



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 6/19/2017
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Drew Combs called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Drew Combs (Chair), Susan Goodhue (arrived at 7:03 p.m.), Larry Kahle (Vice Chair), John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Associate Planner; Sunny Chao, Assistant Planner; Yesenia Jimenez, Associate Planner; Tom Smith, Associate Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers reported that the City Council at its June 6, 2017 meeting held a public hearing on the City's annual budget, which was now scheduled for adoption at its June 20, 2017 meeting. He said at the Council's June 20 meeting they also would hold a study session on an affordable housing project on Willow Road sponsored by MidPen Housing. He noted that Commissioner Susan Goodhue had arrived at 7:03 p.m. He said additionally at the June 20 meeting, the Council would have a consent item to approve the Station 1300 project's final map, which was a subdivision related action.

D. Public Comment

None

E. Consent Calendar

None

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Isabelle Cole/318 Pope Street:
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 regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. The property owner separately applied for a heritage tree removal permit for a heritage redwood, although that removal permit was denied by the City Arborist, and the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) and City Council have upheld the City Arborist's action on appeal. An initial version of the proposed new residence was reviewed by the

Planning Commission at the meeting of April 10, 2017. ([Staff Report #17-038-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Corinna Sandmeier said after the staff report was finalized staff received an email from John Kadwany regarding the heritage tree removal. She said as noted in the project description the City Council denied the application for the heritage tree removal.

Applicant Presentation: Pearl Renaker, Tektive Design, said she was the project architect for the property owners, Scott and Isabelle Cole. She apologized for not being able to attend the April 10, 2017 Commission meeting when the application was originally discussed. She said she watched the hearing and would like to address some of the concerns raised by Commissioners and neighbors. She said in response to Commissioner Kahle's comment about the roof complexity that they have changed the roof to be standing seam metal throughout. She said in response to his request to have more articulation on the right side of the house they added two bay windows for the bedrooms at the side of the second floor. She said another option they would be open to instead would be to add a larger single bay window at the staircase in the middle of the right side. She said a great deal of discussion at the prior hearing had focused on the redwood tree near the southeast corner of the house. She said as noted by staff that tree would remain. She said the tree's continued good health was compatible with the protection measures. She said it was supported by the project arborist and the preservation and protection plan was subject to the review and approval of the City's arborist. She said the right side of the existing house had been next to the tree for the last 90 years. She said the tree was accustomed to those conditions and its roots had grown around the existing foundation. She said the footprint of the new house design for the areas closest to that tree was within the footprint of the existing house with some extra space for working clearance. She said they would use a pier and grade beam foundation as the grade beams would be significantly shallower than the existing foundation. She said piers would be drilled periodically and dug by hand near the redwood tree's roots.

Ms. Renaker said the staff recommendation to move the corner of the house two feet away from the tree was not meaningful as the tree roots could extend 80 to 100 feet around the tree. She said also removing a slice of the house would disrupt the architectural design and make the media room significantly less feasible. She said the two-story gables were a key element of the farmhouse style the owners were seeking. She said regarding Commission comments to look at different sittings for the house that they had done that earlier in the design process. She said they evaluated again after the April hearing. She said the Commission should have a diagram overlaying the proposed footprint of the new house with the existing house and to the modern house design that was approved a couple of years prior. She said similarities to their project design were apparent such as avoiding building on the south side of the lot because of the redwood and two heritage oak trees. She said building into the rear area was difficult as the lot there became much narrower. She said also the owners would like to preserve that space for outdoor living and a private rear yard. She said expanding the existing house to the north toward the alley and toward the front property line ended as the most logical choice. She asked the Commission to approve the house in the same site as presented in April.

Commissioner Larry Kahle asked about the size and profile of the siding and if the corners were mitered. Ms. Renaker said that they were proposing siding with a little bit of a groove with blind nails in between, and that the corners probably would be mitered.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said his previous comments were that the front elevation was very attractive but he had concerns about the sides. He said personally he would favor the single bay window gable at the side of the staircase rather than the two smaller gables. He said he would also support the applicant's request to not notch the corner of the house as it would not reflect what would happen with the roof lines. He said his concern was not with the length of the wall but how to break it up to make it more interesting. He said he was glad they now had only one roof material.

Commissioner Henry Riggs said the project would fit with the neighborhood. He suggested the applicants consider window dressing for the stairwell as he thought it might prove to be a privacy issue for them. He said he tended to agree with Commissioner Kahle not to require the notching of the home as additional protection for the redwood tree.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said the staff report on page 4 talked about the tree and redesigning that corner of the house to increase distance between it and the tree. Associate Planner Sandmeier said the City's arborist had approved the project's arborist report as adequate with the protection measures. She said that staff showed the City's arborist the condition Commissioner Barnes was referencing and he confirmed that it would probably be beneficial to the tree to have the corner of the house further away from it. Principal Planner Rogers said that the condition was added more to address the Commission's direction about the monolithic perception of the wall than tree protection and absent that direction, staff probably would not have added the condition.

Commissioner Barnes said he was fine with the height noting the project was in the flood zone. He said he appreciated the change in roof pitches and materials. He said the standard tree protection measures would be adequate.

Commissioner John Onken said the house seemed large due in large part to the raised grade due to the flood zone and the odd shape of the lot as it tapered to the rear. He said proper measures were being taken to protect the redwood tree. He said regarding privacy concerns that the house was far enough away from other houses to not be a problem. He moved to approve the findings and approve the use permit as recommended by staff but without the project specific condition 4.a.

