



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 12/12/2016
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 Barnes, Drew Combs (Vice Chair), Larry Kahle, John Onken, Henry Riggs (arrived at 7:03 p.m.), Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Absent: Susan Goodhue

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner, Arnold Mammarella, Contract Planner, Barbara Kautz, City Attorney's Office (Goldfarb and Lipman LLP), Margaret Netto, Contract Planner, Kristiann Choy, Transportation Engineer

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Rogers said the City Council at its December 6, 2016 meeting adopted the ordinances for the ConnectMenlo (General Plan Update) to be effective in 30 days pending any litigation. He said at the same meeting the Council adopted revised Building Codes, received a report on the Below Market Rate Housing fund and other fees, and heard a proposal from the Housing and Economic Department to require 12-month leases as an option for certain residential rental properties in Menlo Park. (Commissioner Riggs joined Commission at dais.)

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the November 14, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (John Onken/Strehl) to approve the minutes of November 14, 2016 as presented; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Susan Goodhue not in attendance.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Consider Recommendations to the City Council on the 1300 El Camino Real Project ("Station 1300"), including the following actions: ([Staff Report #16-103-PC](#))

1. Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, along with an associated Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;

2. Architectural Control Review for compliance with Specific Plan standards and guidelines, including determination of a Public Benefit Bonus to exceed the Base level FAR (Floor Area Ratio) and height standards, for a mixed-use development consisting of non-medical office, residential, and community-serving uses on a 6.4-acre site, with a total of approximately 220,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 183 dwelling units;
3. Use Permit for outdoor seating associated with full/limited service restaurants;
4. Tentative Map to merge existing parcels and create one private parcel (with a four-unit commercial condominium) and two public right-of-way parcels; dedicate a new public street extension of Garwood Way; abandon Derry Lane and a portion of the existing Garwood Way right-of-way; and abandon/dedicate public access and public utility easements;
5. Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement for compliance with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program;
6. Heritage Tree Removal Permits to remove 59 heritage trees; and
7. Development Agreement for the project sponsor to secure vested rights, and for the City to secure public benefits, including a \$2.1 million cash contribution, additional affordable housing units, a publicly-accessible dog park, and a sales tax guarantee.

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers noted the large size of the color and materials boards and their location. He referred to page 16 under the sales tax heading of the draft development agreement section that called out 18,600 square feet of community serving uses. He said that should state "between 18,600 and 29,000 square feet." He reported numerous correspondences received either directly by the Planning Commission or by him that were then forwarded to the Planning Commission. He said all correspondence received before 5 p.m. today was collected and printed out for the Commission and public. He said the draft CEQA resolution had some non-substantive revisions.

Attorney Barbara Kautz, Goldfarb and Lipman, LLP, said although the Commission did not need to take action on the findings of the environmental impact report (EIR), it was the intent that the findings be as complete as possible for the Commission's review. She said this was the first infill development EIR the City has done and there were additional findings required that were not typically in EIR findings. She said the added findings were already in the record in the checklist for Infill EIR or in the EIR itself but the findings needed to be expanded somewhat to explain the conclusions in the environmental checklist.

Principal Planner Rogers said he had made copies of the revised draft CEQA resolution for the Commission and copies were also being printed for the public.

Environmental Consultants Presentation:

Ms. Kirsten Chapman, ICF, said they prepared the Infill EIR for the project. She introduced Erin Efner, ICF, and Mark Spencer, W-Trans, transportation consultant for ICF. She said the City of Menlo Park was the lead agency and ICF was the lead consultant in the preparation of the Infill EIR. She said as shown on a map the proposed 6.4-acre project site contained seven existing buildings having approximately 22,000 square feet, which fronted on Derry Lane, Oak Grove Avenue and El Camino Real. She said the project site was within the area of the Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and the EIR for the Specific Plan was certified in June 2012. She said additionally sections were analyzed under various past CEQA documents including the Derry Lane Mixed Use Project EIR that was certified in 2006, for which she noted approvals were no longer valid. She noted also the 1300 El Camino Real Sand Hill Project EIR was certified in 2012. She

said this proposal was different from the Sand Hill proposal and the current environmental analysis looked at the whole current project proposal and did not rely on previous approvals.

