



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 11/16/2015
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair John Onken called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Drew Combs, Katie Ferrick, John Kadvany, Larry Kahle, John Onken and Katherine Strehl

Absent: Susan Goodhue

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Interim Principal Planner, Michele T. Morris, Assistant Planner, Tom Smith, Associate Planner, Kyle Perata, Associate Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Interim Principal Planner Rogers reported the City Council had given direction that for a trial basis most of the downtown plaza parking would have three hours free parking and most parking on the downtown streets would have 90-minute limit. He said exceptions to the three-hour parking were for lots near grocery stores such as Draeger's and Trader Joe's. He said the Council at their November 17 meeting would continue its El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Review. He said that the recommendation made by the Commission at its October 2 meeting to establish a fund to receive public benefit payments from Specific Plan development projects to be used for Specific Plan public projects had been added to the other Specific Plan recommendations previously made by the Commission for the Council's review.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the October 19, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Ferrick) to approve the minutes; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Goodhue absent.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Daniel Warren/120 Chester Street:
Request for a use permit to determine the Floor Area Limit (FAL) of a lot with less than 5,000 square feet of area, associated with the construction of a rear addition to an existing single-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. ([Staff Report #15-025-PC](#))

Assistant Planner Morris said staff had no additions to the written report.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Daniel Warren, Warren Design, said the project was an addition to the rear of the home for a great room and master bedroom, interior renovation, and a front façade update within the Craftsman style prominent in that neighborhood.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. He closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick said the proposal was very thoughtful, reasonable and acceptable.

Commissioner Kahle said the front façade at the gable seemed crowded and suggested it would look nice as an open gable. Mr. Warren said he would speak with the property owner about that, but noted it seemed a reasonable request.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Onken) to approve the use permit as recommended by staff with the following modification; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Goodhue absent.

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 Warren Design, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received November 5, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 16, 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. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- f. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

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 have the flexibility to submit revised plans for an open gable at the front entry subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.*

F2. Use Permit/Ying-Min Li/1980 Santa Cruz Avenue:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot area and lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. In addition, one heritage plum tree (15.9-inch diameter), in poor condition, at the front right side of the property, and one heritage privet tree (17.9-inch diameter), in poor condition, at the rear left side of the property, would be removed. ([Staff Report #15-026-PC](#))

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

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Dick Hartman, Hometec Architecture, said they had met with neighbors and a number of them were pleased that the existing dilapidated home would be replaced. He said it was unfortunate about the trees they would need to remove but their health had deteriorated due to the drought and lack of maintenance.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. He closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Onken said that the proposed project fit within the standards but he thought it was slightly off the mark, noting the awkwardness of the convergence of the hip roofs above the large picture windows and the eave returns.

Commissioner Kahle said it was a large house, and having 10-foot ceilings on the first floor increased the massing. He said nine-foot ceilings were very workable. He agreed with Chair Onken's comment about the eave ends. He suggested they could add a different material to break up all the board and batten siding. He said the windows on the drawings were labeled as Anderson, which he assumed meant wood windows but the details seemed to indicate metal or vinyl windows.

Mr. Hartman said the window would be Anderson vinyl-clad wood windows with wood trim. He said they could change the closed eaves.

Chair Onken noted the arched picture windows that have the hip roof converging just above their center and asked if that was intentional. Mr. Hartman said the first floor was hipping all around the building for a consistent line, which resulted in the roof meeting the second story wall. He said the priority was having the gutter wrap around the first floor roof. Chair Onken said that different windows could resolve that. Mr. Hartman said those were egress windows so he could not raise the sill much more. Chair Onken suggested they could be narrower and two windows rather than just one. Mr. Hartman said they could raise the casement. Chair Onken asked about the material questions raised by Commissioner Kahle. Mr. Hartman said they were using a consistent Hardy panel board and bat.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if pervious pavers were being used. Mr. Hartman said they could use pervious pavers.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about replacement trees. Mr. Hartman said they could add trees noting they did not have a landscape plan at this time. Commissioner Ferrick said she appreciated there were minimal windows on the sides of the home as that provided privacy. She said it was standard to encourage landscape screening between properties, and suggested that they plant a few more trees on the lot and provide landscape screening between the project and neighbor homes.

