais and was available to the public on the rear table. He said the email letter was from the residents of 756 Live Oak Avenue, who raised concerns about building two units on a substandard lot and supported only one single-family residence on the lot. He said the email also raised broader concerns about the density of the area and the loss of single-family homes, discussed parking concerns and traffic congestion in the area attributed to employees from the downtown parking in the area, and police enforcement of parking permits. He said the residents also expressed concern with construction and congestion. He said they were concerned that the project was only proposing one parking space per unit, to which staff replied to clarify that there were four parking spaces proposed, three covered and one uncovered.

Public Comment: Mr. Dan Rhoads, Young and Borlik Architects, said they were proposing two homes on the lot. He said the lot was about 8,500 square feet and adequate for two new homes. He said it was the width that was the substandard

feature. He said the lot was zoned R-3 apartment zoning district. He said the intent of the R-3 zone was to support higher density and contribute to the general walkability of the downtown area. He said the area has apartment buildings with eight or more apartments and some single-family homes. He said the architecture was chosen to reflect the character of the entire downtown area and pulled in traditional and historical styles. He said they tried to keep the scale small in terms of massing, proportions and volumes of the windows. He said they were choosing more traditional materials such as stucco mixed with board and batten siding on the front house and stone on the rear house. He said the front unit would have a large porch in keeping with the pedestrian scale. He said there was an effort to minimize the parking and focus on the pedestrian by keeping almost all the parking spaces in the middle of the property. He said there was a one-car garage at the front but the porch would be the focus as it had the predominant width. He said other elements such as the trellis and vegetation would further minimize the appearance of the garage.

Mr. Rhoads said typically on a wider lot with this type of development that all four parking spaces would be off the parking courtyard and there would be a pair of two-car garages. He said on this 50-foot wide lot that would require all of the parking spaces to require variances. He said with the proposed design only the rear home would need a variance for parking. He said the front unit had the one-car garage and an uncovered parking space. He said in discussion with Planning and Transportation staff they looked at comparable scenarios in terms of the backup distances. He said the typical scenario was a backup distance of 24 feet. He said in comparing to similar scenarios they were able to do a backup distance of 23 foot. He said the benefit of that was to reduce the requested encroachment from five to four feet. He said the covered parking space would encroach by one foot but reducing the backup distance to 23 feet meant there was no encroachment. He said only two of the four parking spaces needed a variance to make this higher density project successful. He said the rest of the project complied with standards and requirements. He said it was only the one-story portion of the garages that would encroach in setbacks. He said all of the first and second story living areas complied with setback requirements from the property line as well as separation distance from adjacent buildings.

Mr. Rhoads said the project also included a request for tree removal to include an Oak at the rear of the property which was in declining health and an English laurel sometimes called English cherry. He said this was more of a shrub than a tree and had been allowed to grow unchecked and rather than measured at breast height, which was a collection of smaller trunks, it was being measured from the base where the trunks bifurcated and made it heritage tree diameter size. He said a third tree, an Oak, had originally been part of the heritage tree removal request, but was proposed to remain. He said that was proposed because of its poor shape and location. He said the existing structure was only five feet or so from the property line with a larger eave which impacted the growth of that tree. He said the other two trees they were applying for removal of were the two Liquidambars in the sidewalk. He said the removal of the latter was not needed for the project itself but it seemed an opportunity to improve the

situation noting the trees were in fair health. He said being under utility lines the trees had been topped pretty aggressively over the years and the root crown was large and impacted the sidewalk. He said they would be installing a larger water line through that area but were relocating the sewer line. He said they intended to replace with trees that might not grow as tall and require such extensive pruning. He said they were willing to work with the City on the preferred species.

Mr. Rhoads said in addition to the City's noticing of the project, his company had sent out notices to 90 of the most adjacent properties. He said the owner of the subject property had allocated time to meet with anyone desiring to discuss the project. He said no one came to that meeting.

Commissioner O'Malley said this was an apartment district. He asked if apartments were built on the site whether the allowed number of residential units would exceed two residential units. Planner Perata said the maximum number of units for this parcel, whether condominiums or apartments, would be two units.

Chair Ferrick said there were two apartment buildings on either side of this lot. She asked how many residents those buildings have. Planner Perata said there were at least five or more units in each of those buildings. Mr. Rhoads said in doing their mailer there were apartments numbered one through eight for both buildings. He said the parking was underneath and approached from the side.

Commissioner Yu asked when the property was acquired. Mr. Rhoads said he was not sure but within the last couple of years.

