



## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** 7/31/2017  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.  
**City Council Chambers**  
**701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025**

### A. Call To Order

Vice Chair Larry Kahle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Susan Goodhue, Larry Kahle (Vice Chair), John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl

Absent: Drew Combs (Chair)

Staff: Michele Morris, Assistant Planner; Ori Paz, Planning Technician; Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

### C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council at its July 18, 2017 meeting heard the appeal of a new residence at 445 Oak Court and granted the appeal for the purposes of adding some clarifications and enhancements to the tree protection plan, but did not change or deny the residential project. He said the project would move forward as approved by the Planning Commission with the height reductions stipulated in its approval. He said at the same meeting the Council authorized funding from the Below Market Rate (BMR) housing fund for a new Mid-peninsula Housing development along Willow Road. He said that was one of the zoning districts where the Planning Commission did not have a discretionary role but would see the project at a study session. He said at the same meeting the Council considered a philanthropic offer to assist with the financing and construction of a new main library in the Burgess Park Civic Center campus. He said the Council authorized pursuing the proposal. He said Council tentatively would hear from staff at its August 22, 2017 meeting as to how the City might fund its portion of the proposed project, the expected process for determining the siting, design, environmental review, and other project implications. He said the state voter approval of recreational marijuana use and sales would go into effect on January 1, 2018. He said cities were looking at tentative regulations related to that. He said that might be prohibition or allowing with specific parameters. He said on August 29, 2017, Council would have a study session with Assistant Community Development Director Mark Muenzer and provide direction so the City would be able to adopt its regulations prior to the January 1, 2018 deadline.

### D. Public Comment

- Nick Jadallah said he was a Cornell University student and City of San Mateo resident. He said

during the summer he was doing sustainable development research work for Menlo Spark, a local environmental organization, whose goal was to help the City achieve carbon neutrality. He said Menlo Spark supported the proposed Stanford Middle Plaza project for its many positive aspects. He said their environmental impact concerns related to green building standards and clean transportation. He said Menlo Spark was requesting that the project adhere to the building codes mandated for the Bayfront and M-2 districts. He said the project should use 100% renewable energy. He said even with the project's proposed Traffic Demand Management program that traffic would still be above the significant impact threshold. He said Stanford could improve the project in both areas.

- Diane Bailey, Director of Menlo Spark, said the Stanford Middle Plaza project was a great opportunity to require the green building standards adopted through the recent General Plan update. She said those policies applied citywide and a big project like the Stanford Middle Plaza project should meet those advanced green building standards. She said Stanford had the capability of building zero carbon advanced green buildings and were doing so on their own campus. She said that Stanford officials had told her group that it did not cost more money to build to those higher green building standards. She said those same officials indicated that the Stanford Middle Plaza project would most likely meet gold LEED standards. She said that commitment was not in writing however.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the June 19, 2017, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Vice Chair Kahle noted Commissioner Henry Riggs had emailed edits. Commissioner Susan Goodhue said on page 2, in the second full paragraph, four lines from the end of the paragraph that it stated: "She said building into the rear year was difficult as the lot..." She suggested that "year" would make more sense as "area" or "yard." She noted on page 5, item F2, it stated: "Chair Combs opened the public hearing and closed it was there were no speakers." and suggested "was" should be replaced with "as."

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Katherine Strehl/Goodhue) to approve the minutes with the following modifications; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Combs absent.

- Page 2, second full paragraph, four lines from the end, correct to read: "She said building into the rear ~~year~~ **area** was difficult as the lot..."
- Page 3, under "**ACTION:**" that the vote should read "passes 5-2" and not "5-0"
- Page 5, item F2, correct to read: "Chair Combs opened the public hearing and closed it ~~was as~~ there were no speakers."
- Page 8, first paragraph, correct to read: "Commissioner Kahle said the first floor ~~grade~~ **elevation** was two-feet and two inches..."

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/William Smith/1105 Almanor Avenue:  
Request for a use permit to determine the Floor Area Limit (FAL) of a lot with less than 5,000 square feet of area, in association with the partial demolition, remodeling, and addition of first- and second-story additions to an existing nonconforming single-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed expansion and remodeling would exceed

50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12 month period. The proposal would also exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure. (Staff Report #17-049-PC)

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Michele Morris said staff had just received a comment letter.

