



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 2/6/2017
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Vice Chair Drew Combs called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Drew Combs (Vice Chair), Susan Goodhue, Larry Kahle, John Onken

Absent: Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Staff: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner, Jim Cogan, Housing and Economic Development Director, Michele T. Morris, Assistant Planner, Kaitie Meador, Associate Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Chow made some informational announcements regarding items of potential interest to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner John Onken noted an oak tree, which had been the showpiece for the 1022 Alma Street project design, had fallen during recent storms, and asked what the procedures for replacement or penalties might be.

Principal Planner Deanna Chow said as part of the project approval that a bond had been posted for the value of the oak tree. She said to her knowledge that would be used to purchase a replacement tree in the same location.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the January 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Andrew Barnes/Onken) to approve the minutes as submitted; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Riggs and Strehl absent.

Commissioner Onken recused himself from consideration of E2.

- E2. Architectural Control/Gregory Eaton/140 Forest Lane:
Request for architectural control for exterior modifications to the front and rear facades of an existing residence in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, including the addition of new gross floor area.
([Staff Report #17-007-PC](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Barnes) to approve the architectural control as recommended in the staff report; passes 4-0-1-2 with Commissioner Onken recused and Commissioners Riggs and Strehl absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Tobin Dougherty Architects, consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received January 24, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 6, 2017 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/Ali Reza Parvir/705 Cambridge Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family house and build a new two-story, single-family residence with a basement on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. ([Staff Report #17-008-PC](#))

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle said there seemed to be contradictions between the neighborhood area plan and some of the drawings in that A0.1 as to which neighboring properties were one-story and which two-story. Assistant Planner Morris reviewed and noted that Commissioner Kahle was correct and that directly behind the project was a one-story home and on the left and right of it were two-story buildings.

Applicant Comment: A gentleman said the project was to be his parents' home and that the existing home was unlivable. He said the neighbors on either side of his project had two-story homes and that they had expressed they were pleased with his project proposal.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the neighbors had concerns about the large balcony on the rear side of the proposed home. Mr. Parvir said he talked with one neighbor to the rear but the other home was not yet occupied.

Vice Chair Combs asked the speaker for his name. The speaker said he was Ali Reza Parvir, the applicant.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle asked about the front entryway noting there was stone and some vertical boxes shown. Leo Li, LEL Design, the project architect, said those indicated the two types of materials being used - stone veneer and vertical wood siding. He provided information on the color scheme. Commissioner Kahle said that at the front entry gable there was some stone work and above the door some boxlike elements, and asked that the latter was. Mr. Li said that it was decorative trellis above the door. Commissioner Kahle noted that the

project height was 10 feet on the first floor, nine feet on the second floor and that the living room height varied from 12 to 13 feet. He asked if they would consider reducing some of the height at least in the living room and bring it down from the maximum height allowed. Mr. Li said they could lower the living room height from 12 feet to 11 feet. He said they had compared their design with other neighbors' homes and those had the same plate height they were using. He said they considered the neighborhood character in their design choices and materials, noting the wood siding, stone veneer and wood shingle roof.

Commissioner Onken said he did not think any of the windows on the side created any privacy concerns. He said also the rear balcony was well screened and did not seem to be a privacy concern. He said the intent was to build another large home along Cambridge Avenue but he thought the design, which had a lot going on with it, might benefit from not being so thick and crowded. He suggested perhaps reducing the height of the living room as that seemed over-scaled, more like a small hotel than a residence.

Commissioner Kahle said the project benefitted from having a large home on either side of it. He said he would like to see the overall height reduced. He said bringing the living room height lower would have a good result for the design. He said the project was designed well on the side windows but the covered balcony in the rear would have a privacy issue to the neighbors' rear yards on either side. He said he appreciated the wood siding and the lack of stucco. He said he was inclined to support the project if the motion included reducing the height of the living room.