Commissioner Eiref said on page B4 it appeared that the apartment buildings had setbacks on the side but appeared to have no setbacks to the rear. Planner Perata said it appeared to be five feet but that information had not been requested for this project. Commissioner Eiref said there were a number of useful diagrams showing turning radiuses and asked if there was any flexibility on the turning radiuses or if that was a zoning requirement. Planner Perata said this was reviewed by Transportation Division staff and there was no flexibility in terms of the angles and size of the radius. Commissioner Eiref asked if there could be one uncovered parking space instead of a covered parking space. Planner Perata said the Zoning Ordinance required that each unit have two parking spaces, one of which needed to be covered. He said this development could have two covered and two uncovered parking spaces.

Commissioner Yu asked if staff knew of a project having 50-foot width on which two residences had been built and complied with the turning radius. Planner Perata said he could not recall any.

Commissioner Kadvany said on Partridge Avenue there were a couple of flag lots with 50-foot wide lots and 10-foot driveways that had two units. Planner Perata said those

were zoned R-2 and had different side yard setback requirements than those for an R-3 parcel.

Commissioner Kadvany said there would be other designs that could be built without variances. Mr. Rhoads said they approached the design looking at the footprint scale that would fit including the parking and transportation standards. Commissioner Kadvany said it appeared that it was important to have two separate residences with attached garages. Mr. Rhoads said one solution could be to have both parking garages in the middle but that would require more of a variance. He said with a 50-foot lot that subtracting the required 10-foot setback from each side left 30 feet in the middle, which were only three cars wide. He said doing that would require another parking space either with a long driveway to the rear where parking would be allowed without variance. He said that would create much more impervious surface and storm water to address. He said all four parking spaces could be at the front with five foot variances on each side. He said parking tended to be a challenge on a 50-foot wide lot.

Commissioner Eiref noted there was a two-car garage in the rear and asked if they had considered one covered and one uncovered parking space instead. Mr. Rhoads said they considered all the scenarios and the two-car garage was chosen as the better scenario to encourage off street parking.

Mr. Michael Zeluzo, Menlo Park, said he was opposed to this project because it would build two residences on a substandard lot, increase parking congestion particularly during the day, and that creating two single-family homes would change the nature of the area noting the existing apartment buildings and older single-family homes. He said the existing structure could be improved as it was.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Eiref said he had trouble supporting variances for required parking. He suggested having one covered and one uncovered parking space rather than a two-car garage in the rear. He said related to the request to remove trees that there was a canopy that traveled down the street. He said it was true the two Liquidambar trees intruded into the power lines but removing them would cut out a chunk of canopy that currently flowed down the length of the street, which he thought was unfortunate.

Commissioner Yu said this reminded her of another project the Commission had considered with a parallelogram shaped lot. She asked if the request for variance was truly because of a hardship or was this to maximize the buildable area of the lot for financial gain for the property owner. She said she thought there had to be a configuration to make a project work on this lot without a variance.

Commissioner Riggs said the lot was between two apartment buildings and the front unit was attractive architecture but the Commissioner needed to follow rules regarding

variances. He said he thought it would be physically possible to have parking for the two units, but he did not think the developer wanted to have a two-car garage shared in the front and the uncovered spaces next to the individual units. He said that would be one option however. He said he was not convinced he could make the findings needed to grant a variance. He said regarding the Liquidambar trees that he believed City staff did not support the use of these trees. He said he would prefer to see the roots trimmed on the sidewalk side. He said trees throughout Menlo Park had to be butchered because of PG&E overhead lines. He said these utilities should have been put underground at least starting 20 to 30 years ago.

Commissioner O'Malley said the plan seemed to use space effectively and even improved the one side setback by a few inches. He said he thought this project would have less people residing there then if it were developed as an apartment building. He said related to construction noise that this occurred whenever there was construction and the City's rules and regulations hopefully kept that noise to a minimum. He said he would like to hear additional comments on the variance findings.

Chair Ferrick said it was a nice looking project. She said there were four findings that must be met to grant a variance. She said she could make three of the four findings. She said the first was that a hardship existed that was unique to the property and not created by any act of the owner. She said the turning radius was not an act of the owner. She said the second finding was that the variances were needed for the substantial enjoyment and preservation of property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity. She said it was an R-3 property located in an apartment zoning district. She said she could find that the other properties could develop more than one residential unit on the same sized lot. She said the third finding was that the granting of the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare and would not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties. She said the adjacent properties were more detrimental than this project would be to the supply of light and air. She said the fourth finding was that the conditions upon which the requested variance was based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification. She said there were numerous properties with this dimension and if development was chosen for those then this variance would be applicable. She said she was having trouble making that finding.