Ms. Chapman said Greenheart Land Company was proposing to redevelop the site into a mixed-use development. She said existing structures would be demolished and 420,000 square feet of mixed-use facilities constructed. She said the project would include three mixed-use buildings up to four stories in height, a parking lot and underground parking with 1,000 parking spaces, linked landscaping, and a privately-owned, publicly accessible park. She said that the uses would total approximately 200,000 square feet of non-medical office space in two buildings, approximately 200,000 square feet of residential space equal to approximately up to 220 living units and up to approximately 30,000 square feet of community-serving space throughout the proposed buildings.

Ms. Chapman said that the project met the design standards of the Specific Plan, was proximate to transit, would use renewable energy, and was within a low vehicle travel area made it eligible for streamlining of the CEQA process for infill projects per SB226. She said although not required under SB226 the City elected to study project alternatives. She reviewed the mitigations that would reduce significant impacts to less than significant: impacts on bicycle and pedestrian facilities, exposure of sensitive receptors to adverse health risks, routine hazardous materials use and accidental release of hazardous materials. She said the Infill EIR also identified impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable and those included transportation impacts.

Application Presentation: Mr. Steve Pierce, Greenheart Land Company, introduced the architectural team of David Israel, BAR Architects, and Bruce Jett, Landscape Architect. He reviewed their four-year plus efforts on the project and the associated public hearings as well as the goals and intent of the development. He said this was a public benefit project under the Specific Plan's bonus density program. He said the project had inherent public benefits such as 180 new housing units next to transit, substantial revenues for a number of entities, underground parking, and retail. He said the public benefit proposed was \$2.1 million contribution to the downtown amenity fund and the provision of 20 below market rate (BMR) units. He said they were also guaranteeing \$84,000 a year in sales tax revenue and providing a dog park. He said they have a focused marketing program for incubator type space, startup or other new companies. He said they would have a robust transportation demand management (TDM) program and sustainability program. He said they would add to the City's bicycle infrastructure.

A video about the proposed project was shown.

Mr. David Israel, BAR Architects, said many changes had been made to the project since the video was created. He said one of the benefits of almost four acres of underground parking was having more open space. He said the parking had two access points from El Camino Real and two access points from Garwood. He said designated retail parking would have elevators and stairs to access the retail uses from the garage. He said the two three-story office buildings would face El Camino Real and provide a civic edge to the project. He said Oak Grove Plaza would be directly accessed by people arriving by train for retail, restaurants and other amenities. He said the Grand Promenade from El Camino Real led to the Central Courtyard. He said the Courtyard was approximately 120 by 170 square feet. He said one change between this current plan and the video was that the open arcades were now closed. He said this brought the retail facades closer to the street edge and would give the shops added presence along the street. He said Garwood Park had been proposed as bocce courts originally. He said based on public input it was now intended as a dog park. He noted that 100% of the residential units were designed to be adaptable for persons with disabilities.

Mr. Bruce Jett, Jett Landscape Architecture and Design, referred to Garwood Plaza as a place for Menlo Park residents to gather. He said there would be a fountain surrounded by palm trees creating an urban oasis where people could linger noting outdoor seating or could easily access the retail uses. He said along Oak Grove Avenue there were street trees, bicycle parking, benches, and trash receptacles creating a human scale. He said there was another four-foot width between the buildings and the eight-foot sidewalk for use by restaurants and retail. He said a key objective of the Central Plaza was to draw people into the space from El Camino Real. He said to that end they had pulled water features forward of the planters. He said they allowed for space for seating around the perimeter of the plaza and integrated the amphitheater into it. He said the scale was such that when empty it would not feel empty and could accommodate a large number of people that might gather for a small event. He said Garwood Park would be a dog park with other amenities such as picnic tables, water fountains for dogs and people, and a public restroom. He said the mews was intended at a smaller scale as separation and screening creating a garden setting with focalized features such as a lap pool, fitness room, and clubhouse noting seating and a fire pit, pavilion with seating, kitchens, fireplace and TV screen.

