



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
June 29, 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** – Combs, Ferrick (arrived at 7:04 p.m.), Goodhue, Kadvany, Kahle, Onken (Chair) (Absent), Strehl (Vice Chair)

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – ~~Deanna Chow, Senior Planner; Stephen O'Connell, Contract Planner; Kyle Perata, Associate Planner;~~ **Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Michele Morris, Assistant Planner,** Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner; **Tom Smith, Associate Planner** ~~Corinna Sandmeier, Associate Planner~~

### A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senior Planner Rogers noted that the list of staff persons on the agenda was inaccurate, and individual staff would introduce themselves.

#### A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. Block Party - June 17, 2015

Senior Planner Rogers said that a chalkboard was posted at the Block Party to solicit ideas and comments from visitors about the planned Chestnut Street paseo and how the space might be used. He said a one month trial use was planned for September. (He noted that Commissioner Ferrick had arrived.)

- b. ConnectMenlo
  - i. General Plan Advisory Committee – June 30, 2015

Senior Planner Rogers said Vice Chair Strehl was the Commission's representative on the General Plan Advisory Committee that would meet June 30, 2015. He said the public was welcome to attend the meeting.

- c. Budget – City Council – June 16 and ~~23~~ 29 2015

Senior Planner Rogers said the City Council reviewed the proposed budget on June 16 and requested revisions and an alternative balanced budget was proposed and approved by the City Council on June 23, 2015 (noted correction needed to the agenda listing).

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

There was none.

## C. CONSENT

**C1.** Approval of minutes from the May 18, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. (*Attachment*)

Vice Chair Strehl noted for the record that there was one correction sent in an email by Commissioner Kadvany.

Commissioner Goodhue said on page 3, under the item D2, after “Staff Comment” it should read “Planner Smith” rather than “Commissioner Smith.”

Commission Action: M/S Kadvany/Combs to approve the minutes with the following modifications.

- Page 3, 8<sup>th</sup> line from bottom: Replace “Commissioner Smith” with “Planner Smith”
- Page 24, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line: Add a period at the end of the second sentence after the word “itself”

Motion carried 6-0 with Chair Onken not in attendance.

## D. PUBLIC HEARING

**D1. Use Permit/Dan Rhoads/218 McKendry Drive:** Request for a use permit to remodel and expand an existing nonconforming single-story residence, including the addition of a second story, on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot area, width, and depth 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.  
([Attachment](#))

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

Public Comment: Mr. Edward Young, Young and Borlik Architects, said he was standing in for his colleague Dan Rhoads. He said that Mr. Rhoads worked on this remodel project with the owners John and Mary Grundy. He said the staff report was thorough. He said he drove through the street-friendly residential neighborhood where the project was located and he believed the proposed design with its simplicity and architectural detail would work well. He said the second story was tapered nicely, and the project was below maximum building height, floor area ratio and lot coverage.

Mr. Grundy introduced his wife Mary. He said they have lived in the Willows for 15 years and they needed to add to their 1,150 square foot home to accommodate their growing family. He said he visited with all their neighbors to share the plans. He said neighbors had feedback that was incorporated into the plan. He said neighbors had written letters of support.

Mrs. Grundy said this would be their dream home.

Vice Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said he was friends with Mr. Young and had worked for Young and Borlik many years ago. He said the proportions of the proposed project were great. He said there seemed to be a lot of shingles, and asked if something else might be added in the gable ends such as horizontal louvers.

Mr. Grundy said they had looked at some horizontal elements and some soft louvering that others had done, but had moved away from that feature. Mrs. Grundy said that she thought the goal was simplicity but she was okay adding something to that area. Mr. Young asked which of the gables should get a different material. Mr. Kahle said there were four gables and suggested doing all of them but at the least the upper main gable.

Commissioner Ferrick said the project met all the setback requirements except for an existing condition on the first floor. She moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion. Vice Chair Strehl said for the record that Chair Onken who was not able to attend this meeting expressed his concern with the number of windows on the left or north side.

Mr. Grundy said that they added more windows to get light into the room there. He said that when he first moved in a skylight was put in to help with the lack of light for this room. He said the windows would face a tall fence and 12 to 15-foot high bushes all along that side. He said most of the windows would not be visible from the street.

Commissioner Ferrick said the side setback on the side with the windows was considerably greater than the minimum required and that opposite that was the neighbor's driveway. She said on the opposite side there were far fewer windows and it had a narrower side setback.