Applicant Presentation: Sarah Potter, Clearstory Construction, project designer, said this was a small home on a small lot. She said the property owners had joined their households and would like to make the home more usable for them. She said the house was mostly surrounded by rental homes and apartment buildings. She said a one-story single-family residence was adjacent to the project site but there were also numerous two-story buildings in the area. She said project would include a master suite on the first floor and two accessory bedrooms on the second floor. She said an existing structure in the backyard was encroaching on a West Bay Sanitary District easement. She said the permit for that structure was never approved, and they were resolving that issue through this application. She said they would reduce the structure by 50%. She said the West Bay Sanitary District Board had approved an agreement creating covenants running with the land to allow the reduced structure over the District's easement. She said she had not seen the letter just submitted and asked if she needed to address it. Vice Chair Kahle said it was a letter of support for the project.

Commissioner Strehl asked about the large amount of impervious coverage on the lot. Ms. Potter said it was existing impervious surface and some would be removed through this project. She said that the Commission's preference was for simulated divided light windows with exterior and interior grids. She said such an expensive window was not common in the area. She the property owners wanted to keep the construction cost down and would like to have a window with a grill similar to existing windows on the first floor.

Vice Chair Kahle said that some of the windows were not shown on the second floor plan. Ms. Potter said the elevations were correct and those were high transom windows. Vice Chair Kahle asked if they could raise the window sills on the right side where the adjacent neighbor's home was fairly close to the property line. Ms. Potter said the clear glazing section of the window would be three-feet six-inches noting those windows were needed for egress. Vice Chair Kahle said window #2 in the front bedroom on the second floor looked like it could meet the egress requirement. He said his concern was the two side windows that overlooked the adjacent neighbor's house as it had windows right on the property line. Ms. Potter said the adjacent home was one-story and she thought the project's second story windows would overlook the neighboring house's roofline.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Henry Riggs said he supported the Floor Area Limit (FAL) as determined in the staff report. He said an alternative to having relatively expensive divided light windows was to have without any grids.

Vice Chair Kahle asked why they were looking at lot size and determining the maximum FAL. Assistant Planner Morris said the Planning Commission had discretion over the FAL on lots less than 5,000 square feet. Vice Chair Kahle asked what the maximum FAL would be if this was a one-story project. Principal Planner Rogers said for lots less than 5,000 square feet that the requirement to establish the floor area still applied whether it was one or two stories. He said the building coverage requirement would put a cap of 40% if it was a one-story residence but it would

still have to come before the Planning Commission for the FAL determination.

Commissioner Goodhue said she agreed with Commissioner Riggs on the FAL. She said the applicant had done a good job keeping the project within a reasonable envelope considering the weird shape of the lot. She said she was an advocate of true divided light windows and liked Commissioner Riggs alternative suggestion to have windows with no grids. She said it sounded however like there were already windows with grids and the applicant would like the new windows to match the existing windows.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said he thought the 48.7% FAL they were being asked to approve was reasonable as well as the square footage of 2091 square feet. He said the 22-foot seven-inch height was good. He asked if they had done the costs on the more expensive windows. Ms. Potter said she had purchased those in the past and there was a significant cost difference for the simulated true divided lights. She said the property owner would be doing much of the work himself so the cost would be less than for other similar projects. Commissioner Barnes said that the Commission had responsibility for architectural control review and there was precedence for having certain design standards throughout the city.

Commissioner Strehl said she appreciated true divided lights and recognized that the City did not have a standard requiring them. She said she did not think it was the Commission's purview to make that a requirement. Vice Chair Kahle said that the requirement would not be true divided lights as those were very hard to get. Commissioner Strehl said she meant the simulated true divided lights and the City did not have a requirement for that.

Commissioner John Onken said he thought the windows on the second story were set back significantly and enough. He was not concerned about the question of true divided lights considering the style of the rest of the house. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion noting that the staff recommendation required simulated divided lights. He asked if Commissioner Onken would accept an absence of simulated divided lights on the second story if that was an expense issue and find that in conformance with the approval. Commissioner Onken agreed.

Replying to Vice Chair Kahle, Principal Planner Rogers said the motion as understood by staff was to approve as recommended in the staff report. He said that would approve the plans showing simulated divided light windows and windows with grills in the glass. He said Commissioner Riggs' clarification would constitute a condition to allow the applicant at their option to propose new windows with no grid whatsoever but it would not allow the applicant to propose any new windows with grilles between the glass. Commissioner Riggs said that was correct. Principal Planner Rogers said there was at least one and possibly more existing windows with grills in the glass grills that the applicant for this application had said would be replaced with simulated divided lights. He asked what the outcome for those should be.

