



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Regular Meeting
April 21, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers**

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler, Eiref (Vice Chair - absent), Ferrick, Kadvany (Chair), Strehl, Riggs

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Kyle Perata, Associate Planner, Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner, Corinna Sandmeier, Contract Planner, Elizabeth Schuller, Assistant Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

a. Housing Element – City Council – April 29, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers said that the City Council at its April 29, 2014 meeting would conduct the next review of the Housing Element with the second reading of the ordinances acted upon previously and further consideration of previously deferred items including the secondary dwelling unit and accessory building ordinances. He said also at the April 29 meeting that the Council would make appointments to the Planning Commission, noting Commissioner Eiref had reapplied and Commissioner Riggs' term expiration created a vacancy that would be filled.

Commissioner Strehl asked about a development at 139 O'Connor Street of a large subdivided lot upon which two large homes were being built. She said the inspection of the front home determined that the garage was six feet into the setback. She said the garage had to be removed and the project redesigned, and asked why this occurred. Senior Planner Rogers said the subdivision had been approved with a five-foot access easement and that setbacks by ordinance were to be measured from access easements. He said the applicant's team on their building plans failed to show the access easement. He said once the error was known the City laid out a process for the applicant that would not have required revisions to the building. He said that option was to record a deed restriction for current and future owners that a vehicle could not be parked in the area between the garage door and the easement line as it would extend into the public's right of access. He said the applicant chose to move forward with a more involved process.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was none.

C. CONSENT

C1. Approval of minutes from the March 24, 2014 Planning Commission meeting

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Strehl to approve the minutes as submitted.

Motion carried 4-0 with Commissioners Kadvany and Onken abstaining and Commissioner Eiref absent.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D1. Use Permit/Reem Yunis/626 Cambridge: Request for a use permit to remodel and construct first- and second-story additions to an existing nonconforming single-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot area and lot width in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. The proposed remodeling and expansion would exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period. The proposed expansion would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure.

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

Public Comment: Ms. Reem Yunis, owner and applicant, said this was a small lot with a shared easement. She said the garage was currently an office but would be returned to a garage use. She said the second story would be set back five feet from the first floor.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken asked about measuring the setback from the easement. Planner Schuller said measuring from the access easement for determination of setback was part of the zoning ordinance. She said the daylight plane was measured from the setback. She said the existing garage would have the entry door removed and a garage door reinstalled to accommodate the one parking space which was a legal existing nonconformance.

Commissioner Ferrick said this was a small lot and the applicant was being as considerate as possible with the design. She moved to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Riggs said this was a thoughtful design. He said his only concern was the attempt to get extra storage by putting a pop-up in the attic as that would have a visual impact. He said he could not support the project with the roof addition.

Commissioner Onken said he concurred with Commissioner Riggs and did not think the attic addition lent anything to the house. He said he could support the project if the clerestory could be removed.

Commissioner Strehl said she also thought the attic storage area was awkward but with the house being so small they needed some storage space. She moved to second the motion made by Commissioner Ferrick.

Planner Schuller said staff had suggested to the applicant to have some other design than a hip roof, and look at alternatives for storage space. She said the roof would be set back.

Commissioner Bressler said he supported the project and did not think the aesthetic concern should preclude the project from approval.

Ms. Yunis, recognized by the Chair, said they needed to move an existing shed to allow for 40% landscape area. She said they created the attic space for storage, and chose this feature based on an earlier individual Commissioner comment to avoid a wedding cake look with second story additions. She said it was set back and would not be visible to people walking by the property.

Commissioner Riggs suggested perhaps a basement could be installed in the rear of the house.

Commissioner Bressler suggested modifying the motion to look at something beside the pop-up but he thought the feature was low and would not be very visible.

Commissioner Ferrick said she would accept the motion for the applicant to look at another option but not to require a change. Commissioner Strehl accepted the amendment as the maker of the motion.

Chair Kadvany said he liked the pop-up feature.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Strehl to approve the item with the following modifications.

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 prepared by Homeplans Co. consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received April 8, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2014, 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.

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

- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit plans indicating that the pop-up attic element at the center of the second story has been removed. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent:

D2. Use Permit/Jeffrey Eaton/1015 Berkeley Avenue: Request for a use permit for interior and exterior modifications and single-story additions to an existing nonconforming single-story, single-family residence that would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing structure in a 12-month period in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed expansion would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure.

Staff Report: Planner Schuller said an email from a neighbor at 1020 Berkeley Avenue had been distributed to the Commission at the dais. She said the applicant had modified the rear elevation.

Public Comment: Mr. Jeffrey Eaton, project architect, noted this was a modest addition and that they had worked within the context of the neighborhood with their design and materials.

