



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 11/14/2016
Time: 7:01 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), Susan Goodhue, Larry Kahle, John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner, Ori Paz, Planning Technician, Tom Smith, Associate Planner

Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council met on November 9, 2016 to discuss the topic of displacement. He said the Council moved forward on requiring 12-month leases for residential buildings and provided other direction on developing displacement policies. He said on the November 15 City Council meeting agenda were consideration of the required ordinance adoption for the Facebook Expansion project, and review of ConnectMenlo, General Plan Update, and the Commission's recommendations on that project. He said on November 29 the City Council would consider amendments to the building code that would include local amendments.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the October 24, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Henry Riggs suggested on page 7 of the minutes in the last paragraph, first sentence, beginning, "Commissioner Riggs said" and continues "for mixed use streets, the vehicles would have at least an equal priority" that "would" be replaced with "should."

ACTION: Motion and second (John Onken/Strehl) to approve with following modification; passes 7-0.

- Page 7, last paragraph, 1st line, ".....for mixed use streets, the vehicles ~~would~~ **should** have at least an equal priority."

E2. Architectural Control/Ian Hamilton/2730 Sand Hill Road:

Request for architectural control review of exterior modifications to an existing office building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research District, Restrictive) zoning district. The proposed exterior modifications would include replacing siding, modifying the exterior color scheme, site improvements and new landscaping. ([Staff Report #16-092-PC](#))

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current 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 architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Jay Adams Design, consisting of 20 plan sheets, dated received October 31, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 14, 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, Recology, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. 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.

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Yu Wu/1048 Menlo Oaks Drive:

Request for a use permit for an addition and interior modifications to an existing, nonconforming one-story, single-family residence on a lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The value of the work would exceed 75 percent of existing replacement value in a 12-month period. ([Staff Report #16-093-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Ori Paz said there were no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Zhihui Chen said proposal was a simple addition to a one-story, single-family residence. He said there was no architectural change.

Commissioner Henry Riggs said entry overhang was a roof as it was not over a porch. He asked for its depth dimension. Mr. Chen said three feet. Commissioner Riggs asked if the applicant had checked with the Planning Department as to what encroachment was allowed with the roof overhang and front setback. Planning Technician Paz said the permitted encroachment for eaves and overhangs was three-feet so long as the setback was greater than 10 feet.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the project was approvable. He noted that the threshold of the front door was six-inches above the landing, and asked if that was intentional.

Ms. Susan Chen, Project Architect, said it was an existing condition but they could increase the landing height to make it even.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the architect had spoken with the applicant about the interior furniture layout. Ms. Chen, said that they had done a livable concept but were not doing the interior design part. She agreed that the rooms were narrow but they would be better than before.

Commissioner Larry Kahle said he shared concerns about the interior layout. He said the addition was tall, boxy looking structure. He said it was approvable but with more design input it could have been a better addition. He said he would prefer, although he would not make them conditions of approval, that the front not be so tall, that they use wood windows instead of vinyl windows, eliminate double doors for a single door as the double doors seemed to overpower the elevation and to take the opportunity to organize and clean up the roof.

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current 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 SC Design Group and Interiors consisting of eight plan sheets, dated received November 08, 2016, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 14, 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
- F2. Use Permit/SlipChip Corporation/230 Constitution Drive:

Request for a use permit for the use and storage of hazardous materials associated with research, development, and manufacturing of nucleic acid and protein detection equipment for point-of-care diagnostics in domestic and global health settings, field-based measurements for industrial applications, and complex assays across a range of laboratory settings, located in an existing

building in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. All hazardous materials would be used and stored within the existing building. ([Staff Report #16-094-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Tom Smith said in the “Agency Review” section a “condition 4.a” was mentioned. He said that had been carried over from a previous review and was not requested as part of this application.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Onken said that the applicant indicated a 900-foot distance from the project site to a high school. He asked if the high school has become a pertinent issue for businesses and projects in this area. Associate Planner Smith said they wanted to keep the Planning Commission advised.

Applicant Presentation: Dr. Martin Goldberg, said SlipChip Corporation was a startup of about 30 people and their business was point of care testing, in particular nucleic-based testing and molecular diagnostics. He said they would do research and development but would not do manufacturing at the site.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the square footage. Dr. Goldberg said it was 24,000 square feet and they would have up to 30 people. He said the previous tenant had 97 people there.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing and closed it as there was no public comment.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the project was approvable. He noted its proximity to the high school and that the City had not had a great deal of say about locating the school there. He said the question was whether they would allow the high school to prejudice the businesses and the activities that were in the area. He said his inclination was to support the local businesses in lieu of what people might see as a new threat a school in proximity. Chair Strehl said she recalled they expressed concern about a school moving into an industrial area where hazardous materials were being used.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said during his tenure on the Commission all the hazardous materials applications reviewed had been approved. He asked if that was because the use of really hazardous materials did not make it that far because of the Fire District and other agencies’ controls. Associate Planner Smith said the City really relied on the relevant review agencies to provide findings related to the suitability of such applications.

Brief discussion on hazardous materials applications ensued with comments by Ms. Ellen Ackerman, Green Environment, as to how applications were prepared, and Principal Planner Rogers about discussions within the General Plan Update to streamline the process.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Onken) to approve as recommended in the staff report; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current 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 provided by Green Environment, Inc., consisting of six plan sheets, dated received September 7, 2016, as well as the Hazardous Materials Information Form (HMIF), dated received September 7, 2016, approved by the Planning Commission on November 14, 2016 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.
- e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
- f. If the business discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire unless a new business submits a new hazardous materials information form and chemical inventory to the Planning Division for review by the applicable agencies to determine whether the new hazardous materials information form and chemical inventory are in substantial compliance with the use permit.

G. Regular Business

G1. Review of Draft 2017 Planning Commission Meeting Dates. ([Staff Report #16-095-PC](#))

Commissioners Barnes and Goodhue indicated the proposed 2017 meeting dates except for the first meeting in June worked for them. Commissioner Onken said the dates worked for him except he would need to miss the July 17 meeting. Commissioner Combs noted the issue of Commissioners needing to be recused and asked about Facebook projects. Principal Planner Rogers said there was nothing calendared yet but staff would check in with the Commission as Facebook projects approached.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: December 5, 2016
- Regular Meeting: December 12, 2016

Replying to the Chair, Principal Planner Rogers noted that Commissioner Goodhue would be absent from both December meetings.

I. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on December 12, 2016