Commissioner Riggs suggested that those existing windows stay. Commissioner Onken said he did not see in the application what the exact plan was for windows. Principal Planner Rogers said on the elevation sheets there was a windows note on the bottom right that stated: "All new windows should be simulated divided lights" and that "existing windows with grill between glass shall be replaced with simulated divided lights."

Commissioner Riggs said his understanding was that the intention of the staff report and plans

were to be consistent with Planning Commission expectations which included replacing the windows on the first floor. He noted that the windows on the first floor did not have any proposed trim to match the new windows but potentially were not seen as they were behind a seven-foot fence. He said the only window he was concerned about was the front window on the street side that was 72-inches by 40-inches. He said his intention was to focus on the second floor windows unless other Commissioners wanted to include the first story window facing the street. He said looking at cost savings, one option would be no grids on the new windows. He said another option would be to have the front window modified.

Ms. Potter said the property owner had noted to her that the entire front yard was covered by a redwood tree so no windows would be seen from the street.

Commissioner Onken said he moved to approve the findings and use permit but with the instruction that the windows must either be simulated true divided lights or have no grids at all. He said he would accept the condition that the new windows would either have the mullions removed entirely or would use simulated true divided lights.

Principal Planner Rogers said to clarify that the motion was that the new windows had to be simulated true divided lights with grids on the exterior and interior or to have no grids at all, and that all existing windows could remain as is or be changed at the applicant's discretion to match the second story new windows.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to approve the use permit with the following modification; passes 5-1-1 with Commissioner Goodhue opposing and Commissioner Combs absent:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current 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 ClearStory Construction, consisting of nine plan sheets, dated received July 19, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 31, 2017 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
- g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Advance Tree Care, dated April 6, 2017.

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 noting that all the new windows of the proposed house shall be either simulated divided lights, or not have any grids; and at the discretion of the applicant, all existing windows shall either remain as-is, or be replaced with windows that match whichever type is selected for the new windows, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.***

- F2. Use Permit Revision/Steve Schwanke/824 Cambridge Avenue:  
Request for a use permit revision for a first-floor addition to an existing two-story single-family residence on a substandard lot with respect to width in the R-2 (low density apartment) zoning district. The previous use permit was approved in 1992. ([Staff Report #17-050-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Ori Paz said staff had no additions to the written report.

Applicant Presentation: Jed Solovin introduced his wife Leslie noting they were 24-year residents of 824 Cambridge Avenue. He said their architect Steve Schwanke was also present. He said they were proposing minor modifications to expand their dining and family rooms noting the rooms currently did not allow for more than four to five people to be in them comfortably. He said that they had the opportunity to speak with some of their neighbors. He said some of the contiguous properties were rental units. He said they spoke with their neighbors across the street who seemed to have no objections. He said they also approached their neighbor to the west who had not indicated any objections.

Vice Chair Kahle noted the raising of the ceiling in the garage and asked how the space was used now. Mr. Solovin said it was attic storage that they had not accessed for some time noting it was accessed by a ladder.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said that this was a modest modification that kept with the style of the existing home. He moved to make the findings and approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Kahle said the application was straight forward and not visible from the street so it was easy to approve.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Combs absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. 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 Schwanke Architecture, consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received July 18, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 31, 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 arborist report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services LLC dated May 2, 2017, and the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

F3. Use Permit/Andrew Young/1060 San Mateo Drive:  
Request for a use permit to construct a first-floor addition, and perform interior and exterior modifications to an existing nonconforming, single-story, single-family residence in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. The work would exceed 75 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period. The project previously received a building permit for a more limited scope of work; however, the proposed revisions would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period and therefore, require a use permit. ([Staff Report #17-051-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Paz said they had received a support email from neighbors Lynn Siegel and Cecil Currier, who said the proposed changes would create a more heterogeneous look with the neighborhood particularly with the change to the exterior walls.

Applicant Presentation: Andrew Young, project architect, said the property owners decided they would like to change the siding. He said construction was stopped so they could apply for the use permit. He said the clients realized they could afford to replace the existing siding that was stucco and wood siding on the bottom. He said the windows were Sierra Pacific, no divided light, gray, aluminum clad, double paned, with interior wood to match the pre-stained cedar shingle siding.

Vice Chair Kahle opened the public hearing.