Mr. Brinton Von Thaden, neighbor, said he supported approval of the project.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Riggs to approve the use permit 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 prepared by Eaton Hall Architecture, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received April 7, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2014, 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. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
 - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following ***project specific*** condition:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans which are consistent with the plans submitted to the Planning Division on April 16, 2014, which show a double door and three windows on the rear elevation where the master bedroom is proposed (Attachment D).

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

D3. Use Permit/John B. Barksdale/483 O'Connor Street: Request for a use permit to determine the Floor Area Limit (FAL) of a lot with less than 5,000 square feet of area, associated with the construction of an approximately 241-square-foot first floor addition to the front and rear of an existing single-story, single-family residence, and the addition of a

528-square foot-second story, on a substandard lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed expansion would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure.

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said the applicant had brought a view of the stairway for the Commission to review.

Public Comment: Mr. John Barksdale, property owner, said he had talked with eleven of his immediate neighbors along O'Connor Street and the homeowners association for the nearby condominium complex. He said the project was supported by the neighbors.

Mr. John Barksdale, architect, said he was the property owner's father. He said his son and wife wanted to add to the home as they were planning to have children. He said they wanted to keep the rear yard as much as possible. He said they designed a partial second story located back from the front and from the west property line. He said the fenestration was oriented to the center of the property which was the garage and driveway. He noted a stairwell with a five foot window with a five foot sill and another with a six foot sill. He said they used varying roof heights, pitches, and gables in working with the daylight plane and articulating the mass.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about a first story window that had been removed noting plan sheet A.3. Mr. Barksdale said that was to provide privacy as the design would open up the living room to the other back bedroom to create a dining room that would access the rear yard directly. Commissioner Ferrick asked about the western fenestration that used long horizontal windows on both the first and second stories. Mr. Barksdale said the one horizontal window was in the existing bathroom above the shower. He said the home used to have industrial steel windows. He said they remodeled the kitchen and bathroom several years ago and replaced some of those windows with wood windows. He said they needed the long horizontal window in the upstairs bathroom but could use any window in the stairwell that provided light.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said he had asked to see the view through the stairwell noting that such stairs held potential privacy impacts to neighbors' yards and living space. He noted that the tankless water heater would be screened. He suggested that such large equipment should be shown on plans. He asked what approval process would be needed if after this meeting the applicant decided they wanted to have an additional skylight or window in the garage. Planner Sandmeier said they would have to look at any proposed change as to whether it would need to be reviewed again by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Onken said the new breakfast nook with the bay window in the front nicely picked up on the neighboring home's front bay window. He said the windows on the second floor bedroom overlook an accessory building on the neighboring property. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Chair Kadvany seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about adding a condition to allow for a window or skylight in the garage.

Chair Kadvany asked the applicant if that was something desired. Mr. Barksdale said that they would like that option noting their current garage has a skylight which he likes.

Commissioners Onken and Kadvany, as the makers of the motion and second respectively, accepted the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Ferrick said the project met daylight plane and setback requirements with nice architectural features on a smaller lot, noting that tended to be challenging.

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

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 prepared by John Barksdale Architect, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received April 10, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2014, 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 conditions:

- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans to include one skylight over the garage, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

D4. Use Permit/Roger Kohler/315 Pope Street: 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-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. As part of the proposal, more than one-fourth of the branches of a heritage oak, measuring approximately 36 inches in diameter and located at 317 Pope Street, will be pruned.

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier noted a correction to the staff report which indicated that the project was surrounded by single-story family homes. She said 317 Pope Street was actually a two-story home with the second floor on the rear of the home.

Questions of Staff: Chair Kadvany asked about the location of the Oak tree and whether it was on the left or right. Planner Sandmeier said it should be shown on the right not the left.

Public Commission: Ms. Amy Kurpius, property owner, said she and her husband had lived in Menlo Park for 15 years, and this was the first opportunity for them to build a home in Menlo Park. She said Craftsman seemed to be the general aesthetic in the neighborhood so they chose that style. She said they had communicated with their neighbors and had their support for the project.

Mr. Roger Kohler, project architect, said they had not shown skylights on the second story for the master bathroom and stairwell but should have. He said they pushed the house back to accommodate the setback and to support the second parking space but also so it lined up better with the house at 317 Pope Street.

Chair Kadvany said the staff report indicated the garage was not a two-car garage. Mr. Kohler said the garage provided one covered parking space and the other required parking space was outside the garage. He noted that garages in Palo Alto and Menlo Park used to be 18-feet by 18-feet and since many cars were smaller now the garage could accommodate two vehicles but would only count as one legal covered space.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about the chimney intrusion. Planner Sandmeier said this type of feature was permitted to intrude up to 18-inches into the setback.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Kadvany noted the applicant's comments about skylights.

