



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Date: 10/19/2016
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 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Drew Combs (Vice Chair) (recused before item F1), Susan Goodhue, (recused before item F1), Larry Kahle, John Onken (recused before item F1), Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Staff: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner, Nikki Nagaya, Transportation Division Manager, Azalea Mitch, Senior Civil Engineer, Heather Abrams, Sustainability Manager, Leigh Prince, City Attorney

C. Reports and Announcements

The Commission beautifully sang Happy Birthday to Commissioner Henry Riggs.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the September 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Goodhue noted on page 9, in the sentence beginning "Vince Bressler said..." to change "foundation" to "fountain" and on page 12, last line, sentence "He said the modifications to the" to change "user" to "use" (permit).

Commissioner Riggs said on page 36, in the last paragraph, 3rd line, that the word "conservation" should be changed to "conservative" and in the same line, the word "element" should be "development".

ACTION: Motion and second (Goodhue/Combs) to approve the minutes as submitted with the following modifications: passes 6-0 with Commissioner Onken abstaining.

- Page 9, sentence beginning "Vince Bressler said..." change "foundation" to "fountain";

- Page 12, last line, sentence: “He said the modifications to the...,” change “user” to “use” before “permit”; and
- Page 36, last paragraph, 3rd line, word “conservation” should be changed to “conservative” and same line, the word “element” should be “development”.

Commissioners Combs, Goodhue and Onken were recused due to potential conflicts of interest for item F1.

F Public Hearing

- F1. City of Menlo Park/General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update, including a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Rezoning, Environmental Review:

The City is proposing to update the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan, including revised goals, policies and programs, the establishment of new land use designations, and the creation of a new street classification system. The General Plan Update seeks to create a live/work/play environment that fosters economic growth, increased sustainability, improved transportation options and mobility, while preserving the existing residential neighborhood character and quality of life enjoyed today. The land use changes are generally focused in the M-2 Area (which is primarily the existing industrial and business parks located between Bayfront Expressway and Highway 101) and could result in an increase in development potential above what would be allowed under the current General Plan, as follows:

- Up to 2.3 million square feet of non-residential space;
- Up to 4,500 residential units; and
- Up to 400 hotel rooms

This additional development potential in the M-2 Area, combined with the remaining development potential under the current General Plan, would result in a total of up to 4.1 million square feet of non-residential development and up to 5,500 residential units in the City.

The Planning Commission will consider and make recommendations to the City Council on the following:

1. General Plan Amendments: Incorporate the updated Land Use and Circulation Elements into the General Plan. Change the General Plan land use designations of properties in the M-2 Area to one of the following designations - Light Industrial, Office, Life Sciences, Mixed Use Residential, Baylands and Public Facilities. No land use designation changes are anticipated outside of the M-2 Area and Baylands Area.
2. Zoning Ordinance Amendments: Create three new zoning districts in the M-2 Area for consistency with the proposed General Plan Land Use Element. The proposed zoning districts include Office (O), Life Science (LS) and Residential-Mixed Use (R-MU) designations. The O district includes overlays to allow hotels (O-H) and corporate housing (O-CH). Overlays for bonus level development are also proposed in the Office, Life Science and Mixed-Use zoning districts (O-B, LS-B, and R-MU-B). In addition, proposed changes to the C-2-B (Neighborhood Commercial District, Restrictive) zoning district would allow for residential uses with up to 30

dwelling units per acre and heights of up to 40 feet for mixed use development. The zoning ordinance amendments also include proposed modifications to streamline the hazardous materials review process as an administrative permit, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director (or designee) when certain criteria are met, and other minor modifications, such as allowing administrative review for architectural changes in the O and LS districts similar to current regulations for the M-2 district, changes to the nonconforming uses and structures chapter, and other minor text amendments for consistency in implementing the proposed changes to the M-2 Area.

3. Rezoning: Rezone property in the M-2 Area to one of the following zoning designations for consistency with the proposed General Plan land use designation amendments – O (Office), Office, Hotel (O-H), Office, Corporate Housing (O-CH), Office, Bonus (O-B), Life Science (LS), Life Science, Bonus (LS-B), Residential Mixed Use, Bonus (R-MU-B), Public Facilities (P-F), and PF (Flood Plain).
4. Environmental Review: Review of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update, which analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update.

(Staff Report #16-083-PC)

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Deanna Chow reviewed the various actions the Commission would consider in making recommendations to the City Council on the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update. She introduced Charlie Knox and Rosie Dudley with Placeworks; David Shiver and Stephanie Hagar with BAE Urban Economics, and Jessica Alba with Nelson/Nygaard. She noted the Commission had received an additional 15 pieces of correspondence since the distribution of the staff report. She said in the correspondence several persons commented that comments related to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) were not addressed. She said however the comments related to VMT were addressed in the Transportation Master Response in the FEIR but not in Chapter 3 of the revisions. She said an errata sheet of the edits consistent with the Transportation Master Response had been distributed for the Commission's review as well as a corrected table in the Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA), Table 39B.

Charlie Knox, Placeworks, introduced the items before the Commission noting the general process for the meeting, and the history of the public process for the item. He said that public process had led to the definition of 2.3 million square feet of new non-residential development; up to 400 hotel rooms, and up to 4500 residential dwelling units in the M-2 zoning area. He said one of the key programs to do an annual review of the General Plan was directly tied to the Capital Improvement Program, and the Commission in its annual review would look directly at whether programs in the General Plan were actually covered by projects the City was undertaking. He said also a statement had been added that the Community Amenities list, which had evolved through both the Belle Haven visioning process and the General Plan Update process, could be modified to meet future community needs.

Mr. Knox said the Circulation Element categories were Safe Transportation, Health and Wellness, and Traffic Demand Management (TDM). He said since the Commission's laws review of the General Plan Update, clarification had been made on how to reestablish the City's Level of Service (LOS) Standards as complementary to the new state VMT standards.

Mr. Knox said three new zoning districts of Office (O), Life Sciences (LS), and Residential Mixed

Use (R-MU) were proposed. He said development in these new districts included TDM program, green building regulations, design standards that were measurable, and provision of community amenities, noting for the last there was a formula and process for achieving those amenities. He said additional changes over the last several months included increased residential height in the C-2-B (Neighborhood Commercial District, Restrictive) zoning district and included a parcel outside the M-2 near the Oil Changers at Bay and Willow Roads. He said they also worked on a streamlined process for hazardous materials use permit approvals.