Commissioner Susan Goodhue said usually she was not one to want roof heights lowered, but in this instance she agreed with Commissioners Kahle and Onken that the balance of the house would be better if the right side was reduced in height noting the windows above that roof line on the second story would not appear so squashed. She said the design was trying to be a modern farmhouse. She said she appreciated their efforts to blend in with the neighbors' Mediterranean style homes but thought the project would be a more modern farmhouse design if they did not use wood siding especially on the upper elevations or used that material on the lower part of the house instead of stone veneer.

Commissioner Barnes said he liked that the second floor was stepped back and largely modulated around the perimeter of the first floor, and agreed that reducing the height of the living room would make the project more acceptable. He said aesthetically he did not understand the stone veneer on the front elevation. He said the back balcony was potentially problematic but otherwise the project was acceptable for him.

Commissioner Kahle said he could see what other Commissioners were saying about the stone veneer. He said he had some concern with the stone on the garage in that it stopped then turned the corner transitioning to another material. He said maybe the stone should not be used on the garage. He said the garage doors appeared really tall and asked what their height was. Mr. Li said the garage doors were eight-foot tall. Commissioner Kahle asked if they would consider using standard seven-foot high garage doors. Mr. Li said that eight-foot tall doors worked proportionately better with the windows over the garage doors.

Commissioner Kahle moved to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report with a condition to lower the height over the living room.

Vice Chair Combs asked staff if a specific height was needed. Principal Planner Chow said she understood that the goal was to reduce the overall exterior height in the front. Commissioner Kahle

said that was correct. Principal Planner Chow said lowering the height of the living room on the right front wing would affect the entryway. She said it appeared the pitched roof of the entry aligned with the pitched roof of the right wing. She asked if they wanted the entryway height also lowered. Commissioner Kahle said he did not want the entry way height changed. He asked if staff wanted a height specified for the living room. Principal Planner Chow said that a specific height would be preferable. Commissioner Kahle said he would amend his motion to request at least a one-foot of reduction of height over the living room.

Commissioner Goodhue asked about the roof height of the garage. Mr. Li said it was 10-foot high.

Vice Chair Combs said the motion was to approve as recommended in the staff report with a condition to lower the exterior height of the living room at least one-foot.

Commissioner Onken said he would second the motion noting that lowering the living room height a foot was about right. He said reducing that height would lessen the somewhat aggressive stepping up of the second floor and would give more space for the bedroom window on the second story above the living room. He said the Commission's main concern with the proposed project was scale and massiveness.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Onken) to approve the use permit with the following modification; passes 5-0 with Commissioners Riggs and Strehl absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") 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 LEL Design consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received February 1, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 6, 2017, 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.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** condition:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an additional section (or sections) through the area above the living room, in order to verify the interior ceiling and attic heights in this area and potential FAL (Floor Area Limit) implications. The diagrams and any associated revisions to the plans relating to FAL compliance shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans of the first floor that reduces the height of the roof of the right side of the front elevation (e.g. living room, dining room) by at least one (1) foot, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**

- F2. Architectural Control and Use Permit/M Arthur Gensler Jr & Associates, Inc./2200 Sand Hill Road: Request for an Architectural Control revision to allow exterior modifications to an existing two-story office building including: the creation of a new entry, updates to the color scheme, modifications to the building elevations, landscaping improvements, and the addition of two accessible parking spaces. The subject property is in the C-1-X (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive - Conditional Development) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for a use permit to reduce the required parking rate per the parking reduction policy. ([Staff Report #17-009-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Kaitie Meador said there were no additions to the staff report noting a colors and materials board was at the dais for the Commission's review.

Applicant Presentation: Bert deViterbo, Gensler Architects said they were proposing a new entry to the building on its west side and made a PowerPoint presentation on the project proposal.

Commissioner Onken asked whether the bronze tinted glass on the materials board would be used. Mr. deViterbo said that was the front entry picture window for which they were proposing laminated glass with bronze mesh so the glass was not completely clear.

