



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 6/6/2016
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Katherine Strehl called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Combs (Vice Chair), Susan Goodhue, Larry Kahle, John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Absent: Andrew Barnes

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner; Kaitlin Meador, Associate Planner; Michele Morris, Assistant Planner; Sunny Chao, Assistant Planner; Tom Smith, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Rogers reported that the City Council at its May 24 meeting considered a staff-recommended one-year extension of the ordinance allowing individuals to convert accessory buildings to secondary dwelling units. He said the Council was interested in a multi-year extension; the revised recommendation will come back to the Council for consideration. He said at its June 7 meeting the Council would conduct a study session on downtown parking and a public hearing on the City's budget.

Commissioner Riggs asked about neighbor approval of reduced setbacks for secondary dwelling units and how that would be addressed under a multi-year plan. Principal Planner Rogers said as codified, owners of accessory buildings who were able to document those buildings had been constructed legally were permitted to convert to secondary dwelling units even if they did not meet current secondary dwelling unit setbacks. He said this was done through an administrative permit that provided notification to neighbors. He said also that with new secondary dwelling units there is a process for neighbor approval to reduce the setbacks.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

Commissioner Riggs asked to pull item E2 from the consent calendar.

- E1. Approval of minutes from the May 9, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve the minutes as submitted; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes absent.

- E2. Architectural Control/City of Menlo Park/701 Laurel Street:
Request for architectural control to remove an existing 60-foot tall lattice tower antenna and replace it with a 120-foot tall monopole antenna for Police and Public Works transmissions located adjacent to the Police Department building in the PF (Public Facilities) zoning district. ([Staff Report #16-041-PC](#))

Commissioner Riggs said the recommended tower was a dark brown. He said a 60-foot pole would be replaced by a 120-foot tall pole that would be taller than many of the trees in its vicinity. He said the Commission had previously requested a gray color for such tall poles as that tended to blend better with the sky. He asked that an option to consider a gray color be part of the approval.

Assistant Public Works Director Ruben Nino confirmed with Commissioner Riggs that he would like consideration of a battleship gray for the monopole antenna.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve with a condition to allow consideration of painting the pole battleship gray. Commissioner Combs said he would second the motion but asked about the choice of the color brown for the pole. Mr. Nino said staff had done a perspective of the brown pole and thought it blended better with existing trees. He said they could also do a perspective to see what the gray would look like, and evaluate which they thought blended best.

Commissioner Kahle said he too thought the brown might stand out more in contrast as the pole was so tall. He asked why the mono-pine was not chosen. Mr. Nino said the mono-pine would create 10 to 12 foot gaps impacting reception.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Combs) to approve the item with the following modification; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes 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. 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 property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by City of Menlo Park Engineering Division consisting of eleven plan sheets, dated received May 16, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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, 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. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
4. **Approve the project subject to the following project-specific condition:**
- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans including an alternative color (specifically, a battleship grey or similar hue) for the monopole antenna structure, which shall have the objective of minimizing the visual impact of the antenna. The plans, if revised, shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.***

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Chris Anderson/269 Santa Margarita Avenue:
Request for a use permit to remodel and add a second floor to an existing nonconforming single-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period and requires approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission. The expansion would also exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area, and is considered equivalent to a new structure. ([Staff Report #16-042-PC](#))

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

Applicant Comment: Mr. Christopher Anderson, project designer, Livermore, said the existing 1,100 square foot one-story home would be demolished except for some walls that would be extended upwards. He said they were increasing wall heights from eight to nine feet.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the setback was five-foot or five feet-six-and five-sixteenth. Mr. Anderson said the house currently was at a five-foot setback. He said one wall would be moved back five-feet-six-inches. Commissioner Kahle said it looked like it was a continuation of the garage wall and asked if that meant the garage was getting smaller. Mr. Anderson said the entire wall was moving. Commissioner Kahle asked why the sill height on the right side window was so low. Mr. Anderson said that was for an egress window. Commissioner Kahle said the sill could be two feet higher and still be egress. Mr. Anderson said they were trying to keep window style the same with the rest of the house. He said that a double hung window was not possible on that side elevation with a higher sill. Commissioner Kahle noted the gutter returns into the gable ends and asked if there was a closed soffit. Mr. Anderson confirmed it was. Replying to Commissioner Kahle's query about how strongly he felt about using closed soffits, Mr. Anderson said he thought it added to the architecture.

