



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
May 4, 2015 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, Combs (absent), Eiref (Chair), Ferrick, Kadvany, Onken (Vice Chair), Strehl

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Michele Morris, Assistant Planner; Justin Murphy, Assistant Community Development Director; Tom Smith, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Associate Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. Planning Commission Appointments – City Council – May 5, 2015

Senior Planner Rogers said the City Council at their May 5 meeting would make appointments for three Planning Commission seats.

- b. ConnectMenlo Workshop – May 2 and 7, 2015

Senior Planner Rogers said a ConnectMenlo community workshop was held on May 2 as part of the Council's decision to conduct more public outreach for the General Plan Update, particularly to the Belle Haven community. He said a second community workshop with the same content would be held on May 7, 2015, Thursday evening at the Belle Haven Senior Center.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS #1

There were none.

C. CONSENT

Commissioner Kadvany asked to pull item C3.

C1. Approval of minutes from the March 23, 2015 Planning Commission meeting ([Attachment](#))

Commission Action: Minutes approved as submitted,

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Combs absent.

C2. Approval of minutes from the April 6, 2015 Planning Commission meeting ([Attachment](#))

Commission Action: Minutes approved as submitted.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Combs absent.

- C3. Sign Review/Michelle Olmstead/4085 Campbell Avenue:** Request for sign review for a new building-mounted sign that would feature greater than 25 percent of the sign area in a bright red color. The signage would be located on an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Kadvany noted some firms in Menlo Park had indicated their need to have red colors in their because of company identity, but he had noticed the same companies located in San Carlos did not use bright colors but rather colors similar to that city's downtown look.

Commissioner Onken said he appreciated Commissioner Kadvany's comments regarding downtown signage. He said this business was located along Hwy. 101 and would be no different than many other businesses' signage along that thoroughfare.

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

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Combs absent.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

- D1. Use Permit/Leopold Vandeneynde/523 Central Avenue:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to lot width, depth and area in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. As part of the proposal, a heritage trident maple measuring 16 inches in diameter, at the front right side of the property, is proposed for removal. ([Attachment](#))

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

Questions of Staff: In response to Commissioner Strehl's inquiry, Planner Sandmeier said that staff had not received any comments on the proposed project.

Public Comment: Mr. Leopold Vandeneynde, project architect, said that Cindy and Jerry Hamilton, the property owners, were present. He said the original home was one-bedroom, one-bath. He said the owners now have two children and would like to stay in the neighborhood, and hoped to have their project approved for a new two-story home in the Tudor style, similar to other homes in the surrounding area. He said the project tried to create more yard space, which was why they were replacing the existing detached garage. He said they needed to remove the maple tree in the front to allow for the required covered and uncovered parking spaces.

Chair Eiref asked about the height of the project. Mr. Vandeneynde said the base flood elevation was 32-inches off the natural grade. He said to have all wood framing above that elevation they had to engineer a foundation that would minimize the footprint and then they tried to maximize plate heights inside the house as much as they could.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about public outreach. Mr. Vandeneynde said when the project development was initiated, about a year ago, Mr. Hamilton took plans door-to-door. He said they paid attention to privacy concerns of neighbors on both sides and minimized windows on

the sides. Commissioner Ferrick asked about the neighbor on the left side. Mr. Vandeneynde said his understanding was that everything from the neighbors had been very positive.

Chair Eiref closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said at first sight the project seemed built to the maximum but it was the almost three feet of elevation needed for the base flood plane requirements that made that necessary.