Chair Onken said Commissioner Kahle had mentioned the 10-foot ceilings that created massing and asked if they had considered a nine-foot eave line. Mr. Hartman said the 10-foot ceiling was very desirable in the marketplace. He said they set back the second story all around to reduce the massing.

Commissioner Kahle noted the prominence of the project site on Santa Cruz Avenue and suggested the project be continued for design improvements.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Strehl, Associate Planner Smith said with the upcoming holidays and pacing of the upcoming meetings that he thought January might be the earliest the project could return to the Commission.

Commissioner Ferrick said with the change of tree canopy on the site the project needed a more detailed plan as to how replacement trees and screening would be addressed.

Chair Onken moved to continue the project with direction for a more descriptive landscape plan showing landscape screening on the sides and location of replacement trees, a revision to the mass and bulk of the proposed design which might simply mean dropping the eave line at the first floor by reducing the ceiling height to nine foot, and to create more finesse with architectural details noting the awkwardness with the windows landing on flashing.

Commissioner Ferrick said one logical place to replace trees was where the privet currently was so that the second story of this home would not overlook the neighbor's backyard as much while avoiding the canopy of the valley oak. She suggested plantings on the other side to protect the view of the other neighbor's yard as well.

Commissioner Kahle seconded the motion by Chair Onken.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Kahle) to continue the project with direction including the following; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Goodhue absent:

- Reduce the massing and bulk of the proposed home
- Revise architectural details to solve awkwardness of the location of the hip roofs and large picture windows and closed eaves
- Provide landscape detail to show location and number of replacement trees, and screening on both sides of the property.

F3. Use Permit Revision/John A. Matthews, Jr./900 Cambridge Avenue:

Request for a use permit revision to add approximately 45 square feet to the right-side of the existing residence for a new bay window extension on both the first and second levels, and reconfigure the interior floor area. The existing two-story nonconforming residence received a use permit in February 2010 and the proposed modifications require a use permit revision. The project is located in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #15-027-PC](#))

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

Applicant Comment: Mr. Tom Wandless, property owner, said for their 2010 project they had replaced nearly all of the foundation of the home. He said essentially they were replacing the rest of the foundation that they had used for storage during their remodel. He said the architect suggested doing this bay window extension.

In reply to Commissioner Kahle, Mr. Wandless said they spoke with the neighbors and showed them the floor plan. He said they had expressed support.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. He closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick said the project was reasonable, and moved to approve. Commissioner Kahle seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Ferrick/Kahle) to approve the use permit request as recommended by staff; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Goodhue absent.

1. 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 John Matthews Architects, consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received on November 4, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 16, 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. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

- F4. Use Permit/City of Menlo Park/Kelly Park (100 Terminal Avenue):
Request for a use permit to allow up to nine recurring special events (three concerts, five movie nights, and the annual Egg Hunt) per year at Kelly Park. The Egg Hunt would generally occur around the Easter holiday and takes place typically between 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. on a Saturday and the concerts would generally occur in August and September, from approximately 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Concerts are anticipated to take place on a weeknight, typically Tuesday evenings. The potential movie nights would generally occur on Thursday evenings in June and July. The events would use amplified sound, which may exceed Noise Ordinance limits and would include associated activities, such as food trucks. ([Staff Report #15-028-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Perata said staff had no additions.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle asked about the location of the stage as relating to a Suburban Park neighbor's letter expressing concern with the level of noise and suggesting relocating the stage. Associate Planner Perata said it had to do with the size of the stage and that it was trucked into the site. He said where it was located, in the parking lot facing the field, was due to the access needed to bring it into the site.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Bridget Matheson said she works with Community Services and has been doing the Egg Hunt since 2009. She said the music in the park was a fairly new event that started in 2013 and was basically the wish of the Belle Haven community and has been fun. She said they wanted to provide more activities as desired by the community.