Commissioner Onken said the stone veneer on the front wrapped around the side and stopped. He asked if there would be plantings in front or whether the stone would continue to grade. Mr. Alexander said there would be plantings in front. Commissioner Onken referred to the second-story bedroom window on the north side that had been mentioned and asked for information on the facing side of the adjacent neighbor's home. Mr. Alexander said they spoke with the neighbors on both sides and they did not have any issues with the proposal.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing, and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said the masonry would appear to be hanging in air as it would not meet grade and landscaping due to the drought might be sparse. He said he had used a thickened foundation below stone to create a sense of anchoring. He said he was not as concerned about the returns in the eaves being in the front only. He said he thought they should reconsider the low sill on the second-story north side.

Commissioner Kahle said he agreed with the comments on the stone noting he assumed there would be a fence to capture the edge of the wraparound stone. He said anything to eliminate the appearance of the stone hanging in air would be appreciated. He said it was a nice design and that with eight and nine feet ceilings it was not very tall, although it did have a steep roof pitch. He said if the style was Craftsman, he would prefer to not see closed soffits on the fascia returns. He said his only other concern was the height of the garage door and suggested that it would be nicer if not so large.

Commissioner Onken said when a proposal has side facing windows applicants were usually asked to use a more modest sill height. He suggested a casement window similar to some of the smaller windows on the other side might be used rather than a double hung window. He said to approve he would like the sill height higher on the north side second-story as a condition.

Commissioner Combs said he visited the site and noted the area was busy with building activity. He said he thought this design would fit nicely with the neighborhood. He said it was approvable without any conditions although he was not opposed to conditions requested by other

Commissioners regarding raising the sill height and some type of treatment for the stone.

Commissioner Kahle said he would second Commissioner Onken's motion noting that the double hung window would not work with a higher sill and it would have to be a different type window such as casement.

Chair Strehl confirmed with Commissioner Onken that he had not made a motion. She asked if the applicant would like to speak to the Commission's concerns. Mr. Anderson said the stone was El Dorado so it was applied to stucco. He said they could bring it down lower although he did not think it would be visible with landscaping. He said they discussed the window with the neighbors. He said changing the style to casement would require a thickened mullion to match the other divided light windows. He said the property owners thought they would be able to get a letter from the neighbors substantiating that they did not have a concern. He noted that it needed to be an egress window.

Commissioner Onken said the guest bath had a pair of slider windows on the ground floor, which did not match the double hung window style. He said future residents of the neighboring home would use the bedroom facing the second-story window. He said he would like a three-foot-four-inch window sill height and possibly reduced window size. Mr. Anderson asked if the change were to be made whether the project would need to come back to the Commission. Commissioner Onken noted it could be done administratively through staff review and approval. Mr. Anderson said they could do a double casement window.

Commissioner Onken moved to approve the project with the condition that the second-story windows facing north should be redesigned with a minimum three-foot sill height to be reviewed and approved by staff. Commissioner Riggs said he would second the motion if it could include bringing the El Dorado stone down to grade. Commissioner Onken said he would accept the condition.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to approve the item with the following modification; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Christopher J. Anderson, Design Discoveries Residential Building Design consisting of twelve plan sheets, dated received April 26, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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 project subject to the following project-specific condition:

- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans addressing the following, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division:**
 - 1) Raise the sill height for the second floor bedroom window on the Right Side (North) Elevation to a minimum of three feet high; and**
 - 2) Add stone veneer to cover the gap between the grade and the bottom edge of stone veneer on the front and side elevations.**

- F2. Use Permit/Muhamed Causevic/1034 Oakland Avenue:
Request for a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and add a second story addition to an existing nonconforming single-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. The proposed expansion and remodeling would exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value 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. ([Staff Report #16-043-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Morris had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Elaine Lee, project architect, said the proposal was to add a second floor to the existing one-story home. She said most of the existing footprint of the first floor would be kept with the intention of expanding it some so the second story would not dominate the first story.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the length of bedroom 2 on the second story and if they had thought about not bringing it forward so much as that would have a lower roof over the dining room. Ms. Lee said the referenced roof was over the great room, which had a vaulted ceiling. She said the goal had been to unify the structure and massing.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing, and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said there some awkward internal spaces but other than that the project was completely acceptable. He said he appreciated the continuing single-garage on the front and although the element was tall on the front, he thought it was scaled properly.