Commissioner Kadvany said he liked the proposed home and the use of shingles. He said also the home was neighborly feeling as the garage was kept at the back of the property.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Goodhue 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 Young and Borlik Architects, consisting of 16 plan sheets, dated received May 8, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 29, 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 and 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 6-0 with Commissioner Onken absent

Commissioners Ferrick and Kahle recused themselves from consideration of item D1 due to the proximity of their principal residences to the subject property.

**D2. Use Permit/Christopher Martin/119 Dunsmuir Way:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story single-family residence and construct a two-story single-family residence with a basement and an attached two-car garage on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and lot area located in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) district. ([Attachment](#))

Staff Comment: Planner Smith said he had no changes to the staff report.

Public Comment: Mr. Chris Martin introduced his wife Deb and said that they have lived in their home since 2002 and that they love the neighborhood. He said they needed to expand their living space for their family, which had grown. He said after much consideration they decided a new home was the best course for them. Ms. Deb Martin said they had a lot of support from neighbors. Mr. Martin said they have a 30 year Japanese maple that they asked the architect to work around in the design.

Mr. Eugene Sakai, Studio S Squared Architecture, Inc., project architect, said Suburban Park was an established neighborhood with ranch homes and also new development of contextually sensitive two-story homes. He said they designed this home to fit quietly within the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany asked if they had considered a garage door type that would look like two doors rather than on wide door or using a trellis with plantings to soften the garage door. Ms. Martin said they would be willing to consider different treatment if the architect thought it could be done.

Commissioner Goodhue asked about the use of simulated divided light windows. Mr. Sakai said there was a cost difference between the true divided light and simulated divided light windows. He said that a window that has more sections has increased chance for leakage, which meant more sealant was needed. He said they would have muntins on both sides of the glass with a metal spacer bar that would match the color of the muntins. Commissioner Goodhue asked about the fiber shingles. Mr. Sakai said it was less expensive than cedar or redwood shingle but was termite-resistant, easily paintable, and long lasting. He said aesthetically that the owners wanted a painted home and not a wood home.

Commissioner Combs moved approval as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kadvany asked for a friendly amendment to provide for a recommendation to work with staff to redesign the garage door. He said he thought in that area however that a planting trellis would look busy.

Commissioners Combs and Goodhue as the makers of the first and second accepted the amendment.

Commission Action: M/S Combs/Goodhue to approve the item with the following modification.

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 Studio S Squared Architecture, Inc., consisting of seventeen plan sheets, dated received on June 8, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 29, 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.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall propose a replacement for the 12-inch red maple street tree to be removed. The replacement street tree species and location shall be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist prior to issuance of the building permit. The tree shall be planted prior to final inspection of the building permit, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. ***Prior to submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall consider aesthetic and/or structural treatments such that the garage door shown in the approved plans has the appearance of being divided into two separate garage doors or provides a true division with two separated, independently functioning garage doors. The applicant shall confer with***

***Planning Division staff regarding the potential options prior to building permit submittal. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall update the approved plans to show the selected treatment, or submit documentation explaining the decision not to proceed with any changes to the approved plans, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 4-0 with Commissioner Onken absent and Commissioners Ferrick and Kahle recused.

Commissioners Ferrick and Kahle rejoined the Commission at the dais.

**D3. Use Permit Revision/Marshall Schneider/1031 Berkeley Avenue:** Request for a use permit revision to add 130 square feet to the first story and 120 square feet to the second story of an existing residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and lot area in the R-1-U zoning district. ([Attachment](#))

Staff Comment: Planner Smith said two pieces of correspondence had been received that day in favor of the project and copies had been distributed to the Commission and made available to the public.

Public Comment: Mr. Matt Poirier, property owner, said he and his wife Alison had lived in the community since 2008. He said they bought this home in 2013, and since then have had another child. He said this proposal would expand the backyard and complete an awkward projection. He said they would maintain the Craftsman style of the existing home.

Mr. Marshall Schneider, project architect, said they focused on adding development to the rear of the lot and adding detail on the front to bring proportion and alignment to all of the windows and doors on the front façade. He said they were under the height limit, maintained setbacks and respected the daylight plane.

Mr. Russell Dember, Menlo Park, said he lived three doors down and across the street from the subject property. He said he was not opposing this project but was speaking out about trends on Berkeley Avenue. He showed a photo of the north facing wall of the existing house. He said his interpretation of the blueprints was that this wall was 47-feet in length. He said it was fairly well obscured. He said there had been an oak tree in the corner of the neighbor's yard that had provided more screening but which had died. He said the research done by a former Council Member to streamline use permit processes found that the main concern residents have with two-story construction were large unarticulated monolithic walls. He said this wall would grow in the rear of the lot and as such was more of concern to an adjacent neighbor, but he was concerned this would set precedence for future development. He said this had happened in the past and there were still ill feelings in the neighborhood because of it.

