



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
April 8, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.  
City Council Chambers  
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

---

**CALL TO ORDER** – 7:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – Bressler, Eiref (arrived 7:04 p.m.), Ferrick (Chair), Kadvany (Vice Chair), O'Malley (absent), Onken, Riggs

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner; Momoko Ishijima, Planner; Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

### A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

##### a. Housing Element

- a. Planning Commission/City Council Joint Meeting – April 9, 2013
- b. Planning Commission – April 22, 2013

Planner Rogers said at the Planning Commission and City Council Joint meeting the next evening there would be a presentation on the Housing Element documents released the previous week. He said the item would then come to the Planning Commission on April 22, 2013.

- b. Facebook West Campus – City Council – March 26, 2013 and April 2, 2013

Planner Rogers said the City Council approved the Facebook West Campus project on March 26, 2013 with some actions being introduced at that meeting that had a second reading at the April 2, 2013 meeting.

- c. 555 Glenwood Avenue – City Council – March 26, 2013

Planner Rogers said the City Council approved the 555 Glenwood Avenue project at the March 26, 2013 meeting.

- d. SRI Campus Modernization Project – City Council Study Session – April 2, 2013

Planner Rogers said the City Council held a study session on April 2, 2013 for the SRI Campus Modernization project. He said this item would come to the Planning

Commission at a yet unspecified date for a Notice of Preparation of Environmental Review and Study Session.

e. 401 Pierce Road – City Council – April 16, 2013

f. 500 El Camino Real – City Council – April 16, 2013

Planner Rogers noted for the City Council's April 16 meeting that the Council would consider for action the Conditional Development Permit revision request for the Boys and Girls Club at 401 Pierce Road, and would hold a study session on 500 El Camino Real, noting for the latter the Council also wanted to consider the review and public process for that project. He said potentially the Council would provide direction on that process.

Chair Ferrick asked about the study sessions before the City Council for the SRI and 500 El Camino Real projects. Planner Rogers said it was not atypical that the SRI project would be introduced in a study session to the Council first as much of the approvals needed would be Council level. He noted that session would have more public exposure through cable access than a Commission meeting with Internet access. He said the applicants for the 500 El Camino Real had taken the Planning Commission and public's input and were revising plans. He noted the City would commence an independent traffic study for that project. He said two Council members had requested that the project be reviewed with the Council and at their last meeting a third member added support to that request.

Chair Ferrick said Commissioner Riggs had an announcement.

Commissioner Riggs said he had provided a handout to the Planning Commission and staff on residential design guidelines from another city. He said the City of Burlingame's Residential Design Guidelines booklet was 85 pages. He said it probably cost \$100,000 or more for a consultant to draft it. He invited the Commission to agendaize a discussion on residential design guidelines for Menlo Park. He said he and another Commissioner had ideas about how to proceed.

Responding to a question from Chair Ferrick on how to proceed, Planner Rogers said after earlier conferral with staff, it seemed the next best step would be to review the information provided by Commissioner Riggs, and then schedule an offline meeting with Commissioner Riggs and the other interested Commissioner to discuss how the idea would be sponsored, when calendared and how the discussion would be structured.

## **B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were none.

## CONSENT

### C1. Approval of minutes from the February 4, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Ferrick noted slight changes that had been emailed by Commissioners.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the minutes with the following modifications.

- Page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from bottom, 3<sup>rd</sup> line: Replace “he said” with “he acknowledged”
- Page 7, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Change “collared” to “pollard”
- Page 8, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from bottom, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Change “collared” to “pollard”

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O’Malley absent:

### C2. Approval of the excerpt minutes for 401 Pierce Road from the March 18, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the 401 Pierce Road excerpt minutes as submitted.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O’Malley absent.

## C. PUBLIC HEARING

- D1. Use Permit/Scott Landry/635 Kenwood Drive:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot depth and lot size, in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The project includes a request for the removal of a heritage street tree (23.5-inch diameter, fair condition).

Staff Comment: Planner Ishijima said there were no additions to the staff report noting the applicant had provided a color rendering and materials board.