Commissioner Riggs said interest in varied paving shades was expressed and asked if they were amenable. Mr. Jett said they were proposing varied concrete pavers with different colors, shapes and patterns for sidewalk and over the podium.

Commissioner Onken asked if Garwood Way would be a dedicated City street and who was constructing it. Principal Planner Rogers said the applicant would do the construction and it would be dedicated to the City as a city street. Commissioner Onken asked about the seven parking spaces in the corner. Principal Planner Rogers said those would be time restricted spaces to incentivize use of the project property but would not be restricted to subject project use only.

Public Hearing:

- Harry Bims, Menlo Park resident, said he was on the Chamber of Commerce Board and that Fran Dehn, their CEO, submitted a letter expressing the Chamber's support of the project. He said he was reiterating that support noting his long time advocacy of mixed use for this property.
- Patrick Pelegri-O'Day, lifetime Menlo Park resident, said he currently worked with Greenbelt Alliance, and was representing their development endorsement team. He said the organization since 1980 has provided independent support or opposition for infill development projects. He said their team was proud to endorse the proposed Station 1300 project. He said a project like this gave him hope that he could afford to live in the area with the career path he chose and have the urban-like amenities he desired.
- Mike Moran said he was born and raised in Menlo Park and had raised two sons here. He said it was time for this project and time to bring in more retail, restaurants, sales tax, transit-oriented housing, new ideas, community, and commerce to Menlo Park and end the blight.
- Marc Bryman, Menlo Park, said he was happy this project might happen for the community noting it had been a methodical and thorough process. He said he hoped the Commission would strongly recommend the project to City Council.
- Skip Hilton said he concurred with all the previous speakers. He said he was a 22-year Menlo Park resident and was not representing any other group. He said he would like to see change

and growth in Menlo Park. He noted he participated in the Specific Plan development and this project completely fulfilled the objectives of that Plan.

- Vince Bressler said he was on the Commission when this project came forward and this proposal was not much different. He said his first reaction was it was a nice project. He said his second reaction was concern with traffic impacts for four streets near train tracks for ingress and egress at Garwood. He said that area by the train tracks was a major bottleneck already. He said he had not heard anything about the project's ability to integrate with grade separation options proposed for rail crossing. He said the Commission could not support the project because it did not solve the train track crossing.
- John Mueller said he agreed with everyone except the last speaker. He said three important things about this project were 1) changing an eyesore; 2) supporting existing services with people and energy; and 3) adding services that his family and others were currently availing themselves of in Palo Alto and Redwood City.
- David Wright said he and his family have lived in Menlo Park for five years and in addition to the favorable aspects of the project mentioned such as affordable housing, new restaurants, retail, and vibrancy, that office employees would avail themselves of downtown amenities.
- Scott Marshall, Menlo Park resident, and member of the Environmental Quality Commission and Heritage Tree subcommittee, said their Commission was asked to approve the removal of 59 heritage trees for the project. He said they did approve with recommendations to try to save some of the native heritage trees. He said 50 of the heritage trees were exotics and had grown quickly in the middle of the parcel. He said along the back of Garwood however there was a Valley oak, Coast live oak, and in the bioswale area near the parking lot was a healthy, native Coast redwood with five trunks and a good cluster. He said these trees would provide a buffer for the neighborhood behind as the project trees grew. He said it was a nice project and hoped for possibility of keeping some of the native heritage trees.

Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Strehl said the Commission at its last meeting heard a staff report regarding options for grade separations including the Oak Grove Avenue crossing. She asked if the applicants had spoken to the consultant preparing that report as to whether the project could accommodate future grade separations.