Commissioner Onken asked about mixing metal and composite shingle on the roof. Mr. Kohler said the metal was an accent feature and found on many new homes over the last two years usually on the lower section of the house.

Commissioner Ferrick said she liked the distinct separate garage doors, the trellis, and the windows on the second story noting those were sized and placed sensitively. She said she did not think the chimney needed to intrude into the setback but it was acceptable under the regulations.

Commissioner Strehl moved to approve as recommended and to include a condition to allow for skylights.

Commissioner Riggs said he was also curious about the mixed roofing and how it would look. He said the second story massing was toward the Oak tree and wondered why it had not been placed on the front or left. Mr. Kohler (son) said the family room on the left side first floor was the only living space with a high ceiling. Commissioner Riggs said he also had a concern about the windows on the stair landing. Mr. Kohler (Sr.) said the window on the landing was six and a half feet above the landing. Commissioner Riggs asked if they had noted where the neighbor's windows were. Mr. Kohler (Jr.) said the landing would face the neighbor's garage.

Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion including the condition to add skylights.

Commissioner Onken said he would need to see the plans with the skylights added.

Ms. Kurpius said she wanted a skylight above the stairwell and master bathroom.

Commissioner Strehl, maker of the motion, said she would amend her motion for addition of two skylights, one over the stairwell, and one over the master bathroom, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the amended motion.

Commission Action: M/S Strehl/Ferrick 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 Kohler Associates Architects, consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received April 8, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2014, 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 project subject to the following project-specific conditions:

- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans to include one skylight over the master bathroom and one skylight over the stairwell, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

D5. Use Permit Revision and Variance/Lauren Jonak/470 Santa Rita Avenue: Request for a use permit revision to a previously approved project and a variance to encroach two feet into the required corner side setback to fill in a recessed area on an existing single-story, nonconforming structure. The subject parcel is located in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban) zoning district.

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs asked if the east-west directions had been reversed on the exterior elevations. Planner Perata reviewed and confirmed the directions were reversed.

Chair Kadvany noted the finding for a variance regarding a hardship peculiar to the property and asked if property included building, which Planner Perata confirmed it did.

Public Comment: Ms. Lauren Jonak said she was representing the firm of Ana Williamson Architect for the project located at 470 Santa Rita Avenue. She said the variance request was for a 10 square foot infill on the existing house. She said during a remodel by previous owners in 2010, the original front door had been moved from Middle Avenue onto Santa Rita Avenue. She said because the entire elevation on Middle Avenue was located two foot into the setback in filling the alcove where the door was required a variance. She said the property owner in 2010 chose to not go through the variance process, thus creating an odd unusable condition in the interior of the home. She said the work done in 2010 had required a use permit so any additional work to the home required a use permit approval process.

Mr. David Pizzuti, property owner, said there would be no change to the roofline and the front and only the recess would be filled in. He said they have neighborhood support.

Chair Kadvany closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken moved to make the findings and approve the variance per the staff report. Commissioner Bressler seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferrick confirmed with staff that verbally repeating the findings listed in the staff report was not necessary.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Bressler 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 16.82.030 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 variances:

- a. The previous property owners relocated the front door to the property line along Santa Rita Avenue, resulting in an existing notch in the corner side façade that reduced the viability of floor plates within the building, thus creating a hardship peculiar to the property.
 - b. The proposed variance allows the property owners to design a more usable layout within the building, allowing for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity. The variance would not constitute a special privilege of the recipient not enjoyed by neighbors.
 - c. Except for the requested variance, the construction of the residence 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 proposed addition is located within the footprint of the existing structure and will otherwise meet the FAL, building coverage, height, and daylight plane requirements of the R-1-S zoning district.
 - d. The conditions upon which the requested variances are based would not be applicable, generally, to other properties within the same zoning classification since the variance is based on the act of a previous owner, the existing nonconforming setback situation, and the corner lot configuration of the property.
 - 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 subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Ana Williamson Architect, consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received April 14, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2014, 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. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

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

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

Commissioner Strehl commented that it was Commissioner Riggs' last meeting and expressed her appreciation for his service on the Commission. Commissioner Ferrick expressed her gratitude for the many hours of volunteer work Commissioner Riggs has provided the City. Chair Kadwany added his appreciation noting Commissioner Riggs' close examination of project proposal details. Commissioner Bressler wished Commissioner Riggs well and said he would be missed on the Commission. Commissioner Onken also expressed his appreciation for Commissioner Riggs' service.

Commissioner Riggs said he had enjoyed his service and wanted to express his appreciation for the Menlo Park Planning staff which he considered to be top notch. He specifically noted the good work of Development Services Manager Justin Murphy. He said the Commission was a great alliance of skills and talent and he was proud of the work they do.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on May 19, 2014