Public Comment: Mr. Scott Landry, Studio 101 Designs, project architect, said they were proposing a modern design that respected the neighborhood context of varied massing with both gable and flat roofs. He said the exterior siding would be cement board panels and white sand color horizontal tongue in groove cedar siding with natural finish and dark bronze doors with complimentary accents. He said the gable roof would be a gray stained metal and the flat roof would be a gray tapia membrane. He said their project goal was to provide improved interior and exterior living spaces with screening as needed. He said they would use prefabricated modules that would be delivered mostly finished. He said the time to construct would be much shorter than a typical construction period. He said there has been ongoing outreach to neighbors and the

design was changed in response to neighbor comments noting they had moved from an all flat roof to include gables and other articulation.

In response to a question from Commissioner Onken, Mr. Landry said the windows were totally vinyl in a darker color, and not plastic clad.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the motivation to remove a Liquid amber street tree noting its location in the middle of a row. Mr. Landry said the request was well received by the City Arborist and that they planned to replace that tree with something nicer. Commissioner Riggs suggested not using the type of Maple that tended to keep its dead leaves from November to June. He said the removal of mature trees on the lot from the right side seemed to present a privacy challenge. Mr. Landry said there were just a couple of small windows on that side and they would be happy to install some type of screening.

Chair Ferrick asked if there was a plan for storing bicycles and lawnmowers. Mr. Landrey said there was a storage bank behind the carport.

Commissioner Onken asked why they chose fiberboard panel. Mr. Landrey said the aesthetic they liked would be flat panels with reveals between the boards that created a modern look and was cost effective. He said they warmed the material at eye level by using cedar.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs asked if they were treating the Hardy panels and horizontal wood as a rain screen. Mr. Landry said they were not in this case. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with Mr. Landry that although there was a reveal there was closure. He said it was important for the storage area at the back of the carport to be used for that purpose. He confirmed with staff that the carport depth required was 20-feet. He said he had some concern with removing the mature trees on the right and asked if there would be replacement trees. Mr. Landry said they had not planned to replace those as they were not heritage trees but they would consider it. Commissioner Riggs asked about the next door garage. Mr. Scott Herscher, property owner, indicated there was a one-car garage on the neighbor's side. Commissioner Riggs suggested that they plant one replacement tree toward the back on the right to provide screening. He said although this project was a departure from the existing house style in the neighborhood that the use of the wood on the first floor and relatively compact form made it harmonious with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Onken said the applicant's description of the benefits of prefabricated modules were subordinate to the needs of the neighborhood. He said this project was proposing the use of vinyl windows, when typically the Commission wanted clad or wood windows.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the profile of the vinyl. Mr. Landrey said it was about an inch and half with really tight lines. He said they had not used vinyl until the availability of it in dark colors, which masked that it was vinyl.

Chair Ferrick said she could support the project noting she did not recall rejecting a project because it had vinyl windows.

Commissioner Kadvany moved to approve as recommended in the staff report and noted the project would complement the neighborhood. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion, noting she had some concern regarding the storage and the carport. She said she was pleased the project did not try to maximize the building design. She suggested making the storage area in the carport deeper if it was possible.

Commissioner Riggs suggested a friendly amendment to require that a tree be planted on the back right side corner to provide for privacy screening. Commissioners Kadvany and Ferrick accepted the friendly amendment.

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

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 Studio 101 Designs, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received March 12, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, 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 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 the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. ***Approve the use permit subject to the following specific project conditions:***
- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a landscape plan or revised site plan with a proposed tree for privacy screening at the back right-side corner of the structure, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

**D2. Use Permit Revision/Michael Davis, D&Z Design Associates, Inc./1325**

**Garden Lane:** Request for a use permit revision to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and subsequently construct a new two-story, 5,048 square foot single-family residence including a basement with light wells that encroach into the required interior side yard and rear yard setbacks and an attached 573 square foot garage on a substandard lot with regard to lot width, lot depth and lot size in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district. Four heritage trees are proposed for removal as part of the project. The request is a revision to a use permit approved on February 4, 2013.