Commissioner Kahle said he would second the motion but asked if Commissioner Onken would be willing to specify one large bay window at the stair landing rather than two smaller ones as suggested by the architect. Commissioner Onken said he would if Commissioner Kahle felt strongly about adding it as a condition. Commissioner Kahle said he did feel strongly about it and suggested that the change be reviewed by staff, with the option to notify the Commission if anything was questionable.

Commissioner Riggs said he would vote against the motion as he did not support designing from the dais. He said he was not opposed to the project.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Kahle) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report with the following modifications; passes 5-2 with Commissioners Goodhue and Riggs opposed.

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 Tektive Design, consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received June 2, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 19, 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 Kevin Kielty Arborist Services LLC, dated revised February 22, 2017, and the addendum report by Kevin Kielty Arborist Services LLC, dated February 22, 2017. In addition, the following maintenance shall be conducted prior to building permit issuance and on an on-going basis after issuance:

- i. Install cables in upper 2/3 of canopy
- ii. During the dry season irrigate the tree with soaker hoses (especially during construction)
- iii. Selectively prune branches to reduce end weight
- iv. Monitor the crotches and overall health of the tree
- v. Conduct a certified arborist inspection of the tree every 2 years

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:

~~**a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing the south-east (right-rear) corner of the proposed residence reduced by a rectangle measuring at least two-foot to the north and at least eleven-foot to the west, removing the proposed bay window in this corner, and retaining the two affected south facing windows without exceeding their proposed sizes or decreasing their proposed sill heights, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**~~

a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing a single bay window at the stairs, along the south elevation, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

b. If the existing detached garage is removed, it shall be replaced with two off-street parking spaces, one of which must be covered, that meet all applicable regulations.

F2. Use Permit/Scott Sattler/330 Nova Lane:

Request for a use permit to modify and add to an existing detached, non-conforming accessory building (garage) on a lot in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. The value of the work would exceed 75 percent of existing replacement value in a 12-month period. ([Staff Report #17-039-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Sunny Chao said staff had no additions to the written report.

Applicant Presentation: Chris Kunding said that his father-in-law owned the house and that he and his wife lived there and wanted to add some additional space for their growing family.

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

Commission Comment: In response to a question from Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Kunding said the existing front home has three bedrooms and two bathrooms.

Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Assistant Planner Chao said that the applicant wanted the additional space at this time for an office and a playroom and were aware that they could apply in the future for a use permit revision for a secondary dwelling unit.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the parking requirement could be accommodated if they applied for a use permit revision in the future for a secondary dwelling unit. Assistant Planner Chao said that if they did apply they would have to provide an additional parking space for a secondary dwelling unit and that could be a tandem space.

Chair Combs said that initially the application was for additional storage and asked how the transition to office and playroom space occurred. Mr. Kundinger said originally the project was proposed as an office and playroom. He said that FEMA however would require 12-inch freeboard above grade for that use but would not if the space was used for storage so they were applying to use the space for storage and to accommodate the office and playroom in the house.

Commissioner Kahle said he was very unhappy with the proposed design as it looked like an addition as its materials and roofline were not the same as the main house. He said he was dubious that it would be storage since there was a full bathroom.

Commissioner Barnes said that the space would have a finished bathroom and shower but be used for storage and those were incongruent uses.

Chair Combs said he was skeptical of the office and playroom use as the unit would have a full bathroom but now having heard it was storage thought it was an illogical use of space.

Commissioner Strehl asked what the FEMA requirement would be for its use as a playroom and office. Principal Planner Rogers suggested that the Commission consider the proposed design as presented noting that if the existing building was conforming that this project would not have come before the Commission. Replying to Chair Combs, Principal Planner Rogers said that a unit needed a kitchen to be a living unit.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve the project. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion. She said in the Willows that a number of accessory buildings were being used as secondary dwelling units without going through the approval processes. She said it was important for neighbors to bring to the City's attention if the use changes in that way.

Commissioner Onken said he would not be able to support the project noting that they would be endorsing a workaround.

Chair Combs said the Commission had received conflicting information about the use and the Commission had a right to get validated information.

Commissioner Barnes said he was supportive of people using land appropriately and he had some struggles with the conflicting use proposal but noted that if it was on a conforming lot it would have been approved for a building permit.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-1-1 with Commissioner Kahle opposing and Commissioner Onken abstaining.

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 Christopher Tripoli Architect consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received June 8, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 19, 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

- F3. Use Permit/1000 Middle Ave Project LLC/1000 Middle Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing two-story single-family residence and build two new two-story single-family residences on a substandard lot with regard to lot width located in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The project includes a request to remove a heritage black oak tree in the front yard as well as administrative review of a tentative parcel map to subdivide the project into two condominium units. ([Staff Report #17-040-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Yesenia Jimenez said staff had no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle asked what the maximum height was in this zoning district. Associate Planner Jimenez said it was 35 feet. Commissioner Kahle confirmed that the property was not in the flood zone.

Neelu Yadav introduced herself and Raj Yadav as the project architects with Yadav Design Group.

She introduced Ravinder Sethi and Nadeem Zafar, the property owners. She said that they would remove the existing two-story residence and replace it with two new modest sized two-story residences on the R-3 lot.

Commissioner Kahle said the first floor elevation was two-feet and two inches above the adjacent grade and asked if the grade could be lower. Mr. Yadav said it could be lower. He said it was the comfortable level for this traditional size of house however.

Commissioner Goodhue said the bird's eye view in schematic B2 showed that there was a wide curb cut for the garage space and then a wider curb cut for the driveway. She said looking at schematic 2, which was the view from the southeast corner, it appeared that a driver would have to do a funny maneuver to park a car in front of the garage.