Commissioner Kadvany said there were probably other options for building two units on this lot that would not require variances but there was an insistence by developers to have separated units and attached garages. He said that this project did not qualify for a variance. He said regarding the Liquidambar trees proposed for removal that he visited the site and if he lived there he would be very upset if those trees were removed. He said Menlo Park was about trees and it would be better to spend money to repair the sidewalks, chop out roots which he had seen done in other cities, and keep the tree canopy. He said these variance requests by developers were for things not available to individual homeowners. He said developers needed to learn to start developing different buildings in Menlo Park or get the zoning ordinance changed.

Commissioner Bressler said he did not think the Planning Commission granted many variances. He asked if a covered parking space had to be in a garage with walls or whether it could just have a roof. Planner Perata said a carport would count as a covered parking space. He said that any covered parking space had to be 10-feet by 20-feet clear as opposed to the uncovered parking space which could be slightly smaller. Commissioner Bressler said he thought that the turning radius might be different for a carport as opposed to a garage. Planner Perata said the posts at the front and back would act as walls so the 23-foot backup distance would still be needed and the turning radius would be the same as for a garage.

Commissioner Yu said she was having difficulty making the first and fourth findings. She said finding one indicated a hardship not created by an act of the owner and peculiar to a property. She said a 50-foot lot width was not peculiar in Menlo Park. She said the fourth finding to her meant that anyone in Menlo Park with a 50-foot lot could get such a variance. She said she agreed with what Commissioner Kadvany had said about the trees.

Chair Ferrick said she could make the first finding as the turnaround requirements were not due to an act of the property owner. She said she could not make the fourth finding because there were numerous lots having the same constraint.

Commissioner Riggs said there was no street parking at night in Menlo Park which reduced multiple car ownership. He said the City had previously allowed uncovered parking to intrude into a setback. He said the Commission could not discuss turning radius but were being asked to consider a building within a setback. He said the Commission would like driveway guidelines and hoped to get flexibility in the future. He said he would like to prompt the applicant and property owner to discuss a possible driveway sharing agreement with neighboring properties. He said this project really only needed four more feet of backup space. He said providing an opening in the fence and perhaps obtaining an easement from the neighboring property might make the required turns work.

Commissioner Kadvany said a shared driveway option was a good idea.

Commissioner Eiref moved that he could not make the findings for the variance request. He said it was not particular to this property that there was a turnaround requirement. He said he could not make the second finding that the variances were needed for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other conforming properties in the same vicinity, and the variance would not constitute a special privilege of the recipient not enjoyed by neighbors. He said he could not make the fourth finding either that the conditions upon which the requested variance was based would not be applicable, generally, to other properties within the same zoning classification.

Commissioner O'Malley said it seemed the Commissioners all agreed they could not make the fourth finding.

Commissioner Eiref retracted his motion.

Chair Ferrick moved that the Commission could not make the fourth finding, specifically that the conditions upon which the requested variance was based would not be applicable, generally, to other properties within the same zoning classification. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bressler asked if they should take action related to the Heritage Tree Removal request. Chair Ferrick asked staff if they should deny the variance request now and then hold off on the tree removal request until the project redesign was brought to the Commission. Planner Rogers said when a heritage tree removal was not development related that the City Arborist had final discretion on approving or not. He said there was nothing related to the development that was contingent upon the removal of the trees and thus was not within the Planning Commission's discretion. He said there was a separate review and appeal process for that with the Environmental Quality Commission and if appealed a second time with the City Council.

Chair Ferrick said she supported two residential units on this property but thought there was a way to accomplish that without a variance.

Mr. Dan Rhoads said within the R-3 zoning district there was a great variation in the depth of the lots. He said the depth of the lot in combination with the width had created the constraints related to the backup distance and turning radius.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Riggs to deny the item as follows.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make the following finding as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the denial of variances:
 - a. The conditions upon which the requested variance is based would generally be applicable to other properties within the same zoning classification since the variance is based on the dimensions of the lot, and there are a significant number of 50 foot wide parcels in the R-3 zoning district.
3. Based upon the findings, deny the variance.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Use Permit, Architectural Control, Major Subdivision, Below Market Rate Housing Agreement, and Environmental Review/389 El Camino Real, LLC/389 El Camino Real:** Request to demolish the existing single-family house at 612 Partridge Avenue and residential triplex at 603-607 College Avenue and construct 26 residential units and associated site improvements on the subject parcels in the C-4(ECR) (General Commercial Applicable to El Camino Real) and R-3 (Apartment) zoning districts. The application includes the following requests:

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said the project request was to demolish an existing single-family residence and residential triplex and construct 26 residential units including 17 attached townhouses and nine 9 detached single family residences on a 1.23 acre site in the R-3 (Apartment) and C-4 El Camino Real and General Commercial Applicable to El Camino Real. She said the Planning Commission was the reviewing and recommending body to the City Council as the final decision making body on the project. She outlined the six areas of review and recommendation. She said the City Council would consider the project at its July 31, 2012 meeting. She said staff had received four additional pieces of correspondence from Rochelle Hutter, Hobart Street, Rico and Ann Rosales, August Circle, Sam Sinnott, architect, and Sohala Khalily, owner of Yogurt Stoppe, El Camino Real. She said all four letters expressed the need to redevelop the project site and supported the proposed project. She said Matt Matteson, the applicant, Glenn Simmons, the project architect and Ethan McAllister, the project engineer were present to address any questions on the proposed project. She said Adam Weinstein, David Clure, and Carolyn Parks from LSA Associates and Paul Stannis, traffic consultant from BKS, were available to answer any questions on the EIR. She said Leigh Prince, City Attorney and staff were also available to answer questions.