Mr. Knox said since the Commission's study session in May of the project the height limits were increased to allow for flood protection in flood zone areas or areas subject to sea level rise in response to comments from interested parties that additional height was needed if they had to raise the base level for flood protection. He said there was a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) sliding scale for bonus development to allow flexibility, and added flexibility related to the design standards. He said façade only improvements would not get the same attention as a large amount of floor area being added or changed. He said the maximum setback in the LS District was eliminated in accordance with property owner and Commission direction. He said also the corner built to envelope had been modified and there was more flexibility related to rooflines. He said it was clarified that Community Amenities for bonus level in the R-MU zoning district included a requirement to provide 15% affordable housing and within 50% of the value of the additional gross floor area. He said the housing was credited toward that 50% value. He said once a developer reached the 15% affordable housing there was the ability to do different things such as physical improvements on the Community Amenities list. He showed the most updated map of the M-2 zoning area and noted the changes made.

Mr. Knox said regarding the EIR for the project that CEQA required the identification of impacts on the environment to be mitigated or if not possible to mitigate, the City would have to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. He said that document had been drafted for review. He said program level EIRs described large, broad issues and were not related to any one project or any one set of development activities. He said mitigation wherever feasible occurred through the policies and programs in the General Plan and the zoning standards. He said this would allow for future projects that were site specific development to be streamlined in terms of review, and could tier off this EIR as long as it was complying with the zoning. He said the FEIR was the October 2016 Response to Comments document together with the Draft EIR, and that Chapter 3 contained revisions to the EIR. He said for the most part that air quality greenhouse gas emissions impacts were unavoidable due to regional context; transportation although significantly worse in Menlo Park than in many places was a regional issue, but mitigation efforts where feasible would be used to address the impacts, noting some of which were not within the City's control. He said impacts to population and housing were basically significant and unavoidable in relation to regional context. He said that CEQA requires the consideration of alternatives to a project. He said one was the "no project alternative." He said the proposed project was the highest impact alternative as it would allow for about 2 million more square feet of development citywide as currently in place. He said another alternative would have overall reduced development and with the same ratio of jobs and housing and residential and nonresidential development in the M-2 area but at 75% level. He said another alternative looked at reducing the non-residential development by 50% which under CEQA was the preferred alternative as there was more new housing than jobs and housing could mitigate some of the impacts. He said an important change per public comment on the EIR was the language in the mitigation measures for air quality, biological resources, water supply and flooding to make the mitigation measures more stringent to try to protect biological resources. He said there were no new impacts discovered or required mitigation under CEQA.

Mr. Knox said the accompanying Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) looked at the fiscal benefits for the ConnectMenlo potential development to a theoretical maximum build out for the plan duration. He said General Plan build out, if no project were adopted, would produce about \$2.6 million per year over the duration. He said the additional development built into Connect/Menlo would more than double that in addition to it and was projected at \$8.3 million per year in net fiscal benefit to City over the duration of the 24-year plan. He said adjustments had been made to the FIA based on its last review before the Commission. He said the General Plan build out was shown separately and the distribution of housing per school district was updated. He said the 1500 units intended to be built as corporate housing would not generate multiple occupants and students. He said there were no impacts from the project to the Ravenswood City and Redwood City school districts. He said ConnectMenlo was revenue neutral for the Las Lomitas school district but potential build out under the current General Plan would have a \$675,000 impact annually, and was about 3% of their annual budget. He said the Menlo Park City school district build out under the current General Plan had a net negative fiscal impact of \$3.4 million per year or 8% of the school district's annual budget. He said the Sequoia Union High School District impact annually was about \$1.6 million per year and based on the 1500 units on the Facebook campus being corporate and not family housing. He said that amount was 1.2% of their current annual budget.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the 400 hotel unit count and potential number of hotels, noting the map in Attachment G, Exhibit B. Mr. Knox said General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) discussion thought synergy would be created having a hotel on one side of the corner and a potential hotel site on the other side. Commissioner Barnes asked about the owner of the other parcel. Principal Planner Chow said she could not recall the property owner's name but noted letters were sent to the property owners whose property would be rezoned in addition to the general noticing or property owners and occupants in the M-2 area. Commissioner Barnes asked about a third site in Haven area. Mr. Knox said the parcel inquired about was owned by Bohannon but was not the site of the Menlo Gateway project. He said property between Marsh Road and the City limit on Haven Avenue was also shown on the zoning map within the O-H zoning district. Commissioner Barnes asked if the 400 hotel rooms were first come, first served. Mr. Knox said the 400 number was the result of long discussion, and looked at viability of the hotel room program as about 150 rooms per hotel with some flexibility. He said if a proposal came in for a 400-room hotel that would be a discussion as to whether it was appropriate for the site.

Commissioner Barnes noted Exhibit D, R-MU, the area of Constitution and Jefferson down to Marsh Road, slated for 1,000 residential units. He said Sobrato was intending to build 600 units and asked about the ownership of the parcels to the left and right of the Sobrato parcel. Mr. Knox said they had a comment from the owner of the most westerly parcel in reaction to the placement of the paseo. He said he did not know if there were discussions between Sobrato and adjacent neighbors as to how many units would go on one site. Commissioner Barnes asked if the affordable housing requirement was intended to apply to the housing units in O-CH. Principal Planner Chow said it was not and the units would be deed-restricted to Facebook employees only.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the 50% of the presumed increased value and land that was repeated as a basis of providing community amenities as there had been no conclusion as to how that figure had entered the report. He asked if that was a Council directive. Mr. Knox said after the establishment of the guiding principles and the General Plan Working Group workshops to develop the alternative that they had talked to Council about amenities. He said discussed logic behind the 50% was it characterized the increased value of development allowed by the new zoning designations to be shared among the community and the developer. He said he recalled they received Council direction not whether it should be 50% but to proceed on the basis that 50%

represented an equal sharing of increase valued of the property between the property owner and the community.