Ms. Yadav said the curb cut was 12 foot. She said where the curb met the property line it was wider but otherwise it lined up with the edge of the building.

Commissioner Kahle noted a IPE siding on the front and asked if that was a screen applied to the wall as it looked like there was a window behind that and a bathroom on the second floor. Mr. Yadav said the idea was to make it into a screen type having a distance between the IPE wood and the stucco behind to provide depth and screen the bathroom window. Commissioner Kahle confirmed that it was the same siding used on the entry as there appeared to be an opening on the sides with the screen.

Chair Combs opened the public hearing.

- Tom Rice, Menlo Park, said he was representing the property owners of the multi-family unit next door and the people who live there. He said their concern was with the driveway line and the fence as the fence extends the length of the driveway and into the backyard and was shared with the Alice Lane properties. He said the whole driveway line that technically was on the subject property was lined with trees that provide screening particularly to the neighboring unit 3. He said the drawing showing the trees did not show much of the oleander shrubs that were actually taller than many of the trees and provided a great deal of privacy. He asked that the protection of privacy for the future owners of the subject property and current neighbors be addressed. He said the use of the word modest to describe the two new buildings was not accurate as currently there was only one home and there would be two large homes in the future that would affect his property and Alice Lane backyards.

Chair Combs closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said a car backing out of the garage for unit 2 would have to back up 100 feet and asked if that was seen as an issue. Associate Planner Jimenez said the Transportation Division looked at the turning radius affirmatively. Commissioner Onken said when cars were parked in the designated spaces there would be no turning radius.

Commissioner Goodhue noted correspondence from a neighbor about the fence that was recently installed. She asked if prior to the fence the properties had shared asphalt. Mr. Sethi said the fence was partial and came out of the back of the property about halfway. He said the front piece of the fence was shared. He said half of their house was exposed to the right property, which was a four-unit apartment building. He said after he bought the property he moved the fence forward following

City's advice to keep the fence back twenty feet from the property line. He said a fair amount of the fence in the front was four foot high and that he had talked to the other property owners about the fence. Replying to Commissioner Goodhue, Mr. Sethi said they intended to keep the fence and provide privacy. Commissioner Goodhue asked if the driveway would be replaced. Mr. Sethi said they would use pavers. Commissioner Goodhue asked if they would put landscaping along the fence on their side. Mr. Sethi said they would.

Commissioner Kahle said the neighbor spoke about the plantings along the fence and asked if those were proposed to stay. Mr. Sethi said they would keep the plantings and most likely add some plants that were nicer than oleander to provide even more privacy. Commissioner Kahle asked if there was enough room in the driveway. Mr. Sethi said he was referring to the west side and not along the driveway. Ms. Yadav said along the driveway they could not do much planting but would use vines. She said they would keep the sight view fence height in the front.

Commissioner Kahle said it was an attractive project. He said they had four materials facing the street and he would prefer that it only be three and that he did not think the stone was really necessary. He said he thought the project was tall and as the finished floor was two-feet above grade he would like the grade lowered at least one foot. He said on the front perspective there was a band on both sides that separated the finished materials and that stopped lower than the sloping roof over the garage. He suggested raising the band up so it aligned with the top of the sloping roof on both sides. He referred to the middle top perspective drawing on sheet A1.0A. Mr. Yadav and Ms. Yadav said they could work on that.

Commissioner Onken asked about the IPE siding on the front of the house. He said in the perspectives and elevations it goes up along the gable ends as just a panel and a similar piece was to the side of the stone entry. Mr. Yadav said the IPE was added to soften the exterior as was not warm aesthetically with a lot of stucco, wood siding and stone. He said they had wanted to add something natural on the front and the side, which was very prominent, but not to incur great expense for the property owners. He said working with staff they decided to do the same treatment on the balcony side and on all sides. Commissioner Onken said for the stairwell window the material wrapped but not on the front entry door. Mr. Yadav said if they wrapped it as siding there was no lightness to the visual effect. He said they were playing with application of the same material to create lightness.

Commissioner Barnes said he liked the project and thought its design picked up the modern home across the street. He asked if they would contemplate coming down to 28 foot rather than 29 foot height.

Commissioner Goodhue said she liked the project and appreciated having two houses where there was now only one. She said it was in the correct zoning for multiple units. She said she tended to like the stone mixed with the wood and stucco. She said she was concerned with the other siding on the stairwell as it popped out but the architect's explanation about the use of that material helped her understand somewhat better. She said it was a very nice project and would certainly be an improvement over the current state of the property. She said she had concerns with people trying to back their cars out onto Middle Avenue.

Commissioner Riggs said the project had brought up a variety of comments. He said usually he recoiled from El Dorado stone being applied to one façade but that in this case it was well used. He said on the elevation where the belly band came in under the garage roof it appeared the stone

wrapped 12-inches and suggested it might be simpler to take the stone up to the soffit and stop the belly band there. He suggested doing some test panels with the pinkish beige siding. He said the details would matter on this project so that the wood panels including how the ends were cut clean, the mitered joints on the bay window, the garage door materials and proportions including the transom and the closed soffits needed to be carried through the construction process with thought as it would make a difference between well done small homes (small for Menlo Park) and homes that looked like builder homes. He said he would wait for other Commissioner comments before he made a motion.

Commissioner Strehl questioned why Commissioners Kahle and Barnes wanted the height reduced as the home as proposed at 29 feet was well below the 35-foot height maximum in the zoning district.