Commissioner Ferrick said the second floor east elevation had some intrusion into the daylight plane and she thought it would impact the neighbor's privacy. Chair Eiref said he had a similar reservation about the east elevation.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make 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 Leopold Design, consisting of 6 plan sheets, dated received April 23, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 4, 2015, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Motion carried 5-1 with Commissioner Ferrick in opposition and Commissioner Combs absent.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Vandenevnde said they were working with the neighbor regarding the intrusion into the daylight plane.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

E1. Modification to Approved Plans Associated with a Conditional Development Permit (CDP)/Jason Chang for CS Bio Co./ 20 Kelly Court: Request for a modification to the project plans associated with an existing conditional development permit (CDP), previously approved by the City Council in December 2012. At this time, the applicant is requesting to defer façade modifications to the single-story concrete tilt-up portion of the subject building, defer installation of a new roof screen on that portion of the building, and to allow the existing trash enclosure to remain. The previously approved project included metal panels on the concrete tilt-up building, a new roof screen, and a new trash enclosure. The applicant would paint the existing concrete tilt-up building to match the new construction; however, any approval of the deferral request would contain a time limit to allow the applicant to consider potential modifications to the overall development at the site as part of the City's General Plan update. As part of the proposal, the applicant is requesting approval to install temporary seasonal decorations on the roof of the building. Per Section 6.3.1 (Major Modifications) of the approved CDP, the applicant may request modifications to the exterior of the building, subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission. The subject site is located in the M-2 (General Industrial, Conditional Development) zoning district. ([Attachment](#))

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

Public Comment: Mr. Jason Chang, Vice President of Operations for CS Bio Co., said in 2012 the Commission had approved a new building for the company which had had its grand opening recently. He said the reason for their request to defer the additions to the tilt-up was that when they announced their expansion their business increased and their building expansion was not enough for the demand. He said they began working with Planning staff in 2013 on the increased expansion. He said during this time the City began work on its General Plan update for the M2 zone and that had the potential to provide the ability for greater expansion than what was currently allowed under code. He said they have acquired additional leases in the nearby vicinity to tide them over while they were building the new facility.

Chair Eiref closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany said if the Commission approved this deferral that should not be considered tacit approval of a future project. He expressed concern that this

maneuvering within land ownership in the M2 as the General Plan was updated might create an unwanted effect.

Commissioner Onken said he thought the project changes were low impact and as an architectural project went above and beyond what people tended to expect in the M2.

Commissioner Bressler said he thought this was a singular proposal, referring to Commission Kadvan's comments. He noted also it would have to be completed by 2017.

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 32 (Section 15332, "In-Fill Development Projects") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make a determination that the proposed modifications are compatible with other building and design elements or onsite/offsite improvements of the approved Conditional Development Permit (CDP) and will not have an adverse impact on safety and/or the character and aesthetics of the site, as outlined in the project plans provided by DES Architects/Engineers, consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received April 29, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 4, 2015 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
3. Approve the modifications to the project plans associated with the CDP subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall submit a complete application to the Planning Division for the necessary land use entitlements (such as but not limited to a CDP Amendment and associated environmental review) by January 1, 2017. If the applicant fails to submit a complete application, then the applicant shall submit a complete building permit to install the deferred items by February 1, 2017, subject to review and approval of the Building and Planning Divisions.
 - b. Any temporary seasonal decorations located at the site shall be limited to 30 days from date of installation and the applicant shall obtain all necessary building permits, subject to review and approval of the Building and Planning Divisions.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Combs absent.

E2. Modification to Approved Plans Associated with a Conditional Development Permit (CDP)/David D. Bohannon/101-155 Constitution Drive and 100-190 Independence Drive: Request for a modification to the project plans associated with an existing conditional development permit (CDP), previously approved by the City Council in June 2010. At this time, the applicant is requesting an increase in the number of hotel rooms from 230 to 250, an increase in the square footage of the hotel of approximately 24,000 from 173,000 to 197,000, incorporation of the health and fitness facility into a parking

structure on the Independence site, a decrease in the square footage of the health and fitness facility of approximately 28,000 from 69,000 to 41,000, and a net decrease in square footage of approximately 4,400 for the total project. The office component of the project would receive updates to the architecture and slight adjustments to building placement. Per Section 6.1.2 of the approved CDP, the applicant may request modifications to the project, subject to review and recommendation by the Planning Commission and a determination from the City Manager. The subject site is located in the M-3-X (Commercial Business Park, Conditional Development) zoning district.
([Attachment](#))

Staff Comment: Planner Smith said there were no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: In response to an inquiry from Chair Eiref, Planner Smith said that under a conditional development permit or CDP, a major modification to the project plans could be approved by a letter from the City Manager through consultation with the City Council and recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Public Comment: Mr. David Bohannon, project applicant, said the hotel health club element in the original approval by the City Council required a modification which was why they had to revisit the project with the City Council. He said the health club was a separate element in the project now and not part of the hotel.

