



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 4/24/2017
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Katherine Strehl called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Drew Combs (Vice Chair), Susan Goodhue, Henry Riggs, Larry Kahle (arrived at 7:31 p.m.), John Onken, Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Staff: Sunny Chao, Assistant Planner; Yesenia Jimenez, Associate Planner; Jean Lin, Senior Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Associate Planner; Ori Paz, Planning Technician; Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council at its April 18 meeting reappointed Katherine Strehl to the Planning Commission. He said at that meeting also the Council approved a one-year bicycle path pilot along Oak Grove Avenue, University Drive, and Crane Street. He said that would impact a number of parking spaces. He said the Transportation Division would work to make the transition as smooth as possible. He said a consideration of the 318 Pope Street heritage tree removal permit was on the Council's May 2 agenda.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the March 27, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Chair Strehl noted that Commissioner Henry Riggs had provided a proposed modification to the March 27 meeting minutes.

ACTION: Motion and second (Goodhue/Riggs) to approve the minutes with the following modification; passes 7-0.

- Page 10, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line from the bottom: Replace “not be occupied until El Camino

Real...” with “not be built until El Camino Real...”

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Chris Pandolfo/1065 Trinity Drive:
Request for a use permit to add on to the main floor and lower floor, and conduct interior modifications to an existing two-story, single-family residence that would exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period. The proposal includes excavation in the required right side and rear yard setbacks, associated with creating access to the lower floor addition and landscape improvements. The parcel is located in the R-E-S (Residential Estate Suburban) zoning district. As part of the proposed development, nine heritage-size trees (two white birches and seven Monterey pines) in poor health, are proposed to be removed. ([Staff Report #17-019-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Ori Paz said the landscaping and tree section of the staff report indicated 21 trees on site. He said as shown in the data table and tree inventory there were actually 22 trees on site.

Applicant Presentation: Andrew Young, Young and Borlik, project architect, introduced the property owners, Chris and Annie Pandolfo. He said the existing home was substandard as it did not have the required 25-foot combined side setbacks. He said the left side of the house was into the setback. He noted the Monterey pines were in a very mature degree of decline, and were proposed to be removed and replaced.

Commissioner John Onken said Commissioner Larry Kahle had texted a question asking if there had been consideration of some other material than stucco for the eaves of the entry and the new gable. Mr. Young noted stucco's longevity and its favorable fire safety factors. He said there were fire rated Hardie products that simulated siding and shingles. He said the house would be sprinkled in response to the fire department's request. He said also the roof was fire rated. He said the applicants' desire was to keep the overall existing massing of the building and treat maintenance issues for the long term. He said unless the Commission had a strong desire for other materials his clients were satisfied with the proposed materials.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said that it was proposed to replace the Monterey pines with the Saratoga pine and that the existing canopy would be replaced with a shrubbier plant. Mr. Young said he believed the landscape architect looked at the City's preferred trees. Mr. Chris Pandolfo said the primary goal on the right side was to work with the neighbors to select the trees and locations that would best meet their collective needs in terms of shielding, privacy and attractiveness. Mr. Young said that they would like to meet with the right side neighbor on the placement of the trees.

Chair Strehl asked about the room with no access to the main house. Mr. Pandolfo said the in-law unit would provide privacy for visiting grandparents. He said they would have liked to have found a way to connect it but there was no way to do it within the project rules and goals. He said another use for it would be for a nanny/au pair.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Neville Golden said he and his wife Joanne were the neighbors to the right of the project site. He said they supported the neighbors' plans to renovate the property. He said they also supported removal of the diseased trees and planting replacement trees to provide screening. He said their concern was privacy noting the project home was 10 feet from the property line and their master bedroom was directly opposite. He said also they have a pool and the upstairs windows would look directly over it. He said they discussed and suggested some changes to the windows including reducing the master bedroom window, removing the shower window and reducing the size of the window in the dressing room. He said the property owners also agreed to use frosted glass to provide more privacy. He said one concern was the proposed side door across from his master bedroom. He said they would prefer some access from the interior to reduce the amount of traffic through the side entry. He said they would prefer that entrance in the front, and if that was not possible, to move it farther forward away from their master bedroom. He said also they would like the fence between the properties to be as high as possible.

Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs asked Mr. Young if he and the property owner were open to a more conventional material for the bottom walls. He said the proposed dry stacked stone was not a good aesthetic choice. Mr. Young asked what other material he was interested in. Commissioner Riggs said that small slivered stone needed mortar. Mr. Young said he was fine with mortared stone.

Commissioner Onken said the reason the front bedroom suite did not connect to the rest of the house was because the project already used all the floor area. Mr. Young said that was correct.

Commissioner Onken said he thought the house was compliant. He said regarding Monterey pines that they did not provide great screening as their canopy was higher and it was their trunks that actually provided any screening. He said he supported changes to the windows on the right side to protect privacy. He said he would also like to see a parking space off the road for the front bedroom unit.

Chair Strehl noted that Mr. Kahle had arrived at 7:31 p.m.

Commissioner Barnes asked if there was any agreement about the fence between the project property and the right hand neighbor's property. Mr. Young said he believed City ordinance allowed for a six-foot fence between the properties. He said he had seen six foot fences with two-foot of lattice. He said hedges could be planted along the fence to fill. He mentioned varieties of pittosporum that would provide screening. Commissioner Barnes said he believed code allowed for a six-foot fence and one-foot lattice. He confirmed that the applicants would work with the neighbors on a satisfactory solution. Commissioner Barnes asked if the neighbors were okay with the porch and the stairwell down to the basement.

In reply to the Chair, Principal Planner Rogers said that the Chair could recognize the applicants and neighbors to speak and/or answer questions after the public hearing closed. He said they needed to come to the microphone when speaking. He said also hedges along a property line that exceeded seven foot would be in violation of City code.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes' question, Mr. Young said sheet A0.2 showed the deck was well beyond the immediacy of the neighbors' master bedroom and half of the deck was stairs. He said the deck was 20-feet from the fence with stairs going down to the lower patio area.

Commissioner Kahle said he knew Mr. Young having worked with him some years prior. He said he was curious about the detailing of the ridge beams and the eaves on the front elevation. Mr. Young said that Commissioner Kahle had suggested a material to break up the stucco and he confirmed with the property owner that was fine. Commissioner Kahle asked if the ridge beam could be more substantial – to which Mr. Young agreed. Commissioner Kahle asked about the head trim over the openings. Mr. Young said he had visualized an exterior crown molding. He said he would stay with the brick mold and have the stucco run into that. Commissioner Kahle said the entry gable eaves could be longer to balance with the two eaves on either side. Mr. Young said that was a fine suggestion.

Commissioner Onken moved to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report. Chair Strehl asked about the parking space for the in-law unit that Commissioner Onken had suggested. Commissioner Onken said he was recommending that for the owner and the record but was not requiring a condition. Commissioner Riggs said he would second the motion if Commissioner Onken would accept a modification to condition a more realistic application of the stone veneer with a mortar image or material. Commissioner Onken said he would not as the material was fairly innocuous, and he did not think that condition was helpful. Commissioner Riggs withdrew his second.

Commissioner Combs seconded the motion. He asked if the changes Commissioner Kahle had suggested had to be conditioned or not. Principal Planner Rogers said the text of the recommendation was that the plans before the Commission were approved so if there was a desire for changes that those needed to be conditioned. No additional conditions were recommended.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Combs) to approve the request as recommended; passes 6-1 with Commissioner Riggs opposing.

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 Young and Borlik Architects consisting of 38 plan sheets, dated received April 19, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 24, 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.