Staff Comment: Planner Grossman said there were no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs said it appeared that the purpose for the permit revision request was to remove a sycamore tree. Planner Grossman said the changes being requested were summarized on page 4 of the staff report. She said the primary impetus for the request was the removal of the sycamore tree but there were also requests for changes to the design to better meet the needs of the applicants. She noted additional privacy measures, specifically raising the sill of the window adjacent to the staircase facing the left side neighbor to seven feet. She said the evergreen screening trees that had been a condition of approval made by the Commission had now been added to the project plan sheet.

Commissioner Kadvany asked what the Commission's position previously had been on the sycamore tree. Planner Grossman said an adjacent neighbor at the previous hearing on this project had specifically asked for the sycamore tree to be removed. She said the applicant had purposefully designed around this heritage sycamore tree. She said there was further discussion among the neighbor, the applicant and the City Arborist about the tree. She said it was definitive that the neighbor wanted the tree removed and that the City Arborist could support its removal. She said at the Commission meeting when this project was first considered, the Commission after hearing discussion and comment from the public had directed staff to work with the applicant, arborist and neighbor to prune the tree if feasible and hopefully more than the 25% that would be allowed without a heritage tree removal permit. She said the left side neighbor phoned staff to express support for the removal of the tree.

Public Comment: Mr. Michael Davis, D&Z Design Associates, said at the hearing on the project, the neighbor had expressed great interest in having the sycamore tree removed. He said the City Arborist met with them and it was noted that the tree had been heavily pollarded over the years. He said the City Arborist then said the tree could be removed. He said they were also bringing a small change to the floor plan. He said there were four evergreen trees that would be planted on the left side property line as well as a replacement tree for the sycamore, also on the left side. He said the floor plan change did not change the front or rear elevation at all but changed the left and right elevations. He said space was taken from the walk in closet on the right side and used for a walk-in pantry on the left side of the house. He said they also lessened glazing on the left side.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Eiref 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 DZ Design Associates, Inc., consisting of 15 plan sheets, dated received March 18, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, 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 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 the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following ***project specific*** condition:
  - a. Concurrent with demolition permit submittal, the demolition plans shall specify that new permanent fencing shall be constructed along the left side and rear property lines at the conclusion of the demolition work, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit documentation verifying installation of the new permanent fencing along the left side and rear property lines, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

Chair Ferrick noted that Commissioner Kadvany would need to recuse himself for the next item because of the proximity of his home to the subject property.

**D3. Use Permit/Brian Kelly/380 Claire Place:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban) zoning district.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Scott Kelly said he was the applicant's brother, and was representing his brother, who was out of town. He said he had no presentation but was available for questions.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Eiref said that in this neighborhood most of the homes featured brick, but this proposal was using cultured stone. He asked if they had considered using brick. Mr. Kelly said the project architect, RH and Associates, had specified cultured stone, a wide variety of Bucks County field stone. He said the house next door to the subject property had a brick façade. Commissioner Eiref said all of the homes except a newer home built next door to the subject property used brick. Mr. Kelly said the house to the right was new construction and was a new/old brick material. He said he did not know if the applicants would want brick. Commissioner Eiref asked if this would be a spec home. Mr. Kelly said it would be.

Commissioner Riggs noted there were two-story neighboring houses, and while this was a big house, the massing fit on the lot. He said there was a stone base like a wainscot on the front of the house only. He said looking at the side of the house it was evident the stone was applied. He said that was a poor use of materials and did not have real architectural reference. He said he had no problem with the stone chimney. He said however it was not evident that the stone came down both sides of the chimney. He said the rear elevation should show some stone next to the door. He said also the stone only appeared to be two and a half feet tall.

Mr. Kelly said they used the stone, which was expensive, for architectural relief, and that they liked the look of it. He said his brother had talked with real estate people in the Menlo Park about the project, who had recommended they eliminate all of the stone except around the fire places. He provided some drawings that showed the façade without the stone base but kept the stone chimney.