Mr. Michael Moscovitz, Ensemble Investments / Ensemble Hotel Partners, provided a presentation on the project and addressed how they approached defining hotel use that would be viable. He said the decision was for a full service hotel with great food and drink options and indoor/outdoor meeting spaces. He said the autograph hotel collection under the Marriott flag would be very unique and iconic to the area but still capture business travelers who want to earn points.

Mr. Jack Highwart, Cuningham Group, said the site was very beautiful and in the heart of technology. He said being along Highway 101 was a great location for a hotel with noise and visual challenges. He said they canted the tower for an optimal solar orientation allowing for an oasis courtyard that could be buffered with landscape and other active uses. He said the juxtaposition of the building also provided interesting views from all sides and pushed the orientation or prow of the hotel toward Independence and allowed for a gracious entrance to the hotel. He showed visuals of the proposed design and colors and materials board. He closed with a video presentation on the prospective hotel.

Mr. Jeffrey Heller, Heller Manus Architects, office project architect, said the overall site organization emphasized the pedestrian interconnectivity that the site presents as a potential to Menlo Park, the Bayfront and the hotel buildings. He said the portion of the site near Highway 101 has the hotel on the right and the parking garages in the middle. He said a major part of the garages on the east side was the health club which would help create the link to hotel and the Independence building. He said the Independence building geometry was modified to take advantage of the geometry of the interchange to make a bold and clear statement about that building. He said the streetscape tied from the hotel to the Independence building and beyond. He said on the Constitution side they had refined the building location and placement to create a sense of space and people place. He said the east side facing the Bayfront was very landscaped and amenity driven. He provided visuals demonstrating the increased pedestrian

interconnectivity. He showed a visual of the proposed Independence building from Marsh Road noting the intent of creating iconic and highly environmentally oriented buildings.

Commissioner Onken asked about signage to get people from Marsh Road to the hotel or out to Bayfront. Mr. Bohannon said they had not put together the signage program. He expected they would prepare a sign district program for approval. He said the primary point of entrance to the hotel would be Bayfront using Chrysler Drive. He said it was not clear if there were would be major changes to ingress/egress from Marsh Road and noted they were talking with the City, Caltrans, and another property developer needing to do mitigations in that area. He said he expected they would have signage along Marsh Road and Chrysler Drive.

Commissioner Onken said he would like to hear from the bird expert consultant Mr. Bohannon had mentioned earlier.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Steve Rottenborn, principal with the ecological firm HT Harvey and Associates, said birds did not see glass as a solid feature, which was why they might try to reach habitat on the other side of the glass or why the reflection of the sky, water or trees in the glass might be inviting for them. He said birds must be near the glass for this to occur. He said he looked at the existing site conditions to determine how migrating birds would see the area as a whole. He said in his opinion the abundance and diversity of birds at the project site was relatively low as it was not good quality bird habitat. He said the intended landscape and other plantings proposed for the project would not increase the quality of bird habitat on the site. He said there was important bird habitat on the bayfront side of Bayfront Expressway. He said there was a defining hard edge between those bird habitats and the urban area. He said migrating birds would perceive what the high quality habitat was and choose it. He said locally there were urban adapted and regionally abundant species that would upon occasion fly into glass. He said within CEQA analysis this was looked at and no significant impact on any bird species was found. He said the project architecture had numerous mullions, fins and sunshades that were solid structures that birds see as solid, which lowered the potential for birds striking the glass. Chair Eiref asked if sounds could warn birds off. Mr. Rottenborn said sounds could be used for migratory birds but local birds would acclimate to the sound. He said he did not see the potential for migratory birds being impacted by these structures.