Public Comment: Patti Fry said she fully supported the project. She said the cedar siding was a little different from the rest of the neighborhood but would fit in. She said regarding the use permit process that this was the kind of project that made no sense for it to have to have Planning Commission approval. She said their development had many standard lots but some homes because of cul de sacs were nonstandard, and because of that even a single-story family residence project would need Commission approval, yet large speculation projects on standard lots were built that did not require use permits. She said regarding a zoning overlay for design guidelines that a non-vote was considered a no vote and with the size of their community it would be nearly impossible to get the votes needed.

Vice Chair Kahle closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl said this was a perfectly approvable project and she tended to agree with many of the comments made by Ms. Fry. She moved to approve the findings and the use permit. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Commissioner Barnes said he agreed with the comments made by Ms. Fry about the use permit process. He said when the City Council considered its 2017 work plan that design guidelines and the absence of them, and the process for designating what is and is not applicable for a use permit



were discussed but he was not sure if that was in motion. He said the project was perfectly approvable.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Strehl/Goodhue) to approve the use permit as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Combs absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. 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 & Borlik Architects, Inc. consisting of 23 plan sheets, dated received July 26, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 31, 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 arborist report by KIELTY Arborist Services LLC dated December 13, 2016 and the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

## **G. Regular Business**

- G1. City of Menlo Park/Transportation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee Nomination of a Planning Commissioner to serve as a representative on the Transportation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee for potential Council appointment on August 29, 2017. ([Staff Report #17-052-PC](#))

Principal Planner Rogers noted there were some at-large vacancies for this Transportation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee should more than one Commissioner be interested in serving and being considered by the City Council for appointment.

Commissioner Riggs nominated Commissioner Strehl. Commissioner Strehl said she was very interested. She said that she wished to also nominate Commissioner Riggs as they had spent a considerable amount of time on this topic during the General Plan update. Commissioner Riggs, responding to Vice Chair Kahle, said he was very interested in serving as he thought transportation was the most important topic in the City.

Commissioner Barnes said he would be very excited to participate on this committee. He noted that he had been very engaged in the ConnectMenlo process, had served on the City's Environmental Quality Commission, and most recently had been appointed by SamTrans to their Citizen Advisory Committee. He said the last provided him a view of regional issues as it related to transportation, infrastructure, mobility for different demographics, and consumer preferences. He said the Commission's recommendation vote on the General Plan update had been 2-2 and much of that rested on its circulation element. He said the Commission struggled with whether these were regional or local issues. He said they had moved the General Plan update to the City Council that approved it with a promise that they would get this Transportation Master Plan right. Replying to Vice Chair Kahle, Commissioner Barnes confirmed he was nominating himself.

Commissioner Goodhue said she supported the nomination of Commissioner Strehl. She suggested that Commissioner Riggs and Strehl might decide who the regular was and who the alternate was. She agreed that transportation was the top issue for the City.

Replying to Vice Chair Kahle, Principal Planner Rogers said that there were two at-large members and persons interested in those positions would apply directly to the City Council. He said the City Council was looking for one nominee from the Planning Commission and no alternates were being considered.

Commissioner Riggs said he continued to support Commissioner Strehl as it would be very appropriate and useful to have her represent the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Onken moved to nominate Commissioner Strehl as the Planning Commission's representative to the Transportation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to nominate Commissioner Strehl to serve as the

Planning Commission's representative to the Transportation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee; passes 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Barnes abstaining and Commissioner Combs absent.

Vice Chair Kahle said he would like to recommend to the City Council that Commissioners Riggs and Barnes be considered as at-large representatives to the committee.

## **H. Informational Items**

### **H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.**

- Regular Meeting: August 14, 2017

Principal Planner Rogers said on the August 14 agenda, they would have a study session on 1075 O'Brien Drive, a residential project, and some clarification about recent secondary dwelling unit state law changes.

- Regular Meeting: August 28, 2017

Principal Planner Rogers said the Commission's comprehensive review and recommendations for the Stanford Middle Plaza project was a potential for the August 28 meeting.

Commissioner Strehl said she would be on vacation from September 11 through September 25, 2017. She said on August 16 there was a Dumbarton Rail stakeholders meeting at 2:30 to 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers to present the study that was commissioned by Facebook in concert with SamTrans. She noted the comments made this evening by Patti Fry and Commissioner Barnes about substandard lots and the use permit process that there was a certain amount of unfairness in the process for substandard lots. She said she was not sure how the City could address that but suggested that it be addressed.

- Regular Meeting: September 11, 2017
- Regular Meeting: September 25, 2017

## **I. Adjournment**

Vice Chair Kahle adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on August 28, 2017