Commissioner Riggs asked if Commission discussion assisted in defining the design elements. Mr. Knox responded affirmatively noting that had been very helpful, and resulted in some flexibility that would allow staff to administer and easier for architects and designers to work with. He noted some outstanding issues that were described about setbacks and LS districts, and rooflines. Chair Strehl asked if 50% of the increased density value included all the costs. Mr. Knox said cost of doing business was included.

Commissioner Barnes said he was concerned that the listed Community Amenities were not prioritized. Principal Planner Chow said Exhibit A of Attachment H list showed the order of priority based on the input received. She said there was the ability under the project to revisit the amenities list in the future.

Chair Strehl said that the Sequoia Union High School District wanted space in what had been the industrial area, and asked if designating them public facilities (PF) would affect neighboring properties. Mr. Knox said he did not see problems regarding compatibility and having safeguards for uses that were compatible.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing.

- Eileen McLaughlin, Citizens Committee to Save the Refuge, said Caltrans owned the land north of the railroad spur; it was permanently protected as Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse mitigation and could not be developed and the other property was owned by someone else. She said both were within the National Wildlife Refuges acquisition boundary established by Congress specific to wetland habitats suitable for inclusion in a refuge. She asked delay of the approval of the FEIR due to many concerns particularly about the biological resources section. She said the biological resource assessment language repeatedly used 10 foot as the distance from the project site to wildlife to assess. She said species were not judged by one number as far as distance on impacts. She said the FEIR was not ready for any kind of approval due to these concerns about its addressing of biological resources.
- James Eggers, Executive Director, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club, said they appreciated the changes related to bird friendly design and green buildings. He said they would also submit a letter later. He said Facebook East was an island surrounded by habitat on all sides including open space habitat to the south. He said the 1500 units proposed upon 57 acre site could house anywhere from 3,000 to 6,000 residents based on unit size and occupancy. He said Belle Haven was 23,000 acres with a population of 5,500. He said the corporate housing seemed too unrealistically dense or perhaps it needed fewer units. He said there had been no discussion about what the O-CH zoning designation meant and they would like that to happen. He asked if the General Plan should have planned infrastructure for a wide tunnel under Willow Road to connect Facebook West Campus to mixed use villages on the south side and whether there would be pedestrian connection to amenities. He said they wouldn't want people marooned on the Facebook campus or to have nighttime lights near the wildlife refuge. He said bonus level for R-MU zoning would allow taller building doubling the size of what R-MU allowed and would also allow office space to increase by 15% of the volume. He said if office space took up 25% of the larger buildings that would encourage office development and very few spaces for residential sites. He said R-MU should not encourage office use as that would create an even greater imbalance between work and housing.

- Patti Fry said her comments would be in addition to the specific comments she had sent earlier; particularly concerns about consistencies among the land use elements and the zoning ordinance, and poorly worded things that were confusing. She said the zoning ordinance amendments needed good attention. She said the planning process had been too limited and the EIR showed there were many impacts that would occur citywide yet the mitigation measures were for the most part restricted to the M-2 area. She said the TDM measures, parking limits, green building measures and those kinds of measures only applied to the Bayfront area. She said a lot of impacts could be lessened further if there was some attention to the rest of the City. She said the current General Plan allows a job/housing ratio of 4.6 in the pipeline projects; ABAG assumes a 2.2 ratio. She said just the zoning allowed in the rest of the City could perpetuate their existing housing shortage. She said there were superior alternatives to the project such as the environmentally superior one that was a reduced residential alternative. She said if that were to include the full complement of hotel space then the budget impact on the City would be 80% of what the project itself would provide and far fewer impacts. She said that was a better way to grow with less intense non-residential development. She said the California State Transportation Agency said the City should consider restricting the magnitude of future development to reduce the VMT demand on the state traffic. She said funding mechanisms for the community amenities and traffic improvements, which were also considered mitigations in another part, were not in place and she was concerned that if any of the project was approved there were development projects that would move forward without anything in place to provide amenities and traffic improvements. She said the nexus studies were required to change the impact fees and those would need to apply before project approvals were granted, otherwise the taxpayers would be left responsible for the things that needed to be done.

Chair Strehl asked if Ms. Fry had additional speaking time from another person. Ms. Fry said she did.

- Ms. Fry said the idea of live/work/play made sense but the proposal indicated there were not enough places to live and things to play. She said that playing fields were not even mentioned for instance. She said if they had 50% more population then more sports facilities would be needed. She said it was good to focus on the Belle Haven community but that was a specific plan and not a citywide plan. She said the EIR did not have standards and thresholds of significance for measuring impacts, and the new land use and circulation elements did not either. She said they needed measurable goals and standards. She said mitigation measures needed to be looked at citywide and funding mechanisms for amenities needed to be put into place now otherwise taxpayers would be left holding the bag for these improvements. She said it as the first comprehensive update since 1994 and they could do better.
- Adina Levin, Transportation Commission and GPAC member, said she was speaking as an individual. She said the project represented years of community input to express a live/work/play vision in the Bayfront / Belle Haven area of Menlo Park. She said what made the Plan work from a transportation point and social perspective, addressing jobs/housing balance, housing affordability, and below market rate housing, was the overall amount of housing. She encouraged the Commission to forward the Plan favorably including housing. She said EIR mentioned as a recommendation to phase jobs and housing; she encouraged the Commission to recommend that as a policy recommendation. She said if they had all the jobs before any housing that would exacerbate the traffic and social impacts. She said

she wrote to the City about how LOS would be used under the policies and the new General Plan. She said the state was starting to require VMT rather than LOS as an environmental impact. She said LOS used as a primary goal discouraged infill development. She said the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) had to have updated guidelines and urged that be done as quickly as possible so the City was not operating under the old rules. She suggested updating the thresholds for LOS so they could adhere to the Plan goals of encouraging and streamlining in-fill mixed use development and multi-modal transportation with less green house gas emissions and improved community health.

