



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
June 23, 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), Ferrick, Kadvany, Onken (Vice Chair), Strehl

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Contract Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. General Plan Update – Consultant Selection Process – City Council – June 17, 2014
- b. 1300 El Camino Real – Info Item – City Council – June 17, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers said at the June 17 City Council meeting that the Council approved the General Plan Update consultant contract. He said upcoming for the Planning Commission at the July 23rd Planning Commission meeting would be the selection of a Commissioner to serve on the General Plan Advisory Committee.

Senior Planner Rogers said Greenheart Land Company acquired the 1300 El Camino Real site, the Derry project site, and a lot at 1258 El Camino Real, and was proposing a mixed use project for those lots. He said staff provided an information item to the City Council at their June 17 meeting regarding staff and the consultant's determination that a focused Infill Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would need to be prepared for the project. He said either at the end of July or beginning of August, the Planning Commission will be asked to conduct a scoping session for the EIR and a project study session. He said depending on the results of those sessions, the City Council would be asked to consider the EIR contract later in August. He said the proposed project was complex and detailed, and the Planning Commission would kick off the environmental review. He said any actions on the project would not occur until 2015 at the earliest.

Senior Planner Rogers said the July 7 Planning Commission meeting was cancelled due to a lack of immediate pending projects and also as the meeting date was immediately following a holiday weekend.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the 1300 El Camino Real project and how developed the project proposal would be that the Planning Commission would see. Senior Planner Rogers said there would be enough project proposal detail to inform the

EIR process and that it was an opportunity for Commissioners to make comments on aspects of the proposal.

Commissioner Onken asked about the Specific Plan Initiative and implications for the Planning Commission's consideration of projects should the Initiative pass. He asked for a report for the Commission once things became more definite about the Initiative. Senior Planner Rogers said he would pass the request on noting that the Initiative was being handled by the City Manager's office because of state law surrounding initiative actions. He said should any projects come to the Commission with potential implications related to the Initiative, staff would provide information but he did not see any major projects coming before the Planning Commission before an election on the Initiative.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was none.

C. CONSENT

C1. Approval of minutes from the May 19, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. (Attachment)

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

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref abstaining.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D1. Use Permit/David W. Terpening/1010 Monte Rosa Drive: Request for a use permit to construct a single-story addition to an existing single-story, single-family, nonconforming residence that would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing structure in a 12-month period in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban) zoning district. (Attachment)

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said there were no additions or changes to the staff report.

Public Comment: Mr. Dave Terpening, project architect, said the project was a fairly straight forward addition and remodel of the existing residence. He said the area of nonconformity was on the left or south side of the property where the existing foundation encroached into the setback approximately one foot. He said keeping with the style of the existing home that they were increasing its size, updating it and adding bedrooms. He said the proposal was well within the limits of height and floor area, and had neighbor support.

Chair Eiref noted that the family room did not appear to have any rear facing windows as shown on sheet A.4. Mr. Terpening said that was where the entertainment center would be and also to protect privacy.

Chair Eiref closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Bressler moved to approve the project.
Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

Chair Eiref noted the high level of successful neighbor outreach the applicants had done.

Commissioner Combs said he visited the site and found the proposal to be modest in scope in comparison to other remodels in the area.

Commission Action: M/S Bressler/Onken 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. 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 David W. Terpening, consisting of 16 plan sheets, dated received May 28, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 23, 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 shall submit revised plans correcting the height notation on Sheet A-4 of the plan set to show a building height of 20 feet.

Motion carried 7-0.

D2. Use Permit Extension/St. Patrick's Seminary and University/320 Middlefield

Rd: Request for a five-year extension of a use permit for a temporary modular building on an existing seminary site in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban) zoning district. The revised use permit would expire in 2019. (*Attachment*)

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Bressler said the building was not very noticeable from the street and asked why it was before the Commission for review. Senior Planner Rogers said this building had been established temporarily, as a longer-term master plan had been intended for this site. He said due to different factors such as the economy that this work had not yet occurred.

Chair Eiref asked if the building could be permitted permanently. Senior Planner Rogers said that he had asked the Building Official about a five year extension on the use permit, but wasn't sure if there were technical issues about it being permanent. He

said staff's perspective that the building was not necessarily objectionable temporarily, but was not aesthetically appropriate from a permanent perspective.

Public Comment: Mr. Curt Longacre said the request was for another five year extension of the use permit. He said the structure was originally permitted in 2002 and extended to 2009. He said they had expected to be ready to do the permanent project but the economy put everything on hold, and the use permit would expire this year. He said recently there had been significant changes in leadership. He said the first three years of the use permit extension would allow the new leadership to determine what they wanted to do and at the end of the three years to develop a plan to move forward on the project.

Chair Eiref closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Eiref said the request was benign and he thought they could ask for it to be permanent. Commissioner Ferrick said she would move to approve as recommended in the staff report but thought it should be kept as a temporary use. Commissioner Combs seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/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 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. Approve the use permit extension subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans and photographs prepared by St. Patrick's Seminary, consisting of six plan sheets, dated received May 20, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 23, 2014, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. The temporary modular structure shall be removed by December 6, 2019, unless the applicant obtains approval of an extension of the use permit by the Planning Commission.

Motion carried 7-0.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 21, 2014