Responding to a question from Chair Onken, Ms. Matheson said that she had not received any complaints or concerns about the concerts since 2013 and in fact was asked by residents if the City could provide more concerts.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kahle, Ms. Matheson said the concerts took place from 6 to 8 p.m. She said an R&B group, Salsa group, and Reggae group were scheduled for 2016.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Combs, Ms. Matheson said the movie night was a new idea that had not yet been fully realized. She said they wanted to do it there and would need to determine where the screen would be located. She said they could look into addressing the concern about noise. She said for the second 2015 concert, which was an R&B group, they had

about 200 people. She said they found attendance was better on Tuesdays rather than on the Thursdays they had been scheduled formerly.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. He closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Onken moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Ferrick seconded the motion. She said a neighbor in Suburban Park had written that if there was a way to reduce the volume of the concerts slightly that would be good. She said she supported the activities.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Ferrick) to approve the use permit request as recommended by staff; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Goodhue absent.

1. 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** condition:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the project plans and project description letter, provided by the applicant, dated September 22, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 16, 2015 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division

G. Study Session

- G1. Study Session/Pollock Realty Corporation/1400 El Camino Real:
Request for a study session for the public benefit bonus proposal associated with the architectural control request to construct a new 63-room hotel consisting of four stories and an underground parking level on an approximately half-acre site in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposed development would be at the Public Benefit Bonus level, which would exceed the Base level floor area ratio (FAR) on the subject site. The public benefit bonus proposal includes the contribution of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenues to the City on an on-going basis. No actions will take place at this meeting, but the study session will provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission and the public to become more familiar with the proposal and to provide initial feedback on the applicability of the Public Benefit Bonus. ([Staff Report #15-029-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Interim Principal Planner Rogers said he was standing in for Jean Lin, Associate Planner, the staff lead for this project proposal. He said correspondence was received from Ms. Lorraine Moriarity, Director of the Society of St. Vincent DePaul of San Mateo County, noting interactions with the project design team and the potential of this project sharing structural walls. He said generally the project was on track for the public benefit bonus. He said a fiscal impact study was done by an independent consultant who indicated \$600,000 per year TOT would be generated to the City from this project. He said even in a low economic phase the study indicated

TOT contribution to the City from the project would be in the \$400,000 range. He said the study session was required for public benefit bonus projects and the Commission was asked to consider and comment on that and the architectural control for the project.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle commented on the use of TOT as a public benefit and asked if that applied to other hotels as well. Interim Principal Planner Rogers said that TOT was an inherent public benefit that the project would provide and not that the project would add extra TOT. He said the another hotel use that tripped the public benefit bonus was the Marriott Residence Inn that converted an existing building and in doing so was just a fraction over the public benefit threshold. He said the Planning Commission and City Council in the 2013 timeframe approved that conversion of an existing use at the public benefit bonus level. He said that was a 127-room hotel and thus had greater TOT; however this hotel was for a different market with a higher room rate, and in the end the TOT provided by the different hotels might be comparable.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Jeff Pollock, representing Pollock Realty Corp, and Pollock 1400 ECR LLC or the Boutique Hotel LLC, introduced Mr. Ross Edwards, their construction and design advisor. He said they were requesting a 1.5 FAR bonus, which would be 33,750 square feet of conditional use plus 17,600 square feet of below grade parking. He noted the proposed pavilion in front of the project along El Camino Real and a courtyard with a 72-inch diameter oak and space for outdoor events and outside seating/standing for patrons of the hotel's restaurant and bar. He said the underground stackable parking would accommodate 72 cars and there would be valet parking. He said regarding justification for the additional FAR that the base zoning FAR was 1.1 and that would be 24,750 square feet. He said to be a viable hotel they needed the 1.5 FAR mainly because this was a small .5 acre site and they needed a flexible way to activate the ground floor and make it economically viable with a restaurant and event space. He said the fiscal impact study indicated about \$604,000 in TOT annually and it would be an ongoing revenue source. He said the hotel would increase vibrancy in the downtown noting that it had a premier location close to Caltrain and was within walking distance to the downtown, and would create additional foot traffic and interaction with the community. He said they have committed to dedicating a right-hand turn lane from Glenwood Avenue onto El Camino Real to improve traffic efficiency at this key intersection. He said landscape plans for the setback area would dramatically improve the façade and this corner property. He said the sidewalk on Glenwood Avenue would be improved, widened and provide outdoor seating. He said they would improve the curb and gutters on both frontages. He said the project would provide economic stimulus for the community. He said they would be LEED silver equivalent. He said regarding community advocacy that he and his father have been active members of the community for 50 years; they would check in with the big local employers and find out what they needed in a boutique hotel; they would provide a nice ambience with music and entertainment at the site; and they would refer back and promote local businesses. He said they considered that if they did the project right they could bring eight to ten, and even 12 million in TOT over the next 10 years for the City.