Commissioner Riggs said he found this to be a modern farmhouse style. He said he liked the massing and relative simplicity of the design. He asked if the belly band had been added voluntarily as an integral part of the design or if it had been suggested by staff.

Ms. Lee said it was an integral part of the design and had not been suggested by staff. She said it was a two-story element to break up the massing and also create transition for the board break.

Commissioner Kahle confirmed with Ms. Lee that the clad noted on the front porch was wood. He said he liked the design. He said he thought the second-story bedroom was going to stick out too far and he would prefer if it was pushed back and reduced in size. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

Commissioner Combs said he liked the belly band and also the shape of the bedroom in question.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Onken) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Elaine Lee Design, consisting of six plan sheets, dated received May 26, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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

F3. Use Permit/Steven MacKay and Anna Muelling/822 College Avenue:
Request for a use permit revision for a second floor addition to an existing two-story residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. ([Staff Report #16-044-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Chao noted an error in the project description on page 1 of the staff report and that it should say "existing 2,596 square foot residence" per the data table in Attachment C.

Applicant Comment: Ms. Tali Hardonaq, project architect, said the project was quite small and would expand into an existing three-foot attic space in a gable and toward the back an additional three feet to create slightly larger bathrooms and more closet space in the master suite. She said she was continuing existing materials.

Commissioner Kahle noted that he and the project architect were friends and colleagues from an architecture group. He asked if the only thing seen from the street was the two-foot-10-inch addition to the side. Ms. Hardonaq said that already existed. She said they were expanding into the gable by raising the peak by about nine inches. Commissioner Kahle confirmed the sun tube at the entry and asked if they could do a skylight. Ms. Hardonaq said a skylight would not work as it would be under the gable. She said she was trying to redirect the sun tube from the porch to the entry.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said he knew the project architect. He said it was a straight forward application and had no planning harm that he could see. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion noting that he thought the project would approve the appearance of the rear of the structure.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes 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.
1. 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.
2. 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 Tali Hardonag Architect consisting of six plan sheets, dated received May 20, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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, 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.

F4. Use Permit/Jessica Sin/117 O'Keefe Street:

Request for a use permit to construct an addition to and remodel an existing single-story, nonconforming structure in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The value of the work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing structure. ([Staff Report #16-045-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Chao said she had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Jessica Sin, project architect, said the project was to add 830 square feet to an existing one-story home.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the window on the side over the garage. Ms. Sin said that was an extra window and the area was open with no loft.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Chair Strehl said she thought this was a nice project and she could support it. Commissioner Onken said he agreed and thought the site had more than enough capacity for this addition. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Chair Strehl seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Strehl) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes 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 JSD Architecture and Interiors consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received May 19, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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, 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

- F5. Use Permit and Architectural Control/DES Architects + Engineers/1530 O'Brien Drive: Request for a use permit to expand second-story office space within an existing research and development (R&D) and office building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. In addition, a request for architectural control for the addition of a door and window glazing on the eastern facade of the building. ([Staff Report #16-046-PC](#))

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle asked about the calculation of the BMR fee. Associate Planner Smith said this was an expansion of office use or Group A space which was the \$15.57 per square foot BMR rate. Commissioner Kahle said space was lost under Group B and asked why there was not a reduction of the fee. Associate Planner Smith referred to F2 that showed the calculation. He said it was an increase of 1,150 square feet of office in the Group A category. He said after the credit was applied for existing square footage versus what was proposed, the total fee was \$17,905.50.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. John Tarlton, Tarlton Properties, said an application like this one took a lot of staff work, and suggested in the future that the Commission might consider having such applications done administratively. He said in this instance 1,100 square feet was being added to existing 1,000,000 square feet and the project had been approved originally to be larger than it was today. He said they were seeking to expand the second floor of Tarlton Properties to support the expansion of the Life Science properties his firm has in the area. He noted Commissioner Kahle's question and that as this was a net increase of square footage or general floor area in the building the BMR rate was applied to each square foot. He said he was fine with that.

Chair Strehl asked staff to place on a future agenda discussion on making such a project as this subject to administrative permitting.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. He said he would support a system for staff to handle such a project administratively with

Commission communication.

Commissioner Kahle said there was a suggestion in the staff report to consider limiting the number of employees on the site as it was under parked. He said he could support that as long as it was not setting a precedent for future projects that added floor area on sites that were under parked.