Commissioner Onken said the question being asked by people in the City was whether a bird safe design had been used for the project. He said there were very specific bird safety design standards for buildings. Mr. Rottenborn said the question was whether there was need for bird safe design in a certain area in a certain context with a certain project before a decision to broadly implement bird safe design. Commissioner Onken noted the proximity of birds across the road to this project and he was surprised that bird safe glass would not be used. Chair Eiref asked about flying height for birds. Mr. Rottenborn said that migrating birds fly about 400 feet in the sky. He said most bird collisions occurred within the first 60-foot height of buildings. He said migratory bird densities in the east were much higher than in the west and was the source of the horror stories about bird collisions.

Ms. Eileen McLaughlin said she was representing the citizen's committee to complete the refuge, a nonprofit that worked closely with the Don Edwards Wildlife Refuge. She said she had brought up the bird safety concern at the study session on this project with the City Council. She said she was pleased that Mr. Bohannon hired HT Harvey and Associates, ecological consultants, and the study that was done. She said it was done however in the context of

CEQA. She said there was only so much they could ask of the Bohannon project. She suggested that monitoring and surveys might be done to provide more information to guide the City's development of bird safe design in the M2 district. She said in parts of the building where inside habitat might increase the chance of bird collision that a solution might be to not allow such habitat and to use design features in those areas to make the areas less attractive to birds. She said rather than thinking about the specific species studied under CEQA that all bird life in general should be considered.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Bohannon said the project team would meet with the Friends of Bayfront/Bedwell Park to discuss the use of certain funds which was not directly related to birds. He said they currently owned and operated a fair amount of office buildings in the area and had not received any reports of bird collisions. He said they have had ducks take residence in ponds and had to hire someone to relocate the ducks carefully. He said also swallows had nested in eaves and they had hired someone to carefully relocate them. They also changed the eaves to make them less attractive to the birds. He said that making wholesale changes to the project without any real data was difficult. He said their project design was taking into consideration birds. He said their landscape architect was designing the groundscape to discourage birds from approaching the lower levels of the building. He said there was a General Plan update and they would hear about policies that would need more study before coming city policy. He said they have cooperated as best they could at this stage and had been as sensitive as possible.

Commissioner Ferrick noted Page A13.2 and asked if that was an area where there was opportunity to use some bird safe design elements. Mr. Rottenborn said it was not so much the north side of Constitution but other areas of large expanse of glass not broken up by mullions or sunshades that had more potential of bird strikes. Commissioner Ferrick asked about the area facing the Bay. Mr. Rottenborn said that area had more detail and features. Mr. Heller said that their firm does considerable work in San Francisco. He said typically in these spaces the mullions and louvering work was done within a frequency so glass size was below the threshold for potential bird collisions. He said for this project the larger glass was the curve at the Bayshore freeway and that had the lowest and unlikely potential of bird strikes. He said their building worked within the criteria discussed by Mr. Rottenborn and was comparable to criteria used in San Francisco to minimize any bird collisions. Commissioner Ferrick asked if there were incidences of bird collisions what remedy there would be. Mr. Heller said the application of dots on the glass could be used. Mr. Bohannon said they would hear about any incidences of bird collisions and as property managers who care deeply about their tenants' happiness they would remedy those issues.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about the habitat ponds near Constitution Park and whether they would attract birds. Ms. Elizabeth Shreve, SWA Architects, said they would work with Mr. Rottenborn on the landscape so they would not use materials attractive to birds as food or nesting. She said the habitat ponds were to meet C3 storm water quality treatment requirements.

Chair Eiref asked about construction sequence. Mr. Bohannon said Phase I would include the hotel, public garage, and the Independence Office Building. He said the Constitution Office Building would be lease driven. He said if in the time that Phase I was underway there was sufficient leasing interest for the Constitution Office Building they would initiate its construction.

Chair Eiref asked about circulation noting the intricacies of entering the site from Marsh Road and not being able to exit onto Marsh Road. Mr. Bohannon said that they hoped to make ingress improvements noting it was a very complicated discussion. He said there would not likely be any change to the egress.

Chair Eiref asked whether the health club, noting its location, was included because it had to be. Mr. Bohannon said that there was no requirement for the health club but he thought it was a nice amenity to offer and they had a great potential club for the site.