Public Comment: Mr. Matteson, applicant, said the original objective was to develop an economically feasible project that would contribute to Menlo Park's housing stock and within that to redevelop the vacant site with a mixture of attached and detached residences that would be compatible with both El Camino Real and the surrounding neighborhood, to develop a project sensitive to the Allied Arts neighborhood, encourage infill development in a way that would create a more vibrant mix of housing on El Camino Real and areas nearby, provide housing and particularly affordable housing, enhance the visual character of El Camino Real, build a project that everyone was proud of, take advantage of El Camino Real as a transit corridor and design a project in such a way that it would encourage residents to use it and the project's proximity for transit services as well as local retail shopping and downtown Menlo Park. He said in summary the project included 26 residences, 17 of which were attached townhomes and nine were detached single-family residences along the rear property line that adjoin other single-family residential neighbors, two of which were located on corners with access for one from Partridge Avenue and the other from College Avenue. He said the latter were designed to blend with neighborhood and not look like the rest of the

development. He said each residence has a two-car garage and guest parking spaces to screen vehicles.

Mr. Matteson presented a visual presentation on the project features. He said revised plans had moved the sidewalk and trellis away from the heritage redwood tree, and had greatly increased the amount of landscaping. He said in working with the neighborhood task force that there would be more extensive landscaping on the College Avenue side of the project.

Mr. Matteson said the project had three below market rate homes for lower income households and would be spread out in three different buildings and would be indistinguishable from other units. He reviewed the cost of the three below market rate units to build and subtracted the allowable purchase price. He said in total the subsidies provided equaled \$1,452,000 for the three units. He said the provision of three below market rate housing units triggered the state density bonus law and qualified the building of 27 residential units. He said their application was for 26 units. He said the traffic studies were done on 27 units as were some of the other environmental studies. He said the application of the state density bonus law allowed the request of development standard waivers. He said they had had 13 requests which had now been reduced to six requests for waivers. He said also they were also by statute eligible for one incentive and their request was to increase the base FAR from 55% to 75%. He said that would bring the project to an overall FAR of 87%.

Mr. Matteson said they had a complete application and plans before the Downtown Specific Plan was finalized so they were exempt but he thought a comparison was helpful. He said the project was consistent with the Plan but it was a little bit less dense and impactful. He said the base FAR in the new zone under the Specific Plan was 110% compared to their plan's 87%. He said under the Plan density was allowed at 25 residences per acre and their proposal was at 21 residences per acre. He said the Plan would allow for 38 feet in height and their project averaged at 30 feet in height or less. He said minimum parking under the Plan was 42 spaces and their project has 69 spaces. He said the Plan required a minimum of 30% open space and their project had a combined 34.1% when common ground and yards were counted.

Mr. Matteson said there had been a few changes to their plans since the last study session. He said they went to the Menlo Park Fire District to get their approval on their plans. He said the District requested they modify the juncture of the sidewalks and driveways to accommodate the weight and turning radiuses of their longest truck. He said that was done in an aesthetically pleasing way and the District had approved. He said they have moved the sidewalk on College Avenue away from the heritage Redwood tree roots. He said the housing units with dens on the first floor had been modified to allow for a half-bath that reduced the garage size, which were larger than they needed to be. He said sidewalks on El Camino Real and College Avenue went from five to six feet. He said Partridge Avenue has four foot wide sidewalks and that would be maintained. He said the project was a transition from lower density to what

would probably be much higher density on the east side of El Camino Real. He said the mix of styles would attract a mix of property owners including young couples, small families, and empty nesters. He said five of the units had the capacity for elevators. He said they were pleased to increase the housing supply near local merchants. He said they have worked on the project for two years with City staff and neighbors. He said the Financial Impact Study showed that they would be paying \$1.1 million in fees to the City and other local agencies and they were providing \$1.45 million in BMR subsidies.

Commissioner Bressler asked how soon construction would begin. Mr. Matteson said it would take six to eight months to do detailed construction plans and he suspected by next spring.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if they had financing for the project. Mr. Matteson said that was no problem.

