



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 12/14/2015
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

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

B. Roll Call

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

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Interim Principal Planner, Kyle Perata, Senior Planner, Tom Smith, Associate Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Interim Principal Planner Thomas Rogers reported that the City Council at their upcoming December 15 meeting would once again consider the bi-annual review of the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan and provide direction to staff. He noted in response to a question from Chair Onken that changes to the Plan would be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

As discussed at the previous meeting, the Commission will informally recognize projects in Menlo Park of interest. Commissioner John Kadvany reported on three such projects accompanied with a visual presentation. He said one project located on the corner of University and College Avenues was a beautiful restoration of the existing structure, originally built in 1923. He said this project showed what could be done without demolishing and rebuilding. He said another project on the corner of Middle and Yale Avenues that had been reviewed and approved by the Commission was a successful modular home that has generous landscaping and nice windows and materials. He said the third project, a house rebuild on Arbor Drive, which was also seen by the Commission, was quite different from anything in Menlo Park and was more like a 1930s home one would see in Pasadena or Long Beach, but that it worked in this location as well.

Commissioner Katherine Strehl reported she recently attended the City's subcommittee on rail meeting. She said the City was releasing a request for proposals for potential alternatives to the Ravenswood Avenue grade separation. She said there were also updates on the grant application for the Middle Avenue pedestrian crossing, high speed rail, the Dumbarton corridor, the rail trail, and the alternatives study particularly from Redwood City to the Facebook campus.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the November 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

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

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Lisa Chaplinsky/2355 Tioga Drive:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story residence and construct a two-story residence on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot width in the R-E-S (Residential Estate Suburban) zoning district. Three heritage trees, a 22-inch Canary Island pine, a 24-inch redwood, and a 17-inch coast live oak, are proposed for removal. The project also includes a request for excavation (removal of more than 12 inches of dirt) within the required rear setback associated with the construction of a retaining wall and driveway. ([Staff Report #15-034-PC](#))

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

Applicant Comment: Ms. Kathleen Liston, Moderna Homes, said the property, located in Sharon Heights, was an existing one-story ranch home with panoramic views of the area. She said they would use the existing footprint to take advantage of the views. She said there were a number of two-story homes in the area in a number of different styles. She said this proposed home was a modern farmhouse with modern forms and traditional elements. She said they were replacing a wood retaining wall in the setback. She provided information on the stone they were proposing to use.

Questions of Staff: In response to a question from Commissioner Larry Kahle, Ms. Liston said this was not a modular home although her firm has done modular homes in Menlo Park.

Commissioner John Kadvany said he had asked about the stone veneer. Noting that there were no windows on that side, he asked if they had thought about reorienting things. Ms. Liston said there would be landscaping screening in that area and there was a very large oak tree on the corner that would screen as well.

Chair Onken asked how the elevations were developed. Ms. Liston said they had worked from photographs.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Onken said the project was ambitious with interesting features and was an interesting use of a corner site. He said at first he thought the home was too close to the street in the rear but then realized it was so sharply against a hill that it really was not visible. He said his only concern was the front master bedroom and bathroom that were on the corner. He said although he liked contrasting the solid bits of stone with the farmhouse elements because this was right on the front of the house it looked like a bunker with little windows.

Commissioner Larry Kahle said this large home over 5,000 square feet was broken up into different massings. He said like Chair Onken he had a concern with the corner looking like a block with a few openings. He said other than that he thought it was a well-thought out design.

Commissioner Susan Goodhue said at first she was not used to seeing a farmhouse style on a hill. She said she had warmed to the project design and agreed that the rear elevation was not visible. She said regarding the front that she was growing accustomed to seeing lower one-story wall blocks in the front with the long volume and eyebrow and higher type windows. She said the oak tree would provide a nice foreground.

Commissioner Kadvany said the word “bunker” had gone through his mind looking at the front elevation, but he thought it had to do with materials. He said farmhouses were built with real stone and not stone veneer. He said most stone veneer similar to simulated divided light windows looked artificial. He said other than that the building was very attractive.

Chair Onken asked if the applicant was willing to work with a condition to change the corner. Ms. Liston said it was their professional opinion that they had worked very hard with their client to meet all their design criteria on how it looked from the street and meeting their privacy needs in the style they wanted. She said their inspiration for this project came from homes using stone and similar styles of massing. She said she was confident that with beautiful trees the elevations would work.