Chair Ferrick asked if there would be a landscape plan and pathway. Mr. Kelly said there would be.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed with the applicant that the stone was grouted and not dry set. He asked if the applicant would be amenable to extending the stone on the chimney up to the gutter level of the adjacent roof on the rear elevation. Mr. Kelly said he had the stone going up to the shroud. Commissioner Riggs said sheet A-4 showed there was six-feet between the chimney and bedroom four, and that for balance the chimney should extend more. He said that chimneys traditionally were two and a half feet taller than any roof within 10 feet.

Mr. Kelly said the shorter chimney seemed to be congruent with the chimney on the left, and that seemed to be intentional by the architect.

Chair Ferrick said she preferred the alternative front elevation that did not have the stone. She said she understood both positions about the chimney.

Commissioner Onken said there was a revision cloud around the stone cladding on the front façade. He asked if staff had asked the applicant to put it on. Planner Perata said initially the stone had gone higher on the front of the building and one gable on the second floor had received more stone treatment than the other. He said the revision was to make it more symmetrical which brought the stone down lower to wainscot level.

Commissioner Eiref agreed that the façade looked much better without the stone.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report with three modifications to use the front façade alternative without the fascia stone, to confirm that the great room chimney had a stone base completely around the ground on both sides, and raise the chimney approximately 30 inches at the great room. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Onken to approve the item with the following modifications.

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 RH Associates Architects consisting of 10 plan sheets, dated received March 27, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, 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 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 the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
  - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

4. **Approve the use permit subject to the following specific conditions:**
  - a. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the plans to remove the stone veneer from the project, with the exception of the chimneys, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
  - b. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit documentation that the middle chimney along the rear elevation contains a stone veneer on all sides of the chimney, and the stone façades shall extend to the grade level, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
  - c. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall raise the height of the middle chimney along the rear façade by a minimum of 30 inches, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent and Commissioner Kadvany recused.

Chair Ferrick noted that the Commission would consider the next two items, D4 and D5, together but would take action on each separately. She noted the Commission had seen this project previously.

**D4. Use Permit, Architectural Control, Major Subdivision/Forrest Mozart/1273**

**Laurel Street:** Request to demolish a single-story, single family home and to construct three detached, two-story dwelling units on the subject parcel in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. Use Permit and Architectural Control would be required for the construction of new residential units. The development would include a common driveway with the adjacent property (1281 Laurel Street) for access to each residence. A Tentative Map would be required to create six residential condominium units, including three units on the neighboring legal parcel (addressed 1281 Laurel Street). As part of the proposal the applicant is proposing to remove three heritage trees, including a coast live oak (42-inch diameter, poor condition) and two incense cedars (33-inch and 27 inch diameter, fair and poor condition). In addition, the applicant is requesting approval of a Below Market Rate (BMR) Agreement for the payment of an in-lieu fee for this project. An initial version of the proposal was reviewed by the Planning Commission at the meeting of March 4, 2013, and was continued with direction for redesign. The proposal has since been revised, with changes to the driveway material, the windows and orientation of the right-side front unit, and modifications to the applied materials throughout the project.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Tony Sarboraria, Project Architect, distributed three packets to the Commission. He said the project was continued by the Commission on March 4 with specific direction particularly about the house on the right side in how it addressed the street, its roof massing, the stone treatment and how it related to the home behind it. He said the other issue was the driveway width and design. He said they contacted the Fire District again and they confirmed with that agency there was a requirement stemming from State Fire Code that roadways or driveways which served four or more residential units were required to be a minimum of 20 feet wide. He noted changes to make the driveway area more attractive and referred the Commission to the handout for the type of pavers proposed for use. He said the sections where the pavers would be located could be seen on the site plan noting that they would be used on the walkways and surface parking stalls. He said they also addressed the roof plan of all of the Plan One buildings. He said the roof on the front unit particularly changed and they had added a gable so there were two gables facing the two sides of the corner. He said significant changes were made to the fenestration facing the street with the addition of a picture window, two smaller windows and a decorative canopy. He said they enlarged the window on the second floor and added a window in the kitchen. He said they added substantially more stone to give the home a strong base. He said the ledge stone would be applied with grout. He said the applicant and he had met with Commissioner Riggs to get some feedback on the changes made thus far. He said two of the four views in the renderings were done specifically to address what they would look like including the view along the back of the houses on the right hand side and the space between Houses #1 and #2 and Houses #2 and #3. He said the landscape sheet on the back of the packet showed the addition of a tree between House #1 and #2 and another tree between House #2 and #3. He said they were open to the type of trees those should be. He said the renderings were done very recently and he was pleased overall but it appeared the windows had white frames. He said they intended to have dark colored clad window sashes that coordinated with the paint scheme for each of the houses. He said the stone texture on the rendering was not quite right and noted the materials board better showed the stone texture.