Mr. John Boyle, former City Council member, said that there was a blight problem along El Camino Real. He said the project developers had worked extensively with neighbors, and he thought there was a good outcome. He said the solution was attractive and something he would be proud of for Menlo Park. He said it was good for the City and local merchants. He said he and others initially wanted some retail but that did not really work at this site. He said having another 100 people to shop locally was a benefit that would add to vibrancy downtown, increase sales tax revenue, add to the housing stock and provide BMR housing.

Mr. Karl Hutter, Menlo Park, said he thought the developer's presentation was excellent. He said the closed car dealerships along El Camino Real did not reflect well on the City. He encouraged the Commission to recommend the project.

Ms. Wendy McPerson, Menlo Park, said she lived about six houses away from the project, and she supported it. She said she spent a good part of the 1990s on the Housing Commission and they had worked hard to get residential zoning along El Camino Real. She said there were many young people and young families who want to live along transportation corridors. She said she thought this would be a great project.

Mr. Howie Dallmar, Menlo Park, said he was a long time friend of the Matteson family, and he knew they would build a quality project. He said he supported the project and noted that it was a thoughtful and responsible project. He said the developer had met with the neighbors, listened to their concerns, made changes and earned the support of the majority of the neighbors. He said the project would add to the housing stock and provide BMR housing. He said he thought everyone would be proud of this project.

Ms. Kimberly Glenn, Menlo Park, said she deliberately does not take visitors down El Camino Real because of the vacant lots. She said they moved from Marin 22 years ago specifically to Menlo Park, which they considered the jewel between Atherton and Palo

Alto. She said the City had disappointingly degraded over the years. She said she loved Menlo Park and would like to see this project move forward.

Ms. Deborah Fitz, Menlo Park, said she completely supported the project and asked the Commission to recommend the approval to the City Council.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Bressler asked if this density bonus would apply to development under the Specific Plan. Planner Rogers said that as a state law it would apply to all development. Commissioner Bressler said the City computes building costs and asked what the construction number per square foot was. Planner Rogers said the City used a spreadsheet for information that has a \$200 per square foot construction cost but that was not as important as the comparative ratio as to how they look at remodels. He said the number was not an exact replica of construction costs.

Commissioner Riggs said if one was building a home where there was an existing home you might budget \$300 per foot. He said if you were building a home where there had been a used car lot there would be a need to bring in services and connection fees which would significantly exceed \$300 per square foot.

Commissioner Bressler said the developer was indicating that it would cost about \$530 per square foot to build these units based on the number offered for the BMR units.

Chair Ferrick said there were six items to vote upon and asked if the Commission wanted to structure the discussion.

Commissioner O'Malley said he would like to take action on all of the items listed noting the project had been discussed ad infinitum. He said it would be hard to find shortcomings with the project as there was considerable support.

Commissioner Eiref asked if any of the Commissioners had any objections.

Commissioner Kadvany said the presentation was excellent and the project had been a long time coming. He said he wanted to discuss each item as he was not comfortable on how the density bonus law was implemented in Menlo Park or at least he wanted to discuss that process.

1. **Use Permit.** A use permit to construct three or more residential units in the R-3 zoning district, and to construct residential units in the C-4(ECR) zoning district.

Chair Ferrick moved to recommend the approval of the use permit to the City Council. Commissioner Yu seconded the motion.

Chair Ferrick said she was pleased to see this project and liked that it fit within what the City has approved in its Specific Plan. Commissioner Bressler said the project fit under what was proposed under the Specific Plan and it would be hard to object to the project in that regard. He said it was important that the project get built quickly so people had an opportunity to see a slightly smaller development on El Camino Real than what the Plan would permit as that was an important part of accessing the Specific Plan.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Yu to recommend approval to the City Council as recommended in the staff report.

1. 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.
2. Approve the Use Permit for construction of three or more units in the R-3 zoning district and new construction of residential units in the C-4(ECR) zoning district.

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Architectural Control.** Design review for the proposed residential buildings and site improvements.

Commissioner Riggs moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the architectural control. He said he had been less than pleased with the initial proposals' scale and aesthetics. He said the turnaround since then in terms of the project scale and aesthetics was an obvious credit to the developer and neighbors and behind the scene work from staff. He said the buildings on College and Partridge Avenues were like anchor buildings in retail terminology as they set a wonderful stage. He said this project would set the bar pretty high in terms of internal site planning, mixes of architectural treatment, details, and materials. He said this was an excellent project and it was wonderful to have an example to refer to in the future. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bressler said putting condominiums on El Camino Real was not his preference but he supported the project moving ahead so people could see what this would look like as opposed to what development could occur under the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Kadvany said he agreed with the quality and that this was an exemplary project but returning to the beginning of the project he did not agree with the assumption of bringing housing to El Camino Real. He said speakers had asked that the project not look like Redwood City or Mountain View along El Camino Real and he thought they

were talking in part about housing coming all the way out on the ground level along El Camino Real. He said El Camino Real was a state highway and not designed for residential. He said the number of parking spaces was somewhat higher than it could be but it was like a suburban cul de sac with separated two-car garages. He said the setbacks were generous near College Avenue but going toward Planet Auto narrowed, and that the City was not getting the setback needed on El Camino Real. He said he agreed that there would be a lot of high perceived value of the project that would motivate other builders and other projects.