- Janelle London, Vice Chair, Menlo Park Environmental Quality Commission, said she was speaking as individual. She said she supported the green and sustainable building codes in the draft zoning regulations. She said the use of clean, renewable and onsite energy where feasible was needed to reduce green house gas emissions. She said the state mandate was to reduce emissions to 1990s levels by 2020 and 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. She said the City's Climate Action Plan targeted a 27% emission reduction from 2005 levels by 2020. She said regulations were needed for the City to lead the way in zero net energy building standard. She said the state Title 24 set goals to achieve zero net energy (ZNE) by 2020 for all new residential buildings and by 2030 for all new commercial, and 50% of existing commercial structures. She said ZNE building was feasible, economical and easier to achieve in more temperate coastal areas. She said ZNE buildings less vulnerable to climate change and helped home and commercial property owners pay less for energy. She said investment in ZNE building created jobs.
- Pastor Arturo Arias, Eternal Life Church, 965 O'Brien Drive, said they have been in the community 28 years and their congregation was Christian with over 100 members. He said they served Menlo Park and East Palo Alto communities. He said they had attended several community meetings on the General Plan and had mentioned previously that they would welcome the improvement especially in those areas where they were ministering. He said that the new map however showed that their property was part of a zoning change. He said they wanted to be sure that their community would continue to be served where they were located. They would like more information in detail as to what the future would be for them.
- Richard Truempier said the Sobrato Organization supported the General Plan Update and in particular the effort to provide housing at all income levels to address the lack of affordability in the area. He said Sobrato was interested in building high-density rental housing for people of all income levels and that high-density rental was one of the most affordable and sustainable types of housing compared to for-sale low density housing that makes up the majority of housing stock in Menlo Park. He said they could build this contemplated rental housing they requested the insertion: "Regarding affordable housing policies, we support the requirement for rental property projects utilizing bonus density to produce affordable housing that is equal to 15% of the project size. We ask that the regulations allow the flexibility for rental projects to meet that requirement either on site or immediately adjacent to the market rate component of the project. The affordable projects would be produced by them deeding land to a nonprofit adjacent to and as part of their larger rental project." He said they could only achieve the deep level of desired affordability by aggregating the affordable housing on a separate legal parcel as that was essential to securing the specialized efficient financing required to maximize the number of affordable units at the desired affordability level. He said allowing them to meet the requirement on an adjacent site as part of the larger planned community would help create a vibrant, mixed

income neighborhood allowing the use of alternative financing sources to make the affordable units feasible. He said regarding the proposed water and energy policy that new housing development that met the state's stringent Title 24 and CalGreen requirements was inherently more sustainable than existing housing. He said high density, multi-family housing was most water and energy efficient form of housing. He said while they supported the energy policy as currently drafted they requested the Commission ask that residential projects be exempt from the non-potable requirement. He said they supported a requirement for new residential projects to be dual plumbed now and to mandate that they tie into non-potable water sources in the future once it was available at a municipal scale. He said the policy as written would be detrimental to the City's goals to provide affordable housing as it would result in lower density and fewer affordable units as developers tried to stay under the 250,000 square foot threshold now set. He said to provide high density affordable housing at all income levels they would need flexibility on how to achieve the affordability requirements.

- Maya Perkins said she was a Belle Haven resident. She said she hoped that housing and retail would be developed first before office space as she wanted to live in a live/work/play community and the retail part of that was very important. She said she did not want to live in a bedroom community and for Belle Haven and Bayfront to provide all the needed housing without amenities such as restaurants and cafes. She said she also did not want to live in a space that was basically a dormitory referring to the O-CH housing. She said her understanding through the process was that zoning would be for the Facebook east campus and now it appeared it was contemplated for the Prologis site. She said that was a large piece of housing that would be just for corporate. Chair Strehl said she did not think that was the case. Ms. Perkins said regarding mixed-income affordable housing that 15% was a great start but she thought they had to have more affordable housing in the same building. She said she did not support a model where there was side by side housing with one building regular and one building affordable as that was not a healthy way for people to live. She said to have a healthy culturally diverse experience, people needed to live together. She said trenching was on the table for Willow Road and that did not fit into the vision of the cute, walkable, live/work/play downtown neighborhood that many residents would like. She requested that Willow Road be a walkable accessible road and complete street without any trenching. She said the proposed name change to Bayfront excluded a lot of the residents that worked hard and came to many of the meetings. She said the 50% density bonus should be looked at again and not decided upon tonight.
- Pamela Jones said it was exciting process to decide the last places to build on the peninsula, and the City could demand whatever it wanted from the builders. She said regarding affordable housing that they have excluded the people who only make \$120,000 annually. She said a person would have to make that to live in one of the \$6,000 a month rentals. She said they should redefine how they looked at affordable housing and low income and moderate income housing needed to be integrated throughout the space and particularly in apartments. She said there was already rail that could go from Redwood City to Menlo Park to Willow Road and that would take a lot of the transportation issues off the table. She asked about the occupancy rates of all the new large apartment buildings in Redwood City and suggested they might find that they were not using resources together regionally as best they could. She said displacement in the area was horrific, noting that no one was looking at foreclosures but only at those who got rent increases and had to move.
- Vicky Robledo, Belle Haven resident, said they wanted to track the amenities by top

priorities. She said she supported what the speakers Perkins and Jones had said. She said the individuals talking about environmental impacts to marsh lands caused her concern as well as impacts to her community and people. She said traffic impacts on wildlife would be a severe impact. She said the overpass was wonderful but was not for the community but for Facebook employees. She said a division was being created between her community and others in the area. She asked how a new community could be integrated into an existing community so the latter feel a part of the new community and not separated. She said that Facebook has been active in offering community meetings and asking for their input, which was given, but that did not take into account buying acreage to build housing for their employees. She said those who were born and lived in Menlo Park and Belle Haven wanted to stay and raise their children there too but they could not afford to be there. She said a pharmacy was needed for their senior residents to walk to. She said the number of increased cars on the road was not being addressed. She said she worked four miles from her home and it took her 40 minutes in the evening to get home. She said her shortcut would be lost with the new construction on Haven Avenue and another 1200 apartments. She said she was glad the Chilco improvements were made by Facebook but was concerned the City had not taken care of it previously. She questioned why Belle Haven would be renamed.