F2. Use Permit/Arzang Development L.P./262 Yale Road:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story home and detached garage, and build a new two-story residence on a substandard lot with respect to width. The subject property is in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #17-020-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Yesenia Jimenez said the applicants had brought photos of the landscaping along the side of the property for the Commissioners' review.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Phillip Kamangar, property owner, said they wanted to demolish an existing one-story home and replace it with a two-story home. He said he was available for questions.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the large window at the top of the staircase facing the neighbor's home. Mr. Kamangar said that window was 18 feet from the property line and there was another 10 feet to the neighbor's building. He said the window would overlook the neighbor's first floor roof line. Commissioner Kahle said on the other side that the window in the master shower was very tall. Mr. Kamangar said it was at the end of the corridor in the master bathroom and was there to provide light. Commissioner Kahle said he could not see how it was situated in terms of the neighboring property. Mr. Kamangar said the property on the left side was single-story and the window did not line up with any of their larger windows. He said a pair of obscure bathroom windows on the left side were in close vicinity to the master bathroom window but would in no way

provide a line of sight. Commissioner Kahle suggested raising the sill of the window so it would align with other sill heights along that elevation. Mr. Kamangar said they would be happy to align it with the right hand window next to it. Commissioner Kahle said that would be great. He said the front elevation mentioned an optional 1 by 3 trim. He asked if "optional" could be removed and make it required. Mr. Kamangar said yes but asked if he wanted it on all four sides or just at the sill which was what they intended. Commissioner Kahle said he was requesting the trim on all sides, noting the quantity of stucco being used. He asked if the right hand gable could have louvered vents or siding. Mr. Kamangar said they would be open to louvered vents or three pigeon holes. Replying to Commissioner Kahle, Mr. Kamangar said the style was traditional and lightly Mediterranean with a more contemporary interior. Commissioner Kahle said the three pigeon holes was more reminiscent of Mediterranean style so he suggested not using. Mr. Kamangar confirmed with Commissioner Kahle that painted louvered vents would work. Commissioner Kahle said he thought the entry porch was overpowered by the garage. Mr. Kamangar said they had considered some stone veneer that was not dry stacked, if the Commission was supportive of that. Commissioner Kahle said he would make the latter a recommendation but noted he wanted to require his other suggestions, including raising the sill of the master shower window, requiring window trim on all four sides, and giving the gable ends a louvered finish.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the right side landscape plan. Mr. Kamangar said as shown in the photos provided that was quite a bit of mature landscaping on both properties in that location. He said they planned to fence and keep the mature landscaping along both sides. Commissioner Barnes asked about heritage trees. Mr. Kamangar said there was one heritage tree in the right rear that would be preserved and protected and another heritage tree in front left of the property at the street area. He said that was in front of the neighbors' home and they intended to protect it. Commissioner Barnes asked about neighbor outreach. Mr. Kamangar said he originally talked with the neighbors about the removal of the cedar tree and the plan to demolish the existing home. He said that they have not since met or talked. Commissioner Barnes asked about the decorative fireplace off the second story. Mr. Kamangar said that the fireplaces were direct vent and did not require chimney stack. He said the feature was to provide a more traditional look of a home with a chimney. Commissioner Barnes asked about the width of the chimney. Mr. Kamangar said it was 20- by 24-inches.

Chair Strehl confirmed with the applicant that the home would be sold.

Commissioner Riggs said on one side the setback was five-foot and on the other side four-foot eight-inches. He said one side had a walkway and the other side was implied to have a walking strip. He questioned whether landscaping of any significance would be possible on the project side setbacks. He asked if keeping the mature landscaping referred to the neighbor's landscaping. Mr. Kamangar said the photos indicated that the neighbors had very green, mature landscaping on the sides and the project site in the front setback had pretty mature landscaping. He said they were open to adding greenery and shrubs for screening and beautification. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with Associate Planner Jimenez that neighbors had not commented on the landscaping. Ms. Jimenez said that one neighbor had commented on the board and batten materials originally proposed. She said that neighbor was satisfied when the material was changed to stucco.

Commissioner Barnes asked what aluminum framing for the windows was. Mr. Kamangar said those were aluminum clad windows outside with wood inside and color integrated.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said he appreciated Commissioner Kahle's input, and moved to approve with the three recommendations made by Commissioner Kahle to raise the sill of the master shower window, apply wood trim on all four sides of windows, and treat gable ends with louvered finish. Commissioner Kahle seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Kahle) to approve the request as recommended with the following modifications; passes 7-0.

