



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
September 22, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:03 p.m.

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

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. General Plan (ConnectMenlo)
 1. Workshops – September 11 and 17, 2014
 2. Symposium – Growth Management and Economic Development – September 23, 2014
 3. Focus Group – Growth Management and Economic Development – September 29, 2014

Senior Planner Rogers reported on General Plan Update vents that had occurred. He said workshops with identical content were held on September 11 in the downtown and on September 17 at the Senior Center. He said that 30 to 40 residents attended each workshop. He said now an online interactive activity was available for those unable to attend either workshop to provide input to the visioning part of the General Plan Update by going to the ConnectMenlo webpage. He said the following evening a Symposium on Growth Management and Economic Development would be held at which the presenters would be a team from Bay Area Economics or BAE. He said that event would be streamed and available on the website. He noted a focus group session would also be held on the same topic.

Chair Eiref noted outdoor seating at The Left Bank, and asked if there were be a report back on such pilot public spaces deriving from the Downtown Specific Plan (Plan). Senior Planner Rogers said all the proposed public space improvements under the Plan were to be implemented on a trial basis. He said they were establishing metrics to measure success and what worked and/or what needed improvement. He said the Community Services Department held three trial events on Friday nights called Menlo Movie Night, which was being evaluated. He said the City's Economic Development Team was also looking for sidewalk extensions for businesses not on Santa Cruz Avenue. He said The Refuge had asked for a similar arrangement. Chair Eiref commented that at The Left Bank the tables sat directly on asphalt and suggested something could be laid down under the tables so it was more attractive.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS #1 (Limited to 30 minutes)

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Each of the items on the Consent Calendar was considered separately.

C1. Approval of minutes from the August 18, 2014 Planning Commission meeting ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Onken suggested on page 7, 1st paragraph, 1st line that “Commissioner Bressler said the project had too little interpretation...” should be replaced with “Commissioner Bressler said the project had too literal interpretation...”

Commission Action: M/S Strehl/Ferrick to approve the minutes with the following modification:

- Page 7, 1st paragraph, 1st line: Replace “Commissioner Bressler said the project had too little interpretation...” with “Commissioner Bressler said the project had too literal interpretation...”

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Kadvany abstaining:

C2. **Architectural Control Revision/R. Tod Spieker/2275 Sharon Road:** Request for an architectural control revision to allow exterior modifications to two existing apartment buildings in the R-3-A(X) (Garden Apartment, Conditional Development) zoning district. The proposed exterior modifications would include replacing balcony railings, siding, fencing, and patio screens, and modifying the exterior color scheme. ([Attachment](#))

Chair Eiref asked if there were interior improvements as well. Planner Lin said she was not aware of interior improvements but said she would not if such interior improvements had no effect on the exterior of the building.

Chair Eiref said the proposed colors seem quite bright compared to what the building looked like currently, noting the building blended well with the trees.

Mr. Edwin Bruce, project architect, said there were some interior remodels that were going through Building Department review and work to bring the stairwell heights to code. He said the existing building colors blended so well with the trees that they felt it almost disappeared from view. He said they wanted to open up the inside and outside of the apartment complex.

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

1. Adopt 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 revision request subject to the following **standard** conditions of approval:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Edwin Bruce Associates, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received by the Planning Division on August 28, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on September 22, 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 applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Health Department, and utility company's 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 cannot be placed underground. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for 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.

- C3. Sign Review/Tom Donahue/3565 Haven Avenue:** Request for sign review to construct a new freestanding monument sign with up to five individual tenants. The proposed tenants could occupy less than 25 percent of the gross leasable square footage of the property. ([Attachment](#))

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make a finding that the sign is appropriate and compatible with the businesses and signage in the general area, and is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Signs.
3. Approve the sign subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by the applicant, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received August 28, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on September 22, 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 applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.

Motion carried 7-0.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

- D1. Use Permit/Fitton and Chowdhary/675 Woodland Avenue:** Request for a use permit to remodel and expand an existing single-story residence, including the addition of a second story, on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed project would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area, and is considered equivalent to a new structure. The proposal includes a request for removal of a heritage palm tree in the front-left.

Item continued to the Planning Commission meeting of October 6, 2014.

- D2. Use Permit/Kateeva, Inc./1105 O'Brien Dr:** Request for a use permit for the indoor storage and use of hazardous materials associated with the manufacturing of organic light emitting diode (OLED) displays in an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. ([Attachment](#))

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

Public Comment: Mr. John Tarlton said they were pleased to represent Kateeva, Inc., which was expanding its business. Mr. Mike Harburn, Kateeva, Inc., said they had received a major

overseas manufacturing order and needed to expand their business square footage in response.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the local schools and Boys and Girls Club had been notified of this expansion. Mr. Tarlton said those properties were located within the notification area and the owners would have been notified as part of the use permit application process. He said there was not anything associated with this application that would require special outreach to those property owners.

Chair Eiref closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick noted that Menlo Park Fire District, County Environmental Health, West Bay Sanitary District and the Building Department had signed off on the hazardous materials plan. She moved to approve the use permit request as recommended in the staff report. Chair Eiref seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Eiref to approve the item as recommended in the staff report:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by DES Architects/Engineers, consisting of five plan sheets, dated received September 17, 2014, and approved by the Planning Commission on September 22, 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 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 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

There was no regular business.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was no Commission business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on November 3, 2014