Commissioner Eiref said it was unfair to encumber one project with the vision for what was 10 acres of vacant space. He said hopefully they would see different approaches to using this land. He said with the Specific Plan in place and this project kicking off there was an opportunity to think about where they should go with the rest of the land. He said it was an excellent opportunity to change the momentum and perception of what was happening on El Camino Real.

Commissioner Yu said she was supportive of the project and that it was not meant to summarize every ideal for El Camino Real. She said the housing was setting a nice aesthetic bar. She said there had been a great process and the proponents cared about the community. She said it set a nice tone for being the first project on El Camino Real since the adoption of the Specific Plan, but it did not have to encapsulate all of the City's hopes and dreams.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/O'Malley to recommend to the City Council to approve the architectural control.

3. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structures 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; and,
 - 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 proposed design of the new buildings and site improvements.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Major Subdivision.** Tentative Map for seven existing legal lots to be merged into two lots; the public street easement for Alto Lane would be abandoned; and 26 residential condominium units would be created.

Commissioner Riggs moved to recommend approval of the major subdivision to the City Council. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kadvany wished he had understood earlier the significance that the City was giving the developer Alto Lane. Recognized by the Chair, Planner Lin said that the City was abandoning Alto Lane but it was important to recognize that the lane only served the triplexes currently on the property. She said when those triplexes were demolished the lane would serve no purpose. Commissioner Kadvany said that while it was the right thing for the City to do, he would have liked the City's beneficence to have been more apparent at the beginning of the process and that might have helped with some of the issues. Commissioner Riggs said his context was the alleys of the Willows which the City did not seem to want to own. He said for that reason he did not see Alto Lane as having any intrinsic value although its abandonment provided land to the developer.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to recommend the City Council approve the Major Subdivision.

5. Make findings that the proposed major subdivision is technically correct and in compliance with all applicable State regulations, City General Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, and the State Subdivision Map Act.
6. Approve the request for a Tentative Map to merge seven lots into two lots, abandon the public street easement for Alto Lane, and create 26 residential condominium units.

Motion carried 7-0.

4. **Below Market Rate Housing Agreement.** A Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement to provide for the development of three on-site low-income BMR units in accordance with the City's BMR Program and the provisions of Government Code Section 65915, the State Density Bonus Law.

Commissioner O'Malley moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the Below Market Rate Housing Agreement as recommended in the staff report. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion. She noted that the Housing Commission had analyzed the BMR Housing Agreement and supported.

Commissioner Riggs said the Planning Commission had about a two-hour session about a year ago on the state density bonus law and was something they were made aware of and subsequently that knowledge was useful for the consideration of this project.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about density and intensity of units per acre. Planner Rogers said that some cities in addition to maximum standards have minimum density standards. He said in the absence of that the BMR state density bonus was based on a percentage of the units the developer was opting for so there was no mechanism by which the City could require minimum density.

Chair Ferrick suggested that the motion for the BMR be combined with a motion for the state density bonus law which was listed next on the approval. Commissioner O'Malley agreed as the maker of the motion to include also a recommendation to the City Council to approve the incentive and six development standard waivers requested under the state density bonus law. Chair Ferrick seconded.

Commissioner Kadvany said that the state density bonus law was the item he wanted to address.

Commissioner O'Malley retracted the modification to the motion.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Ferrick to recommend that the City Council approve the Below Market Rate Housing Agreement.

7. Approve the Below Market Rate Housing Agreement to provide three on-site BMR units in accordance with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program and State Density Bonus Law (Attachment E).

Motion carried 7-0.

- 5. State Density Bonus Law.** The application is being submitted subject to the State Density Bonus Law, which permits exceptions to the City's Zoning Ordinance requirement, to allow one incentive and six development standard waivers.