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:
 1. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Atelier Designs, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated April 5, 2017 and stamped received on April 11, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 24, 2017, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 2. 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.
 3. 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.
 4. 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.
 5. 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.
 6. 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.

7. 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 conditions:**

- a. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, revised plans shall be submitted modifying the elevations to indicate that all windows will have trim around them, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
- b. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, a revised front elevation shall be submitted modifying the second-story gabled-roof end to show a louvered vent, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
- c. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, revised plans shall be submitted modifying the left elevation to reflect the raising of the sill height of the large second-story master bathroom window on the left to match the four-foot, four-inch sill height of the adjacent master bathroom window on the right, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**

F3. Use Permit/Alex Lai & Jessy Tseng/845 Arbor Road:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with respect to width and area in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #17-021-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Corinna Sandmeier said staff had no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Barnes noted the home was prefabricated and that as a Commissioner it was the first such structure he had seen. He asked if there were many prefabricated homes in Menlo Park. Associate Planner Sandmeier said there were some. Chair Strehl said the Commission had seen some but she could not recall addresses.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Toby Long, project architect, introduced the property owner, Mr. Alex Lai, who introduced his wife Jessy. Mr. Long provided images of the proposed structure. He said he had been doing prefabricated homes in Menlo Park for some time. He said the neighborhood was modest and they wanted an architecture that was compatible both in the design and its materials. He said the new home was basically in the same footprint and the garage would be in the same place. He said he had provided a materials sample for the stone veneer used as trim around the garage doors. He said there was a dramatic heritage tree in the rear yard they would protect and preserve. He said the house was built offsite and they would coordinate with PG&E to install the home.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the number of modules. Mr. Long said it had six modules with three on each floor. He said on the first floor those ran front to back and on the second floor side to side.

Commissioner Kahle said on sheet A2.2 that the second floor plan showed the roof as 4 by 12 and he thought that was 2 by 12. Mr. Long said Commissioner Kahle was correct. Commissioner Kahle said on the same plan in bedroom 3 the bottom window was marked as an egress window while on the elevation the sill was high on that window, sheet A.4. Mr. Long said window 41 was moved up to protect privacy in the side yard and the middle window W41 was egress. Commissioner Kahle said the window on A4 had a sill one foot above the floor. He asked why it was one foot on the left of bedroom 3 and two feet on the right side of bedroom 2. Mr. Long said he was trying to differentiate as he thought they did not look pleasing when they were the same size. Commissioner Kahle asked if they had considered privacy with shades. Mr. Long said they had been discussing greenery for screening on the side planting area with their landscape architect and staff. Commissioner Kahle asked about at the front. Mr. Long said it would be screened through drapery and interior blinds.

Commissioner Onken asked about the coated metal fascia and gutter on the renderings as it looked like a black line around the edge of the roof. Mr. Long said it was a sheet metal fascia with a four-inch square gutter.

Commissioner Barnes said in bedroom 3 that the window sill was one foot from the floor and in bedrooms 2 and 4 the sill was two foot high. He said he thought the sill heights were very low. Mr. Long said the impetus was to have large windows. He said they could consider taller sills but it would change the look of the window. Commissioner Barnes said his concern was the front and side window sill heights.

Commissioner Onken asked if they had done the prefabricated home on Middle Avenue. Mr. Long said they had.

Commissioner Kahle asked how tall the fascia was. Mr. Long said it was 12-inches. Commissioner Kahle said in bedroom 3 had a corner trim. Mr. Long said as the windows met in the corner that piece would match the window material rather than stucco. He said it was metal to match the fascia and the gutter. Commissioner Kahle confirmed that the windows were fiber glass.

Commissioner Riggs said that the image on the cover sheet was of a slider. Mr. Long said that the windows would have casements and awnings. Commissioner Riggs noted the stairway window was clerestory. He asked about the stone veneer and scale. Mr. Long said that they were quarry thin stone veneer and it was a natural quarried stone. He said he did not think the stones would be over 12 inches, and confirmed for Commissioner Riggs that they would be dry set.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said it was a very attractive house, very well proportioned and used great materials. He said he liked the composition even though some window sills were rather low. He said he would like the depth of the fascia smaller. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Onken said the rendering of the house and fascia made the house look tall but it would have a gutter and a profile. He said most of the eaves had depth and variation. He said the side window in bedroom 4 was large and close to the

property line. He asked if that window could be more discreet. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion made by Commissioner Kahle to approve as recommended. Commissioner Barnes said he liked the project and the concept of the prefabricated structure. He said he was having a hard time with the low sill height in bedroom 3 facing the street.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Riggs) to approve the use permit as recommended; passes 7-0.