Chair Ferrick said she liked the addition of the window in the kitchen and the picture window on House #1. She asked if Houses #2 and #3 would also enjoy such windows. Mr. Sarboraria said there was the question of privacy between the houses. He said those houses had the majority of their windows toward the left and fewer and smaller windows on the right. He noted the fence lines were designed to wrap around for a yard on the left side with a 20 foot space between them.

Commissioner Onken said the last time this item was considered Commissioner Riggs expressed concern that the planting area under the heritage oak tree be kept dry and free of irrigation as much as possible. He asked if they would use rocks and pebbles rather than bark mulch. Ms. Shari Van Dom, Landscape Architect, said typically bark mulch was healthier for the tree than doing pebbles and rocks as that reduced the air flow.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the proportion of stucco to shingling on some of the houses, noting House #6 had a large stucco on front and a small amount of shingling on the side. Mr. Sarboraria said it was intentional.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Ferrick said she appreciated the updated plans and she liked the way House #1 addressed the street. She said some of the houses looked like a layered cake, but noted that it might be because of the colors shown in the rendering. Mr. Sarboraria said there were six houses and three color schemes. He said three of the houses on the second story would have stained gray shingles and the other three would have horizontal siding. He said the siding would be painted and the shingles would be stained. He said in each of the three color schemes there were two upper story shingled siding colors. He said all of the roofs would be the same and all of the bases would be the same with a variation in colors of the walls in between.

Commissioner Onken said comments made previously about the driveway had been addressed. He said that it was not that the driveway was terribly wide but that it seemed more so because it was next to a narrow cul de sac street. He said he found the driveway width acceptable and appreciated the changes made. He said the applied stone was compatible with this new-style Craftsman look. He said the stone should however be extended to the ground. Mr. Sarboraria said there were code issues. Commissioner Onken asked whether there could be a damp layer if the stone was grouted solid. Mr. Sarboraria said there were some tricky ways of leaving weep holes with little pieces of flashing sticking out and filling in more stone underneath. He said he was making a note to add fancy detail at the base of the stone.

Commissioner Bressler asked about the pavers and the Fire District truck weights. Mr. Sarboraria said the Fire District would require that the pavers be engineered to support the vehicular weight. Commissioner Bressler asked the difference in cost between doing pavers and concrete. Mr. Sarboraria said it was significant but he did not have a dollar amount.

Commissioner Riggs said he appreciated the applicant team's responsiveness to the Commission's comments. He thanked the applicants for doing the renderings, and for planting trees against the blank walls. He said the City leaves a majority of the drip line in non-irrigated form for its oak trees. Ms. Van Dom said there were a number of plants that worked under oak trees and those would be used with very low water drip systems. Commissioner Riggs said on the left rear middle of the lot a major tree had been removed near Unit 4. He suggested planting a specimen tree there or in front of Unit 5. Ms. Van Dom said they had considered that but the spaces in front of the houses were just too small for a specimen tree to grow well without impinging on the buildings.