Chair Onken opened public comment. He closed public comment.

Commission Comments: Commissioner Kahle noted the 16-inch oak tree over the basement. Mr. Ross Edwards said they were working with their arborist and would dig a pit to accommodate the tree and there would not be a lift at that location.

Discussion ensued about the parking garage and stacking system. The applicants indicated that parking would be valet only, that there would be signage to keep cars from advancing past a

certain point, parking there would be for the restaurant as well, and describe the flow to make the parking work.

Commissioner Kahle said it seemed the building would appear monolithic and as it was on a prominent corner building would something to alleviate that. He said rather than the steel pavilion at the entry lobby he would like to see something more dramatic there as the focal point. Mr. Edwards said they didn't like the sloped braces and that would change. He said the port cochere would get fatter as an element. He said Planning staff had indicated architectural detail was needed and they were in the process of changing their design plans.

Mr. Pollock said he would like to meet his design team to meet with the Commission sooner rather than later as they would like to get even more specific input. He said they met with neighbors recently mainly about shoring and tie back arrangements. He said they would do whatever they could to address any privacy concerns.

Commissioner Ferrick said the project was on the right track and would help activate El Camino Real and the downtown. She suggested they strive for LEED gold or better noting that LEED silver essentially met state building code. Mr. Pollock said it made sense to strive for that and they would like to do so within their budget. She said she supported the 1.5 FAR as the project was located at the best place for that – a busy intersection with proximate transit. She said a hotel in the Plan area was essentially a public benefit in the sense that it would generate revenue for the City annually. She said she liked the local network and relationships. She said she would just like greater environmental sustainability including water and energy efficiencies.

Commissioner Kadvany said the TOT was a major part of what could be counted as public benefit. He said the question was whether the TOT funds would go into the Plan area, which was preferable, or into the City's general fund, which was less preferable. He said the street level of the building looked pretty interesting and noted the curtain wall element. He said the building above the first floors looked very linear and that the hotel needed a more interesting design. He said a functional concern was for the corner windows noting if those were for rooms, the view would be of Camino Real, and only private if the curtains were closed. He said they needed a better look noting they were getting the bonus level FAR. He said the rear façade also needed improvement.

Mr. Edwards said the project was a hotel and articulation impacted room size. He said they were working with the minor and major building setbacks required under the Specific Plan. He said the building would be rectangular. He said facing Glenwood Avenue, the rooms would have brise soleil louvers. He said the rooms facing the courtyard would have the best view and they would maximize the glass there.

Commissioner Kadvany said if they couldn't change the structure they would have to find a solution to improve the look of the hotel.

Mr. Pollock said they would be changing the colors and were using wood product with a rich color. He said they would like to meet with their architect and see what could be done on this .5 acre lot. He said the rooms were already at 338 square feet. He said they would like to get comments from the Commissioner early on as they further developed the design.