Commissioner Goodhue asked about the material for the planter in the area leading from the ADA entrance. Mr. deViterbo said it was painted metal.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the proposal was acceptable but he thought the entryway glass might be less inviting than the applicant expected. He moved to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Commissioner Barnes said he was glad a parking survey had been done for this project, noting he was very supportive of opportunities to reduce surface parking where it was not being utilized. He said from an architectural point he thought this was a good project.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Riggs and Strehl absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. 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.
4. Approve the architectural control and use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Gensler, consisting of 41 plan sheets, dated received January 26, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 6, 2017, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

G. Regular Business

- G1. Housing Element Annual Report/City of Menlo Park:
Opportunity to consider and provide comments and/or a recommendation to the City Council on the 2016 Annual Report on the status and implementation of the City's Housing Element (2015-2023).
([Staff Report #17-010-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Chow introduced Jim Cogan, Economic and Housing Development Director. She said the Housing Element annual report was submitted to the state's Department of Housing and Community Development by April 1 each year and it reported on the City's housing production and housing program implementation for the preceding calendar year. She said 2016 highlights included the adoption of the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan and the M-2 Area Zoning Update after a multi-year process, and noted that housing was a major theme throughout the General Plan discussion. She said part of the new vision of a live/work/play environment in the former industrial and warehouse M-2 through the Land Use Element and the newly crafted R-MU (Residential Mixed Use) zoning district included up to 4,500 net new housing units where no housing was previously permitted. She said the R-MU zoning district also included a requirement for below market rate housing and affordable units from potential projects seeking bonus development. She said in 2016 as well the City Council began more formal discussions on how to address displacement in the City, and in December adopted an ordinance requiring 12-month lease agreements for apartments of four or more units. She said the Council referred two other potential ordinances related to rental conflict resolution and rent

assistance to the Housing Commission for review and discussion. She said related to housing production that the City issued 66 building permits for new dwelling units in 2016. She said most of the units were located in the Mid-Pen Sequoia and Belle Haven Affordable Senior development located at 1221 Willow Road. She said 15 of the 66 new units were located within the mixed-use development at 1295 El Camino Real. She said the Council extended the conversion process for accessory buildings to secondary dwelling units for an additional three years. She said recent state laws superseded the City's secondary dwelling unit conversion process and allowed for a non-discretionary process. She said in February, the Housing Commission supported the Housing Element Annual Report moving forward to the City Council. She said the Housing Commission discussed various topics including housing on Pierce Road, changing the language of the notice availability of funding to relax the criteria, working on an anti-retaliation ordinance, revisiting secondary dwelling unit criteria to reduce the minimum lot size requirement, working on items to address displacement more directly, and increasing marketing efforts for when affordable housing units become available.

Vice Chair Combs opened the public comment period and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes noted page 2, 3rd paragraph, the line: "The Council also adopted a provision whereby current or recently displaced Belle Haven residents would have a preference for the units, in recognition that the community amenities should benefit the people and area that may be most directly impacted by increased development." He asked how that would work. Principal Planner Chow said they would need to define the mechanics of how that would be implemented. She said the sentence was added in response to displacement in the Belle Haven area adjacent to the M-2 area and an interest to create some flexibility to assist persons recently displaced or on the City's wait list but who might no longer be eligible. She said they worked with the City's housing partner "Hello Housing," the firm that administers the City's below market rate housing program to review the list for who might qualify under that preference provision.

Mr. Cogan said a person needed to be either a resident or be employed in Menlo Park to qualify. Commissioner Barnes said a displaced Menlo Park resident might not then qualify to be on that list. Mr. Cogan said that was true. He said one of the items the Council referred back to the Housing Commission for consideration and prioritization was changing that requirement so that if you had been on the BMR list as an existing Menlo Park resident but since had been displaced that qualification to be on that list might be extended up to three years.

General discussion ensued with Mr. Cogan answering questions about the lists for rental and ownership BMR units as to eligibility and other factors.