Commissioner Strehl asked about neighborhood outreach. Mr. Robert Chaplinsky, property owner, said all the neighbors know his wife and him. He said they sent all of their neighbors the elevations and a letter providing a construction time line. He said people were familiar with the quality of homes he builds. He said he just built a home with the same stone veneer that they would use on this project, and everyone who wanted to buy that home loved the stone. He said it was a warm, dove-white veneer. He said veneers looked fake if not properly applied. He said the mixture of stone, wood, and glass elements in this new transitional style was friendly and warm and not aggressively modern. Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Chaplinsky said he and his wife would live in the home.

ACTION: Motion and second (Combs/Kahle) to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Kadvany abstaining.

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 Moderna Homes, consisting of 20 plan sheets, dated received on December 2, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 14, 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 the site plan to specify heritage tree replacements for the 22-inch Canary Island pine, a 24-inch redwood, and 17-inch coast live oak to be removed, subject to review and approval of the City Arborist and Planning Division. The trees shall be planted prior to final inspection of the building permit, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

F2. Use Permit/Cheryl Cheng/760 Hobart Street:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story residence and construct a new two-story residence with a basement on a substandard lot as to lot width in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. *Item continued to a future meeting*

F3. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Heather Young for 765 University Drive, LLC/765 University Drive:

Request for a use permit and architectural control to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct four new dwelling units within two structures on an R-3 (Apartment) district parcel. The front building would have a ground-level parking garage with three units located on two floors above the parking garage. The rear building would be a detached two-story dwelling unit. As part of this proposal, a heritage size Douglas fir tree in fair-to-good condition (29 inches in diameter), located along the left-side property line is proposed to be removed. The proposed project would be designed to retain the heritage size coast live oak tree in good health (49 inches in diameter) located in the middle, rear portion of the site. *(Staff Report #15-035-PC)*

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Kyle Perata said a colors and materials board was being distributed to the Commission at the dais. He said since publication of the staff report, four

additional pieces of correspondence about the project had been received by the City. He said three of those were emails that have been sent to the Commission. He said two of the emails expressed concern about the removal of the Douglas fir tree, one email expressed support of the project and removal of the Douglas fir tree, and the last email that just came in expressed support for the project and the accessible design of the main building.

Questions of Staff: Chair Onken asked about the parking requirements and compliance.

Senior Planner Perata said the applicant was proposing parking that was in compliance with the R-3 zoning district. He said this parcel was unique in that it was in the R-3 greater than 10,000 square feet zoning district that has some different parking requirements. He said two parking spaces, one covered, was required for two or more bedroom units, and one-and-a-half parking spaces, one covered, were required for one-bedroom and studio apartments. He said with this project the two one-bedroom units have three parking spaces rather than four spaces.

Commissioner Kadvany said he had inquired about lessening the driveway width to the street from 22-feet and asked if there had been a response from the Transportation Division. Senior Planner Perata said the requirement for a multi-family unit driveway was 26-feet but had been reduced to the minimum required 22-foot, six-inch width due to the location of a utility pole.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Billy McNair, one of the property owners, said the property was within the apartment zoning district or R-3, which has a requirement for a minimum of four units on such property, noting the Housing Element adopted in 2013. He said they have been working with Fergus Garber Young Architects on the project for about 18 months. He said the largest constraint was a coast live oak centered widthwise and located about two-thirds into the depth of the parcel. He said the project was designed to look like a single-family home and was accessible on the first story with elevator service to all the other levels. He said they would plant 16 new trees, 11 of which would be 24-inch box trees. He said he had done extensive neighborhood outreach since 2014 and has held three different neighbor meetings. He said he worked closely with the single-family residential owner next to the project site.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Responding to Chair Onken, Senior Planner Perata said this was the first project to come forward under the increased density requirements from 2013 Housing Element.

Commissioner Ferrick asked about the rear building and its interface with the oak tree. Mr. McNair said the rear building was designed to minimize any need to prune any of the growth. He said the building was on the right of the tree where it had had fewer limbs. He said the rear structure was designed to fall under the canopy of the oak. Commissioner Ferrick asked if there were any concerns with a relatively tall building in the rear. Mr. McNair said on the right hand side the two story element faces the single-family residential property he had mentioned. He said they worked with that property owner on the window placement and she was very supportive of the project.