- Gary Lauder, Atherton Transportation Committee, said he was representing himself. He said the M-2 Plan's and Facebook's EIR both found significant and unavoidable impacts. He said that until all alternatives had been exhausted for decongesting traffic that those impacts were not unavoidable. He said the M-2 proposed over \$2 billion of real estate development and from that development applied traffic impact fees would help pay for the impact of the incremental traffic each project represented. He recommended looking at traffic in the intersections of Bayfront and Willow Road, and Bayfront and University Avenue. He said in the p.m. the p.m. rush hour congestion was so bad that the Willow/Hwy. 101 intersection spilled back onto the highway a full mile. He said if the Hwy. 101 / Willow Road interchange was to be rebuilt as planned all the traffic exiting north at the p.m. rush hour would have to exit at the same exit adding 15 minutes to the nightly commute for those going to Menlo Park. He said the EIR did not look at that impact on the residents of Menlo Park. He said we depend on government to build the public good such as roads and urged looking at traffic impact fees (TIF) sufficiently high to address the problem.
- John Tarlton said he was representing a good portion of the LS zoning district. He said he provided a letter earlier today that had been distributed to the Commission. He said that some of the new requirements whose intent was for the bonus level based on all the meetings he had tended had now crept into the base level requirements, and he believed it was inappropriate to change the existing zoning. He noted the minimum step back requirement for the base level development and requested it be changed. He said as discussed in prior meetings floors in Life Science buildings needed to be stacked for purposes of laboratories and a 10 foot step back was inconsistent with that. He said regarding public amenities that it was not clear how 50% would work and requested the City specifically establish a rate. He regarding the appraisal process that there be a rate in the event that a small project wanted to move forward without going forward with that process. He said regarding the average building height that this was probably unintentional but they believed the zoning as proposed would require an average height of four and half stories on a particular parcel. He said they understood the intent was to have an average of four and half stories across the zoning district. He said regarding green sustainable building there seemed to be an inconsistency between page 24 and table 16 and suggested they be the

same. He said for the purpose of alterations and tenant improvements that those be matched to CalGreen as opposed to some other kind of standard. He said the energy regulations had not quite addressed Life Science buildings although they were in favor of being progressive in that manner. He said regarding the minimum open space requirement that there were some intricacies of Life Science to have service yards for nitrogen tanks and such. He said the way open space was defined and the minimum requirement of it was not compatible with their uses.

- Harold Schapelhouman, Chief, Menlo Park Fire District, said the Fire District was opposed to the high school in the M-2 area. He said they wanted prudent development and growth in the community. He said the Plan did not include any impact fees to the District and allowed only tax. He said he was very dissatisfied with how the District was being treated under this Plan and questioned that the EIR found there were no impacts to the District under the Plan. He said a letter regarding their opposition to the Plan had been sent and would be posted on the District's website the next day.
- Steve Schmidt said he donated his time to Patti Fry and had 10 seconds left. He encouraged the Commission to read all the comment letters carefully.
- Leora Tanjuatco, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County, said they wholeheartedly supported the purpose of the General Plan update and the City's efforts to alleviate the job/housing imbalance that was widespread throughout San Mateo County. She said they fully supported housing at all income levels. She said her organization mostly focused on incentivizing housing and alleviating the job/housing imbalance. She said they encouraged the City to support maximum residential development to support the commercial and retail development opportunities being created. She encouraged the City to consider density, inclusion, and walkable places for people to live near where they work, which would be key in reducing a lot of the congestion that plagued the Bay area. She said there were sites they might identify suitable for housing outside the M-2 and asked if that was something they should bring up now or later.

Principal Planner Chow said land outside of what was studied in the EIR could not be contemplated as part of the ConnectMenlo process.

- Fergus O'Shea, Director of Campus Facilities for Facebook, said they have actively participated in the ConnectMenlo process since 2014. He said in 2015 they purchased the Prologis Scientific Technology Park with the goal of redeveloping an aging industrial warehouse park into something more than a typical Silicon Valley office campus. He said the property was envisioned to provide retail amenities, a grocery store, housing and green space to create a true live/work/play area. He said their goal was to make further investments in infrastructure to support the Plan. He said they supported all policies that served to create new homes for all income levels. He said for their campus expansion agreement they would do a minimum of 1500 living units. He said the sooner the Plan was adopted the sooner they could build housing and reduce traffic. He said as they understood it the draft zoning would allow property owners to aggregate FAR and uses across sites under the same ownership but only if they have the same zoning designation. He said in May they commented that they needed flexibility with the Prologis site to aggregate uses and FAR since the line dividing the R-MU area from the O-area was basically arbitrary. He said they had understood that the Commission was in agreement. He said as written the zoning would not allow them flexibility but would lock them into a map

that was not a fully developed Master Plan. He requested the wording be revised.

- Tim Tosta said from perspective of what was going on with land use in California particularly in the Bay Area that they were beginning to look at old former industrial areas that had tended to separate residential communities, such as Belle Haven, from the Bay. He said this undertaking was extraordinary as it was in the midst of radical change and putting uses together so people did not have to travel so much. He said since the Plan was beginning and an experiment that they would have to revisit it to make it even better.

Chair Strehl closed the public hearing, and recessed the meeting for a short break.

Chair Strehl reconvened the meeting.

Commission Comment: Chair Strehl said based on the time the meeting would conclude at 11 p.m. and the item would be continued to the meeting of October 24, 2016.

Commissioner Kahle suggested consultant and staff might address some of the matters raised by the public. Chair Strehl noted the reference to the name “Bayfront” replacing “Belle Haven” and asked about the source of that.

Mr. Knox said originally they were looking for a new name for the M-2 but not for Belle Haven, Suburban Park, Lorelei Manor, Flood Triangle or the Willows. He said the intent was to give people a sense of where this area was in Menlo Park. He said when Ms. Perkins had commented that Belle Haven residents’ perception was that the Life Science area, Menlo Business Park, and Prologis were part of Belle Haven, they took that to heart but kept Bayfront in the EIR as it was descriptive and didn’t seem offensive or to impinge on Belle Haven as a neighborhood. He said the Commission could discuss what the right way to identify.

Chair Strehl noted the rezoning of the land of the Eternal Life Church and asked how that affected the church and its community. Principal Planner Chow said existing uses could remain and there was no requirement to redevelop the property to conform with the LS standards. She said there was a section on nonconforming uses and there was no amortization by which the building would have to begin to conform.