Mr. Pierce said they met with staff and discussed the options. He said Option A would not impact the project. He said Options B and C would require that Oak Grove Avenue be half submerged. He said they looked at the preliminary drawings for that in terms of road grade changes and how those might impact the project. He said visually and spatially there was no problem. He said if Oak Grove Avenue dropped down for Options B or C it would also bring down Merrill Street and Garwood, so they would still basically have the ability to go from Oak Grove Avenue into the project or out of the project. He said likewise under Option C, Glenwood Avenue would be dropped down, but Garwood would rise back up. He said that would keep the back of their project at grade, so there was no huge conflict. He said for the retailers on Oak Grove Avenue this option would not be optimal as there would be less visibility from cars driving by of their stores. He said if the \$300 million option came to the fore, they would want to be involved with that as the plans they had seen thus far made it difficult to get from the train station as a pedestrian to their development, so modifications would be needed for pedestrian access. He said nothing their development was doing would

preclude or make more expensive changing the grade and building a retaining wall. Chair Strehl asked if he was saying that a grade separation at both Glenwood and Oak Grove Avenues would allow access at Garwood. Mr. Pierce said that was correct as preliminary plans showed Garwood dropping to the level of Oak Grove Avenue so the turning movements would exist. He said where it came back up at full grade it was at a location that would still work for them relative to the entrances to their garage.

Commissioner John Onken asked if Mr. Israel could highlight the main changes in this proposal from the previous proposal. Mr. Israel said the change to the commercial office buildings was to enclose the arcades as community serving retail spaces. He said that did not affect the form or mass of the building. Commissioner Onken said in the EIR they were given ranges of the residential/office/retail/community areas from 18,000 to 36,000 square feet. He confirmed with Mr. Israel that the current data sheet was concise and was what the Commission was being asked to recommend approval. Mr. Israel said the only remaining range was for the retail/commercial use which had a minimum to be maintained while providing for larger retail spaces.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes asked what determined whether they went for the minimum amount or maximum amount of community serving retail space. Mr. Pierce said it was in response to marketplace forces. He said on Oak Grove Avenue this was physically fixed. He said on El Camino Real that it would depend upon the tenants they get and how deep a space they might want. He said the 18,600 square feet was a minimum level commitment, but if they got tenants who wanted greater and deeper space they wanted the capacity to provide that. Commissioner Barnes asked what types of businesses would want greater and deeper space. Mr. Pierce said restaurants or a health or fitness studio. He said planning for the space would take place during the marketing phase.

Mr. Pierce described some of the expected uses for the Central Plaza in reply to a question from Commissioner Barnes.

Commissioner Larry Kahle asked how the public places would be secured at night. Mr. Pierce said they would maintain security and do maintenance for all of their facilities noting the dog park and public restroom.

Replying to Chair Strehl, Mr. Pierce said that security would be maintained for the dog park so it was not used for overnight camping and that the dog park was for residents of the development and the general community.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes' question about parking, Mr. Pierce described time limit parking for community-serving businesses, office parking and dedicated residential parking. He said they did a shared parking analysis as there was overlap and they did not need all the parking in the additive sense. He said potentially for weekend special events downtown that office and community-serving parking spaces could be available.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the focus on incubator/startup types of businesses. Mr. Pierce said this arose in their conversations with the City's negotiating team. He said that team had a desire to have focused outreach and marketing to those particular uses.

Chair Strehl confirmed with Mr. Pierce that office and residential tenants would pay a parking fee. He said rates had not been determined; he said the intent was to de-incentivize the use of cars. Chair Strehl noted a letter of concern that startup companies might be 24 hour operations. Mr.

Pierce said the development was intended to have normal business hours and reiterated that the push for incubator companies came from the City Council members on the negotiations team with the idea to try to create spaces where companies might be fostered to grow in Menlo Park. He said it was not their intent to turn this into an area that was very dense on employees.