Commissioner Onken said that the two windows in the second story bedrooms were probably not a problem as they were located almost 30 feet away from neighbors. He said he was fine with the mixed materials and thought the ipe screening on the front would be interesting. He said he was happy to make a motion to make the findings to approve the use permit.

Mr. Yadav said the left side elevation showed that most of the building was 28-feet two-inches in height and it was only toward the rear one-third of the building that the height became 29-feet two inches.

Commissioner Riggs said he would like to second the motion. Chair Combs asked if there had been a motion as he had heard Commissioner Onken said he would be happy to make a motion. Commissioner Onken moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report; Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion.

Commissioner Barnes said regarding the height that it was well below the maximum height for the zoning district but within the context of single-family residences in Menlo Park that 28-foot height was the norm. He said it was a recommendation only.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; 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 Yadav Design Group, consisting of 22 plan sheets, dated received June 8, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 19, 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 Mayne Tree Expert Company, Inc. revised on February 9, 2017.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:

- a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay the Transportation Impact Fee, currently estimated at \$3,139.49, as required by the Transportation Division.
- b. Prior to the recordation of the parcel map, the applicant shall pay the Recreation-in-Lieu fee of \$78,400, as required by the Engineering Division.

F4. Prezoning, Rezoning, General Plan Amendment, Tentative Map, Use Permit, Architectural Control, and Environmental Review/Leland Stanford Junior University/2111-2121 Sand Hill Road: Request for pre-zoning of a portion of a 15.8-acre parcel presently located in unincorporated San Mateo County to the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) and C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research District, Restrictive) zoning districts. In addition, rezoning of the remaining portion of the parcel currently located in the R-1-S zoning district to the C-1-C zoning district. Also, a General Plan amendment to establish Low Density Residential and Professional and Administrative Offices land use designations for the portion of the parcel to be prezoned, and to change the land use designation from Low Density Residential to Professional and Administrative Offices for the portion of the parcel to be rezoned. Additionally, a request for a tentative map for a two parcel subdivision, one parcel containing an existing residence, the other containing an existing office building. In addition, a request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a new approximately 39,800-square-foot, two-story office building in the proposed C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research, Restrictive) zoning district, which would be on the same parcel as the existing office building. The project includes a Below Market

Rate (BMR) Agreement for compliance with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program. A retaining wall would be constructed within the required rear setback. The project includes a request to remove up to six heritage trees due to poor health and construction-related activities associated with the proposed project. The Planning Commission is a recommending body to the City Council who will be the final decision-making body on the proposed applications. The annexation of the 15.8-acre parcel into the City of Menlo Park is subject to approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo). ([Staff Report #17-041-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Tom Smith said that six pieces of correspondence had been received since the publication of the staff report and were available at the dais. He said in general the correspondences pointed to traffic conditions, speed limits, safety concerns related to Sand Hill Road, Santa Cruz Avenue, Alpine Road, and other intersections in the vicinity, the value of park and recreational uses on the site versus proposed office uses, safe routes to school and how traffic might affect that, and the jobs and housing imbalance in the community and whether this project fully addressed that.

Commissioner Onken said he needed to recuse himself due to a potential conflict of interest.

Questions of Staff: Chair Combs asked what a property tax exchange negotiation was. Associate Planner Smith said Stanford recently filed an annexation application with LAFCo. He said one of the first steps was an estimate made by the County Controller as to the total taxable revenue generated within the proposed annexation area. He said after they have that amount the City and County would discuss how that should be allocated to cover the different services required by the annexation proposal.

Commissioner Strehl asked what services the County would provide and asked about the criteria of how much would go to the City and how much to the County. Associate Planner Smith said he was not sure but in general this was a very urbanized area and about 250 feet of Sand Hill Road would be incorporated as a result of the project as well as about a third of the intersection of Sand Hill Road and Santa Cruz Avenue which would make a couple of traffic lights the City's as well as some pavement. He said negotiations would be about these relatively small areas that would be annexed into the City but in addition there was police service, park and recreation and similar things to consider.

Commissioner Strehl asked if Menlo Park Fire District already covered this area whether it was annexed into Menlo Park or not. Associate Planner Smith confirmed that was correct.

Applicant Presentation: John Donahoe, Associate Director of Planning and Entitlement for Stanford Real Estate, made a brief PowerPoint presentation. He said the project itself was a 39,000 square foot office building. He said the site was a legal parcel running from Alpine Road along Sand Hill Road, somewhat triangular that included the former Buck estate, which was now used as Stanford's Provost's residence, and the Hewlett Foundation building developed several years ago and zoned in the County as residential estate zoning. He said a PG&E gas easement was located along the length of one segment of their property and adjacent to that was the Stanford Hills Subdivision, originally constructed in 1959. He said the Stanford Hills park was also owned by Stanford with a long term ground lease to the City of Menlo Park and had been constructed shortly after subdivision construction.

Mr. Donahoe said the annexation, general plan amendment and rezoning was needed because they wanted to look at the development of the vacant portion of the property. He said there was an existing memorandum of understanding between the County of San Mateo and the City of Menlo Park that said in these kinds of areas that urban development should occur within urban boundaries. He said they were looking at creating residential zoning for the Provost home and commercial zoning for the remainder of the parcel.