Chair Strehl said Eileen McLaughlin questioned the use of 10 feet distance in doing biological resource assessment. Mr. Knox said they were trying to understand that as well and said it might have been a typo and should be 100 feet or no distance or a reference to adjacent sites. Chair Strehl suggested they try to find out the distance by Monday’s meeting.

Commissioner Riggs said at the Facebook EIR hearing it was noted that the intersection of Bay Road and Ringwood had been excluded from the analysis. He asked if they had responded to that intersection and added it to the review. Ms. Nikki Nagaya, City Transportation Manager, said they received several public comments at the Commission hearing as well as in writing. She said each were responded to in the FEIR. She said specifically for the Bay and Ringwood intersection they looked at the potential for the project traffic to add additional volume on Bay and Ringwood. She said based on the models they had very little traffic in addition to what was already anticipated on those two corridors. She said vehicles were less than 100 a day on Bay Road and there was no increase on Ringwood Avenue. She said based on that, further analysis would show a less than significant impact.

Commissioner Riggs said the FIA evaluated benefits to the City, school districts, Fire District and other agencies based on expected tax base and improvement through the build out to 2040. He asked how much of that was based on hotel transient occupancy tax (TOT). Ms. Stephanie Hagar, BAE Urban Economics, said the project's anticipated TOT was \$2.4 million of the total \$8.3 million and was based on the 400 hotel rooms.

Commissioner Barnes referred to the Community Amenities discussion and asked about the 50% of the additional gross floor area limit (FAL). Mr. Knox said the original idea was to find the value that accrued to the property because of the change in zoning but with the costs removed, and that the true increase in value would be shared between the property owner and the rest of community. He said the idea of 50% came from discussion with the City Council about how added new value would be shared with the community and was a philosophical approach to sharing the value. Commissioner Barnes asked if there was a sense that stakeholders shared that sentiment. Mr. Knox said they had discussed at less and more. Commissioner Barnes asked if they had ever refined the number at maximum build out of what the value of the 50% in terms of dollar amounts was. Mr. Knox said they made some assumptions at one point where they used \$150 to \$160 per square foot. He said it created something like \$230 million of total value but this would need the appraisal process to happen.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the process for the developer interested in bonus development. Mr. Knox said if the land was in R-MU, there was a strong expectation for housing as the amenity. He said of the 50% value, 15% of the affordable housing would probably be a lot of the 50%. He said there might be some value beyond that. He said for the LS zoning district it had to do with the size of the project. He said for a very large corporate entity and a big development with a lot of value the developer might offer a large piece of infrastructure such as a bridge or new crossing. He said it would be more complicated for smaller projects if value when appraised was not enough to do anything on the Community Amenities list. He said then they could do in-lieu fee or do something with another property owner. He said the applicant could do a nexus study too to know what they could provide.

Principal Planner Chow said the Community Amenities would be considered as part of the review process. She said asking for a bonus level development would either require a use permit subject to Planning Commission review and approval or a conditional development permit subject to Planning Commission review and recommendation and City Council review and approval. She said the Commission would have the opportunity to look at what the applicant was proposing as community amenities, whether it was onsite or offsite, whether the City adopted an impact fee and whether that was more appropriate than an actual contribution.

Commissioner Barnes asked if the amenity had to be inclusionary on site within the same structure to be contributive. Principal Planner Chow said for the R-MU they were proposing to include THAT the 15% affordable housing requirement might be met on site or off site. She said they heard comments tonight that it should be separated and also that it should be on same site. She said the Community Amenities list did require that it be located within the M-2 Belle Haven area north of Hwy. 101 except for affordable housing. She said inclusionary was not so prescriptive it had to be in the same building. Mr. Knox said there was a cap in M-2 of 4500 housing units. He said if a project proponent for R-MU, LS, or O zoning districts wanted to provide affordable housing as an amenity for the City and the cap of 4500 units had been reached already other sites could be looked at.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the cost and space needed for water reuse systems for

projects about 250,000 square feet. Azalea Mitch, Public Works, Senior Civil Engineer, said the size and cost of the onsite recycling unit depended upon whether it was a gray water system or a system that included black water; it depended upon the process itself and the size and capacity. She said they have been evaluating a lot of options regarding recycled water. She said they cost to purchased recycle water was very expensive. She said RWC would sell recycled water at \$16 per unit and noted the cost of potable water was \$5 or \$6 per unit. She said having the systems placed on site by the developer would be more cost effective than purchasing and would help offset potential water shortfalls caused by drought. She said the purple pipe plumbing system was required whether the reused water was coming from an onsite or offsite location. She said Redwood City and Palo Alto have required dual plumbing since 2008.

Commissioner Riggs asked whether the requirement was to require purple pipe only or some level of storage and treatment. Ms. Mitch said the requirement was for every new building to be dual plumbed and once purple pipe distribution was available, buildings would have to connect. She said new building of 250,000 square feet or larger were required to do onsite water treatment now. She said that focused on one building that size. She said a question for the Commission was whether building aggregate square footage of 250,000 or more on a parcel would also require an onsite system. Commissioner Riggs asked how much a system would cost. Ms. Mitch said the cost for a black water system could be \$1 million. Commissioner Riggs said that building codes and fire codes were more restrictive and all of this created costs. Chair Strehl said at GPAC meetings they had agreed upon dual plumbing so that when nonpotable water distribution became available they facilities could connect. She said she was not sure when the direction to require onsite water recycling for projects over 250,000 square feet came. Commissioner Riggs asked about rainfall reuse. Ms. Mitch said the amount of storage needed to collect the amount of water needed when it rained would have to be significantly large. Commissioner Barnes asked if the City was looking at having its own water reuse system. Ms. Mitch said they were studying that as part of the water system master plan and looking at partnering with West Bay Sanitary District to look at options for recycling plants in the M-2 area. Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Ms. Mitch said the plant and the distribution system would need to be built and that cost of that would be anywhere from \$20 to \$30 million in a 10-year horizon.