Commissioner Drew Combs asked if the City Council had a reference of an actual business model they wanted to see replicated. Mr. Pierce said it was presented as a concept. He said their guarantee was that they would approach those particular business operators and would engage brokers for specific uses. He said the direction from the Council was not to ignore those users and reach out to them. He said although it was a unique requirement it was easily satisfied by being very proactive in terms of contacting the operators of such businesses. Commissioner Combs asked about the 10-year development agreement and whether the provision of BMR units and the dog park would cease after 10 years. Mr. Pierce said the BMR requirement for 20 units was a standard 55-year BMR agreement. He said the other obligations would expire in 10 years. Ms. Kautz said the dog park would run with the land and would go beyond the term of the agreement. Commissioner Combs said they had received letters that most of the office population was based upon a 300 square foot per employee estimate while a company like Facebook did something much smaller than that, and asked why. Mr. Pierce said that some tech operators have a much more open landscape format with more employees per square foot as opposed to some professional businesses that prefer to use the space much more office density, which lowers the density of employees. He said he thought they would end up with a mix of tech and professional services businesses but most of their inquiries had been from professional service businesses. Commissioner Combs asked about the reason for a four-unit commercial condo. Mr. Pierce said there would be one for each office building. He said the third would be the entire residential building and the fourth would be the common areas including the plazas and garage. He said the reason was to allow for flexibility so that if at some point in the future the development was sold that it could be sold that way. He said the three elements that could be sold would be the three buildings with each having a proportionate ownership in the common area. He said they had no intent to sell the development.

Chair Strehl said they were paying \$2.1 million for public benefit. She said the transportation impact fee was the same amount and asked if those were separate payments. Mr. Pierce said that was correct. Chair Strehl confirmed with the applicant that the project would not have a trip cap but would have a very proactive TDM program.

Replying to Commissioner Kahle, Mr. Pierce said a rough range estimate of the number of employees present at any given time was 700 to 900. He said that the open arcades counted as floor area, and since those wrapped around the restaurant space and would be good dining areas they decided to capture that. He said also it became redundant area for circulation particularly since there were such deep sidewalks. Commissioner Kahle asked about the archway leading into the plaza noting a GoFundMe to recreate three Menlo Park arches. Mr. Pierce said they had not given that any thought. He said they could look if there was a place on the site for those. Commissioner Kahle noted the heritage tree removal and due to the Hetch Hetchy the need to raise Garwood up. Mr. Pierce said one of the most difficult issues with the trees was the space between the extended Garwood and the railroad right-of-way, which was about eight foot. He said that was required as bio-swale meaning they had to put special soils there. He said they were also required to put a 24-inch diameter storm drain into the bio-swale. He said with boring and a bit of overcut there would be about a three-foot diameter hole right under those trees which would be devastating to them. He said raising the street they would build a retaining wall along the railroad right-of-way to retain the bio-swale soils. He said within the narrow area of these trees there would

be a three-foot hole, soil removed and replaced with bio-swale soil mix, and two retaining walls constructed, which do a great deal of violence to the area. He said they hired an arborist to advise them on their plan. He said the City hired an arborist who recommended retaining two trees. He said one was right where the future sidewalk would be and not possible to save. He said the other was a palm that could be relocated. He said regarding the multi-trunk redwood tree that it was a seven-foot wide tree in an eight-foot size zone. Commissioner Kahle said looking at the civil engineering drawings he tended to agree that the trees along Garwood were difficult to save. He said he thought the redwood tree at the carwash area was an exception. Mr. Pierce said the foundation would be about 10-feet away from that tree and that would impact all the root structure. He said also where the tree was located a six to eight foot well would be required around the three foot diameter tree to allow for its growth. He said the edge of the tree was now at the edge of the sidewalk and the well would eat into the sidewalk about four feet. He said given the configuration of the road that was not desirable.

Commissioner Kahle asked if there was any way to tie workforce housing to people who work in Menlo Park such as teachers and fire district staff. Ms. Kautz said there were issues with requiring that. She said a state law said that as a condition of an application you could not give preference based on occupation and income. She said that made it difficult to make those requirements with any planning application. She said there were also laws regarding disparate impact but as a condition of a planning application you could not condition to discriminate against anyone based on income or occupation, although you could prefer agricultural employees. She said the City gave preference to people who worked or lived in Menlo Park for BMR housing.

