



## Regular Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 2/8/2016  
**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:** Combs, Ferrick, Goodhue, Kadvany, Kahle, Onken (Chair), Strehl (Vice Chair)

**Absent:** None

**Staff:** Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Senior Planner; Tom Smith, Associate Planner

### C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers reported that the City Council at its February 9, 2016 meeting would consider an informational item on a water supply assessment process that was underway for ConnectMenlo and Facebook projects; an appeal of the imposition of a Transportation Impact Fee by the Bright Angel preschool on Bay Road whose use permit was approved by the Planning Commission previously; and a potential schedule adjustment for the ConnectMenlo project to possibly include more topic area discussions.

Commissioner Katherine Strehl said with a proposed schedule change for ConnectMenlo there might be a Saturday meeting to provide information. She said public feedback had been that the volume of information was such that people needed more time to consider everything that was being proposed. Principal Planner Rogers noted that there might be one meeting on the weekend or a series of weeknight meetings with a revised schedule.

### D. Public Comment

There was none.

### E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the January 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Chair Onken said there were suggested edits received from Commissioners Susan Goodhue and John Kadvany.

Commissioner Katie Ferrick moved to approve the January 11 meeting minutes with the suggested revisions. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

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

- Page 1, under “Reports and Announcements”, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Replace “Encinal Drive” with “Encinal Avenue”
- Page 1, under “Reports and Announcements”, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line: Replace “Encinal Drive” with “Encinal Avenue”
- Page 1, under “Reports and Announcements”, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last line: Replace “Commissioner” with “Commission”
- Page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line: Replace “roof” with “roof styles”
- Page 4, 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line: Replace “bum pouts” with “bumps outs”
- Page 8, 8<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Insert “garage” after “...prominence of the”

- E2. Architectural Control/Chris Hall/1029 El Camino Real: Request for architectural control to allow modifications to the façade of an existing commercial building in conjunction with a restaurant use in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The existing second floor would be reconfigured to include a dining area, but the gross floor area for the building would not increase as part of the project. ([Staff Report #16-006-PC](#))

Commissioner John Kadvany pulled the item from the consent agenda. He noted the outdoor heating elements and asked if there was outdoor dining. Mr. Chris Hall, project architect, said the heating was for the comfort of customers who might need to stand in line waiting to be seated.

Commissioner Larry Kahle asked what the difference was between the existing sign on the property and the new sign. Mr. Hall said there was a design for a blade sign to be visible to traffic coming in both directions on El Camino Real.

Chair Onken asked if there was any public comment. There was not.

Chair Onken moved to approve the item as recommended. Commissioner Susan Goodhue seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report, passes 7-0.

1. Make findings with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that the proposal is within the scope of the project covered by the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, which was certified on June 5, 2012. Specifically, make findings that:
  - a. The project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current CEQA Guidelines.
  - b. Relevant mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment F), which is approved as part of this finding.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:

- a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
  - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
  - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
  - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
  - e. The development is consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, as verified in detail in the Standards and Guidelines Compliance Worksheet (Attachment E).
3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Eaton Hall Architecture, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received February 1, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 8, 2016 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, Recology, 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. 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.
  - e. Prior to commencing any construction activities in the public right-of-way or public easements, including, but not limited to, installation of the proposed canopy over the public sidewalk, the applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
4. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing rooftop mechanical installations are screened from view from publicly accessible spaces, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Any citation or notification of violation by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the sale of alcoholic beverages will be grounds for considering revocation of the architectural control.

- c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans showing a cover over the existing trash enclosure in the adjacent private parking lot located at the southeast corner of Menlo Avenue and Johnson Lane, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and Engineering Division.