Commissioner Riggs said the project energy target was net zero. He said mainly photovoltaic (PV) was used and the quantity of that was determined by the size of roof relative to the occupants' needs. Heather Abrams, City Sustainability Manager, said in the regulations they did not specifically require net zero but they were working towards that. She said regarding the energy requirements that the original draft had 80% of the demand as PV. She said they received comments from developers about using green roofs. She said the next draft looked at feasibility for onsite generation on the roof and parking areas and found that 30% of that was feasible on the site. Commissioner Riggs asked if this was feasible after deducting the open space requirement. Planner Chow said that use would be in areas not used for other uses; she said open space should be free of extra space taken up by obstructions such as PV.

Replying to Commissioner Kahle, Ms. Abrams said for natural gas use renewable energy credits (REC) could be purchased to offset toward meeting the greenhouse gas emission reduction target set by Council and the sustainability goals incorporated into this project. Chair Strehl asked about the cost of the Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE) and if they were competitive with PGE. Ms. Abrams said PCE set their rates so the base rate was 50% renewable. She said that was much better than PGE. She said they also have an opt-up rate that was 100% renewable energy and was what the City was buying for the City Hall building. She said the PCE rate for 100% renewable was about ½ cent per KWH more than the current PG&E rate, which was at 27% renewable. Commissioner

Riggs asked about commercial rates being different. Ms. Abrams said the 50% rate was about 5% lower than PG&E. She said PG&E charges an exit cost and that was not an extra charge, and pro-rated in the PCE bill.

Commissioner Riggs noted the request by Fergus O'Shea to aggregate the requirement across the R-MU and LS zones and recalled a discussion about that. Principal Planner Chow said that was discussed at the Planning Commission's study session in May. She said she recalled sharing among properties owned by the same entity would be allowed among the same zoning district. She said within the R-MU-B there were multiple parcels on the Prologis campus; so there could be an aggregate of perhaps housing on one side and parking on another side. She said the request made tonight she thought was to consider expansion of sharing or calculation between the R-MU and the O-B which raised some potential concerns as there were different regulation standards between the two districts such as different height requirements. She suggested the Commission might want to discuss the idea. Commissioner Riggs said in past they might have had a project overlapping R-3 and C-4. He said in that instance they took the most restrictive of the elements and applied those to anything in a common structure. He asked if such a method could resolve the conflict or whether it was more complicated than that. Principal Planner Chow said that more restrictive standards might not be what the applicant was seeking or provide the flexibility desired. Commissioner Riggs asked if they would be making a proposal about this to bring back to the Commission. Principal Planner Chow said they could do that and bring it back to the Commission at its October 24 meeting.

Commissioner Riggs said James Eggers wrote that in the O and particularly in the R-MU zone that with bonus level it appeared the bonus square footage could be used specifically for additional office space rather than additional housing. Principal Planner Chow said in R-MU there were FARs for both the residential and non-residential component so in bonus level could get up to 200% density for the residential component and 25% for the non-residential component. She said there must be residential before there could be any non-residential use.

Commissioner Riggs said he had not reviewed the project from the perspective of dedicated parks and fields. He said for one of the 50-acre projects for Facebook although it was not in the General Plan they had open space but not sports space. He asked if soccer and other playing fields were needed to meet the demand of having 50% more people in Menlo Park. Principal Planner Chow said there were open space requirements for open space and public open space and provisions for community paseos, but parks were not included on the map. She said each development would be required to provide open space amenities for their tenants and there would be publicly accessible requirements in three zoning districts opportunities for connectivity and interactions between residents. She said they had nothing for aggregated park space required in the Plan.

Commissioner Riggs said a speaker talked about the metrics for measuring traffic impacts. He said the threshold for LOS at intersections and segments triggers a traffic study for what often was quite a small increase in intersecting traffic. He suggested as part of the project to include a paragraph on the LOS threshold. Principal Planner Chow said they have clarification in the General Plan related to using LOS and reestablishing City's standards in addition to VMTs. Commissioner Riggs said the LOS was still there so the threshold was still there. He said at Bay and Ringwood he thought the addition of three cars an hour would hit the threshold. Ms. Nagaya said the impact criteria they have was time based. She said at an intersection, either signalized or not, at peak hour, if a project added more than .8 seconds to critical approach that could be considered a potentially significant impact. She said policies and programs outlined in the General Plan gave the ability to look at future traffic impact analysis guidelines updates. She said policy

direction in the circulation element gave general direction to include VMT as a future metric but also incorporated LOS. Commissioner Riggs asked what neighboring communities used as the threshold. Ms. Nagaya said the current entirety of Santa Clara County and the Town of Atherton use a 4-second interval for the average intersection as opposed to the critical approach. She said they were also tracking what cities were doing statewide related to VMT and LOS as potential state guidelines are finalized in coming months. Commissioner Riggs asked if Transportation would want to make a recommendation on whether they wanted to continue using the critical approach as it seemed to be an impediment to streamlining and a relic. Ms. Nagaya said they would be happy to look at the guidelines and what the actual thresholds were. She said whether that was on the timeline to bring back to the Commission was another question as staff would need to reassess as to what information they have and could compile. She said through the General Plan Update process they have heard that the TIA guidelines update would be a future project and was shown in the future CIP for FY 2018-2019. She said she understood LOS could be an impediment to encouraging development in areas where they might want to encourage development but they needed to balance that with what the general direction they have received from the GPAC and City Council. Commissioner Riggs said he thought it was a housekeeping item. Ms. Nagaya said the recommendation and technicalities of it might be straight forward but thought it was still very much a controversial issue on how traffic impacts would be analyzed. She said they would need to assess whether it could be done as a housekeeping item.