Chair Onken said the rendering showed something mundane that looked like many other hotels along El Camino Real. He said the drawing on the screen looked different. He said he agreed that

they all wanted a hotel that impressed people. He suggested they might be able to modulate the parapet to create interest. He discussed with the applicants his concerns about the area traffic conditions and the impact of this building's access and egress on that. The applicants indicated they had a traffic consultant working with them and were providing the dedicated right-turn lane.

Commissioner Combs said generally he thought the project was nice. He said that the applicants were getting a bonus whose value was not being shared with the City. He said he was not sure whether TOT should be the public benefit. Mr. Pollock said it was in the Specific Plan and the City would get 12% the first year whether the project worked or failed. Mr. Edwards said the other benefit was the vitalization the hotel would bring. He said there would an incredible restaurant at the site.

Commissioner Kahle said he also was concerned that TOT was the only public benefit. He asked if there was space they could offer to the public at least once a year. Mr. Pollock said they were very charitable and could perhaps offer to host a State of the City event in the future, or some non-profit use. He said they were very community oriented and were open to ideas.

Commissioner Strehl said the public benefit of this project was the TOT, and over 10 years could possibly be \$7,000,000 to the City, which was more than any Specific Plan project's contribution of public benefit that they had seen thus far. She said also they were installing a dedicated right lane onto El Camino Real that was an investment for the public, and they would pay into the BMR housing fund. She said she was not uncomfortable with the public benefit. She asked about the laundry. Mr. Pollock said it would be taken offsite.

Commissioner Kadvany said he liked Chair Onken's suggestion to do something interesting with the roofline. He said the area above the port cochere and lobby seemed to create negative space that needed something to enhance it. He mentioned the sculptural solution of the Café Borrone building. Mr. Pollock said they were striking a balance between modern and traditional, and would use rich materials and lighting that would hold its value over time.

Commissioner Ferrick said she wanted to see a greater investment in sustainability features. She said that added cost to the project which she saw as public benefit in assisting the City to get closer to its net zero greenhouse emissions goal. She asked about Ms. Moriarity's concern regarding foundation work. Mr. Pollock said they had met with Ms. Moriarity and would continue to do so but at this point they had not discussed the shoring. He said she has a facility person with whom they would speak about the shoring and any privacy concerns she might have.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the stairway on the corner as he felt it was very prominent and tall. Mr. Edwards said they had worked on several iterations of the location of the stairway with staff. He said it has been rotated, moved back, would have a 42 to 48 inch wall, and be gated. Commissioner Kahle asked what the feature at the top was. Mr. Edwards said it was probably a railing but they had not detailed it yet, and would get back to the Commissioner about.

Commissioner Combs wanted to clarify that he well knew TOT was a public benefit that hotels provide. He said his concern was that public benefit was something that should be discussed and it should not be always assumed that TOT was sufficient.

Chair Onken said also public benefit was getting a quality structure. He said people would be okay with the four stories as long as they thought the project was worthwhile.

Commissioner Kadvany said he did not think the building had any personality and he thought that was what needed.

Interim Principal Planner Rogers said their Economic Development Manager Jim Cogan was present as well. He summarized the Commission's comments as follows:

- Generally more support than not (noting one Commissioner was absent) for TOT being the primary public benefit
- Design suggestions independent of public benefit
- Also the ideas that design could be tied to public benefit and quality design was an example of that
- Individual Commissioner suggestions of sustainability being a public benefit element as well as opening up the public spaces to the public more formally
- More Commissioners than not indicated design fundamentals could be solid but additional interest and thought were needed for the corner treatment, other prominent spots and rear facade.

Chair Onken said he would like the applicants to stay open to the possibilities and through staff to share with Commissioners what they are developing.

Interim Principal Planner Rogers said applicants could meet individually with Commissioners, if the Commissioners had time and interest, while developing their design as long as the applicants and Commissioners did not report to each other what the other Commissioners were saying to be compliant with public meeting laws.

H. Informational Items

- H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.

- Regular Meeting: December 7, 2015
- Regular Meeting: December 14, 2015

I. Adjournment

Chair Onken adjourned the meeting at 9:19 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Interim Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on December 14, 2015