Commissioner Onken noted the 35-foot maximum height of the project and asked about the need for the interior ceiling heights of 10-feet, six-inches. Mr. McNair said part of this was for the elevator shaft but also to allow for more natural light into what were small units.

Commissioner Kahle said he has worked with Mr. McNair on other projects and had met with him on this project. He said he was concerned about the colors and thought something more eye-

catching was needed. He noted the elevator would face the street on the second story and asked if they would tone down the commercial look of the elevator door. He asked if they could modulate the tall concrete wall somehow.

Mr. McNair said they were trying to keep the color palette neutral and mix the materials to be a warm, cream tone. He said regarding the elevator door that it was located in the best place to provide privacy and he did not think it would be a steel commercial type door. He said they had discussed the concrete wall but with the garage door behind it, they were concerned with any opening that would provide a view into the garage. He said they would landscape with grasses and use creeping fig on the wall.

Commissioner Strehl said she also met with the applicant, and after having gone through the project with him, she was very comfortable with it. She said she liked the look and the density of the project.

Commissioner Kadvany questioned the required width of the driveway noting it was a waste of land. He said he has communicated with the Transportation Division and shared information on driving width standards from other agencies. He said the single-door garage door on this project was a good solution and the project was good looking. He said he liked the arborist report and the enthusiasm expressed about protecting the oak tree.

Commissioner Goodhue said the applicant had done a tremendous job working within the restraints such as parking requirements and garage turnaround.

Commissioner Kahle asked about construction parking. Senior Planner Perata said the Planning and Building Divisions would not typically require a plan for construction parking for a project this size.

In response to Commissioner Kahle, Mr. McNair said they would use the garage and the existing driveway for construction parking.

Commissioner Ferrick said she liked that there were four smaller units rather than two larger units as it was a type of housing needed and appreciated Mr. McNair's dedication to quality construction. She said the accessibility and elevator also broadened the appeal of the residences. She said she was somewhat concerned with the building height next to single-family homes but it was within regulations for the R-3 zoning district.

Chair Onken said the building would be 35-feet in height and would loom over the one-story bungalow next door. He said they needed community buy-in for this height. He said this type of architecture could be sublime or bunker-like. He suggested the ceiling heights could be nine-foot, which reduce the height by three feet making it much more palatable. He said he would either like to continue the application to improve fenestration and reduce the height or condition it for those things.

Commissioner Strehl said Mr. McNair had commented that these were small units and higher ceiling heights would make the units feel larger and more open. She said she would usually agree with Chair Onken about height but thought the ceiling height was well warranted for this project.

Chair Onken said his concern was the harm and impact to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ferrick said she agreed with both Chair Onken and Commissioner Strehl regarding the height. She said the difference for her was the project was in an R-3 zoning district rather than an R-1 neighborhood, but she thought it would look very tall.

Commissioner Kahle said he thought the project was well designed and he saw the point about the height. He said in his experience an interior 11-foot ceiling height was really tall. He suggested bringing the interior ceiling height down to 10 foot.

Commissioner Kadvany said he agreed with Commissioner Kahle. He said while a higher ceiling helped a small space that reducing that one foot would make a perceptible difference.

Commissioner Combs said he shared concerns about the height and that if approved they would hear from neighbors at some point. He said however this was an area where higher density was wanted and this project was transitional and so might draw criticism.

Mr. McNair said that the height steps back and the height was in the interior of the unit. Chair Onken said except for the elevator or cut in for the balconies that the parapet was 35 feet in height all around the building.

Ms. Heather Young, Fergus Garber Young Architects referred to page A3.4 showing the building steps back from the front façade so the entire envelope was not 35-feet high. She said page A3.2 showed the large terrace on the third floor where the mass of the building height also steps back, and noted that the two-story rear unit did not even get close to 35 feet in height.

Chair Onken said the front façade and the most public face of the building was 35-foot height that was built up with garage height, podium construction, 10-foot, six-inch ceiling height, and a parapet. He said if there was a public concern that this building as too tall there were opportunities to reduce the height. Ms. Young said the garage was the minimum allowable height to provide clearance for emergency vehicles. She said the interior ceiling heights were intended to bring as much light into the units and a view of the sky as possible.

Mr. McNair said a large two-story multi-family unit was located on the left side of the project property. He said the zoning ordinance allowed for height of 35 feet. He said if he reduced the height and in the future 35-foot high buildings were built on either side that would impact his building. He said they were not asking for an exception or variance.