Commissioner Kadvany said he had mentioned, earlier this meeting, the origins of the project with driveways off Partridge and College Avenue as he believed that project had struck great fear into neighbors that there would be considerable traffic increase on those streets. He said neighbors, rightly so, began mobilizing. He said as originally proposed having a retail use on El Camino Real with ingress/egress from College and Partridge Avenues, he could understand neighbors' concern. He said however that the processes bifurcated with the neighborhood group working with the developer, contrasted with what was happening in the public meetings. He said neighbors were

very concerned about traffic and the project went from a project with 3,000 square feet of retail to zero retail. He said that made sense for the neighbors and from then on out that group was setting the premises for the developer. He said in the meantime at the Planning Commission the next phase of the project seen was under the state density bonus law. He said that seemed to remove any decision making power or design influence the Commission had. He said the Commission spent a lot of time with the City Attorney trying to understand what the law implied and what influence the Commission could have on this project. He said the project changed through the persistence of the neighbors. He agreed with one of the letters received that the project was organized around cars, garages and was suburban. He said there was never really an opportunity to discuss including some portion as retail. He said in terms of process that the process disappeared. He said because residents were worried about cars then the focus was on parking. He said he was pleased there were real below market rate homes through this project but he did not like the state density bonus law hijacking the process so the Commission could not focus on the project in a meaningful way.

Chair Ferrick said the state density bonus law was a mechanism and it happened to apply to this project.

Commissioner Riggs moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the one incentive and six development standard waivers allowable under the state density bonus law. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kadvany said this project could have probably been built under the Specific Plan.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/O'Malley to recommend the following action to the City Council.

8. Apply the State Density Bonus Law to allow one incentive and six development standard waivers.

Motion carried 5-2 with Commissioners Bressler and Kadvany dissenting.

6. **Environmental Review.** The project is analyzed for potential environmental impacts in the focused EIR.

Commissioner Kadvany said there was a letter from the Department of Transportation stating they thought the project was overparked, suggesting more facilities for bicycles, and decoupling spaces. He said the reply was on page 16 and it indicated that residents could utilize on street parking along El Camino Real, College Avenue and Partridge Avenue but failed to point out there was no overnight street parking. He thanked LSA for a well organized and thorough environmental document.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Yu to recommend the following action to the City Council.

9. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park, State of California, Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 389 El Camino Real Project for the 389 El Camino Real Project (Attachment I).

Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Bressler said he thought the overhead and process cost for this project had been huge. He said he had an expectation that with some of that cost not being there for the Specific Plan that this would result in projects for Menlo Park to enjoy. Commissioner Riggs said he agreed with that comment. He said he wanted to thank staff for the staff reports that made this process very functional for the Commission and City. Chair Ferrick said she applauded the developer and neighbors for bringing divergent viewpoints to a good compromise.

4. **General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Tentative Map, Environmental Review/ City of Menlo Park/ 50 Terminal Avenue and 1467 Chilco Street:** Request for a General Plan map amendment, rezoning, and subdivision of a 3.9-acre site that is currently occupied by a private school and a fire station. The site will be rezoned from the U Unclassified district to the R-1-U Single Family Urban Residential and PF Public Facilities districts, with a corresponding change in the General Plan land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential and Public Facilities. A Tentative Map is proposed to subdivide the site and a portion of the adjacent community center parking lot into three parcels. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared, which analyzes the project's potential environmental impacts.

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said staff had no additional comments. She said Ms. Marilyn Anderson, the principal of Beechwood School, was present and available to answer questions about the school.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kadvany said that there were no comments from the Menlo Park Fire District or the Onetta Harris Community Center. Planner Lin said that City staff has been in contact with the Fire District and that the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration had been distributed to the Fire District for their review, but they made no comments. She said the Tentative Map was included with that mailing.

Commissioner O'Malley said he understood that Beechwood School would purchase all of Parcel 2 but questioned why the area was being rezoned to R-1-U zoning district. He asked if that occurred whether the entire parcel would be the school. He asked if that was the case why it was rezoned residential. Planner Lin said the expectation was that Beechwood School would purchase the entirety of Parcel 2. She said it is a private

school and in the R-1-U district a private school was considered a conditional use. She said if they were to expand the school they would apply for a use permit. Commissioner O'Malley asked if in the future they no longer wanted to operate the school whether the parcel could be used for residential development. Planner Lin said that was correct. Commissioner O'Malley asked if there was a contract for the school to purchase the parcel. Planner Lin said the City Council had approved a contract for Beechwood School to purchase the parcel.

Commissioner Eiref asked if the parcel was being sold or valued in any way that made it attractive as an educational environment for school as opposed to residential, and if it would be kept as school. Planner Rogers said the value of the land was not for the Planning Division's discretion nor germane to the action before the Commission. He said it was the City Council's discretion as to the property. He said there was a valuation procedure and that probably recognized the constrained nature of this parcel in regard to width and access. He said there had been a residential project proposed for this site that received a lot of neighbor opposition.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Riggs as to why the site was zoned R-1-U and not PF, Planner Rogers said the PF zoning could be more restrictive and also more freeing in some ways and could allow for some less harmonious government uses. He said this was a solution that seemed to offer the most protection for the residential neighborhood if a school was not there and also provided flexibility of development parameters for the school itself.