## **F. Public Hearing**

- F1. Use Permit/Andrea Henry/605 Cotton Street:  
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and build a two-story, single-family residence with a basement on a substandard lot with regard to width in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban) zoning district. In addition, one heritage fruitless mulberry tree (16.2-inch diameter), in poor condition, at the left side of the property would be removed. ([Staff Report #16-008-PC](#))

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

Applicant Comment: Ms. Peony Quan, opq Design, introduced the property owners, Andrea and Brian Henry, and noted neighbors in attendance in support of the project. She said the existing single-story ranch house was built in the 1950s and that the existing house and guest house both intruded into the side setback. She said their proposal would bring the structures into compliance with side yard setback requirements. She said the project would be a stucco home with anodized aluminum windows. She said rectangular pavers with gray stained wood detailing would be used in the front. She noted in working with Planning staff that they decided to change the garage door to a gray stained wood door.

Ms. Andrea Henry, property owner, said they had spoken with their neighbors about the design. She said it was contemporary, but restrained.

Commissioner Strehl said the garage protruded from the front of the house and asked how far. Ms. Quan said about four and a half feet.

Chair Onken said the rendering did not show the roof slope. Ms. Quan said the roof pitch was quite gentle. She said the slope was shown on the second rendering where the high point of the house was at the rear of the property sloping down toward the front. Chair Onken said the rendering indicated the roof would be about four inches thick. Ms. Quan said it should show an eight inch projection. Chair Onken said the windows seemed to go up to the soffit and he suggested that in reality there would be something above the windows. Ms. Quan said the windows would go as high as possible to the junction.

Commissioner Kahle asked if they had considered any other roof lines besides the shed roof. Ms. Quan said originally they had considered a flat roof and decided on a bit of a slope as that was more preferable to the property owners. She said they did not want anything to raise the height of the house.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Ferrick said she appreciated the side setbacks being brought into conformance. She said generally the screening between properties was good for privacy except for a gap between the subject property and 619 Cotton Street. She asked if they would be amenable to planting some type of vegetation screening in that area.

Ms. Quan said they definitely supported lush landscaping and trees to protect privacy.

Commissioner Kahle said he understood they were seeking the minimal aesthetic but he thought it was boxy and there was too much mass with the second story side walls.

Commissioner Ferrick said it seemed the applicants were using high quality materials for their windows and garage door. She asked the applicants to address their architectural intent.

Ms. Quan said they definitely were not interested in a more minimal developer approach to a stucco building. She said the structure would be as refined as possible and noted that stucco was a good ecological material. She said they would use four simple materials in a restrained and not overly complex way which would work well with the landscaping and the neighborhood.

Chair Onken said bedroom 3 in the rear had a large window looking directly across the property line, and asked what the views were. Ms. Quan said along that side of the house they were planning to have a row of trees that would be at least 10-feet in height.

Commissioner Andrew Combs said for the record that staff brought up two items with the applicants including the garage panel door and that the garage protruded from the front of the house, and the right side setback and elevation. He asked what changes they had considered based on staff's recommendations. Ms. Quan said they changed the garage door to a wood door and raised it to nine-feet in height as staff had indicated it looked too squat. She said they wanted to show on the right side the vegetation as well as the wood fence that would run the length of that side as well as the windows to break up the expanse of stucco.

Chair Onken said he thought the home would look better than what the renderings indicated. He said it was unfortunate to have a double garage door at the street but he could support the project as proposed.

Commissioner Ferrick noted the side setbacks were more than 10-foot in width. She said she could approve with a condition to provide screening between this subject property and 619 Cotton Street.

Commissioner Kahle said he thought the project design needed more refining and that it would look boxy when built. He said the massing of the second story walls needed attention.

Commissioner Combs said that the prominence of the garage was usually what the Commission did not support and that was not addressed with changing the type of garage door and staining it gray.

Commissioner Strehl said she did not know what could be done to change the garage that would not also impact the design of the house.

Chair Onken said Cotton Street has spectacular homes. He said the Commission typically did not support prominent front facing garages. He asked if there was some modulation of the second story that could occur noting the expanse of the second story front façade. Ms. Quan said they were open to different garage door materials. She said they did not see a problem with the one plane of the second story front façade as the mass was broken with wood details and different sized windows. She said they could consider slight projections of the windows where the bathrooms were as that would not affect the interior. She said houses along this street repeated a

front façade of the entry door and the garage.