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 Clever Homes, consisting of 20 plan sheets, dated received April 11, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 24, 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 and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Evergreen Arborist Consultants dated March 23, 2017

- F4. Use Permit/Kanler, Inc./515 Bay Road:
Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and lot area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. In addition, one heritage Joshua tree, 30 inches in diameter, in fair condition, and one heritage coast live oak, 22 inches in diameter, in fair condition, at the right side of the property would be removed. In addition, a heritage coast live oak, 16 inches in diameter, in fair condition, would be pruned more than 25 percent. An earlier version of the proposal was reviewed and continued by the Planning Commission on February 27, 2017. *Application withdrawn.*
- F5. Use Permit/Goldsilverisland Properties LLC/674-676 Partridge Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish two existing one-story single-family residences and a detached two-car garage, and construct two new two-story single-family residences, an attached one-car garage and a detached one-car garage. The proposal includes the removal of one heritage black acacia tree in the right rear area of the parcel as well as administrative review of a tentative parcel map to subdivide the project into two condominium units. The subject property is in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. (*Staff Report #17-022-PC*)

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Sunny Chao said each Commissioner had received a corrected sheet A.2 noting that the printing had caused some shifting of the polygon on that page.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle asked for more information on the differences between the sheet submitted and the new sheet. Assistant Planner Chao said she asked the applicant to have the shading of the adjacent neighbors on the left and right driveway to be clear. She said when they printed the electronically reviewed sheet it shifted the polygon.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Rick Hartman, Hometec Architecture, said this was the third project of this type on Partridge Avenue that they have done. He said the other two were completed. He said they had a neighborhood open house meeting on the property with all the drawings and 3D renderings. He said they received good response noting that the other two projects had been well received. He said they wanted to preserve the heritage trees noting one would have to be removed. He said windows were smaller and one large window on the east would have obscure glass. He said their arborist was available to answer any questions about tree protection and preservation.

Chair Strehl noted the staff report indicated the neighborhood meeting was on September 12, 2017 and suggested that should read 2016.

Commissioner Onken said that on one house the large window was shown as obscured but not on the other house. Mr. Hartman said both would be and that was an omission. Commissioner Onken said the driveway was concrete and asked what it was before and why the change. Mr. Hartman said they had discussed pavers and the arborist felt that was not a critical need in this case. Commissioner Onken said that permeable pavers was a hydrology issue, and he suspected that at some point it would be required.

Commissioner Kahle said he appreciated the gable end detail. He said on the front streetscape that to the right of the large window in bedroom 4 the gable return was shown but it was not shown on the left side. Mr. Hartman said the 2D on sheet A6 was correct.

Principal Planner Rogers said the streetscape was to indicate massing and had less detail while the elevations were more detailed.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Charles Irvey, 702 Partridge Avenue, said he and his wife had reviewed the plans with the front neighbors and the builder and were fairly happy with it. He said it was not clear until construction what the upper windows of the front house would see when looking into his house. He said they had an agreement when the other project was done on the other side to split the cost of screening trees along the driveway. He said he hoped they could have a similar arrangement so if screening trees were needed to provide privacy in their bedroom that such an arrangement could be made.

Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the project was to be commended for scale and ceiling height. He said it appeared there was 70 feet between 702 Partridge Avenue and the project front house. He said he supported if needed that there be cooperation between property owners on plantings for screening. He said he would like a condition for permeable pavers.

Commissioner Barnes said he liked the projects this developer was doing and he supported as a condition permeable pavers.

Commissioner Onken moved to approve the use permit with an added condition that the main driveway be redesigned with permeable pavers. Commissioner Kahle seconded the motion.