Commissioner Kahle said he thought park space as had been noted was an opportunity that had been overlooked in the General Plan update. He said he coached a soccer team in Menlo Park and there was a shortage of playing fields. He said they should not let the opportunity go by if they can include it.. He said regarding phasing work that he hoped with opportunities that not all office would be built first with housing at a later date. He asked if that had been implemented or thought through. Principal Planner Chow said the proposed project did not include a phasing program and was not evaluated. She said through public comment and the EIR process, and comments tonight, there was suggestion to require a portion of housing be developed first before any new non-residential use came on line. She said the Commission could provide guidance on that. She said now there was no limitation on what was built first.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the specific issues raised by Mr. Tarlton. Principal Planner Chow said baseline development maintained existing FAR ratios. She said additional requirements such as sustainable and green building requirements and design standards were other objectives the Council wanted to achieve. She said while different from what was currently required under the M-2 zoning ordinance, the existing development parameters were still the same and other requirements were supported by other objectives of the General Plan. She said in the revised resolution received this evening they had eliminated the minimum step back requirements, eliminated the requirement for where the building should be placed, and also an elimination for corner lot on where building should be placed. She said they believed the step back was fairly important in providing some modulation articulation to the building. She said the requirement was for a 10-foot step back above the base level height. She said areas in flood zone or sea level rise the building was allowed an additional 10-feet of height so it could potentially be 55-feet tall with a 10-foot step back at 55-feet up to the maximum height level. She said only one step back requirement being proposed. She said regarding community amenities there had been discussion around that. She said if it was to establish a specific fee that needed a nexus study; she said it required the study be done and in place, and the fee adopted before development could take place. She said it had the potential to delay community amenities. She said regarding the average building height they had discussed that a canyon effect was unwanted. She said some variation in height was wanted and the green area showed three to six stories. She said that was reflective of

what was seen in zoning code. Commissioner Kahle asked if the average building height was meant to be per site. Principal Planner Chow said it was meant to be per site. She said regarding green and sustainable building regulations that 30 percent references what was feasible. She said the site would have a feasibility analysis and 30 percent of that feasibility would be required on site; the remainder would be through other options of 100% such as PCE . She said regarding the open space requirement that it lent itself to creating opportunities for connections between properties and even with Life Sciences there were ways to secure their properties and allow for openness and inclusiveness with their properties.

Commissioner Kahle said regarding naming that the triangular area in the middle was Belle Haven on one of the other maps and that should be called Belle Haven and all the rest could be considered Bayfront area.

Chair Strehl said Mr. Eggers raised question that 1500 units on Facebook East on 57 acres with 3000 residents potentially raised the issue of connecting to amenities. She asked if staff could clarify this by the Monday meeting. Principal Planner Chow said the intent of the corporate housing would be to deed restrict occupants to employees only so there would not be families or others who did not work at the site.

Chair Strehl said it was supposed to be live/work/play and there were no places to play except for the community center. She said to the extent possible they should try to identify some areas where they could put in some park facilities. She asked if other cities in proximity to Menlo Park besides Palo Alto require 100% renewable energy. Ms. Abrams said the PCE was relatively new and was launched on October 3. She said Palo Alto delivers 100% GHG free energy because they have their own utility. She said they did not have a model of other cities doing exactly what was proposed – models like requiring solar on all new rooftops buildings or residences. She said what was being proposed was unique and designed to fit the needs of Menlo Park. Chair Strehl asked if Redwood City required 100% renewable energy for development. Ms. Abrams said the City of San Mateo just adopted code to push companies and buildings to do more than basic code would require. Chair Strehl said she was concerned about this requirement as it might put businesses here at a disadvantage to businesses in other areas. She asked if they could bring back comparable goals of other cities regarding renewable energy.

Commissioner Barnes asked how the 10-foot in the flood zone and for sea level rise was utilized. Principal Planner Chow said a proposed requirement had been that the increase would be 24-inches above base flood elevation to accommodate sea level rise. She said conversation at the last Planning Commission study session was that additional height was needed to accommodate plate heights and construction type. She said they added up to 10 foot additional height to accommodate construction methods. She said it could be added to base level height or to the overall height if area was susceptible to flood zone and sea level rise.

Commissioner Barnes said he did not understand why Menlo Park was still doing LOS. He said the state was going to VMT, the City Council in Redwood City last night directed staff to use VMT, San Francisco and Oakland uses VMT. He said in the context of environmental concerns VMT reduces GHE and brings in urban infill. Ms. Nagaya said Redwood City's action was an indication of where some cities were headed. She said because the state has not yet adopted VMT requirements the actual VMT metrics were not known and the threshold of significance was still questionable. She said that was where the future update to the TIA guidelines would come in as a future implementation. She said the circulation element referenced supplementing LOS with VMT and defined how LOS would be used in the future. She said LOS could be a useful planning tool

looking at delays at corridors as part of City processes outside development review. Commissioner Barnes asked when the update of TIA guidelines would be. Ms. Nagaya said it was programmed in the CIP for 2018-2019. She said after the General Plan update, the next priority was the Transportation Master Plan for the City and that would be used to update their fee plan. She said after that they would tackle the TIA guidelines.

Commissioner Riggs said page 5 of the staff report listed Land Use (LU) goals. He said in his opinion LU-4 largely covered same ground as LU-3. He said rather than elaborate on LU-3 that Business Development and Retention should reflect at least one of the guiding principles (page A20): competitive and innovative business destination. He suggested using that rather than limiting to goods and services for the community and the priority goal of avoiding environmental impacts. He said that the circulation element supported goals of alternative transportation with prioritization of the transportation modes of bicycle, pedestrian, transit buses and autos, the first three of which had equal top priority and autos had least priority. He said the numbers of users of the first three were not close to the numbers of autos used. He said that they needed to think again about who the users were. He said regarding the LS zoning district that they needed ground floor space and that their back of house was far unlike residential and office with huge gas tanks, multiple loading docks trash compactors that rivaled those of hotels, and generators that would run a portion of the City. He said the idea of open space was much more challenging and they had a different relationship to the rest of the world. He said LS people come and go all day and their buildings might have 10 times the electrical requirements of an office building on a square footage basis. He said that wouldn't be effectively solved with PVs. He said it was heavily dependent upon tenant improvements and should the firm go to manufacturing the tenants would leave. He said to get a new tenant you had to be able to do tenant improvements in 90 days. He requested they review the requirements for the LS zoning district.

Chair Strehl asked for the next meeting that staff review and provide some overview answers to some of the issues raised by the Fire District, East Palo Alto, Sequoia Union High and Ravenswood school districts.

Chair Strehl continued the item to the meeting of October 24, 2016.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: October 24, 2016
- Regular Meeting: November 7, 2016
- Regular Meeting: November 14, 2016
- Regular Meeting: December 5, 2016

I. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 11:06 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Principal Planner Deanna Chow

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett