



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
June 10, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 6:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler, Eiref (Vice Chair – arrived 6:04 p.m.), Ferrick, Kadvany (Chair), Onken (arrived 6:55 p.m.), Riggs (arrived 6:04 p.m.), Strehl

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Momoko Ishijima, Planner; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

i. PRESENTATION

i1. Presentation on the West Haven Waterfront Area Vision Plans by Students of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Staff Comment: Planner Chow said Professor Kelly Main and her City and Regional Planning Program graduate class at California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly) San Luis Obispo had done a 10-week study in partnership with the City to develop a “vision plan” for the Haven Avenue Area.

Atousa Zolfaghari, one of the students, provided an introduction and overview of the project. She said their studio had researched the site and reviewed the City’s El Camino Real Specific Plan. She said they did community outreach and then each team developed a vision plan for the West Haven waterfront area. She said the major themes in all three plans were connectivity, extending the Bay Trail, building a pedestrian bridge, making internal and external connections, developing complete streets, enhancing the bayfront entrance, and providing a mixture of uses with neighborhood amenities and public spaces. She noted that flooding was a concern with this site. She introduced the next three speakers, Tom, Mike and Jennifer, who would represent each team.

Tom Van Pelt said community input they received was the need for more park and open space along the bayfront. He said that many of the local existing businesses in the subject area were built with their backs to the bay front. He said his team’s plan included increasing the Bay trail along the bay front, enhancing the bay front area, and preserving ecological features such as the salt ponds. He said their plan looked at maintaining light industrial along the Redwood City portion of the site and having new structured parking to create buffer zones as mitigation for noise and air quality impacts. He said that perhaps in the future some of the light industrial businesses surrounding the residential might rezone to commercial and additional residential. He said their plan allowed for space for community gardens and looked to businesses that would support

street life and art. He noted the importance a good farmers' market would have for the area.

Mike Germeraad said his team visited Bayfront Park, Burgess Park and the Facebook campus. He said they would like to connect Bayfront Park to the Haven site. He talked about streets, street trees, bike lanes, and other amenities to slow traffic. He noted as it was a noisy area because of traffic their plan included building a simple sound barrier along Highway 101. He said they met with the developers for the site to get their input. He said that their proposal was an inward looking development, which would be a near term condition, but the vision plan included providing pedestrian connectivity and extending the Bay Trail. He noted the flood risk and safety concerns.

Jennifer Franich said her team found that there was a major warehousing district for the City and on the Redwood City side of Haven Avenue that likely would stay light industrial. She said business owners in that area they spoke with expressed concern that they would be priced out by new residential development. Her team suggested preserving some of the existing uses and the character. She said feedback was there was a lack of visual interest in the area. She said they suggested leaving a neighborhood industrial zone. She said infill development on the south side of Haven Avenue would buffer traffic noise. She said people love parks and needed better bike infrastructure and services in the area. She said the residential streets should provide bicycle lanes and a connection for bicyclists and pedestrians from Haven Avenue to the Bay Trail. She said they suggested keeping the existing taco truck vendors and attract other vendors, and providing a public space or plaza. She said as the area was physically separated from downtown Menlo Park that there should be improved connections to both public space and the downtown. She said her team saw the industrial use as the aesthetic for the area and creating a sense of neighborhood entrance.

Atousa suggested that the city engagement continue and create implementation and phasing plan.

Commissioner Bressler asked if these vision plans were to come to fruition how many new homes that would bring to the area. Mike indicated in the short term it would be about 500 residential units mostly one-bedroom, some two-bedrooms and a few three-bedrooms with 1.75 parking spaces per unit. He said the plans proposed different levels of housing.

Commissioner Kadvany said he liked the idea of bicycle and pedestrian trails and improving the view of the Bay. He said he was encouraged by the vision that there would be more than the one development in the future and that he appreciated the buffer zone ideas.

Commissioner Riggs said all three presentations were enlightening and he appreciated the support of the existing industrial uses. He said he thought the bicycle pedestrian bridge was supportable. He said he liked the concept of creating a pedestrian mall along the Bayfront, and if that was a long term goal, an interim goal might be a green belt in the area.

Commissioner Eiref noted the location of Facebook. He said the Commission understood that many Facebook employees lived in San Francisco and used various transit modes to get to Menlo Park. He asked if the teams had looked at other areas that mixed light industrial with residential, noting Potrero Hill in San Francisco, and areas where that combination had been successful.

Tom said they had done outreach and visited Facebook. He said as noted many of the employees lived either in San Francisco or San Jose and commuted. He said there were reasons why they lived in cities, noting urban amenities. He said a mix of uses and urban amenities could attract those professionals to live in Menlo Park. He said they had looked at that Potrero Hill area. He said that many of the Facebook employees they had spoken with expressed no interest in living in Menlo Park as it was currently, but that if things changed they would be interested. He said the area could become more dynamic with the Menlo Gateway project. He said it was noted that there would be employees from other countries working at Facebook and that they would not necessarily want to live in the City and would like living close to their place of employment.

Chair Kadvany said issues alluded to for this area were its separateness from Menlo Park, noise from 101, and water and flooding. He asked about strategies leading to development of these plans and asked if it would be the number of homes, the pedestrian path, or looking for different developers that would be the drivers for implementation.

Atousa said they had looked at the broad picture, and the first step was the zoning. She said if they had more time they could have asked what the priorities were and looked at the phasing. Mike suggested first steps of building a pedestrian bridge and improving Haven Avenue to make it bike and pedestrian friendly and connecting it to Bayfront Park, the Bay Trail, and Marsh Manor which was the nearest center offering amenities.

Chair Kadvany asked if there were existing buildings that might be redeveloped.

Tom said that was a theme they had not been able to explore in depth but they had noted some existing large buildings that might be redeveloped into commercial uses. He said they had not specifically looked at any one business.

Chair Kadvany asked what their next steps would be if they were continuing on the vision plan.

Jennifer said the next step would be a specific plan that would do more in depth study as to what would work there economically.

Professor Main said in regard to next steps that she and her students had heard from the community about how much they love Bayfront Park. She said great public spaces bring people. She said the new residents in this area will need retail space and neighborhood uses but the destination place of Bayfront Park for the rest of the

community was an existing natural attraction that could be upgraded slightly to provide greater recreational features.

Planner Chow said the students would finalize the plans and those would be posted on the City's webpage.

Public Comment: Ms. Anne Moser said she had been a member of the Housing Commission. She said she had an opportunity to meet the students working on this project, and thanked them. She said the bike pedestrian across 101 was absolutely essential or else the area would be isolated. She said the City needed to plan space for children and nursery schools as well as local services, restaurants, and bars. She said there would be a lot of housing need stemming from the Stanford expansion and housing for seniors and lower income people who work in Menlo Park was needed.

Planner Chow thanked Professor Main and the graduate students for their great work.

Chair Kadvany noted that Commissioner Onken had arrived, and recessed the meeting for a short break.

REGULAR SESSION – 7:07 p.m.

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

a. Housing Element – City Council – May 21, June 4, and June 11, 2013

Planner Rogers said on May 21 the City Council opened the public hearing for the Housing Element, took most of the actions except for the Secondary Dwelling Units, which would be considered by the Council on June 11, 2013. He noted that they were now starting the next cycle of the Housing Element, which was also on the Council's June 11 meeting agenda.

b. SRI Campus Modernization Project – EIR/FIA Contracts – City Council – June 11, 2013

Planner Rogers said certain contract amounts needed Council action so the environmental impact report and fiscal impact analysis contracts for the SRI Campus Modernization Project would be considered by the Council at their June 11 meeting. He said the contracts were pass-through costs for the applicant. He said there would be a study session and an environmental scoping session held by the Commission later in the summer.

c. Downtown Block Party – June 19, 2013

Planner Rogers said the first City Downtown Block Party of this year would be June 19. Commissioner Ferrick noted it was the only Block Party of the summer.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Chair Kadvany noted there were two sets of minutes on the agenda, and some modifications had been sent to the Commissioners by email.

Commission Onken recommended that on page 11 of the April 29 minutes, 1st paragraph, 19th line, removing “bullet proof.”

Commissioner Strehl said she would abstain from the vote on the minutes for April 29, 2013 as she was not yet on the Commission. She said for the minutes of May 6, 2013 that it was more accurate to say she recused herself and left the dais.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to approve the consent calendar with the changes as presented. Chair Kadvany seconded the motion.

C1. Approval of minutes from the April 29, 2013 Planning Commission meeting

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

- Page 11, 1st paragraph, 19th line: Replace “Commission agreed with wanting rough, undulating, and bullet proof face” with “Commission agreed with wanting rough and undulating face”
- Page 14, 4th paragraph, 7th line: Replace “Commissioner Kadvany said to mix bike parking within a parking structure and was convenient within the building.” with “Commissioner Kadvany said if bike parking was within a parking structure then it should be conveniently located within the building.”
- Page 16, between paragraph 15 and 16: Remove extra period.
- Page 21, 1st regular paragraph following Amendment 3: Replace “Commissioner Kadvany suggested that a program be added to the Housing Element for a project to start in 2014 to develop a transportation management association to increase connectivity of the east Menlo Park and provide transit and alternative transportation incentives. He said he had heard that Redwood City was proposing a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing somewhere in this area, and perhaps if they were, this City could partner with them depending on where they were going to locate the bridge.” with “Commissioner Kadvany suggested that a program be added to the Housing Element for a City project to start in 2014 to develop a Transportation Management Association to increase connectivity for east Menlo Park, emphasizing the proposed Haven development area and all transit modes along Bayfront Expressway. Also included would be connectivity across 101 to the area around Marsh Manor. The TMA could address transit issues including transportation incentives. Following a question from Commissioner Riggs, he clarified that he proposed such a project to begin in 2014, not that the TMA would be up and running in that year.”

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Strehl abstaining.

C2. Approval of minutes from the May 6, 2013 Planning Commission meeting

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

- Page 4, 1st paragraph, last line: Replace the “,” with “.”
- Page 5, 3rd paragraph from bottom, 2nd line: Replace “She left the Council Chambers.” with “She left the dais.”
- Page 21, 4th paragraph, last sentence: Replace “proposals” with “proposal”

Motion carried 7-0.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D1. Use Permit and Variance/Richard A. Hartman/712 Partridge Avenue: Request for a use permit to demolish two single-family dwelling units and an accessory building and to construct two two-story, single-family dwelling units and associated site improvements on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. Request for a variance to build an accessory structure in the front half of the property, 87.5 feet from the front property line where 94 feet would be required. 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 design from traditional to a craftsman style for more compatibility with the neighborhood character, more articulation and detail on bare walls to address massing, and addition of materials and detail to add higher integrity to the design. *(Continued from the Meeting of 5/20/2013)*

Staff Comment: Planner Ishjima said staff had no additions to the written report.

Public Comment: Mr. Rick Hartman, Hometek Architecture, said they had significantly changed the project and there was no stucco at all. He said they added a wraparound porch to the front residence to provide a friendly street face. He said by increasing the fire sprinkler system in the rear unit they were able to get Fire District approval for a 10-foot wide rather than 14-foot wide driveway.

Mr. Charles Irby, Menlo Park, said he was a neighbor and that Mr. Hartman had been very accommodating. He said they had discussed that he and the other property owner adjacent to the subject property would be able to review the fence design to insure maximum privacy for everyone. He said with that accommodation he was satisfied to support the use permit request.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken thanked the applicant for working on the design based on the Commission’s direction made at the prior hearing for the request. He said the designs of the two homes were much improved. He said he hoped however

that Craftsman-style design would not be the default style for projects seeking Commission approval.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to approve. She said she could make the findings for the variance request as described in the staff report. She said she appreciated that the parking and setbacks were brought into conformance. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs said the design was much improved, if somewhat busy for his taste. He agreed with Commissioner Onken that it was not desirable for the Craftsman-style design to be the fallback of applicants who need to come before the Commission with their projects.

Chair Kadvany thanked Mr. Peter Colby, a neighbor of the subject property, for his useful input to the project design.

Commissioner Ferrick noted Mr. Colby had provided good detail on the trees that informed the preservation plan.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Strehl 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. Make the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of the variances:
 - a. The substandard lot width and the location of the heritage redwood and English laurel trees create a constraint to the design potential for the redevelopment of two residential units on the site with the required number and size of parking stalls without approval of the requested variance.
 - b. The proposed variance is necessary for the preservation of the heritage trees 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.