Commissioner Riggs said they had discussed changing the vertical stair window. Mr. Sarboraria said his preference was to keep the three stacked windows as designed to

provide more light and better aesthetic inside noting it was around the side of the house. He said however he had brought an alternative with a smaller window. He said they were willing to make that change but the preference was to keep it as it was designed. Commissioner Riggs asked about the window frame and trim colors. Mr. Sarboraria said they had not selected the manufacturer or exact color yet but they would be wood sash exterior clad and with accent colors that would work well with the color adjacent to them. He said he did not think that there would be any white or off white but would include brown tones or reddish brown tones. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with the architect that the trim and frames would be within the color plan. He asked if others were interested in changing the three stacked windows. Chair Ferrick noted the window was within the side area that was offset by the fence. Commissioner Riggs said that was a good point.

Commissioner Kadvany said related to driveway width that previously he had spoken with staff at California Fire Code who had indicated that it was local policy making that determined the driveway width using the state code as the framework. He said their local policy was that a fire access road was what was required for a development of three or more homes. He suggested that in the future that these not be called driveways but fire access roads. He asked the applicant if they had thought about breaking up the double garage doors so they looked like two single doors either functional or not. Mr. Sarboraria said they had not thought about it but noted it was possible. Commissioner Kadvany asked about the color of the pavers. Mr. Sarboraria said the pavers would be a variegated natural stone color. Commissioner Kadvany said he had raised the question about the three guest parking spaces. Mr. Sarboraria said there would need to be some restrictions written into the CC&R's so the spaces were shared by the property owners.

Chair Ferrick said she was impressed with how well the project was designed to fit within the lot area. She moved to recommend approval for 1273 Laurel Street to the City Council. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion. He noted that they should include two trees between the homes as noted on the landscape plan and that the applicant had indicated the stone would be grouted as previously stated. He said the applicant team was very responsive and the project would be an attractive addition to Menlo Park.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Riggs to recommend approval to the City Council of the following actions and direction:

1. Adopt a finding that the redevelopment of the site is categorically exempt under Class 32 (Section 15332, "In-Fill Development Projects") of the current State 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. 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 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.
  - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
4. Approve the use permit and architectural control requests subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by AJS Architecture and Planning, consisting of 29 plan sheets, dated received March 27, 2013 and recommended by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. Landscaping shall properly screen all utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground. 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.
  - h. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit proposed landscape and irrigation documentation as required by Chapter 12.44 (Water-Efficient Landscaping) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. If required, the applicant shall submit all parts of the landscape project application as listed in section 12.44.040 of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The landscaping shall be installed and inspected prior to final inspection of the building.
5. Adopt 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.

The Planning Commission provided direction that the stone veneer should contain grout between the individual stones, instead of a dry stack design.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

**D5. Use Permit, Architectural Control, Major Subdivision/Forrest Mozart/1281 Laurel Street:** Request to demolish a single-story, single family home and to construct three detached, two-story dwelling units on the subject parcel in the R-3

(Apartment) zoning district. Use Permit and Architectural Control would be required for the construction of new residential units. The development would include a common driveway with the adjacent property (1273 Laurel Street) for access to each residence. A Tentative Map would be required to create six residential condominium units, including three units on the neighboring legal parcel (addressed 1273 Laurel Street). As part of the proposal the applicant is proposing to remove two heritage size Mexican fan palms (22-inch and 17-inch diameter, good condition). In addition, the applicant is requesting approval of a Below Market Rate (BMR) Agreement for the payment of an in-lieu fee for this project. An initial version of the proposal was reviewed by the Planning Commission at the meeting of March 4, 2013, and was continued with direction for redesign. The proposal has since been revised, with changes to the driveway material, the windows and orientation of the right-side front unit, and modifications to the applied materials throughout the project.