Commission Barnes noted page 3 of the staff report and asked about the affordable housing overlay (AHO). Principal Planner Chow said that in 2013 the City added an AHO that was applied to specific sites with the potential to be developed including some parcels on Haven Avenue and some on Willow Road such as the Mid-Pen Housing project and all of the Specific Plan area.

General discussion ensued with Principal Planner Chow and Mr. Cogan discussing the nexus study to support requiring the provision of BMR units from developers.

Replying to Vice Chair Combs, Mr. Cogan said that within the 21 Elements group there was discussion on the question of Airbnb rentals. He said the City had not taken a position but was also being discussed in the Silicon Valley Economic Development Alliance and was one of 15 topics the City Council has referred to the Housing Commission for prioritization.

Replying to Commissioner Kahle's question about using surplus land owned by the City for affordable housing, Mr. Cogan said that more accurately the City has underutilized land that could be used for affordable housing. He said one of the 53 goals taken to the City Council on January 27 was the concept of doing a downtown design contest related to use of City owned parking plazas. He said the Council gave them homework to look at potential public-private partnership for development ideas for parking plazas 1, 2 and 3.

Commissioner Onken said his firm was responding to an RFP for San Mateo regarding developing a parking lot to include parking and mixed use.

Replying to Commissioner Goodhue, Mr. Cogan said Lot 1 was the lot behind Suzie's Cakes, Lot 2 was the smaller lot on Oak Grove Avenue between Crane and Chestnut Avenues, and Lot 3 was on the other side of Crane Avenue behind the restaurant, Refuge.

Vice Chair Combs asked if the Commissioners' individual comments would be shared with the Council or whether the Commission should summarize concluding comments for Council. Principal Planner Chow said she was taking notes on the clarifying questions asked but noted the Commission could comment on priorities and those could be provided to the Council for consideration at its February 7 meeting, and/or the Commission could comment on the annual report itself that was scheduled for the City Council's consideration on March 14.

Commissioner Barnes said regarding H2C and the ordinance amendment to protect existing housing that housing conversion to condominiums or Tenants in Common (TICs) was not necessarily a bad thing. He said there was affordable housing and affordability as it related to housing. He said condominium conversions and TICs could be good entry points for people who could not afford detached homes in Menlo Park. He said he would not want restrictions on conversions to those types of properties as he thought supply helped with the goal of affordability. Principal Planner Chow said the intent of the H2C program was to have residential properties zoned as residential and not zoned as commercial.

Vice Chair Combs asked if two parties wanted to convert a duplex to condominium or a TIC whether or condo was that something that would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission for approval. Principal Planner Chow said with two units on an R-2 property that the property owners could come to the City with a condominium map, which would come to the Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Barnes said regarding City surplus properties for housing and using downtown parking lots as suggested that it might be better to look at density downtown through the biennial review of the Specific Plan. He said that the proposal to take a public square and use it for housing that would be enjoyed by a few was not an equitable use of that land for City residents.

Mr. Cogan said the Council had not approved anything for the downtown parking plazas and they were very cognizant about the parking concern. He said in the short term additional parking would have to be part of any use of those lots. He said with emerging technologies of travel should those eliminate parking needs, in such a future they would need to see what use parking garages might be converted to.

Commissioner Goodhue said people often complain that they cannot find parking in Menlo Park. She said she has no problem parking in Menlo Park, which for her was typically early in the morning and later in the day. She asked if the City has studied the use of all of the parking plazas. She said people also express concern about the loss of parking spaces along Santa Cruz Avenue

for outdoor restaurant seating and bicycle parking. She said she would like data to use to respond to people upset about the City removing downtown parking.

Mr. Cogan said the City has extensively studied parking and particularly downtown. He said the City has more than enough parking and that the Specific Plan noted a surplus of 60 parking spaces downtown. He said people's parking perceptions were often based on how far they would need to walk from where they parked to where they would like to go. He said parking could be difficult in Plaza 3 at lunchtime. He said to add building square footage downtown was hindered by parking need. Replying to Commissioner Barnes' question about a utilization study, Mr. Cogan said he believed the last one done of the parking downtown was 2014.

Commissioner Onken said in terms of policy regarding the Housing Element there was much discussion about transportation impact analysis and other transportation concerns. He asked if the initiative to review the parking requirements every time low income projects came forward would continue. He said depending on the location it could be argued that the parking requirement was not needed, and asked if that was built into the Housing Element.

Principal Planner Chow said with the AHO it was recognized that potentially senior housing or affordable housing might have different parking standards. She said with the adoption of the new zoning district that different parking standards were established for residential and commercial. She said also there was the potential for shared parking of uses. She said in the Specific Plan there was a reduction of parking in areas with proximity to transit. She said also when people use the state density bonus law for development that parking reduction was potentially one of the available exchanges.

Commissioner Barnes asked, regarding section H4A which was to modify R-2 zoning to maximize unit potential, what net count of units that might contribute. Principal Planner Chow said the intent was to incentivize two units on an R-2 lot rather than maximizing the Floor Area Limit for one unit on an R-2 lot. She said this was currently in place for the R-4-S District to allow more Floor Area Ratio with greater density. She said they also did this with a sliding scale for the R-M-U district.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the BMR fund amount and for a projection on how many units that could add. Mr. Cogan said currently there was \$7.9 million in the BMR fund. He said with a combination of funds for a program that was not used anymore and loans coming due they were working with the finance department to determine what additional funding there was, noting that they would have a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) in 2017. He said there was money coming in from developments such as Facebook. He said looking forward funding was in the \$10 to \$15 million range.

Commissioner Goodhue noted the amount of money the City has given Mid-Pen Housing and asked if the ratio of city funds to developer funds was situational or if there was a rule. Mr. Cogan said it was very project dependent with many elements in the analysis. He said typically they look at a per unit subsidy. He said for every project depending on their scale of affordability and unit count, there might be a high per unit cost. He said for instance moderate income units were actually more expensive from the City's standpoint as a developer of those would not get Federal tax credit for them. He said it depended on where they needed the units and what other funds they were leveraging.

Commissioner Onken asked if the Planning Commission could push projects to build units rather than developers paying into a fund. Mr. Cogan said units were preferable. He said a Stanford commercial project near Sand Hill Road would supply two additional BMR units through its 500 EI

Camino Real project, noting that the Housing Commission recommended a two year check-in on such arrangements.

Vice Chair Combs said the Housing Element was not a delivery of housing units but provided planning and zoning guidelines for the City to create an environment where additional housing units could be provided. Principal Planner Chow said that the City has a housing production number provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments for the planning period of 2015 to 2023. She said the City also identified a number of programs and when those would likely be implemented. She said the City reports annually on how it was meeting its total housing production including how well for each income category. She said the City was doing great in terms of overall housing production, noting housing on Haven Avenue. She said the City still had a ways to go to meet the low income housing needs. She said regarding the implementation programs that the City reports on what it will work on each year. She said the reporting holds the City accountable. She said the City's housing assessment for the full period was 665 units. She referred to page A3 or page 3 of 11 on the attachment that showed the total number of units that needed to be provided with 233 units for very low income, 129 units for low income, 143 units for moderate income, and 150 units above moderate income. She said in the far right column were the numbers of units produced and what remains to be done.

Vice Chair Combs asked if the City Council had a vision of the type of City density and if that might be shown graphically. He said he had heard concerns about too much density from people who wanted a certain type of life style and living environment. He asked if perhaps it would be possible at some point to illustrate what the City would look similar to some other city. Commissioner Kahle concurred it would be nice to point to another city as an example of what was envisioned.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

- Regular Meeting: February 27, 2017
- Regular Meeting: March 13, 2017
- Regular Meeting: March 27, 2017
- Regular Meeting: April 10, 2017

I. Adjournment

Vice Chair Combs adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on March 13, 2017