Mr. Donahoe said that the existing access road off Sand Hill Road only went to the Hewlett Foundation and no further. He said it did not go all the way to Alpine Road. He said the project included a two-story class 1 office building and would have two-level below grade parking and some above grade parking. He said they have been working with the Hewlett Foundation administrators and the Stanford Hills Subdivision residents on this project. He said they would provide two additional BMR units on another Stanford project within the City rather than do in-lieu fees for this project. He said the project has generous setbacks and they would plant 91 more trees. He said they designed the building to be compatible and complementary to the Hewlett Foundation building. He said the Stanford Hills Homeowners Association (HOA) asked them to delete the clerestory from this project although that was an aspect of the Hewlett Foundation building. He said greatest physical constraint in assigning the commercial zoning to this parcel next to an existing neighborhood was it must have 75 foot setback from the residential and that included also a 35-foot PG&E easement and a 75-foot setback from Sand Hill Road. He said as mentioned they would plant 91 new trees including 46, 72-inch box giant sequoia trees along the rear but not within the 35 foot PG&E easement. He said they would also plant seven water gum trees, also an evergreen, closer to the building at the request of the HOA. He said they were discussing with PG&E to put a solid fence around their vault and trees for screening.

Chair Combs opened the public hearing.

- Janet Davis said she has lived on Alpine Road for 50 years. She said her broad concern was the jobs and housing imbalance in San Mateo County. She said Stanford had done a study and had identified this area as a site for affordable housing for lower paid SLAC and Stanford University employees who would be close enough to walk or bike to work. She said her local concern was with traffic. She said the area of Sand Hill Road and Alpine Road was chaotic. She said the traffic study done was just magical thinking and there was a particular problem with the Alpine and Sand Hill Road intersection and was a death trap for bicyclists and cars. She said construction trucks used Alpine Road as it has no traffic lights. She said public transit was practically non-existent. She said there were inconsistent speed signs that needed addressing. She asked what the \$180,866 for transportation impact fees would be used for.
- Ron Snow, Stanford Avenue, said his understanding was that the Hewlett Foundation building had been allowed to be developed but the rest of property could not be. He said he thought the applicant was positioning to incorporate the land into Menlo Park to avoid that understanding. He suggested looking at the original agreement for the use of the property. He said the traffic study for the project was very flawed. He said the site had 163 parking spaces but apparently only 30-40 cars adding to the volumes at peak hours. He said that there would be several hundred cars leaving and going into that parking lot during the day. He said pedestrians cause delays for autos turning from Sharon Heights and that a right hand turn light was needed to turn right into the property. He said he met with the Mayor of Menlo Park and the County's Board of Supervisors about the need for traffic mitigation in this area. He said the area needed more affordable housing and not more office space.

- Molly Glennan, unincorporated Menlo Park, said that the increase in traffic referred to Alpine and Sand Hill Roads but impacted Santa Cruz Avenue and the Alameda as well. She said that there was a big disconnect between the traffic study and what was there. She said people chose to live in that area for the small town life style and the quality of life was being impacted. She said over the last five years residents had seen phenomenal traffic increases driven by developments such as Stanford's.
- Mark Trail, president, Stanford Hills HOA, said their association had 78 homes, 15 of which border the development. He said they had two main concerns if the development went forward and that was included in their April 23rd letter, and that was mitigation of construction noise and dust and what hours work would be conducted. He said the residents on Branner suffered from construction fatigue due to PG&E's 24/7 work to replace their pipeline that included the use of stadium lights. He said people moved to the front of their houses to get away from the lights and one elderly neighbor was so fatigued from the construction impacts that she stumbled and died. He said they also wanted adequate privacy screening from the project. He suggested seeing if the building could be moved further forward toward Sand Hill Road to allow for thicker vegetation screening. He thanked Stanford for engaging with the HOA and conducting several meetings.
- William Greenleaf, 2372 Branner Drive, said he lived in one of the closest houses to the project. He said that Stanford has a conflict of interest as it owned the land upon which the Stanford Hills residences were located and has expressed interest in acquiring houses when they go on the market. He said they might be putting themselves ahead of the market through extending the lease agreement. He said Stanford could be perceived to benefit from any actions that might temporarily or permanently depress the market value of the Stanford Hills residences. He said the project proposal needed careful review.

Chair Combs closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl asked if there was any understanding or agreement on the designation of use for this property that existed at some point in the past. Associate Planner Smith said the Hewlett Foundation development went through a use permit process with the County and noted he was not familiar with the conditions that might have been attached. He said the property was zoned for residential and he believed that there might be some requirement about what types of office uses were permitted.

Mr. Donahue said this property was not part of the Stanford founding grant property but was owned by the Buck and Meyer family for decades. He said when the last members of the family passed in the late 1970s they dedicated the property to Stanford. He said the Hewlett Foundation was developed based upon a particular zoning section in San Mateo County zoning that allowed for philanthropic organizations to build within residential zoning. He said the lease with the Hewlett Foundation required that they remain a philanthropic organization but that did not coincide with their proposal. He said they could have developed a residential property on the vacant part of this parcel. He said in 2012 the City in updating its Housing Element had looked at this site for potential as high density residential but was ultimately rejected. He said they then came back with this proposal.

Commissioner Strehl confirmed with Mr. Donahoe that this project and the Hewlett Foundation did not have access now and would not get through this development project access to Alpine Road through the parcel. She confirmed with him also that the two BMR units for this project would be above and beyond what was proposed for the other pending project. She asked what the estimate was for employee count. Mr. Donahoe said they expected one employee per 300 square feet or about 133 employees.

Commissioner Kahle noted for the record that he was friends with Mark Trail, one of the speakers, and that they have a mutual friend who lived on the back side of Branner Drive. He said he had not received the traffic study that other Commissioners seemed to have and referred to concerns about the adequacy of the traffic study. Associate Planner Smith said based on the criteria the City has for determining whether proposed development would worsen conditions at intersections that there would be a very minimal increase in existing conditions and would not downgrade the existing conditions at the site. He said that Transportation Division staff was present as well as a representative from Hexagon, the consultants that had done the traffic analysis.