Commissioner Kadvany reminded the applicant about the option to modify the garage doors in the previous discussion to appear like two doors rather than one wide door.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Riggs to recommend approval of the item to the City Council of the following actions and direction:

1. Adopt a finding that the redevelopment of the site is categorically exempt under Class 32 (Section 15332, "In-Fill Development Projects") of the current State 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. 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 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.
  - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
4. Approve the use permit and architectural control requests subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by AJS Architecture and Planning, consisting of 29 plan sheets, dated received March 27, 2013 and recommended by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. Landscaping shall properly screen all utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - d. 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.
  - e. 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.
  - f. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

- g. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit proposed landscape and irrigation documentation as required by Chapter 12.44 (Water-Efficient Landscaping) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. If required, the applicant shall submit all parts of the landscape project application as listed in section 12.44.040 of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The landscaping shall be installed and inspected prior to final inspection of the building.
  - h. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit proposed landscape and irrigation documentation as required by Chapter 12.44 (Water-Efficient Landscaping) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. If required, the applicant shall submit all parts of the landscape project application as listed in section 12.44.040 of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions. The landscaping shall be installed and inspected prior to final inspection of the building.
5. Adopt 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.

The Planning Commission provided direction to the applicant that:

- The stone veneer should contain grout between the individual stones, instead of a dry stack design; and
- Add two screening trees between the units on the right side parcel (1281 Laurel Street).

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent:

**D6. Use Permit/HeartVista/990 Hamilton Avenue:** Request for a use permit for the storage and use of hazardous materials for the research and development of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) software to assist in the diagnosis of heart diseases, within an existing building located in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. All chemicals would be used and stored within the building.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Juan Santos, CEO of HeartVista, said his company was a startup that came out of Stanford Electrical Engineering. He said they do software for magnetic resonance imaging with a goal to improve the diagnostics. He said to further their

efforts they would like to install an MRI machine in their facility to test software directly. He said that required the use of helium.  
Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken moved to approve as recommended and Chair Ferrick seconded the motion. Commissioner Riggs said he checked with the Fire District because of the amount of helium that would be stored. He said the Fire District confirmed that the cylinders in which the helium was stored in had safety vents in case of fire or pressure.

Ms. Ellen Ackerman, Green Environment, San Carlos, confirmed that helium vessels have a safety mechanism, noting it was a benign gas.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Ferrick to approve the item 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 current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Dennis Kobza & Associates, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received March 27, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or

the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.

- e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
- f. If the business discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire unless a new business submits a new hazardous materials business plan to the Planning Division within 90 days, for review by the applicable agencies to determine whether the new hazardous materials business plan is in substantial compliance with the use permit.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:

- a. Simultaneous with a complete building permit submittal, the applicant shall submit an address change request to the City identifying the tenant space as 990 Hamilton Avenue, and an appropriate suite number, subject to review and approval of the Planning and Building Divisions.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

**D7. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Melanie Roth/1143 Crane Street:**

Request for a use permit and architectural control to allow outdoor seating within the public right-of-way and exterior modifications to the building façade in conjunction with a restaurant use in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposed exterior modifications include adjustments to the height of the existing awning, installation of wainscot siding in the entry alcove, replacement of storefront windows, and changes to the building's color scheme.

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said staff received five additional letters expressing support for the project. She said materials and color boards were being distributed and should be used for reference and not the elevations.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kadvany asked if the sidewalk could be extended on side streets noting there had been discussion about extending sidewalks on Santa Cruz Avenue during the Specific Plan process. Planner Rogers said it had not come up for discussion one way or the other.

Public Comment: Ms. Melanie Roth said she and her husband Matt Levin were the owners of The Refuge. She introduced Ms. Stephanie Batiste, their project designer.

She said their restaurant specialized in pastrami and Belgian beer noting they had an existing location in San Carlos. She said they had requested a permit for outdoor seating as that would draw attention to the space and also maintain consistency with their existing restaurant in San Carlos.

Ms. Batiste said they would raise the awning structure higher and install larger operable windows to bring light into the space and attract attention from street traffic. She said they also wanted to enhance the color.

Commissioner Onken asked about signage. Planner Lin said the signage had been considered under a sign permit application and noted the main sign would be on the awning.

Commissioner Eiref said the sidewalk seemed narrow to accommodate two tables. Planner Lin said they had verified the width of the sidewalk and there would be enough room for pedestrians with two tables located close to the tree well. Commissioner Eiref asked if the outdoor seating and tables would be put away at night. Planner Lin indicated they would be.