Ms. Victoria Tracoming, Menlo Park, said her concern was with the wall. She said when this home was remodeled 20 years ago, the adjacent neighbor had indicated they were comfortable with the plan. She said after the project was built the neighbors were shocked to discover the sun no longer reached their living room and they moved away shortly after that. She said many of the long time residents on the street were shocked by that development. She said the wall on this property was not obscured for a good part of the year as the screening trees were

deciduous. She said the street trees did not provide any screening of the wall. She said this house was at the apex of a curve in the street with single-story homes on either side and this dramatized the feeling of the massive space. She said this proposal appeared to be a 30 percent increase of wall in the rear. She said it would be visible driving and walking down the street. She said no other homes on the street were built out to the maximum, and this proposal was only three foot shy of the maximum build out for this size lot. She said the house was massive and she thought the window details would bring more attention to the house.

Vice Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said he had approached the site from Highway 101 and the wall was massive. He said he appreciated the addition of the windows as that helped soften the view. He asked if any consideration had been made to stepping the second floor in for the rear addition. Mr. Poirier said the existing wall on the first floor would be strengthened and this would maximize the use of the space. He said stepping in the second story would reduce a considerable amount of square footage and to do that they would need to increase the foundation. Mr. Schneider said they looked at different areas to add space on the second story. He said the existing living room has a vaulted ceiling and they had considered putting the second story there but thought that would make the house look bulkier. He said they added the windows to break up the space.

Commissioner Kadvany said he thought the windows would make the wall look better. He said regarding future development and Mr. Dembar's concern that large walls should have to face other large walls, he noted this was the case in more urban areas. He said he did not think there would be a precedent to support future bad design. He said there was a space between the first three windows and the last three windows in which landscape screening could be used to improve the appearance. He said he was definitely against large swathes of blank walls.

Commissioner Goodhue said the applicant's window treatment and placing them higher up helped break up the wall. She said Mr. Dembar's photo showed the original problem with the project design. She asked if neighbors had ever approached the property owners with these concerns about the expanse of wall, and if that was built into how they addressed the project.

Mr. Poirier said the neighbor on that side of the house did not have any issues with their proposal. He said they had consulted with them to see if they would have any concerns and they did not. He said they also sat down with the other neighbor on the other side. Commissioner Goodhue suggested reaching a landscaping scheme in coordination with the neighbors to protect privacy and break up the expanse of wall.

Commissioner Kahle said the overall the design worked well but he understood the concern with the 12-foot extension on the second story. He said he did not think it would be that difficult to accomplish an offset for the second story and suggested they could add to the end of room to gain square footage.

Mr. Poirier said they had worked on the plans for six months and had looked at all ways to maximize the space, soften the aesthetic, provide room for their family and respect the culture in the neighborhood. He said bringing the walls in would make the home look blocky from the front.



Commissioner Kahle said his suggestion was to step in the second story only. Mr. Schneider said if the second floor was made narrower that would make the top portion of the back second story look quite tall. He said they would accept a condition to do some planting between the bathroom and rear windows. He said setting the second story in 18-inches in would not make much of a difference. He said they would do landscape planting for the larger part of the wall.

Commissioner Ferrick said that sounded acceptable and suggested the neighbor might plant a tree in the location where the oak tree had been. She said the project was not pushing toward the rear setback at all. She said she thought plantings on this property and on the neighbor's property, if they agreed, would work. She said they were not really adding a whole second story but squaring off the back in a pretty reasonable fashion.