- c. Except for the requested variance, the proposed construction will conform to all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property since the location of the structure will not be visible from the street, will allow a heritage tree to be preserved, will provide adequate on-site parking, and will meet the floor area limit, building coverage, and height per the R-2 zoning district.
 - d. The conditions upon which the requested variance is based would not be applicable, generally, to other properties within the same zoning classification since the variance is based on a lack of feasible parking alternatives that provide access and circulation while preserving the heritage tree.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding an unusual factor is required to be made.
4. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Hometec Architecture, Inc., consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received May 8, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 20, 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.
- 5. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
 - a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans implementing the recommendations provided by Barrie D. Coates and Associates, dated March 26, 2013 and May 13, 2013, for the preservation of the heritage redwood tree or English laurel tree, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. An arborist should be present during this process.

Motion carried 7-0.

D2. Variance/329 Oak Ct/Paul Eric Rasmussen: Request for a variance to allow for a single-story addition 10 feet from the front property line, where the front setback requirement is 20 feet, to an existing nonconforming, single-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Paul Rasmussen said their lot was big and the addition was less than 300 square feet. He said they were trying to remedy construction that had been done by a previous owner. He said a bedroom was constructed in the garage and they wanted to move it out of there and put a bedroom in unused space behind the garage. He said they wanted to bring the home to code and improve safety. He said they did not want to change the look or feel of the existing structure.

Commissioner Ferrick said she had met Mr. Rasmussen at a public event, and he had expressed his interest in doing an addition and the difficulties he was experiencing pursuing that objective. She said ultimately it was apparent he would need a variance to do the work desired.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the applicant had wanted the bedroom addition to be larger than 12 by 12 foot.

Mr. Richard Morrison, project architect, said they had originally designed a slightly larger bedroom but because of the rule that the variance could be no greater than one-half of the required setback they had to scale back the bedroom.

Commissioner Ferrick asked if they had considered moving the addition away from the setback. Commissioner Riggs asked if new noticing would be required if the addition expanded toward the north elevation. Planner Ishijima said that they would need to re-notice the project for an additional one-foot to the north, and whatever amount of square footage that was.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to approve and make the findings for the variance request. Commissioner Onken said they should consider giving the City's Development Services Manager the ability to approve such minor exceptions to regulations. He seconded the motion.

Commissioner Eiref asked when the Commission made suggestions such as flipping the front and side setbacks for properties built before the 1950s if that made more sense, whether these suggestions were captured for inclusion on the next General Plan update, or were Commissioners responsible to remember those. Planner Rogers said staff was keeping those suggestions in mind but the Commission and public also needed to track those. Commissioner Ferrick suggested the Chair and Vice Chair might maintain such a list. Commissioner Riggs said he thought staff should maintain the list as many of the Commissioners would be termed out when the General Plan update was undertaken, which was proposed at the earliest in 2018.

Mr. Rasmussen said they were to remove a shed in the rear was it was technically located in the front setback. He said he had spent \$5,000 fixing it up including foundation improvements, and asked if it could be kept.

Planner Ishijima said the City's planning code required accessory structures to be ten feet away from the main structure and if the addition were approved the shed would be within 10-feet of the main structure. She said in addition the code required that the shed be in the rear half of the property. She said staff did not know if the shed had been built with a permit.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the Commission could find the shed as legal non-conforming and as an historic use before this property had been annexed to Menlo Park. He asked if the shed could be moved so it was at least 10-feet away from the main structure. Planner Ishijima said that the shed could be moved to the rear of the property.

Mr. Rasmussen said the shed foundation was concrete and that it was about eight or ten wide. He said they could trim it so it was 10-feet away from the main structure.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Onken 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 the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of the variance for the front setback:
 - a. The existing orientation of the residence on the panhandle lot, its internal room layout, and the application of the definition of front lot line on a panhandle lot, create a constraint to the design potential for the single-story bedroom expansion without approval of the requested variance.

- b. The proposed variance is necessary for the substantial property rights possessed by other conforming properties in the same vicinity in that it would permit the restoration of the two-car garage and the creation of a permitted third bedroom, and the variance would not constitute a special privilege of the recipient not enjoyed by neighbors.
 - c. Except for the requested variance, the proposed construction will conform to all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties, will not be visible from the street or driveway, and will meet the floor area limit, building coverage, and height per the R-1-U zoning district.
 - d. The conditions upon which the requested variance is based would not be applicable, generally, to other properties within the same zoning classification since the variance is based on the unique footprint and layout of the existing residence in relation to the Zoning Ordinance's front lot line definition.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding an unusual factor is required to be made.
3. Approve the variance subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Richard Morrison, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received May 30, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Motion carried 7-0.