Commissioner Barnes asked if there was a sunset clause for the sales tax payment. Ms. Kautz said it ran with the 10-year term of the development agreement which was when it would expire. Commissioner Barnes asked about relocating the Canary palm tree. Mr. Pierce said it would be relocated offsite.

Commissioner Henry Riggs said the Commission received a comment letter regarding the valuation of the parking in the development agreement. Principal Planner Rogers said with the Planning Commission and City Council's reviews of the public benefit proposal earlier in 2016, the City provided a fiscal analysis by an independent consultant BAE whose work was overseen by the City. He said that analysis looked at what the public benefit valuation. He said in the analysis presentation it was clear that development has moving elements and the analysis was the best snapshot in time based on those parameters. He said as the project moved forward some parking was reduced which might create savings for the developer but there were other factors that had changed, likely to the detriment of the developer's profit line, including pending interest rate changes, construction cost increases, and the cost of the land being vacant. He said the City Council through the development agreement set the terms and had reviewed and approved the term sheet for the project.

Commissioner Riggs said renderings had notes that some of this was no longer current. Mr. Pierce said there were no major changes to the form, shape, style of the buildings and changes related to landscape treatment and awnings. He said there was a great deal of signage shown on the renderings and their signage plan had yet to go through the City. He said the more substantive change was to the grand entry into the residential building area by changing that into a grand lobby that could also become an amenity area. Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Mr. Pierce said they were open to staff suggestions about materials and elements. He said regarding colors they were in total concurrence. Commissioner Riggs asked about the bronze metal window frames on the materials board and the brown framed windows in the renderings in the video. Mr. Israel said part

of that was in response to staff to comply with standards of the Specific Plan for changes in materials, color and fenestration from building to building. He said it was a purposeful response to use dark brown on the windows of one of the buildings and dark red brown on the other to contrast color and fenestration. He said they intended to do everything they could to give the building a feel of integrity and quality. He said they wanted the architecture to be referential but not replicate traditional architecture. Commissioner Riggs said the arch that contained the 1300 seemed light in contrast to the architecture and asked if they were considering other versions of the arch. Mr. Israel said they were happy to look at that with staff. He said the genesis of the arch form was tied to the notion of the rail history and location and cast iron trestle found around rail stations. He said regarding the enclosure of the main arch into the central area that there were indoor halls interrupted by outdoor spaces that residents would need to access for various reasons. Commissioner Riggs asked about the finishes on the open air stairs. Mr. Israel said staff had indicated that was something they would like to work with them closely on to make sure the colors were appropriate to the style. He said they agree with that collaboration and expected either a transparent opaque stain complementary to the buildings' color and not some completely inconsistent stylistic approach. Commissioner Riggs asked if there would be decorative elements or if they would be simple exit stairs.

Mr. Israel said the open air stairs would have stylistically consistent, probably articulated, solid wall with some more traditional cap elements. He said the residential would have direct access from the streets to the stoops with a wall that connected to the street. He said they had not gotten as far as the stair steps but it would be architecturally consistent. He said the stairs were significant light wells that would draw people up from the parking garage to the plaza and retail and allow people to exit graciously.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the idea of changing parking along Oak Grove Avenue to free up space for a bicycle lane. Mr. Pierce said that the City intended to expand the width of Oak Grove Avenue at that location and initial plans were to widen the street and include the bikeways specified in the Specific Plan. He said their plan was to have parking on both sides of Oak Grove Avenue as there currently was and to have five-foot bikeways with two-and-a-half buffer with 11-foot drive lanes. He said at either the Bicycle or Transportation Commission hearings the thought came up to not widen the street and remove the parking from the Station 1300 side of the street and keep the parking on the other side of the street as well as the bikeways at the same dimensions as he previously mentioned. He said their preference was to keep the parking in part because of the retail. He said the safety concern was with vehicles crossing bike paths to park. Commissioner Riggs confirmed the applicant's proposal was to retain parking on both sides of the street.