Principal Planner Rogers said Ms. Chao and he were discussing that sometimes arborists recommended concrete driveways because they require less excavation depth for excavation than permeable pavers. He said although the latter was better for plantings and drainage that sometimes deeper excavation was needed to install which might impact roots. He said if the Commission was amenable the action could be amended to indicate that it was recommended subject to verification of the project arborist.

Commissioner Onken said he would amend his motion and not make permeable pavers a condition. Commissioner Kahle seconded the amended motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Kahle) to approve the use permit as recommended; passes 7-0.

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 Hometec Architecture, Inc., consisting of 21 plan sheets, dated received April 12, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on April 24, 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 and the recommendations in the arborist report by Kielty Arborist Services revised on March 21, 2017.
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 revised plans showing the driveway as permeable, along with documentation from the project arborist that this change will not negatively impact existing trees. The revised plans and project arborist documentation are subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division and City Arborist, who may waive***

this requirement if existing trees would be negatively impacted.

F6. Use Permit Revision and Architectural Control Revision/The Kastrop Group/210 Oak Grove Avenue:

Request for a use permit revision and architectural control revision for a single-story addition to an existing social hall (O'Hare Center) on a church site in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district. Modifications to on-site parking are proposed, including the conversion of an existing three-car garage to gathering space and the construction of a new detached two-car garage. ([Staff Report #17-023-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Lin said regarding Attachment A, the recommended actions, that the owner was listed as Menlo Business Park, LLC and the owner was the Archdiocese of San Francisco. She said the color chips for the project were being circulated at the dais.

Applicant Presentation: Monsignor Otellini, pastor of Nativity Parish, said they wanted to modify the meeting room that had been there since 1977. He said the rectory had been constructed with the idea that the first floor would be offices and meeting areas. He said that had not proven practical for modern needs. He said they wanted to have a new office space in the O'Hare Center and meeting spaces in the new O'Hare Center.

Mr. Mike Kastrop, The Kastrop Group, project architect, said the area function used to be for outdoor barbecues. He said when the school was added, those outdoor functions moved up the street. He said there was now an area not being utilized. He said the three-car garage would move to the back of the property. He said the O'Hare Center would have an office, a bride's room and sufficient bathroom space.

Commissioner Onken confirmed with Mr. Kastrop that the bathrooms proposed for the Center would also serve the church.

Commissioner Kahle asked what the galley would serve. Monsignor Otellini said it was a gathering place after liturgies for coffee and doughnuts. Commissioner Kahle said there seemed to be a range in the galley. Monsignor Otellini said that a group met for lunches and used the facilities to warm their food, and would include a microwave.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Barnes said he supported the project. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Onken) to approve the use permit as recommended; 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. 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.
4. Approve the use permit revision and architectural control revision subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by The Kastrop Group consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received April 18, 2017, and the project description letters, dated received January 5, 2017 and October 7, 2016, all approved by the Planning Commission on April 24, 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. Prior to commencing any work within the right-of-way or public easements, the applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the Engineering Division.
 - h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.
 - i. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the Project Arborist's recommendations.
5. Approve the use permit revision and architectural control revision subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) at an office rate of \$4.63 per square foot of floor area ratio for a total estimated TIF of \$5,667.12, subject to the Municipal Code Section 13.26. The fee rate is subject to change annually on July 1 and the final calculation will be based upon the rate at the time of fee payment. The TIF rate is adjusted each year based on the Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index percentage change for San Francisco

Chair Strehl and Commissioner Riggs thanked Senior Planner Lin for her service to the City, and wished her much success in Seattle.

G. Informational Items

G1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Principal Planner Rogers said a number of residential projects would come forward for the May meetings. He said a study session for 115 El Camino Real would be on the May 8 agenda. He said 2131 Sand Hill Road would not be on the May 8 agenda, and that new notices would be sent when it is rescheduled.

- Regular Meeting: May 8, 2017
- Regular Meeting: May 22, 2017
- Regular Meeting: June 5, 2017

H. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Principal Planner Thomas Rogers

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on May 22, 2017