Chair Ferrick opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, she closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Ferrick asked if it was the City or school that determined the zoning. Planner Lin said the City.

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

Environmental Review

1. Make the following findings relative to the environmental review of the proposal and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration:
 - a. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and circulated for public review in accordance with current State CEQA Guidelines;
 - b. The Planning Commission has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposal and any comments received during the public review period; and

- c Based on the Initial Study prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration and any comments received on the document, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment.

Subdivision

- 2. Make findings that the proposed subdivision is technically correct and in compliance with all applicable State regulations, City General Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, and the State Subdivision Map Act.

General Plan Map Amendments

- 3. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park, Amending the General Plan to Change the Land Use Designation for Properties Located at 50 Terminal Avenue and 1467 Chilco Street

Rezoning

- 4. Introduce an Ordinance of the City of Menlo Park, Rezoning Properties Located at 50 Terminal Avenue and 1467 Chilco Street

Motion carried 7-0.

E. STUDY SESSION

- 1. **Study Session/David Bouquillon for DivcoWest/2460 Sand Hill Road:**
Request for a study session for the demolition of the existing building located at 2460 Sand Hill Road (Quadrus Building 4) and the construction of a new building in the same location. The existing and proposed general, non-medical, office buildings would be approximately 33,000 square feet. The proposed project is located in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research, Restrictive) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Perata said there was an error on Sheet C1 which showed Tree #726 labeled as a six-inch Maple and that tag really was for tree #758. He said all plans and the use permit application would be updated to correct the inaccuracy.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley said there was a mention that this building had to make up for 913 square feet on another building the Commission had approved. He said his calculations came up with 288 square feet. Planner Perata said the 913 square foot removal was a condition of approval for Building 9 that was recently reviewed by the Commission. He said 913 square feet was removed from this proposed building. He said the 288 square foot GFA mentioned on page 3 referred to

the difference between the existing as-built building and the proposed building. He said the proposal would be a slight reduction in GFA over the site.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Robert Remiker, project architect, said the building that was proposed for replacement did not exhibit the same grace as the three buildings built before it and the four buildings built after it. He said originally it was built to house the accounting department and mainframe computers and was not amenable to the current leasing environments. He said the project would replace the existing three-story building with a two-story building and underground parking, and would have a more square footprint and floor plate that would be more adaptable for single or multiple tenants. He said the base would be concrete, the middle level would be office space with cement plaster and stucco, and the top level would be wood batten siding. He said in conversation with the Fire District they had requested some of the circulation ways and turning radii be increased. He said any parking lost because of those changes would be accommodated so there was no loss of parking.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about making the building more energy efficient. Mr. Remiker said one thing they were exploring, as the question had come up about operable windows and the problems they can create for heating and air conditioning systems, was to provide lots of doors to exterior decks to allow people to use outdoor spaces which might lead to natural ventilation inside. He said they were also looking at variable refrigerant manifold systems that are very economical. He said there are small footprint, rooftop chilling unit and heat exchange systems with which the project could exceed Title 24 by 50%.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about showers for bicyclists. Mr. Remiker said they there would be bike storage in the basement. He said they were questioning whether showers would be better in the basement or in the office area. Commissioner Kadvany confirmed there was an elevator for accessibility from the parking garage.

Chair Ferrick noted that her preference would be to have showers on the office floors and not the basement. She said energy conservation and allowing for other modes of transportation were important.

Mr. Remiker asked if there were a number of bicycle spaces needed or required. Planner Perata said the Zoning Ordinance did not have requirements for bicycle parking but the Cal Green Code might. He said staff would research and report back.

Chair Ferrick said she liked the design proposed and that it fit well with the rest of the campus and greater Sand Hill Road area.

Commissioner Yu said the next time the project came forward it would be good to see how this building would blend with the other buildings.

Commissioner Riggs said he thought the architecture was a very nice solution and a good addition to the Quadrus campus and Menlo Park.

Commissioner Eiref asked if there were tenants currently. Mr. David Bouquillon, DivcoWest, said that the building had been completely empty one year and mostly vacant for the last eight years due to its undesirable floor configuration.

As a study session item, the Commission did not take action on the item, but individual comments are summarized below.

- Consider incorporating energy saving features and more efficient HVAC units than are currently required by the Building Code.
- Incorporate bicycle facilities, such as racks, lockers, and showers into the design of the building. Consider incorporating the shower facilities closer to the offices instead of inside the parking garage.
- The use permit and architectural control application should identify how the proposed building relates to the existing site, to provide context.
- The Commission provided generally positive feedback on the design of the proposed building.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 23, 2012