Chair Strehl asked about construction staging and whether they were proposing to have construction vehicles travel down Oak Grove Avenue to Middlefield Road. She said one of the concerns expressed to her was construction traffic down Oak Grove Avenue past schools such as Nativity School and on Encinal Avenue going by Encinal School. Mr. Bob Burke, Greenheart Land Company, said the City has street identified routes for truck traffic. Principal Planner Rogers said sheet A8.02 showed flows around the site with a copy of the City's truck route map on the right. He said the unlimited truck routes were the freeways, Bayfront Expressway and El Camino Real. He said there were limited truck routes down Santa Cruz Avenue, Ravenswood Avenue and part of Middlefield and Willow Roads. He said on Attachment C11 there were conditions for the applicant to submit plans for building permit for construction parking management, construction staging and storing, as well as traffic control.

Commissioner Kahle said there appeared to be copper gutters and flashing. He said the City of Palo Alto had banned its use due to water contamination. Principal Planner Rogers said he would have to get back to him as to his knowledge the City of Menlo Park had not banned its use.

Commissioner Onken said that more than due diligence had been given to this project. He said he appreciated that the architect had gone from a fairly Santa Barbara style to a more collegiate, Stanford style. He said he thought the open arcades were critical and suggested whether they could get some of the permeability-feel back with some portion of that on the front. He said it was important to understand how the signage program would work on this project. He said he hoped it would take its opportunity to say high class and restrained. He said with the question of what would happen with raising and lowering railroad crossings that if Options B or C were done that the corner would still work but would not be the same as proposed. He said as they go over this process that if there was clarity about the railroad crossing that Greenheart should have flexibility to manipulate the corner accordingly. He said initially he was going to complain about removal of the heritage trees along Garwood but he understood the issues. He said he would depend on the arborist regarding the redwood and oak trees. He said the public benefit being offered was appropriate, and he could support the project.

Commissioner Kahle said he agreed with Commissioner Onken about the signage program and the public benefit. He said he also preferred the open arcades providing more of a Stanford quad feel. He said at the last meeting they had considered this project he had been concerned with the plaza and it potentially feeling empty. He said the applicant had done a good job of enhancing the areas with water features and other amenities. He said he was a little concerned about the security of the site at night. He asked if there was any support to keep the one redwood tree. He said it was a suggestion about the archway and he agreed with Commissioner Riggs that the arch seemed light given the size and entryway. He said he fully supported the project.

Commissioner Riggs said he had a long list of things he found commendable about the project. He said he had some questions for staff. He said the Downtown Specific Plan had established a bike route that included Garwood Way. He said in the plans it was shown as a Class 3 bike route. He asked if it was at all feasible to move it up to a Class 2. Principal Planner Rogers said the Class 3 bike route was consistent with what was in the Specific Plan. He said to accomplish Class 2 was likely possible with removal of parking on one side of the street. He said that request if supported by the majority of the Commission could be looked at in more detail during the period between tonight's hearing and when the project went before the City Council for approval. Commissioner Riggs said he was not completely opposed to using a Class 3 bike lane. He asked regarding the Oak Grove Avenue curb relocation he had discussed with the applicant whether staff was amenable should the Commission support that. He said it was very significant to have parking in front for retail. Principal Planner Rogers said the Transportation Commission's recommendation was brought forward but staff believed the designs that were the applicant's preferred scenario of moving the curb, retaining the parking on both sides, and adding a bike lane and buffer met modern standards for bicycle lanes. He said there was not a clear regulatory or safety reason to not permit that. He said the Transportation Commission's concern was that even with a buffer for bicycles from opening car doors that cars would be passing through bike lanes to park.

Commissioner Riggs said he supported staff's conclusions about the proposed heritage tree removals. He said he found the public benefit of \$2.1 million, 20 BMR units, and a dog park appropriate and sufficient for the bonus density level. He said the architecture and landscape architecture were commendable and he appreciated the references to historical and not actual historical features. He said the open space, dog park and public restroom were desirable. He noted

the underground parking was highly desirable and would serve the community well. He said the applicant brought forth a very attractive project meeting all of the requirements of the Specific Plan. He said he thought the retail uses would be charming and enhance downtown.