Commissioner Bressler asked what kind of businesses would lease Office Building 1. Mr. Bohannon said he did not know. He said five years prior he would have said attorney firms. He said technology firms were now embracing taller buildings and willing to pay higher leases. He said he was not sure though. Commissioner Bressler said there were 1,500 parking spaces in the garages. He asked whether they could leverage the parking to get Transportation Management Demand programs. Mr. Bohannon said the parking was sufficient for typical office use. Noting different parking challenges for tech companies, he said that they would have a very robust TDM (transportation demand management) program and would work with other property owners on circulation solutions.

Commissioner Strehl said it appeared the egress from this development was primarily from Chrysler out to Bayfront. Mr. Bohannon said to a large degree with additional egress to the south on Chilco Avenue. Commissioner Strehl confirmed the pergola was open and that they would have a significant TDM program. She asked about potential Marsh Road changes. Mr. Mike Mowery, Kimley-Horn and Associates, transportation and civil engineers for the project, said there were three separate projects that have mitigations at Marsh and Bayfront: one to have a triple right turn from Marsh Road onto Bayfront Expressway, a number of pedestrian and ADA ramp improvements from Haven Avenue and the Park, and some additional lanes and widening. He said there were efforts to increase capacity at the intersection and also small capacity changes to reduce the amount of time vehicles needed for green lights and better pedestrian circulation through the intersection.

Commissioner Onken noted the traffic challenges of Marsh Road currently and asked whether the project as proposed was still found to have no significant traffic impact.

Assistant Community Development Director Murphy said in general the project was in accordance with CEQA. He said more specifically the project was approved in 2010 and every transportation study document prepared since then including the Facebook EIR, the Housing Element Update, and the Commonwealth Project included the trips associated with this project approval. He said mitigation measures that some of the other projects were responsible for were accounting for the trips associated with this project.

Commissioner Onken asked if the parking share for the hotel and office building 1 was formalized noting different uses had different parking ratios. Mr. Bohannon said there was a shared parking analysis that took into account the relationship between those uses and influence of that relationship on parking demand. He said the parking count decreased in sharing uses as opposed to serving the uses discretely. Commissioner Onken asked for a rough percentage of the hotel parking in the garage. Mr. Bohannon said about 25%.

Mr. Steve Buchholz, Heller Manus Architects, said there were 921 parking spaces in parking garage 1 and the hotel share was about 250 spaces. Commissioner Onken said that was a space for every room. Mr. Mowery, Kimley-Horn and Associates, said the parking analysis started with the zoning codes parking rates for each of the individual land uses and then added into the shared parking analysis the different times those different uses peak.

Commissioner Ferrick said she liked how the project looked and was changed. She said the hotel being set back was more sensitive to nearby residential. She said she liked the addition of a bike lane on Independence but that appeared only on one side. Mr. Mowery said there was an unknown of the other parcels development in the area. He said they planned the lane on their frontage with the idea that the development of the other parcels would create the bike lane along the opposing frontage. He said it was not shown currently because there was on street parking on Independence and Constitution. He said they were proposing to remove that parking on their frontage. He said the other property owners had not been approached about removing their frontage parking, which would allow for a bike lane.

Commissioner Ferrick said she liked the positioning of the health club against the parking garage, and the canopy scrim between office buildings 1 and 2. She asked why the project was not at least LEED platinum. She asked if the garage would be built to accommodate future bus-through traffic so that future tenants would be able to have different modes of mobility.

Mr. Bohannon said they would be doing things within the project to make alternative forms of transportation as easy as possible. He said they were looking very closely at sustainability and had agreed to LEED gold. He said he thought they could do better.