D3. Use Permit/Rob Mayer/209 Lexington Drive: Request for a use permit for interior remodeling and the construction of first- and second-floor additions to an existing single-story, nonconforming single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width, lot depth, and lot size in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The project would exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period and requires approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Rob Mayer, project architect, said he had previously done a second-story at 208 Lexington Drive, which the 209 Lexington Drive property owner had liked. He said there was a typographical error due to his drawings. He said the project would be five bedrooms and three and a half bathrooms, with three bedrooms on the first floor and two bedrooms on the second floor.

It was confirmed with staff that the error pointed out by Mr. Mayer had no impact on the conditions of approval.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said his primary concern was privacy between buildings, and often developers put main windows on the sides. He noted the architect had minimized the windows on the sides. He moved to approve as recommended. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs said it was hard to add a second-story to a one-story but the architect had done so functionally. He said he particularly like the end gables.

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 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 Robert Mayer, Architect, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received May 29, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

D4. Use Permit/Jim Maliksi/270 San Mateo Drive: Request for a use permit to demolish an existing two-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 (Residential Suburban) zoning district.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Jim Maliksi, project architect, said the project was designed for the client but sensitively for the neighbors. He said his clients had reached out to all the neighboring properties and received good comments.

Mr. Robert Shimp, property owner, said the home has an unsafe foundation and it needed to be rebuilt. He said their goal was to keep the design complementary to the

neighborhood, preserve the trees and maintain a good sized garden. He said they planned to live there for the rest of their lives.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Eiref said the design was a very handsome house. He asked about the shingles and prominent chimneys. Mr. Maliksi said they would use asphalt composition shingles. He said the chimneys were all functional and the fireplaces were gas. Commissioner Eiref asked if anyone had expressed concern about the height of the chimneys. Mr. Maliksi said there had not been any concerns expressed about the chimney heights.

Commissioner Onken said the house proposal was close to the limits but the site was large and the setbacks were met. He said speaking architecturally that the kitchen was located on the north side with a porch around it, and that would require artificial lighting year round.

Commissioner Riggs said this was a big house with a lot of roof elements and a lot of detail. He said it was a big enough house to have those details and the lot was big enough to hold the house. He said he appreciated the chimneys being proper architectural dimensions. He moved to make the findings and approve the use permit. Chair Kadvany seconded the motion noting the applicants' efforts to work with the neighbors.

Commissioner Ferrick asked if they had been able to share the elevations and plan sheets that showed the heights with the neighbors. Mr. Shimp said they had shared the large plan sheets with their neighbors.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Kadvany 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 Jim Maliksi and Associates, consisting of 17 plan sheets, dated received May 21, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

D5. Use Permit/Anna Chernykh/1950 Santa Cruz Avenue: Request for a use permit to construct an 866 square foot addition, including the addition of a second story, to an existing one-story single-family residence that is currently non-conforming with regard to both side yard setbacks. In addition, the lot is substandard with regard to lot width and lot size in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposed remodeling and expansion would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area, and is considered equivalent to a new structure. The project would also exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period, which requires approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Public Comment: Ms. Anna Chernykh, property owner, said their current home was a 900 square foot, two bedroom, one bath house. She said their design would add another bedroom and two bathrooms. She said building green was at the heart of their project. She said they wanted to add a second story and maintain the existing backyard. She said they have great support from their neighbors and 12 letters of support including their adjacent neighbors. She said the second story would step back and windows would be located higher on the second story. She said they would do tree screening. She said they would use a metal roof even though it was more expensive.

Mr. Victor Buathier, Menlo Park, said he was a neighbor and supported the project.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken asked what the window materials would be. Ms. Chernykh said they were talking to different window contractors and had not made a decision but were leaning toward Andersen 400, which were wood interior and clad exterior. Commissioner Onken said if they had indicated vinyl that might be a problem. He asked what was on the neighbors' side wall facing the applicants' house. Mr. Bill Englehardt, project architect, said the neighbor had high windows on that side and it was their living room. He said there were trees screening the neighboring property, and they would add trees. He said none of their windows directly faced the neighbors' windows.

Commissioner Strehl said she had visited the site. She said the proposed design would look attractive in the neighborhood and the proposal has tremendous neighbor support.

Commissioner Eiref said it was a modest addition and there were quite a few trees providing screening. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion. She said the applicants were thoughtful about the second story addition, and had worked with the neighbors.

Commissioner Riggs said it was easy to support the project and it reflected some real design input.

Commissioner Onken said the scheme was supportable and it would work. He said it was the relationship of the houses and not the people that should be the priority as the people can move out but the houses remain. He suggested increasing the efficiency of the insulation by using the next highest rating noting that would not cost much more. He encouraged them to incorporate details to offset the plainness of the design.

Commission Action: M/S Eiref/Ferrick 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 Engelhardt Architecture consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received May 29, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

D6. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Richard Jacobsen/50, 243, and 297

Terminal Avenue: Request for a use permit and architectural control to remove six existing modular buildings and construct new school facilities consisting of seven classroom buildings, an administration building, a social center, an equipment storage shed, 12-foot tall fencing along a sport court, and associated site improvements at an existing private school and adjacent vacant land located at 50 Terminal Avenue. As part of the proposed development, two single-family residences adjacent to the school site located at 243 and 297 Terminal Avenue are proposed to be demolished and replaced with two new single-story, single-family residences. A total of 18 heritage trees are proposed for removal. The entire project site is in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district.

This item has been continued to the meeting of June 24, 2013.

D7. Use Permit/Spinal Modulation/1135 and 1165B O'Brien Drive: Request for a use permit for the storage and use of hazardous materials for the research and development and manufacturing of electromechanical devices for the treatment of

chronic pain, within an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. All hazardous materials would be used and stored within the building.

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

Public Comment: Mr. Ron Krietemeyer, Vice President of Operations for Tarlton Properties, said Spinal Modulation, their tenant, was growing and expanding. He said they needed to increase onsite manufacturing. He introduced Matt Connolly, the head of Facilities and IT at Spinal Modulation.

Mr. Matt Connolly, Manager of Facilities and IT, said Spinal Modulation was a startup, noting they had moved to this location about five years previously. He said they were creating devices to treat chronic pain. He said they were recently approved to sell the devices in Europe and were seeking approval to sell in the U.S. He said to sell the devices in Europe they needed to expand their manufacturing capabilities.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick said on the second to last page of the San Mateo County Environmental Health Division form it was indicated that they needed another electronic County permit.

Mr. Connolly said since the suites were not adjacent they needed to split the inventory specific to each building and to ensure they submitted for the two different addresses.

Commissioner Onken said there were issues of trade secrets related to the chemical inventory and asked if there was anything of concern being used.

Ms. Ellen Ackerman, Green Environment, said she had developed the hazardous materials application, was working with Spinal Modulation, and represented the interest of Menlo Business Park. She said she would not present something that would put the building, the tenant, or neighbors in harm's way. She said the Fire District and County have access to the chemical information in the instance there was an emergency at the site.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Bressler to approve the use permit for 1135 O'Brien Drive 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 DES Architects/Engineers, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received May 28, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

Commission Action: M/S Kadvany/Strehl to approve the use permit for 1165B O'Brien Drive 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 DES Architects/Engineers, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received May 28, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS

E1. Single-Family Residential Design Review: The Planning Commission will discuss issues related to the creation and use of residential Design Review guidelines and the formation of a Design Review subcommittee.

Chair Kadvany said that Commissioners Riggs, Onken and he have had informal discussions about the potential role for residential design guidelines that at a minimum would have categorical criteria for applicants bringing residential projects to the Planning Commission. He said tonight's discussion would look at issues related to development and the use of residential Design Review (DR) guidelines and the formation of a DR subcommittee. He said as stated in the staff report, topics for discussion might include the motivations for developing DR guidelines; the history of DR in Menlo Park; DR examples from other cities; how the Commission might develop and evaluate a DR guidelines draft for Menlo Park; how Menlo Park residents and builders might benefit from DR guidelines; how DR guidelines might be implemented in Menlo Park; neighborhood or other residential input; and near-term subcommittee goals.

Commissioner Bressler said Commissioner Ferrick had commented this evening about one application that it was the biggest house she had ever seen as a Commissioner. He said comparably there were even bigger houses built in Menlo Park that the Commission never saw because there was no substandard lot or noncompliance with zoning regulations. He said residential development was a political issue and there were people who wanted more oversight of development and those who wanted less oversight. He said the Commission had previously considered an ordinance amendment for single-family residential development that ultimately failed before the Council.