Commissioner Barnes said he supported the project and preferred the mix of residential and commercial rather than just being residential. He said the public benefit was adequate and the environmental review was very well done. He said with the corridor that he did not think the central courtyard would be attractive to the public but would be more for the residents. He said if they truly wanted that to be a public space they would need to make it more inviting. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with Commissioner Barnes that he was referring to the 1300 arch.

Chair Strehl said she concurred with other Commissioners that the project adhered to the Specific Plan and would be a great addition to the community.

Commissioner Combs moved that the Planning Commission make a recommendation that the City Council take the appropriate actions for approval of 1300 El Camino Real project, Station 1300, as outlined in Attachment A of the staff report. Chair Strehl seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the makers of the motion and second would support recommendation to allow the applicant to move the Oak Grove Avenue curb to the plan line so they might have the row of parking in addition to the bike lane on either side. Commissioners Combs and Strehl accepted Commissioner Riggs' proposed amendment.

Commissioner Riggs asked in deference to Commissioners Onken and Kahle if the Commission wanted to suggest to staff that the archway to the residential or Commissioner Barnes' idea to work with the archway to the retail space be reviewed for enhancement. Chair Strehl said from her perspective that keeping the entry to the residential closed off to the public was appropriate. Commissioner Riggs said he thought Commissioner Onken was asking for more depth at the top of the stairs or something implying an entry even if it was not.

Commissioner Onken said they were looking at the rendering in question and not the stairs. He said on either side of the arch on El Camino Real there had been the beginnings of arcades that had been removed in the latest plan. He said those had given a more permeable feel to the entry and thought it would be good to get more openness there. He said this was an appropriate opportunity to prescribe particular architectural moves noting the architect and developer thus far have seemed responsive to concerns. He said he was happy to see things move forward without prescribing any architectural moves.

ACTION: Motion and second (Combs/Strehl) to make a recommendation that the City Council take the appropriate actions for approval of 1300 El Camino Real project, Station 1300, as outlined in Attachment A of the staff report with one modification to recommend approval of the applicant's proposal for the Oak Grove Avenue configuration; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Goodhue not in attendance:

Environmental Review

1. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Adopting Findings Required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Certifying the Final Infill Environmental Impact Report for the 1300 El Camino Real Project, Located at 1258-1300 El Camino Real, 550-580 Oak Grove Avenue, and 540-570 Derry Lane (Attachment B)

Architectural Control, Use Permit, and Tentative Map

2. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Approving Findings and Conditions for the Architectural Control, Use Permit, and Tentative Map for the 1300 El Camino Real Project located at 1258-1300 El Camino Real, 550-580 Oak Grove Avenue, and 540-570 Derry Lane (Attachment C).

Heritage Tree Removal Permits

3. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Approving the Heritage Tree Removal Permits for the 1300 El Camino Real Project, located at 1258-1300 El Camino Real, 550-580 Oak Grove Avenue, and 540-570 Derry Lane (Attachment D)

Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement

4. Adopt a Resolution Approving a Below Market Rate Housing Agreement with Real Social Good Investments, LLC for the 1300 El Camino Real Project, located at 1258-1300 El Camino Real, 550-580 Oak Grove Avenue, and 540-570 Derry Lane (Attachment E)

Development Agreement

5. Introduce an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Approving the Development Agreement with Real Social Good Investments, LLC for the 1300 El Camino Real Project, located at 1258-1300 El Camino Real, 550-580 Oak Grove Avenue, and 540-570 Derry Lane (Attachment F)

G. Informational Items

G1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: January 9, 2017
- Regular Meeting: January 23, 2017
- Regular Meeting: February 6, 2017
- Regular Meeting: February 27, 2017

H. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 9:57 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on January 23, 2017