Commissioner Riggs said he would support Commissioner Kahle's suggestion if the number had capacity to increase if occupied up to the available space.

Mr. Tarlton said he could live with a number and it would be preferable if the number had some room within it to allow for an increase. He said he would need to calculate the number.

Commissioner Kahle said he supported Commissioner Riggs' suggestion regarding the number.

Commissioner Combs asked how the number of employees would be enforced. Associate Planner Smith said staff would rely on written claims or concerns from employees utilizing the site about g traffic.

Commissioner Onken noted the site would need less parking if new zoning was approved in the M2 area. He said this building would be zoned Life Sciences and that would be at a parking rate of 2.5 per 1,000 square feet as opposed to current parking rate of 3 per 1,000 square feet.

Commissioner Strehl said that existing parking was not fully utilized, and she thought Commissioner Onken's comments on parking were apropos.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the parking ratio could be adopted with flexibility for change should the parking requirement be reduced later.

Principal Planner Rogers said if the parking ratio was established by new zoning that would be the parking ratio regardless of the use permit. He said if there was an employee limit that would likely remain unless it was worded to say that the employee limit would no longer apply if the parking was conforming.

Commissioner Goodhue said she did not think an employee limit was needed for this application. She said it was in the best interest of the tenant and the tenant's employees to adhere to a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) plan whether official or unofficial.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed with staff that the applicant would not be stuck with the current parking requirement should that decrease in the future. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Onken) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Barnes 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 Below Market Rate Housing In Lieu Fee Agreement.
4. 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 property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
5. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects + Engineers consisting of eighteen plan sheets, dated received June 1, 2016, as well as the Project Description Letter, dated received February 25, 2016, and the Request for Parking Reduction Letter, dated May 25, 2016, approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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, 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.

- F6. Use Permit/Facebook, Inc./923-925 Hamilton Avenue: Request for a use permit for the conversion of an existing research and development building into medical and dental offices associated with nearby multi-building office use. The site is nonconforming with regard to parking and the conversion would also include general office and employee amenity spaces within the building. The existing building is located in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. ([Staff Report #16-047-PC](#))

Commissioner Combs recused himself due to his employment with Facebook and left the meeting.

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

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Steve Tsuruoka, project manager with Facebook, said they wanted to relocate their Health Center to this site as they had outgrown their facility on the east campus.

Replying to a question from Commissioner Goodhue, Mr. Tsuruoka said the larger site was based upon the increased amount of employees.

Commissioner Onken confirmed that the health services were strictly for Facebook employees and their dependents.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said Facebook had done much to allay neighborhood fears about increased traffic through traffic studies and TDM plan. He said he appreciated the reuse of an existing building. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs asked if in four years Facebook moved their medical facility whether the building would still have a use permit for medical and dental use. Senior Planner Perata said the use permit would run with the land. He said, however, it was very specific to the user and a general medical office such as Stanford Medical would not be able to move into the site.

Commissioner Riggs asked whether reuse of the existing campus space would increase the number of employees and how that limit was set. Senior Planner Perata said the east campus has a trip cap and the former health center site might be repurposed for office and additional employees as long as the trip cap was not exceeded.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the building would be identified as a Facebook building and whether the brown color on the arches could be changed. Mr. Tsuruoka said the building would have minimal signage to identify it as the Facebook Health Center. He said at this time they did not plan anything with the arches.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-0 with Commissioner Combs recused and Commissioner Barnes absent.

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 project plans by DES Architects and Engineers consisting of 12 plan sheets (dated received May 20, 2016), the project description letter (dated March 25, 2016), trip generation and TDM memorandum (dated May 25, 2016) and approved by the Planning Commission on June 6, 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 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. Regular Business

Principal Planner Rogers noted that Commissioner Combs would need to remain recused for the next item, and that Commissioner Onken would also have to recuse himself for anything related to ConnectMenlo.

- G1. Selection of an Alternate Vice Chair for Agenda Items Relating to ConnectMenlo and Facebook ([Staff Report #16-048-PC](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Goodhue) to designate Commissioner Riggs as the Alternate Vice Chair for items relating to ConnectMenlo and Facebook; passes 4-0 with Commissioners Combs and Onken recused, and Commissioner Barnes absent.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: June 20, 2016
- Regular Meeting: July 11, 2016
- Regular Meeting: July 25, 2016

J. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 11, 2016