Commissioner Ferrick moved to approve as recommended in the staff report with and added condition of trellis or planting to screen the wall expanse, and for the applicant to work with staff and the neighbors on a possible replacement tree for the oak. Commissioner Combs seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/Combs 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 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 Marshall Schneider, consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received June 8, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 29, 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.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise Sheets A0.1, A1.0, and A1.1, consistent with the boundary and topographic survey prepared by Roger E. Dodge, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. The project information table on Sheet A0.1 shall be revised showing the accurate lot area of 6,937.8 square feet and maximum building coverage of 2,428.2 square feet; Sheet A1.0 shall be revised to show a front setback of 20 feet, two inches; and Sheet A1.1 shall be revised to show a front setback of 20 feet, two inches, a left side setback of five feet, nine inches, a right side setback of five feet, 3 inches, a rear setback of 41 feet, as well as a six-foot public utility easement running along the rear of the property.
  - b. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the approved plans to indicate additional screening landscaping and/or a climbing plant trellis along the north (right) side elevation, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division. The landscaping shall be installed prior to final inspection of the building permit, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***
  - c. ***Prior to submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall consult with the owner(s) of 1035 Berkeley Avenue to consider planting a tree in the front left side yard of the 1035 Berkeley Avenue property, at the applicant's expense. The tree species may be chosen from the suggested list of heritage tree replacements provided by the City, or another species that will reach a mature height of greater than 30 feet. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating the tree location and species, or documentation that the property owner(s) at 1035 Berkeley Avenue elect, in writing, not to have a tree planted on their property or were non-responsive to the request. If a tree is to be planted, it shall be installed prior to final inspection of the building permit, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 5-1 with Commissioner Kahle in opposition and Commissioner Onken absent.

Vice Chair Strehl recused herself because of the proximity of her home to the project site.

Commissioner Combs served as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

**D4. Use Permit Revision/German-American International School/475 Pope Street:**

Request for a use permit revision to allow after-school child care to occur until 6:00 p.m. on a site that recently received use permit, architectural control, and sign review approval for a private school use on an approximately 3.9-acre site in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. The after-school child care component has been an integral part of the school's operation for over 20 years, and this component was erroneously omitted from the previous use permit application. No other changes to the educational program, school operations, or site improvements as previously approved. ([Attachment](#))

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Goodhue said in the original approval the Commission had approved after school activities up to 6 p.m. Planner Lin said that was correct. Commissioner Goodhue asked if procedurally that was not enough to approve the day care. Planner Lin said that was correct. She said what the Commission approved on May 18 was extracurricular activities on the grounds up until 6:00 p.m. and that did not specify after school child care.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about regulatory certification requirements for the child care. Planner Lin said that the school was not providing day care and rather these were school age children staying for after school activities and being supervised by school personnel until their parents were able to pick them up.

Commissioner Ferrick asked why the after school child care had to be spelled out differently than what was allowed in the original use permit. Planner Lin said that the application had not specifically called out the child care use and this revision was to make the clarification that the child care was included.

Public Comment: Ms. Camas Steinmetz, German-American International School, said this hearing was to correct an error in their project description letter and make it consistent with the use permit. She said this revision would explicitly specify child care as part of the extracurricular activities at this project site. She said their letter had erroneously indicated the child care would remain at their prior O'Connor site.

Acting Chair Combs closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Goodhue asked if the child care use was only during the school year. Ms. Steinmetz said that was correct and the campus was used during the summer for summer school. Commissioner Goodhue asked if there was child care during the summer school. Ms. Steinmetz said the German-American School of Palo Alto summer school was 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. with an after school component from 2 to 6 p.m. and that ran from mid-June through mid-July.

Commissioner Ferrick asked if this revision would change any other element of the use permit such as field use. Planner Lin said the school was still obligated to adhere to the agreement between the City and School District with respect to use of the playing fields.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 14 (Section 15314, "Minor Additions to Schools") 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 revision, subject to the following **standard, construction-related** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects + Engineers, consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received on May 11, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 18, 2015 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. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans for any off-site improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division, and the improvements must be completed prior to the start of the 2015-2016 school year.
  - e. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. Approve the use permit revision subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
  - a. A stop sign shall be installed on eastbound Elm Street at the intersection of Pope Street, subject to review of the Transportation and Engineering Divisions, and the improvements must be completed prior to the start of the 2015-2016 school year.
5. Approve the use permit revision subject to the following **ongoing, project-**

**specific** conditions:

- a. All student instruction and regular school activities shall be allowed to operate within the parameters identified in the table below:

Operator	Days of Week	Months of Year	Hours of Operation	Maximum Student Enrollment
<i>German-American International School</i>	Monday through Friday	August to June	8:20 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and extracurricular activities and child care program after school would run until 6:00 p.m.	400*
<i>German-American School of Palo Alto</i>	Saturdays	September to June	9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.	110
	Monday through Friday	Mid-June to Mid-August	9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.	90
			2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.	20
<i>Palo Alto French Education Association</i>	Tuesdays and Thursdays	September to June	4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.	40

\*Note: The maximum enrollment of 400 students shall follow the enrollment phasing schedule outlined below, provided that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the daily trip cap and parking demand is effectively managed on the subject site, as specified in conditions 5e and 5f below, prior to embarking onto the subsequent enrollment phase.

