



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
May 19, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 p.m.

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

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Contract Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

a. 772 Harvard Avenue Appeal – City Council – May 6, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers reported that the City Council at their May 6, 2014 meeting considered a neighbor's appeal of a project at 772 Harvard Avenue and denied the appeal, upholding the Planning Commission's approval of the project. He said some Council members had visited the site and found the distance between the project and the neighbor's home in combination with the landscaping to provide adequately for privacy.

b. Housing Element – City Council – May 13, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers said the accessory building and secondary dwelling unit ordinances of the Housing Element had a second reading at the May 13 Council meeting, and those would become effective in 30 days from the meeting date.

c. Santa Cruz Avenue Enhanced On-Street Seating Pilot Program – May 13, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers said the City Council at its May 13 meeting approved an On-Street Seating Pilot Program near The Left Bank restaurant on Santa Cruz Avenue, which would be evaluated in the future, as it relates to the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan's planned streetscape improvements for downtown.

d. Commissioner Training and Appreciation – May 20, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers noted the Commissioner training and appreciation event would be held on May 20, 2014.

Commissioner Bressler asked for an explanation of build out under the Specific Plan and the Specific Plan EIR. Senior Planner Rogers said the Specific Plan evaluated new development on a number of opportunity sites within the Plan area and was representative of what could be build out over the 20 to 30 year time frame that the Plan was intended to meet. He said limits under the Plan were 680 residential units and 474,000 square feet of non-residential uses. He said the net new development was on a variety of opportunity sites that were not proposed for any development previously but seemed likely to turn over and were found throughout the entire Plan area. He said for CEQA, the EIR looked at cumulative development within the Plan area and considered previously approved and proposed projects. He said the Plan regulates new development in the Plan area from the date of its adoption.

Commissioner Kadvany suggested that the Specific Plan Initiative be placed on a near future Commission agenda for discussion. Acting Chair Onken asked staff to look at putting the topic on a future agenda.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Commissioner Ferrick asked that item C2 be pulled from the consent calendar.

C1. Approval of minutes from the April 21, 2014 Planning Commission meeting

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

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Combs abstaining and Commissioner Eiref absent.

C2. Architectural Control/Brayton Hughes Design Studio/2800 Sand Hill Road:

Request for architectural control to modify the rear elevation of an existing two-story office building by altering the window pattern and glazing, creating a new rear entrance that leads to a new deck, modifying the existing rear entrance stairs to create a second floor balcony space, and altering the existing roof eave to install new latticing. Site improvements would also include a new drive to access the rear of the building. As part of the proposal, the applicant is requesting that approximately 18 paved parking spaces be reclassified as landscape reserve spaces, which can be used for landscaping/patio areas, until such time as parking

issues justify their restoration. The modifications would result in 190 paved parking spaces and 77 spaces in landscape reserve. As part of the proposed project, one heritage size coast live oak (12-inch diameter) in good health is proposed to be removed. The project is located in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research District, Restrictive) zoning district.

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Ferrick asked for an approximate number of empty parking spaces found at the site during the day. Planner Perata deferred to the applicant.

Public Comment: Ms. Laurie Shepherd said she was the owner of the property and that there were two tenants in the building, one of whom prompted the proposed updates. She said the two firms combined would have 140 employees. She said historically their parking use was low and thought this was a good time to add to their garden space. She said on any typical day there was not a problem parking at the site.

Commissioner Strehl asked if there was any way to avoid the removal of the Coast live oak. Ms. Shepherd said the tree was located right where the driveway would be routed to the back entrance. She said a large box Oak would be planted in the new patio area.

Vice Chair Onken asked about the need for a patio and a door. Ms. Shepherd said the tenant moving into the back portion of the building wanted to be able to take advantage of an indoor/outdoor experience. Vice Chair Onken noted the fire escape would be removed and asked about egress. Ms. Shepherd said it would be an internal secondary exit near the new entrance.

Ms. Sylvia Dickinson said she lived behind 2800 Sand Hill Road and was concerned about privacy impacts from this proposed building extension.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion. Acting Chair Onken said the project did not appear to increase the building's presence to neighbors.

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 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:

- a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following **standard** conditions of approval:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Brayton Hughes Design Studios, dated received May 8, 2014, consisting of 33 plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on May 19, 2014, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay 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. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. Landscaping shall properly screen all utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

4. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following **project-specific** conditions of approval:
 - a. The applicant shall maintain a minimum of 260 off-street parking spaces, of which 70 parking spaces are in landscape reserve. If landscape reserve parking needs to be converted into parking spaces in the future, either the applicant or the City can make a request, which is subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - b. If landscape reserve parking is required to be converted in the future, the applicant shall comply with the necessary Engineering Division requirements.
 - c. If landscape reserve parking is required to be converted in the future, the applicant shall comply with the City's Parking Stall Design Guidelines and other applicable requirements of the Transportation Division.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

Commissioner Ferrick recused herself from consideration of agenda item D1 due to a potential conflict of interest.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D1. Use Permit/Robert Steinmetz/129 Bay Road: Request for a use permit to remodel an existing single-story residence, including the addition of a second story, on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot area and lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed 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. The proposed project would also exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area, and is considered equivalent to a new structure.

Staff Comment: Planner Lin noted a correction on page 3 of the staff report. She said the next to last paragraph in the design and materials section should have the word "simulated" to read: *The proposed windows would consist of **simulated** true-divided light windows with interior and exterior grids with spacer bars between the glass.*

Public Comment: Mr. Larry Kahle, Metropolis Architecture, said the property owners could not attend because of a previously planned trip. He said the project had been in design some months, and the property owners were looking forward to building.

Responding to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Kahle said the property owners had spoken with all neighbors about the project.

Ms. Katie Ferrick, Menlo Park, said she supported the project noting it was next door to her own home. She said she was pleased the property owners were using architect Larry Kahle as he also lived in Suburban Park and understood what people liked in that area, and produced high quality architecture. She said she and her husband had one concern with a proposed dormer and encroachment into the daylight plane, but the architect had revised it so there was no intrusion with adequate light being provided to the project stairwell.

Acting Chair Onken closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany said the project was a good match for the neighborhood noting the second story was stepped back. He said the double garage door in the front was a large element and he would prefer page A.4 as it would match the front door and create vertical lines. Acting Chair Onken noted that the front garage door was the norm in the neighborhood and this was not a standard double garage door.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Metropolis Architecture, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received on May 12, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 19, 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.

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Ferrick recused and Commissioner Eiref absent.

Commissioner Kadvany noted this was a good example of what could be designed for a 50-foot wide lot.

D2. Use Permit/Flury Bryant Design Group/634 Creek Drive: Request for a use permit to exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period. The proposal includes the addition of an upper level, as well as a remodel of the main and lower levels. The subject parcel is located in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said the Engineering Division had confirmed that a Grading and Drainage Plan for the project was not required which eliminated condition 3.f.

Commission Comment: Mr. Bob Flury, Flury Bryant Design Group, said he had no additions to the written staff report.

Commissioner Strehl asked about the storage area. Mr. Flury said it had been a carport in 1957, and then enclosed at some point and later a washer added. He said they were proposing to make it a single-car garage.

Acting Chair Onken closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany said he thought this was a very charming design, and moved to approve. Commissioner Bressler seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferrick said currently there was no parking provided noting a table in the staff report. Planner Sandmeier said that referred to the carport area that had been illegally converted to storage but which was now being converted back to a garage and would be the legally permitted nonconforming one parking space.

Commissioner Kadvany noted his motion should include the removal of condition 3.f. Commissioner Bressler as the maker of the second agreed.

Commission Action: M/S Kadvany/Bressler to approve the item with the following modification.

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 Flury Bryant Design Group, Inc., consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received April 30, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 19, 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*** condition:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an encroachment permit application for the existing fence and gates within the public right-of-way, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division. The encroachment permit agreement shall be executed and recorded against the property prior to building permit issuance.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an updated arborist report with more detailed analysis of possible construction impacts to heritage trees.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

E. STUDY SESSION

- E1. R-4-S Compliance Review/Greenheart Land Co./721-851 Hamilton Avenue:**
Study session to review a 195-unit, multi-family residential development relative to the development regulations and design standards of the R-4-S (High Density Residential, Special) zoning district. The Planning Commission's review is advisory only and will be taken into consideration as part of the Community Development Director's determination of whether the proposal is in compliance with the R-4-S development regulations and design standards. ***Continued from the Planning Commission meeting of May 5, 2014***

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Chow said staff had no additional comments to the written report. She said a materials board and a copy of the applicant's presentation were being distributed to the Commission.

Questions of Staff: Vice Chair Onken asked about community outreach. Senior Planner Chow said the City had sent out notification of the application submittal to neighbors within a 300-foot radius of the project and another notification regarding this meeting date for the study session.

Public Comment: Mr. Bob Burke, principal for Greenheart Land Co., said they had held 31 meetings in the Belle Haven neighborhood to receive input on the proposed project. He noted that there were many employers in the area and they expected the units to be rented by employees of local companies. He said the proposal met and exceeded the standards of the R-4-S District. He said there would be photovoltaic cells on the carports that would power 100 percent of the electricity for the common area which would use LED lighting. He said each unit would be metered for water use and tenants would pay for their usage. He said with metered use and low flow fixtures they expected the water demand would be less than 50 gallons per day per person. He said they would have zip cars, bicycle sharing and charging stations available for tenants.

Mr. Michael Gould, KTG Y Group, Oakland, provided slides of the site plan and design. He said green space was located next to buildings and the main entry would be in the middle of the site that would use an existing PG&E easement. He showed slides demonstrating the modulation of the buildings and views of the building layouts and entry ways.

Mr. Phil vanderToolen, Landscape Architect, said the site was very linear and the generous setback to the buildings allowed for landscaping between the buildings and the street. He said the major amenity area was in the center noting there was a dog park area and a continuous pathway through the site. He described the spa, barbecue, and resort quality type center suitable for larger and more intimate events. He provided views of other proposed landscaping at the site including palm trees.

Mr. Jeff Adams, Redwood City, said he was representing his employer Facebook. He said employees had expressed interest in being closer to work and connecting with their community near their work. He expressed overall support of the project.

Mr. Sam Wright, Menlo Park, said he was part of the development group that facilitated the sale of this property, and that their strong desire had been for a property owner who could work with the community, which he thought Greenheart had done and expected they would continue. He said having housing options like this was important for future residents of the City.

Mr. Matt Henry, Menlo Park, said there was not even one two-story home on Hamilton Avenue between Carlton and Windermere. He said those homes would be completely overwhelmed by four blocks of three-story apartment buildings that were completely out of scale with the existing neighborhood. He said he had suggested more than once during public outreach meetings to put single-story buildings at the front of the lot and taller buildings in the rear. He said people would be coming from all over to see the rooftop landscaping on the Facebook building and this project would block Belle Haven's view of this rooftop landscaping. He said the present design would only allow the Belle Haven neighborhood to see four boxlike and boring buildings. He said what people were able to see was important as it could adjust attitudes.

Ms. Fran Dehn, Chamber of Commerce, said the proposed project was functional and attractive and the design was forward thinking and cognizant of Menlo Park's environmental and aesthetic concerns. She said it addressed identified housing need for the community and would reduce traffic concerns. She said Greenheart had been engaged with the community in development of their project proposal.

Acting Chair Onken closed the public comment period.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Combs asked if the open space features of the complex would be accessible by the public. Mr. Burke said the facilities were for residents only. Commissioner Combs asked if any consideration was given to providing front doors to some of the front units on Hamilton Avenue so that it would flow better with the neighborhood. Mr. Burke said they had discussed that a great deal but had decided having the center portals and a centering of the entryways was better than individual access along the street.

Commissioner Bressler asked if it was correct that the Commission had no discretionary power even regarding architectural control for this proposal. Senior Planner Chow said similar to the St. Anton project on Haven Avenue that the Commission reviewed last fall this project was located in the R-4-S District. She said in that district if the project complied with the development regulations and the design standards the Community Development Director was able to deem the project in compliance. She said the study session was for the Commission to provide feedback for consideration by the Community Development Director in making her determination as to whether this project was in compliance. She said this project would not return to the Commission for any formal action although there was an opportunity for non-discretionary approval.

Commissioner Bressler said this project did not have Below Market Rate (BMR) housing. Senior Planner Chow said this project differed from the St. Anton project as it did not have a state density bonus component and was not within the affordable housing overlay.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the applicant had met with Mr. Henry, whether their development would block the view of Facebook for Belle Haven residents, and what consideration had been given residents of the single-story homes on Hamilton Avenue. Mr. Steve Pierce, principal with Greenheart, asked the Commission to look at sheet A40 showing a cross-section through the center of 777 Hamilton Avenue showing Facebook and beyond. He said their buildings were 34 feet in height and the Facebook building behind them was 72 feet high which was where they understood the "forest" on the top would be planted. He said that would be visible for much of the Belle Haven area. He said to get the amount of required parking as well as the density required of 30 units per acre did not allow for one-story and various height buildings. He said they compromised on pushing the front of the project back along Hamilton Avenue to provide

for a landscaped face to the project. He said they would be planting 200 trees with many of those in the space between the buildings and the street.

Commissioner Strehl asked how the leasing and amenities building would work. Mr. Pierce said the leasing office was to the front and the lobby could become a gathering space as part of the amenity spaces at other times. Commissioner Strehl asked if there was an option for exercise and a gym. Mr. Pierce said there was an exercise room in that building as well. Commissioner Strehl said every unit would have washer and dryer. Mr. Pierce said that was correct and bicycle parking for each unit as well. Commissioner Strehl asked if they had a sense of what the rents for these units would be. Mr. Pierce said the units would be completed maybe in a year and half, and there were a lot of units being built in Menlo Park on Haven Avenue and in downtown Redwood City and other factors that would determine pricing. He said the rents might be lower than downtown Redwood City units and higher than units in Newark.

Commissioner Ferrick said she agreed with Mr. Henry that the view of the world class architecture at Facebook should not be compromised for Belle Haven residents. She said looking at the heights of the project and Facebook she thought unless one was standing on Hamilton Avenue directly in front of this project that views would be unimpeded. She said she liked the corridor views through the project and noted that driving along Hamilton Avenue there would be nice views. She asked if they had thought about aligning the back buildings with the front buildings so there were even more view corridors. Mr. Gould said they looked at that and at gathering the four buildings as they sit on Hamilton Avenue but to hit the needed density and keep the parking pushed by the railway it naturally created the pedestrian entry, the courtyard on each side of the project, and the ability to give a unit the opportunity to have its bit of front door instead of becoming a building that got lost in the rear of the project.

Commissioner Ferrick confirmed with Mr. Gould that residents would be able to see the Facebook rooftop over the top of the rear buildings. Mr. Gould said also there was a 120-foot opening at the end of Sevier Avenue that would provide a broad viewing corridor. Commissioner Ferrick said she liked the architecture and the finishes. She said the stucco surface seemed rough but suggested that might be by design. She asked about the gray stucco as it was particularly rough and asked where that would be located. Mr. Gould said that was the siding material down the face of the buildings, and would change color to create variety traveling down Hamilton Avenue but was in the smaller pieces. He said the larger field material or color would be the plaster. Commissioner Ferrick noted that it would not be that unfinished looking gray.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the bike closets on the balconies and whether people would carry bikes upstairs through the living space to the balconies. Mr. Gould said that was a common feature noting that some of these bicycles cost as much as a small car and people preferred their own storage to a common storage area. Commissioner Kadvany asked if they had considered giving up some parking spaces on the west side so residents there could have a more localized basketball court. Mr.

Gould said at this stage parking was very close to the required and only perhaps two or three spaces could be lost and still meet the standard. He said regarding outdoor space that there was an acute angle at Windermere and Hamilton Avenue that was open space as well as the "Main Street" ribbon that connected all through the project.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the stucco and if smooth stucco was the required standard. Senior Planner Chow said under code 5A2 that all external stucco shall be completed in textures that are smooth, sanded, or fine scraped. She said the stucco on the materials board was similar to a sanded finish. Commissioner Kadvany said it was rough looking and would make a difference in how the buildings looked. He said that material quality was important for these buildings because of the visual impact they would have and the materials he had seen thus far concerned him. He said that there was a Silicon Valley utilitarian building look that he hoped would not be the case here noting the Belle Haven neighborhood and their less than generous view of Facebook because of this project. He said the organization of the buildings, the water use and landscaping were nice.

Acting Chair Onken asked about the experience of working to the design standards. Mr. Gould said they would have done things differently without the guidelines. He said the elevations in the packet however were greatly driven by the guidelines and accomplished an attractive design. He said there was some clumsiness in the wording and how it applied, for example in the reference to rotated form and how a building met that intent noting that 90 degree corners could meet that reference.

Acting Chair Onken asked how community outreach had fed into the design, noting they had set buildings back so there was not a sea of parking in the front. Mr. Gould said there were certainly items they were made aware of and they considered the community feelings and how they would perceive the project. He said that was why they broke the project down to seven buildings so as not to overwhelm the residential neighborhood. He said they worked to minimize fencing on the public edge. He said working to the design standards drove so much more than anything.

Acting Chair Onken said he liked the openness of the project and how it was open to the community. He said regarding A.40 that in drawing site lines from the top of the Facebook building across the project section a pedestrian would have to be two blocks back to see anything of the Facebook rooftop. He said the upper levels of the building do step back from the front. He said there was concern with the handling of fiberboard and stucco in that if it was not maintained well it would look shabby in five years. He said choices of finishes would make the facades attractive. Mr. Gould said it would take a commitment from whoever owned the complex to continue maintaining the project. He said the initial execution was important in getting general contractors that work on such a project scale. He said the plaster and Hardi board was the most common in this type of product right now, but they could review the finish and the grain of the sand finish of the stucco. He said Hardi board was making a good product that was much more durable than natural wood. Acting Chair Onken said vinyl windows were a

concern and asked if there had been some consideration made of aluminum or wood clad. Mr. Gould said they looked at an aluminum window product and did a full elevation similar to what was in the packet but the price cost was too significant between those and vinyl windows.

Commissioner Combs asked about current parking restrictions on Hamilton Avenue. Senior Planner Chow said she did not think there was parking allowed on Hamilton Avenue.

Commissioner Bressler noted the dog park and the open space would not be for the public. He said that was why he had fought for years to get public benefit as much as possible. He said he thought the whole proposal was a failure. He said he did not know entirely what the impact of the project would be on Belle Haven but he thought there would be traffic impacts and increased home rentals. He said the project would not be a boost to the community.

Commissioner Kadvany said there were very large surfaces on buildings 5, 6 and 7 and suggested good finishes and landscaping there.

Acting Chair Onken asked if there was a sense of the demographic market. Mr. Burke said he thought technological industry workers, local employees, singles, young married couples, and some families noting the three-bedroom units. He said these would be rental units. Vice Chair Onken noted that it seemed the project would have a low impact on local school districts.

Commissioner Strehl asked if there were amenities for children. Mr. Burke said there was some open space but no play structures; he expected from other similar projects that there might be six to seven children at most.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on June 23, 2014