Commissioner Ferrick said she had intended to move approval to include a condition for additional landscape screening. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kahle said the right-side elevation was a second story wall with no modulation, and he was not able to support the project.

Associate Planner Smith asked if the landscape screening being required by condition would be reviewed and approved through staff review. Principal Planner Rogers noted that there were two trees on the left side intended for removal and asked if the landscape screening condition should apply there as well. Commissioner Ferrick said that the additional landscape screening would be for both the left and right sides subject to review and approval of staff.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Ferrick/Strehl) to approve the item with the following modification, passes 4-3 with Commissioners Kadvany, Kahle and Onken opposed.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt 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 OPQ Design, consisting of 17 plan sheets, dated received on January 25, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 8, 2016, 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 architectural control subject to the following project-specific conditions:*

- a. *Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide a landscape plan indicating new screening trees to be planted along the right and left side yards. The proposed trees shall be located to help screen the two-story wall and second-story windows on the right side of the residence, and to help screen the large stairwell window and promote privacy for the adjacent left-side property. The proposed landscape plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.*

F2. Use Permit/Amin Ahmadi/427 Bay Road:

Request for a use permit for an addition to, and remodeling of, an existing, nonconforming one-story, single-family residence on a lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The value of the work would exceed 75 percent of existing replacement value in a 12-month period.

*Item continued to a future meeting.*

F3. Use Permit Revision/InVisage Technologies, Inc./990 Hamilton Avenue:

Request for a revision to a use permit, previously approved in July 2011, for the indoor storage and use of hazardous materials for the research and development of novel semiconductor materials and devices in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. ([Staff Report #16-009-PC](#))

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

Commissioner Combs recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Remi Lacombe, InVisage Technologies, said they would be staying in the same facility for another year or two but were changing some of the chemical inventory they use and store.

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

Commission Comment: Chair Onken said as there were no comments, he moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report, passes 6-0 with Commissioner Combs recused.

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 five plan sheets, dated received January 28, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 8 2016 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.

F4. Use Permit/Henry Riggs/210 McKendry Drive:

Request for a use permit to add a second floor, as well as conduct interior modifications, to a single-family residence that would exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period. The proposal would also exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure. The subject parcel is located on a substandard lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. ([Staff Report #16-007-PC](#))

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



Applicant Presentation: Ms. Deborah Wachs, property owner, said she and her husband had worked with Henry Riggs, the project architect, for about three-quarters of a year to develop the project design.

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

Commission Comment: Chair Onken said he liked the long wall with the smaller windows and it appeared an idiosyncratic salt box house.

Commissioner Kahle questioned why the addition was mainly in the rear noting there was a lot of roof in the front. He said the existing home was very charming and keeping that charm and tying it into the addition would have been his preference.

Ms. Wachs said many of the homes in the Willows have a front room that pops up into the attic. She said their front room extends up to the height of the current roof and they wanted to keep that open spatial feeling rather than have the second story there.

Commissioner Ferrick said she liked the project noting it was a modest addition. She said on the left side there was a 14-foot side setback which was generous. She said there appeared to be landscape screening for the window on the right side, which side had a smaller setback. Ms. Wachs indicated that was correct. Commissioner Ferrick said she liked the farmhouse look and dormer.

Chair Onken moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Combs seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Combs) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report, passes 6-1 with Commissioner Kahle opposed.

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 Henry L. Riggs, consisting of 9 plan sheets, dated received January 28, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 8, 2016, 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.

#### **G. Informational Items**

- G1. 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: February 22, 2016
  - Regular Meeting: March 7, 2016
  - Regular Meeting: March 21, 2016

#### **H. Adjournment**

Chair Onken adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2016