Commissioner Strehl asked when that had occurred. Commissioner Bressler said around 2000 and that there was additional information about that available.

Commissioner Onken said he thought that they should consider process to accomplish residential DR guidelines. He said such a document would provide applicants coming to the Commission with information on what to expect. He said if they could work that document into the statutory approval process for development than those residential development projects the Commission does not review would be even better. He suggested that a draft be written without public comment by the subcommittee, next presented to the Commission, and then distributed for public comment for a designated time period. Based on public input, the document would be revised and then considered for adoption.

Commissioner Ferrick said that it seemed DR guidelines would place a higher bar on the smallest properties with the most potentially cost constrained residents than on those whose lots were large and standard, and whose projects did not need to come before the Commission. She noted also that there were a diversity of designs noting that the one application they heard tonight on Santa Cruz Avenue worked within its particular location but might not fit DR guidelines. She said not being an architect she

was trying to imagine what the guidelines could be so that they would not necessarily exclude designs that could actually be fine.

Chair Kadvany said he hoped that those questions would be addressed through the process of how the guidelines would be used.

Commissioner Riggs said he got involved in Menlo Park government when he heard about ordinance 915 that sought to effectively put all second story additions under Planning Commission review. He said part of the momentum behind that ordinance was a group of residents who wanted to preserve as much as possible the architectural character of Menlo Park, and began labeling new, large homes as “monster” homes. He said that ordinance and a later ordinance 926 seemed to overreach what the middle ground would accept. He said he could not accept ordinance 926 although it allowed his neighborhood greater freedom to build and he definitely could not support ordinance 915. He said his neighborhood was one in which residents who wanted to do additions to their homes for growing families or for aging parents faced having to pay application costs to come before the Commission. He said during the housing boom, people bought homes in his neighborhood and added a second story above the garage five feet from the property line and then sold the home. He and others developed a compromise that was the Lorelei Manor Overlay, which took the issues from both points of view toward development and put them together as a fair trade. He said the trade was whether the residents wanted the ability to add to their home without the need to bring their project to the Commission but in turn were held to different rules related to setbacks. He said there was overwhelming support for the Overlay. He said he would like DR guidelines that would apply to all lots and that no lots were standard or substandard in terms of process but would reflect the various shapes and issues of lots such as height and setbacks. He said in terms of process that one of the best ways to determine a scope was to build a prototype. He said some of the DR guidelines should be mandatory. He suggested that the daylight plane needed to be reduced. He said they would need to create suggestions and some would become rules and some would be suggestions.

Commissioner Eiref suggested identifying the problem statements. He said that the DR guidelines potentially could be very long document. He asked if it would be written by the Commission or whether a consultant would be needed to write it. He said he was sensitive to Commissioner Ferrick’s comments and that the town was not uniform in its residential character, and there was a broad array of tastes and styles. He said he liked the idea of having DR guidelines in particular for things that come up repeatedly such as driveway widths, not using tacky looking stone all over the front of a home, and other things that were just common sense. He said those were probably easy to document but there were other more complex issues.

Chair Kadvany said the nature of their deliverable would prevent it from being an overwhelming document as people needed to be able to digest it. He said it could be seen as an educational project to help people design homes they and their neighbors would like. He said staff members did not have a lot of time for this project and it would be upon the Commission. He said a common thought expressed by Commissioners Onken and Riggs was to use the Commission as a test bed. He said they could begin

by listing the categories and issues they planned to address and much of that could be framed by the subcommittee.

Commissioner Eiref said they needed to identify if these DR guidelines were just for projects that came before the Commission or all projects, which might actually change code. Chair Kadvany said it might just be communication rather than regulatory.

Commissioner Onken said there were ordinances they would like to amend and there were DR guidelines. He said they were two very different matters. He suggested items for the guidelines would be along the idea of recommending such things as not using more than three materials on the front façade or considerations about roof slopes. He said DR guidelines were in parallel with City code but the intent was not to rewrite zoning code at this time. He said there were great similarities among the residential guidelines used in other cities. He said principal was identifying neighborhood character and asking that the application respond to that as gently as possible. He suggested that they focus on creating the guidelines which would be subjective.