Ms. Andrea Traber, principal with Integral Group, a high performance engineering sustainability firm, said they looked very closely at water and energy use and they were striving for LEED platinum. She said they were working on a net zero analysis requested by Mr. Bohannon. She said on the Independence site it was probably not possible for both hotel and office so they were looking exclusively at the office and had made many such recommendations for the project.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if they were looking at reuse of water on the site. Ms. Traber said they were looking at some of those strategies. She said with the current design they were meeting the water budget goals with a much reduced irrigation requirement and building conservation requirements. She said there were some opportunities for water reuse. She noted reuse and recycling of water associated with cooling towers. She said there was also rainwater catchment but noted the limited supply due to the drought. She said they were looking at how to access reclaimed water and meeting their water budget. Commissioner Kadvany suggested in the future, and perhaps within the period of construction, that new technology for water reuse onsite might develop and that they be prepared to incorporate. Mr. Bohannon said their direction to designers and engineers on this project was to do the most forward designs to bring into fruition feasibly and for those not yet feasible to be ready to do them looking to the future.

Commissioner Kadvany said garage 1 on the Hwy. 101 side looked plain noting redwoods in the area in front. Mr. Bohannon said that they were constrained by water availability and were balancing water use with design. Mr. Heller said the greenery strategy would occur pretty much on all sides in varying degree and they were looking at low water planting elements. He said their greenery design would move the visual of the redwoods into the background. Mr. Heller

said they detailed the horizontal elements of the garage to create shadowing as opposed to flat surface, and noted on the Constitution Drive and Bayfront side there were screening trees.

Commissioner Onken asked if the hotel laundry would be done onsite or offsite. Mr. Moscovitz said they were studying both ways. He said offsite laundry was not necessarily more efficient.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the architecture was really good and how the hotel created its own village was well done. He complimented the meeting facilities and their flow into great outdoor great space. He said the project was isolated and not really connected to anything else beyond existing connections, but here was not much the development team could do to solve that other than buy connecting properties. He said regarding bird safe glass, the catch-22 was either there was visibility without the overlay dots or obstructed views because of the use of the overlay dots. He said the biggest bird risk would be the beautiful barrel lattice structure which he thought would be the home of seagulls and pigeons especially after they were chased out of Bayfront Park. He said the façade facing the bay was designed with bird safe consideration following the commitments that the City has made regarding façade. He moved to approve the item as recommended in that staff report.

Chair Eiref said this project was exciting and he felt the design was organically creative with references to earth and water. He said this project was setting the bar for other developments. He said he hoped that the properties between this project's buildings would be developed as well as this project. He seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bressler said he was pleased with the project.

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

1. Make a finding that the modified project will not result in any increased impacts in the areas of Air Quality, Traffic and Circulation, Utilities and Service Systems (Water Only), or Climate Change beyond those identified in the certified EIR, as described by Kimley-Horn in its memo "Updated Trip Generation and Trip Distribution for Menlo Gateway Project" and Integral Group in its memo "Menlo Gateway Project: GHG, Energy, Water Use Estimates and LEED Compliance," subject to review by the Building, Planning, Engineering and Transportation Divisions and approval by the City Manager.
2. Make a determination that the proposed modifications are compatible with other building and design elements or onsite/offsite improvements of the approved Conditional Development Permit (CDP) and will not have an adverse impact on safety and/or the character and aesthetics of the site, as outlined in the three project plan sets provided by Heller Manus Architects and Cuninghame Group, consisting of 73 plan sheets, dated received April 29, 2015, and recommended by the Planning Commission on May 4, 2015, subject to review and approval of the City Manager in accordance with section 6 of the Conditional Development Permit.

3. Make a determination that the three project plan sets provided by Heller Manus Architects and Cuningham Group, consisting of 73 plan sheets, dated received April 29, 2015, in conjunction with the presentation and discussion of the modified project plans at the May 4, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, fulfill the requirement of a Planning Commission review prior to building permit submittal as specified by Section 8.12 of the Conditional Development Permit.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Combs absent.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

G. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

H. INFORMATION ITEMS

There were none.

Chair Eiref and Commissioner Bressler shared their appreciation for having been able to serve on the Planning Commission. The other Commissioners thanked the outgoing Commissioners for their service. Chair Eiref also thanked staff for their quality professional work. Commissioner Bressler complimented staff on how well they moved from the Specific Plan to the Housing Element update.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on June 8, 2015