Commissioner Kahle asked Mr. Donahoe to pull up the slide showing the 75 foot setbacks. He asked why the building could not be shifted more towards Sand Hill Road and away from the PG&E easement and the residences behind that. Mr. Donahoe said that the Hewlett Foundation had a ground lease over the property and already through discussion with Hewlett Foundation a portion of Stanford's project would go some distance over the other's property. He said the neighbors had said that they did not want to see parking in the setback area. He said also a 75 foot turnaround for emergency services was needed so they were a little constricted in that area. He said they figured out what they could do within the setbacks and worked with Hewlett Foundation to push that as much as they could. Commissioner Kahle asked about the left side restriction for the Hewlett Foundation building. Mr. Donahoe showed the lease line on a slide. Commissioner Kahle asked what the limitations for moving the building over there were. Mr. Donahoe said that the subject property would have two levels of underground parking but needed surface parking as well. He said they also had to locate the trash enclosure in an appropriate location.

Commissioner Kahle said the trips generated for peak a.m. and p.m. hours did not equate with two below parking floors and surface parking, and two ingresses and egresses. Mr. Donahoe said that the project was meeting the parking requirement for the zoning. He said the Hewlett Foundation's vacant area to the left was their parking reserve, which was currently landscaped. Commissioner Kahle asked why there were two accesses and two egresses. Mr. Donahoe said that if they had more of a rectangular building and more efficient alignment of the two below grade parking levels they might have been able to have one access and egress. He said they tried to configure one access and one egress but found they would lose more parking spaces in doing that.

Commissioner Goodhue asked in reference to the County and the residential zoning allowance for philanthropic organizations why the County had not kicked the Hewlett Foundation project over to the City for annexation at that time as being in a more urban area. Mr. Donahoe said the Buck Meyer estate was donated to Stanford but without any maintenance funds associated with it. He said Stanford's lease money from the Hewlett Foundation was used to renovate the estate.

Commissioner Goodhue asked for the record the number of employees at the Hewlett Foundation currently. Mr. Donahoe said there were approximately 200 employees. Commissioner Goodhue asked about their TDM program. Mr. Donahoe said that the Hewlett Foundation did not have a TDM requirement but they offered TDM programs. He said Stanford has offered the use of surface

parking to the Foundation as needed for certain events so the parking landscape reserve would be kept as such. Commissioner Goodhue confirmed with Mr. Donahoe that this property's use would not impact trip counts for Stanford University.

Commissioner Barnes noted that the Hewlett Foundation produced no tax revenue. He asked about tax revenue for the new development use and whether there would be a requirement to lease to a company that would generate tax revenue. Mr. Donahoe said the project was viewed as a net gain fiscally as it was an investment property for Stanford and not intended to be occupied by Stanford. He said any tax revenues would ultimately go to the City once the annexation was complete. Commissioner Barnes asked if there was anything memorializing that this project and the Middle Plaza project would not be use used by Stanford and its affiliates. Mr. Donahoe said they could not guarantee the future. He said Stanford owned a lot of property on Sand Hill Road and did not occupy much of it. He said it makes more economic sense to lease property for income purposes.

Commissioner Barnes asked how big the Sand Hill submarket from leasable square footage office space was. Mr. Donahoe said he was told \$1.3 million. Commissioner Barnes confirmed they were talking about 40,000 to 1.3 million square feet. He asked why the first floor was seven feet below grade on the back side. Mr. Donahoe said an average grade was calculated, and that the site was relatively flat. He said they were not suppressing too much other than to go below two levels for a garage. He said with that there would be some grading and a need immediately adjacent to that area for some bio-infiltration areas. Mr. Barnes asked about the comment that upgrading the pedestrian crossing from the project site to the Sharon Heights Plaza would cause impacts to traffic flow. Mr. Donahoe said he would defer to the City.

Kristiann Choy, City of Menlo Park Transportation Division, Senior Transportation Engineer, said they would look at the crosswalk design and whether to change the phasing there. She said the intersection operated successfully currently and they didn't expect to need to change the phasing to operate very differently.

Chair Combs said Stanford owned the Stanford Hills development land and asked about a comment that Stanford's interest in developing the subject property might intersect with their long term interest regarding the housing development. He asked if there was a connection between this plan and long term plans for those homes.

Mr. Steve Elliott, Stanford Real Estate, said Stanford owned lands under the Stanford Hills subdivision, and had entered into an agreement with all the property owners for a lease extension some time ago. He said he disagreed with the claim that there was conflict or some economic interest for Stanford regarding this project and that subdivision. He said the creation of this office building would not only screen Sand Hill Road but also the operations of Sharon Heights plaza. He said that was seen by many as an improvement. He said their landscape and tree screening would not only screen their building but Sand Hill Road as well.

Commissioner Riggs suggested for the proposed crosswalk across Sand Hill Road that the applicant research and provide a two-level timing one for able bodied pedestrians and bicyclists and the other for disabled persons to not impede traffic flow. He said he appreciated the work that went into the site planning and the architecture to complement the Hewlett Foundation building. He asked if there would be exposed rafter tails on the new building similar to the Hewlett Foundation building. He said the 11 by 17 rendering did not show any rafter tails but sheet A1.7 did. The

project architect, Mr. Chow, said the building would have the same rafter tails as the Hewlett Foundation building.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the driveway was the conflict with oaks 93 and 97. Mr. Donahoe said there should be a tree disposition in the packet. Commissioner Riggs asked if that showed the driveway superimposed. Mr. Donahoe suggested looking at the grading and drainage plan C4.1. He said staff had recommended a condition to either redesign or transplant the tree. He said they prefer to transplant the tree.