	Enrollment Phasing					
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phase 6
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>400</b>

Any increase in student enrollment and/or changes to the hours of operation shall require approval of a use permit revision by the Planning Commission.

- b. Activities held during the hours of operation on a school day are permitted and are not considered special events regulated by this permit. The following school activities are allowed to occur outside of normal school hours and days, and shall end by 10:00 p.m.:

*Intentionally left blank*

Event	Frequency/ Day(s)	Hours	Anticipated Attendance
Open Classrooms	Annually in August	10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.	50 people, staggered
Parents Evening (kindergarten to 4 <sup>th</sup> grades)	Annually in September	5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	80 people, staggered
Parents Evening (5 <sup>th</sup> to 8 <sup>th</sup> grades)	Annually in September	5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	80 people, staggered
Community Meeting	Annually in September	7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.	60 people
PS Game Night	Annually in October	5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	30 people
St. Martin's Parade	Annually in November	5:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	200 people
Open House	Annually in November	1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	50 people, staggered
Winter Fest	Annually in December	2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	200 people
Open House	Annually in January	1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	50 people, staggered
Pizza and Game Night	Annually in April	6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.	30 people
Community Meeting	Annually in May	7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.	60 people
Summer Fest	Annually in June	3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.	200 people
Dance	Twice a year, in January and May	6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.	60 people
Graduation	Annually in June, not anticipated until 2021	Evening	TBD

The applicant must obtain a Special Event permit for any major events that are not listed above.

- c. The applicant shall submit a copy of the student enrollment roster to the Planning Division for the purposes of verifying the student enrollment. The roster shall be submitted annually three months from the first day of the school year. The Planning Division shall return the roster to the school after completion of review. The City shall not make copies of the roster or disseminate any information from the roster to the public to the extent allowed by law.
- d. To the greatest extent possible, GAIS shall continue to promote and encourage families to carpool to school. GAIS shall implement the carpool program and monitor its progress.
- e. Normal operation of the school shall not exceed 920 daily trips. The applicant shall monitor the driveways accessing the site (i.e., primary driveway on Elm

Street, and secondary driveway leading to GAIS campus from Willow Oaks Elementary School's rear parking lot) over three (3) weekdays (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) in October and March of each school year, excluding holiday periods. The daily trip count shall be the average of the three weekday counts. The data from the traffic counts shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park Transportation Division in a report for review. The City may also choose to conduct its own monitoring if desired. If the monitoring shows that the trip cap is exceeded, then the applicant will have 60 days to prepare a revised Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that incorporates additional TDM measures, and an additional 60 days to implement the revised TDM program in order to bring the site into compliance with the daily trip cap. A subsequent monitoring will be conducted by the City after 60 days. If the subsequent monitoring indicates that the site still exceeds the daily trip cap, then the applicant will not be allowed to increase student enrollment for the subsequent school year and may also need to reduce student enrollment accordingly to bring the site into compliance with the daily trip cap. Non-compliance may also result in review of the use permit by the Planning Commission. Any proposed changes to the daily trip cap and/or enrollment cap will require a revision to the use permit.

- f. Based on the limited parking supply, the applicant shall manage the parking demand so that the parking of school-related vehicles will not overflow into the surrounding neighborhood. Staff observations and resident complaints will be used to determine if parking is impacting the neighborhood. If an overflow of parking is found to occur in the neighborhood, then the applicant will have 30 days to implement measures to reduce the school's parking demand and prevent parking in the neighborhood. If overflow parking continues to occur in the neighborhood after the 30 days, the applicant will not be allowed to increase student enrollment and may also need to reduce student enrollment in order to reduce the parking demand. Non-compliance may also result in review of the use permit by the Planning Commission.
- g. The existing pedestrian path from Willow Road to Pope Street that traverses through the subject site's parking lot shall continue to remain open and unobstructed.
- h. During normal operation of the school, school-related vehicles are not permitted to park on any public street or the Willow Oaks Park parking lot. During school events, the applicant shall minimize any parking overflow into the surrounding neighborhood.
- i. All student drop-off and pick-up shall occur within the subject site's parking lot. No students shall be dropped off or picked up along any public streets or the Willow Oaks Park parking lot.
- j. No outdoor sound amplification shall be directed towards the adjacent residences.