Commissioner Onken asked about the glass for the new windows. Ms. Batiste said it would be clear glass.

Ms. Fran Dehn, Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce, said that the proposed changes would make the site much more inviting inside. She noted that The Refuge served really good pastrami.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken noted that awnings and tinted glass were not a good combination for retail stores. He encouraged them to consider whether the awning was necessary.

Commissioner Riggs noted the color scheme was nice but could be bolder. He moved to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kadvany suggested that the applicants become familiar with the Downtown Specific Plan as well as meet their neighbors and consider activating what was possible under the Plan that would enliven the area.

Chair Ferrick suggested the applicant confer with Ms. Fran Dehn about summer activities.

Commissioner Eiref asked about piped music to attract customers. Planner Rogers said that depended too on the surrounding uses. He suggested the applicant consult with staff directly.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the item 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 current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.440 of the Zoning Ordinance, that the proposed outdoor seating and the sale of beer and wine in conjunction with a restaurant are appropriate and would not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use. In addition, the outdoor seating would maintain unimpeded pedestrian access on the public right-of-way.
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 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.
  - e. The development is consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan.
4. 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 the applicant, consisting of three plan sheets, dated received March 25, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 8, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, 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 Division that are directly applicable to the project.
5. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
- a. Any citation or notification of violation by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the sale of alcoholic beverages will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
  - b. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit prior to implementation of the proposed outdoor seating. The encroachment permit shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

**D8. Use Permit Revision/Jane Vaughan/200 Middlefield Road:** Request for a use permit revision for a reduction of six parking spaces, from a total of 162 to 156 parking spaces, to accommodate an expanded electrical room, additional mechanical units, exhaust venting, and bicycle parking in the underground garage at an existing non-medical office building in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said staff had no additional comments.

Question of Staff: In response to a question from Commissioner Kadvany about the process and allowance for adjusting parking requirements, Planner Rogers said that Chapter 16.72 "Off Street Parking" provides parking requirements for all parts of the City except for the area within the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan. He said reductions in requirements for commercial and industrial land use might be allowed through an administrative permit as outlined in Chapter 16.82. He said for projects whose original action required architectural control review that required a use permit rather than an administrative permit. He said the Parking Policy for the commercial and industrial land uses were adopted by the City Council around the same time as the Use Based Parking Guidelines.

In response to a question from Chair Ferrick, Planner Lin noted the bicycle parking would accommodate up to 11 bicycles.

Public Comment: Ms. Jane Vaughan, Menlo Equities, said the use permit was approved a year before and they had been allowed to use the Use Based Parking Guidelines, which was requiring one parking space for 300 square feet or 138 parking spaces. She said however they had submitted plans that showed 162 parking spaces, noting they wanted to put more landscaping in the back and in the parking lot. She said subsequently they had to take some parking for PG&E equipment and to bring the exhaust system up to code in the underground garage. She said also their tenant wanted additional bicycle parking that was inside and secure. She said the tenant had an occupancy space of about 423 square feet per tenant. She said she did not think there was a parking issue at all.

In response to a question from Chair Ferrick, Planner Lin said the Use Permit Revision would go with the property and the number of identified parking spaces would be fixed with the square footage of the building.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said he had visited the site and the parking garage seemed deserted in the afternoon. He said the one parking space per 300 square foot seemed viable and he liked that they would be adding bicycle parking. He said the site had expensive finishes and large offices. He moved to make the findings for the use permit revision and approve as recommended in the staff report. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion noting that 11 bicycle spaces were of greater value than two car parking spaces.

Commissioner Onken said that secure bike parking had greater value than non-secure bike parking.

Ms. Vaughn said in other cities applicants were able to have less parking than what was approved and only had to come back if they needed more parking.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the item 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 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 conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Studio G Architects, consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received March 21, 2013, 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.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** condition:
  - a. Administrative and Professional Office uses (except medical office) are the only permitted uses within the building. All other uses would require a revision to the Use Permit for the parking reduction.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner O'Malley absent.

#### **D. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

There were no Commission Business items.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Planner Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on May 6, 2013