Commissioner Riggs suggested staffing that in Appendix F, sheet F12, requirement 51, the first bullet for dust control requiring that exposed surfaces shall be watered two times a day that they add a clause unless the area had already been watered by falling rain. Associate Planner Smith said he believed that could be added to the clause.

Commissioner Riggs said the project proposal was a good design and that the applicant had made good efforts to respond to neighbors. He said he was supportive of the project.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the applicants anticipated one or more tenants in the building. Mr. Donahoe said the intent was one tenant but the building was flexible enough to accommodate two tenants. Commissioner Strehl asked about tenant amenities such as eating facilities. Mr. Donahoe said that would be part of the tenant improvements discussion; he noted that showers in the parking garage were planned. Commissioner Strehl asked if large oak trees could be successfully transplanted. Mr. Donahoe said these trees were not large trees compared to other trees that they have successfully transplanted. He said he expected transplanting them to the triangular area of the parcel.

Commissioner Strehl said the speed limit signs between Santa Cruz Avenue and the Alameda should be consistent. Ms. Choy noted that Santa Cruz Avenue and the Alameda to the north were all within the County jurisdiction. She said that the County recently lowered its speed limit on Alpine Road and the City removed its sign that indicated a higher speed. She said she would request the County remove conflicting speed signs.

Commissioner Strehl said she had asked the applicant about TDM and that they work with the Hewlett Foundation to encourage carpooling, car sharing, bicycling and walking to minimize traffic impacts on Sand Hill Road and Santa Cruz Avenue.

Chair Combs said that speakers indicated they understood that in the development of the Hewlett Foundation through the County that any other development in the area would be properties within the City's jurisdiction. He said as this property was not within the City's jurisdiction the residents' sense was that it would not be developed. He said this proposal to annex the property into the City for development seemed somewhat like a fast move to them. Mr. Donahoe said he did not think this was true. He said the property was currently in the County's residential zoning. He said his comment earlier about urban area was a general description. He said the question was if development occurred within which jurisdiction should it be done and not whether you could or should not develop. He said the City when looking at its Housing Element considered the parcel for high density housing which indicated there was no prohibition on development there. He said at that time neighbors were concerned with R3 high density zoning on that parcel. He said he had examined the lease information they have with the Hewlett Foundation and researched County ordinances in place at the time of the Hewlett Foundation development. He said the zoning to

permit development in residential zoning for philanthropic organizations remained. Chair Combs said that to develop a commercial building here however that they needed to change the zoning. Mr. Donahoe said they could have done the same process they were proposing through the City through the County instead.

Chair Combs asked if the project had been developed with the County whether the City have had any way to provide input and control. Principal Planner Rogers said the County does environmental review for project development. He said notifications of that review are sent to the City for properties with some adjacency. He said the City would basically have the same rights as any other interested party but with no right of approval as the development was happening in another jurisdiction.

Mr. Elliott said the Hewlett Foundation ground lease for their parcel was from Stanford. He said with that they went forward about 20 years ago or so to work with the County to develop the property. He said Stanford was not the developer of that property. He said the three and a half acres for this proposal was not part of that other development discussion. He said there was no discussion that this part of the parcel would never be developed.

Commissioner Barnes asked what mitigations for traffic impacts were being contemplated. Ms. Choy said the traffic analysis was done according to the City's Transportation Impact Guidelines and followed the City's standards of significance for traffic impacts. She said the project was found to not have any significant traffic impacts. She said the only recommendation the City made was about the crosswalk at Sand Hill Road and the Sharon Park project driveway intersection. She said it did not have a fourth crosswalk leg and with this development there was an expected increase in pedestrian traffic to and from the southeast and on the other side of the intersection.

Commissioner Barnes asked about TDM and alternates to auto travel for the project. Mr. Donahoe said creating an alliance with the Hewlett Foundation on that was important as more mass was needed for successful van and carpools. He said public transit up and down Sand Hill Road could be better. He said Stanford has a Marguerite shuttle that served SLAC. Commissioner Barnes asked if they would monitor trip counts from the site. Mr. Donahoe said they would not and that was more of the City's purview.

Commissioner Barnes said they had been tasked with making sure the project was aligned with the General Plan. He said that Plan said that any new office use must make provisions for adequate off street parking. He said this project with its underground parking did a good job of removing on street parking needs. He said they had already talked about mitigating traffic impacts and developing effective alternatives to auto commuting. He said in regards to adhering to acceptable architectural standards that he liked the proposed building design and its reference to the neighboring Hewlett Foundation building. He said regarding protecting adjacent neighbors from uses with negative impacts that although neighbors here would prefer a one-story building the proposed building was screened. He said the applicant had made changes to make it work for the site and address neighbors' concerns. He said he was inclined to support the project.

Commissioner Kahle said that the projected trip generation for the project did not seem believable and asked how it was calculated. Ms. Choy said the City uses the Institute of Transportation Engineer's trip generation publication. She said because the size of the proposed project was on the smaller side than a lot of the surveys done for the standard trip rate that they had their traffic control team do surveys of office buildings of similar size in the area to determine the trip rate. She

said the peak trip generation was for only one hour in the a.m. or one hour in the p.m. Replying to Commissioner Kahle, she said they looked at an a.m. peak period of 7 to 9 a.m. and p.m. peak period of 4 to 6 p.m. and arrived at the peak hour count. She said the team surveyed one site per day and looked at three sites. Commissioner Kahle said that did not seem adequate.