- k. The Community Development Director shall review any complaints received by the City regarding operation of the German-American International School or its sublessors. The Community Development Director and her/his designee shall work with the applicant and the neighbors to try to resolve such complaints, when possible. The Community Development Director shall have the discretion to bring complaints to the Planning Commission for review.
- l. The applicant shall comply with the relevant provisions of the Joint Use Agreement between the City and the Ravenswood City School District regarding the use of the playing fields.

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Onken absent and Commissioner Strehl recused.

## **E. STUDY SESSION**

There were no study session items.

## **F. REGULAR BUSINESS**

There were no regular business items.

- F1. New Agenda and Staff Report Format:** The Planning Commission will receive a brief update on pending changes to Commission/Council agenda and staff report formats. This item also provides an opportunity for Planning Commissioners to potentially provide comments on staff reports in general, for the consideration of staff as the other updates are undertaken. ([Attachment](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Rogers said this item did not require Commission action. He said that there were pending changes to the City's Council and Commission agenda and staff report formats that were scheduled to roll out in July. He said these were to improve the branding of the City and overall communications. He said one change would be to have a recommendation at the beginning of the report although not the complete recommendation. He said with the new format there was no room for the data table on the front page and that would be included as an attachment. He said Commissioner Strehl had communicated she benefitted from having the data table on the front page. He asked what the Commission liked or would prefer to see in staff reports and whether they were interested in electronic packets in the future.

Commissioner Kadvany said he liked the first page as it was presently formatted. He said the data table was important to the Commission's business to review the proposed project. He said the free space was valuable for his notes. He said he knew where to find important information, and he said he did not think it would be informative to have the recommendation on the front page. He said the user group which the Commission was should have been consulted before these changes were made. He said what was important for staff should be considered too.

Commissioner Goodhue said she supported streamlining and improvement. She said she uses the table on the first page for context and to see if the project was out of conformance beyond the nonconformance that required the project to have Commission review. She said she also liked to see if the proposed project brought things into conformance. She said she would like to have all of the names including staff's and a basic executive summary on the front page. She



said she would like to view agendas and reports on an iPad. She said she did not benefit from the 8 ½ x 11 plan sheets. She said she would like to see plans in hard copy with electronic files as a backup. She said she would prefer to get the packets earlier than the Friday morning before the Monday evening meeting. She said she would like to see at a high level the discussion between staff and applicants noting that sometimes applicants indicate staff has asked them to do something that a Commissioner was now asking them to remove or change. She said the Commission might disagree with staff but with more information staff and the Commission would seem more coordinated in their approaches with the applicants. She said she uses the project description site and circles the properties that have provided comments whether favorable or not. She asked if staff could do that on the map for the Commission. She said it would be good to get comments upfront and encourage applicants to do good neighborhood outreach. She said it would be helpful for them to get their materials in a binder with tabs to include the plans in a foldout.

Commissioner Ferrick said she must have the table on the first page as the information was a snapshot of what they would see in the rest of the packet, and informed her about what she needed to focus on in the report. She said she would not want to have to find it as an attachment and thought it could be included in the new template. She said the front content was critical to her.

Commissioner Kahle said he did not have a strong opinion on the packet noting he goes immediately to the plans. He said he agreed with Commissioner Goodhue that the 8 ½ x 11 plan sheets should be dumped and they should stick with the larger plan sheets.

Commissioner Combs said in journalism the lead was identified for a story. He said he thought the recommendation was the lead. He said he likes the 8 ½ x 11 plans.

Commissioner Kadvany said he liked the suggestion to have more interpretive commentary in the recommendation. He said sometimes he tried to read between the lines or later wished he had paid more attention to something, and the evolution of the context and topics discussed could be helpful. He said for the record that the Commission should have been consulted about this change and not had the change dictated to them.

Commissioner Goodhue said she liked to have tables and supported the idea to put the heritage trees proposed for removal in a table rather than in narrative format. She said that same table could show what trees were proposed as replacement.

Commissioner Combs asked if staff saw the Commission as the user group and if so the most important one. Senior Planner Rogers said the Commission was a key user group and the public was another key user group. He said the 8 ½ x 11 plans were part of the staff report for the public.

Commissioner Kadvany said the date on the front page should be spelled out and not written numerically. He said Community Development was in very large font and the rest was smaller font. He suggested Planning Commission should be a header of some kind. He said the recommendation should be at the bottom of the page. He said if a person was looking this up on the Internet they needed to see the date, address quickly.

Commissioner Ferrick said she would be absent July 20.

#### **G. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

There were no Commission Business items.

#### **H. INFORMATION ITEMS**

There were no information items.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 20, 2015