Commissioner Kadvany said that all of the sides of the buildings were interesting and attractive. He asked if the height was reduced somewhat, if that would impact the windows. Ms. Young said they would change.

Chair Onken said the fenestration worked well in the front but the rest of the windows were mildly arbitrary. He said he thought they could be reworked and the height lowered without any diminution of the project.

Commissioner Goodhue said the project was within the maximum height for this zoning district and agreed with Commissioner Combs that this was a transitional project, and there would be growing pains. She said the applicant has demonstrated that they have worked very well with the existing neighbors, some of whom lived in single-story residences. She said this project might stick out for a while, but the developer was doing exactly what they wanted developers in this area to do as

intended in the Specific Plan. She said it was a very well designed project, and the articulation on each side and on the back was well done.

Commissioner Kahle said it was a well-designed project. He said however they were used to seeing a maximum height at a ridge that then slopes away but here they would see the bulk of the building at the height limit. He moved to approve as designed with a modification to require a reduction of one foot in height or six-inches less in height on each floor.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the applicant could provide that flexibility in the design. Mr. McNair said at every turn from the oak tree to the parking requirements over the past 18 months they have somehow managed to fit the project within the zoning ordinance regulations. He said that ordinance provides for 35-foot height and they were within the maximum and not requesting variances. He said he did not think a reduction of one foot in height would change the public's opinion about this building.

Commissioner Kadvany said this project was designed to the maximum height but everything was mitigated in relation to it.

Commissioner Strehl said as the motion made by Commissioner Kahle had no second, she would move to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Goodhue) to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-1 with Commissioner Onken opposing.

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. Make findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

4. 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 Fergus Garber Young, Architects, consisting of 28 plan sheets, dated received December 3, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 14, 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. The existing curb inlet shall be converted to a junction box and the applicant shall install a new curb inlet per the City's standards.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating the removal of the existing curb, gutter, and sidewalk and installation of new curb, gutter, sidewalk, and planting strip per City standards along the entire property frontage. 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.
 - h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit, the applicant shall update the plans to indicate the removal of the existing driveway and the installation of a new driveway per City standards.
 - i. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, if applicable, the applicant shall document compliance with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) in effect at the time of building permit submittal.
5. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
 - a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) at the rate for multi-family dwellings, subject to the Municipal Code Section 13.26. The fee rate is subject to change annually on July 1 and the final calculation will be based upon the rate at the time of fee payment. The TIF rate is adjusted each year based on the ENR Construction Cost Index percentage change for San Francisco. The current estimated fee is \$4,568.59.

- b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the plans to identify the species of the proposed street tree. The species and location will be subject to review and approval of the Planning and Engineering Divisions and City Arborist.
- c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an updated arborist report that evaluates the possibility of utilizing Silva Cell modular pavement suspension system during construction to aid in the regrowth of cut roots, subject to review and approval of the City Arborist, Building, and Planning Divisions.

F4. Use Permit/OMT Therapeutics, Inc./1490 O'Brien Drive:

Request for a use permit for the use and storage of hazardous materials associated with the research and development of therapeutics for the treatment of cancer and infectious diseases, located in an existing building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. All hazardous materials would be used and stored within the building. ([Staff Report #15-036-PC](#))

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

Applicant Comment: Mr. John Tarleton, Menlo Business Park, introduced Mr. Wim van Schooten with OMT Therapeutics.

Mr. van Schooten, Chief Scientific Officer, said their team was developing next generation therapies involving protein bodies to treat cancer and infectious diseases. He said they planned to bring their research to clinical trials in 2018.

Chair Onken opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Goodhue said the staff report indicated that the applicant has been doing the same research in another location within Menlo Park.

Commissioner Ferrick thanked Ms. Ellen Ackerman, Green Environment, Inc., for her great report and noted the approvals from the regulatory agencies.

ACTION: Motion and second (Ferrick/Strehl) to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Green Environment, Inc., consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received December 9, 2015, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 14, 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 applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.
- e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
- f. If the business discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire unless a new business submits a new hazardous materials business plan to the Planning Division for review by the applicable agencies to determine whether the new hazardous materials business plan is in substantial compliance with the use permit.

G. Informational Items

G1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

- Regular Meeting: January 11, 2016
- Regular Meeting: January 25, 2016
- Regular Meeting: February 8, 2016

H. Adjournment

Chair Onken adjourned the meeting at 8:39 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Interim Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on January 25, 2016