Commissioner Kahle said the site plan and front elevation showed a gable on the left side but on the left elevation in the section it looked like a hip. He said to match the Hewlett Foundation building he wanted to make sure there was no gable. Mr. Chow, the project architect, said it was all hip. Commissioner Kahle suggested they correct the site plan and front elevation.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the maximum height for the zoning was 35 feet above natural grade. Associate Planner Smith said that was correct and the project height was 31 and half feet. Commissioner Kahle asked about addressing concerns regarding noise and what were the construction hours. Associate Planner Smith said the City's construction hours were 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday and there was a condition for the generation of a noise plan before any construction or grading work began. He said a notice would be sent to neighbors that would specify that affected residents should be contacted for development of that plan and to have a manager as part of the project development that could be contacted in case of noise complaints throughout the construction process. Commissioner Kahle said there was a request for a story pole and asked if there was any value using those. Principal Planner Rogers said that was a fairly regularly made request but the City has found that renderings had gotten to the point that they were much more accurate and helpful than a frame like a story pole. He said how people related to buildings was influenced by surface finish and materials. He said a frame only can give an inaccurate representation of a building's overall feel.

Commissioner Kahle said it was an attractive building and tied in well with the Hewlett Foundation building. He said he would prefer that the building be sited away as much as possible from the residences. He said the landscaping shared tonight was adequate. He said he would encourage HOA and Stanford however to continue to work on that together so it was satisfactory.

Commissioner Riggs said he would like to make a motion but first asked the applicant if they would be willing to look into a cross walk signal having two separate possible intervals and provide it for this project. Mr. Elliott said they would be happy to look into it and if possible as a City requirement.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the recommendation to the City to make the findings for the zoning change, use permit and other recommendations to the City Council as drafted in the staff report. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion. She said she also would like to recommend to the City Council that they make sure TDM measures were implemented when the building was occupied. Commissioner Riggs suggested requesting a lease clause that would require TDM. Mr. Elliott said they had not had that in previous approvals but it sounded like something the City was moving towards. Commissioner Riggs said for tenant improvements there would be a building application and that application was reviewed by staff. He asked if TDM would be requested at that time for tenant improvements. Associate Planner Smith said not under current practice. Commissioner Riggs asked what level of TDM Commissioner Strehl wanted. Commissioner Strehl said comparable to other businesses of similar size.

Chair Combs asked what information Council received regarding the Commission's recommendation for approval. Principal Planner Rogers said as a general practice they try to get the minutes prepared for such items but noted that the longer the discussion in the minutes they

less likely Council would review it. He said if the Commission wanted to highlight something that it should be part of the recommendation.

Commissioner Riggs said he thought they could also recommend to Council that TDM be required as a tenant lease condition.

Commissioner Barnes said Stanford has a robust business park TDM program. He suggested to not looking at this as an independent project with its own infrastructure to develop the TDM but to roll it into the Stanford Business Park. Commissioner Strehl said that the Stanford Business Park was some distance from this project and was too specific she thought. She said she would prefer that the City Council address it for this development. Commissioner Riggs suggested recommending that a TDM requirement be part of the tenant lease for the project.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to recommend approval actions as recommended in the staff report with one additional recommendation; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Onken recused.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council take the following actions:

Environmental Review

1. Make the following findings relative to the environmental review of the proposal and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration:
 - a. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and circulated for public review in accordance with current State CEQA Guidelines;
 - b. The City Council has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposal and any comments received during the public review period; and
 - c. Based on the Initial Study prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration and any comments received on the document, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment.
2. Adopt a Resolution Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Properties Located at 2111 and 2121 Sand Hill Road (Attachment B)

Rezoning

3. Introduce an Ordinance of the City of Menlo Park, Rezoning All That Certain Parcel of Land Being the Whole of the Parcel at 2111 and 2121 Sand Hill Road and Additional Land, Situated in the County of San Mateo, State of California, and More Particularly Described in Exhibit A (Attachment C)

General Plan Map Amendments

4. Adopt a Resolution Amending the General Plan to Establish and Modify Land Use Designations for Properties Located at 2111 and 2121 Sand Hill Road (Attachment E)

Rezoning

5. Introduce an Ordinance of the City of Menlo Park, Rezoning Property with Assessor's Parcel Numbers 074-331-210 and 074-321-110 (Attachment D)

Use Permit

6. 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.
7. Approve the Use Permit for construction of a new office building in the C-1-C zoning district (Attachment F) **and add a new condition for TDM.**

Architectural Control

8. 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 structures 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; and
 - e. The proposed project is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
9. Approve the proposed design of the new building and site improvements (Attachment F).

Tentative Map

10. Make findings that the proposed tentative map is technically correct and in compliance with all applicable State regulations, City General Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, and the State Subdivision Map Act (Attachment F).

Below Market Rate Housing

11. Adopt a Resolution Approving a Below Market Rate Housing Agreement with Leland Stanford Junior University for the Project at 2111 and 2121 Sand Hill Road (Attachment G)

Heritage Tree Removal Permit

12. Adopt a Resolution Approving Heritage Tree Removal Permits for the Properties Located at 2111 and 2121 Sand Hill Road (Attachment H).

G. Informational Items

G1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Principal Planner Rogers noted that Commissioners Onken and Strehl would be absent for the July 17 meeting and reviewed the quorum requirements.

- Regular Meeting: July 17, 2017
- Regular Meeting: July 31, 2017
- Regular Meeting: August 14, 2017
- Regular Meeting: August 28, 2017

H. Adjournment

Chair Combs adjourned the meeting at 10:03 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Principal Planner Thomas Rogers

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 31, 2017