Commissioner Riggs said he agreed that they focus on the guidelines noting that the residential rezoning was not expected to be done until 2018.

Commissioner Kadvany said it might be a good opportunity to frame the sections of the codes that need review.

Commissioner Ferrick said based on Commissioner Onken's description she thought it was fairly achievable to get a first draft noting that many cities have similar documents and to go from there.

Chair Kadvany volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Commissioner Bressler wanted it confirmed that they would not address daylight plane as that was a code issue. Chair Kadvany said there was second story setback that might be considered. Commissioner Bressler said anything that established when an application had to go through discretionary review process or was codified should not be addressed for change. Chair Kadvany said concepts would appear but they would not be changing the code.

Commissioner Eiref asked if they were trying to change when projects would come before the Commission or not or trying to streamline the process for applications that come before the Commission. Chair Kadvany said they were not looking to change the process for when projects came before the Commission but to provide guidelines. Commissioner Eiref said each of them could probably look at projects that came before the Commission over the past 10 years and identify design elements for which they had requested design revision.

Commissioner Onken said some applicants bring forth projects that were obtrusive to the neighbors and ugly, yet could not seem to understand why the Commission was reluctant to approve as the applicant saw the project as meeting code.

Commissioner Ferrick said one goal of DR guidelines might be that fewer applications would need to be sent back for redesign. Chair Kadvany said even if it reduced a percentage of continuance that was a plus.

Commissioner Riggs said the loudest criticisms about residential development 12 to 13 years ago were about homes considered to be out of scale, creating privacy and sun access impacts, massing and the materials used. He said those things were typically addressed in design guidelines, noting that aesthetics were not just for corporate use and buildings built by wealthy people. He said it was a matter of honoring the existing neighborhood. He said obstacles were created by the expectations by designers outside the City and the question of expense. He said he thought the guidelines should bind all lots and not just nonconforming lots.

Commissioner Eiref asked if they could make the case that they were lowering the cost for projects coming before them. He asked if applicants paid for the writing of the staff reports. Planner Rogers said staff bills for each hour spent on a project. Commissioner Eiref asked if it was a good argument that design guidelines could reduce the cost of an application. Planner Rogers said that was the overall objective of increasing the consistency of applicants' projects coming before the Commission, but that the Commission's actions were not always clearly consistent. He said also there might be unusual projects that could check off all the boxes but still not work, or vice versa. He said depending on the scope of the DR guidelines project it might require CEQA review and at least initial study. He said he thought they would need a mitigated negative declaration. He said in terms of guidelines they would need to be applied consistently. He said CEQA depended upon how in depth the guidelines were. He said that they might want to have questions that would lead the applicant to address the issues of concern. He said he had a copy of the design guidelines associated with Ordinance 915, which staff generally viewed as reasonable, common-sense items. He said a different Council rescinded that ordinance and adopted something completely different, which was then challenged by a group of residents and ultimately was recalled. He said project priorities were set by City Council and they had not prioritized residential design guidelines. He said the Council would need to authorize resources for the project if that was needed.

Commissioner Onken said after the subcommittee created the document and it was vetted by the Commission, that it could be placed on the website as DR guidelines and be available in the office for applicants. He said he did not see what they would need to do that would need Council approval. He said the designs for 85% of the applications they review were ordinary, and that ordinariness meant there were ways to streamline the process and raise the bar for design. He said 10% of the projects they saw were stinkers and about 5% were really amazing projects.

Commissioner Strehl asked if this would be strictly advisory from the Commission or if it applied to the City would it go to the Council. Commissioner Riggs said that he thought the Council's approval was needed but he thought generally they were favorable toward design guidelines. He said if they had to do CEQA that was fine. He said if nothing else the design guidelines would be a good reference tool. Planner Rogers said City policy needed review and approval by the Council. He said applicants were already

given information related to application submittal which could possibly contain those categories of design the Commission would consider.

Commissioner Riggs suggested the subcommittee work with the Council's liaison to the Commission.

Chair Kadvany asked about volunteers for the subcommittee. Commissioners Onken and Riggs volunteered to join Chair Kadvany as the subcommittee on DR Guidelines. The subcommittee will report back to the Commission.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

Chair Kadvany said neither he nor Vice Chair Eiref would be able to attend the July 8 Commission meeting. It was noted the other Commissioners would attend and they would select a pro-tem chair at that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 8, 2013