



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 10/16/2017
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 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

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

Staff: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner; Kyle Perata, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Deanna Chow said the City Council approved the Stanford mixed-use project at 500 El Camino Real. She said the Council at its October 17, 2017 meeting would consider the second hearing of the rezoning for the annexation at 2131 Sand Hill Road. She said the Council was also considering a 45-day emergency moratorium on commercial cannabis storefronts. She said the 1005 Almanor project previously approved by the Commission had been appealed, and was tentatively scheduled for the Council on November 7, 2017. She said the Planning Commission meeting of October 23, 2017 was canceled.

Commissioner Susan Goodhue asked the reason for the appeal of the 1005 Almanor project. Principal Planner Chow said the next door neighbor filed an appeal because they were concerned they would lose egress to their detached garage and indicated that there were discrepancies with the setback measurements. She said staff would meet with both the appellant and applicant to determine if there were discrepancies, and whether the project would need to come back to the Planning Commission.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the September 11, 2017, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Chair Combs said that Commissioner Goodhue had provided suggested clarifications and corrections.

ACTION: Motion and second (Goodhue/Larry Kahle) to approve the consent calendar with the following modifications to the minutes; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Katherine Strehl abstaining.

- Page 6, 2nd paragraph, 1st line: replace “Mr. Miller said primarily it was the tree appearance and it mess why they wanted to remove it but...” with “Mr. Miller said primarily the tree appearance and its mess was why they wanted to remove it, but ...”
- Page 10, 2nd paragraph: add a period at the end of the paragraph
- Page 11, 1st paragraph, 2nd line: replace “He” with “She”
- Page 11, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line: replace “stake holders” with “stakeholders”
- Page 14, 3rd paragraph, 1st line: replace “Power” with “Powers”
- Page 14, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line: replace “operate” with “operates”
- Page 15, 1st full paragraph, 9th line: replace “said” with “asked”
- Page 17, 1st paragraph, 4th line: replace “live-experience” with “lived experience”
- Page 17, 2nd bullet, 5th line: replace “aqueduct” with “viaduct”
- Global replace “Shoofy” with “shoofly”

F. Regular Business

- F1. Review of Substantial Conformance Determination/David Ruth/350 Sharon Park Drive: Review of staff determination of substantial conformance for exterior modifications to 18 apartment buildings and a clubhouse located at 350 Sharon Park Drive located in the R-3-A-Z zoning district. ([Attachment](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Chow said there were no corrections or additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Garrett Walton said he was representing Maximus Real Estate, the property managers for the project site, Sharon Green Apartments. He said the basis for the project revisions was the content of hazardous materials identified through additional testing. He said they would no longer do smooth coat stucco on all of the eighteen buildings and that those buildings would be painted instead. He said they had originally specified a new nail-on window but due to the content of hazardous material that would be replaced with a vinyl retrofit window painted the same color as had been proposed for the nail-on aluminum window. He said the stair towers had originally been proposed to be made flat but would be kept as existing to prevent disturbance of the existing stucco.

Replying to Commissioner John Onken, Mr. Walton said the hazardous material found was 2% asbestos.

Commissioner Henry Riggs asked if had considered removing the asbestos stucco and disposing of it properly. Mr. Walton said they had looked at applying smooth stucco but found it failed the adhesion test. He said to apply they would need to sandblast the exterior walls to achieve adhesion which would have required tenting of each building. He said they looked at doing that from both a cost and safety consideration and found it infeasible. Commissioner Riggs suggested that at some point either when the buildings were demolished or more extensive renovation occurred the 2% stucco would need to be removed and disposed of safely. Mr. Walton said the property owners considered doing that as well as the risk of getting into the existing stucco.

Commissioner Strehl asked about the cost difference between the proposed treatment and that suggested by Commissioner Riggs. Mr. Walton said the delta would be over \$3 million for just the stucco and \$1.2 million for the windows.

Chair Combs asked staff to address why the removal of the 2% asbestos stucco required for a major renovation as asserted by Commissioner Riggs was not required at this specific juncture.

Principal Planner Chow said the applicant was requesting that they not be required to do that at this time. She said they were requesting to paint the existing stucco in the color that had been proposed for the new stucco and to do window retrofits rather than window replacements. Chair Combs asked if in the future substantial change was made to the buildings whether the asbestos would need to be addressed. Principal Planner Chow said if demolition was done the proper disposal of the asbestos abatement would have to occur. She said in this case the applicant was not intending to do a major redevelopment but rather a refresh of the existing exterior. She said they were looking to balance that with what they found and to move forward with an updated look. Chair Combs asked whether in the future they could do a refresh and still not be required to remove the asbestos stucco and dispose of it properly. Principal Planner Chow said she understood that it could be left if untouched or only painted but if more was done involving getting into the asbestos stucco that an applicant would need to look at the proper abatement.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs noted he was not at the March 2 Planning Commission meeting when a downgrade of the materials for this project was requested. He said the project came before the Commission over a year ago that included a significant refreshing of exterior design elements and considerable interior remodels. He said his concern with what was done in March and what was proposed today was that they approved a project over a year ago with which he had reservations because they were helping a well-located, fairly good size apartment complex go up market. He said that was balanced for him at that time by the fact the visual exterior improvements and green space were very attractive and a visual improvement for residents, neighbors, and people driving by. He said he asked that this substantial conformance item be agendaized as he thought the project no longer provided that benefit. He said he would like to hear what other Commissioners thought about it.

Chair Combs asked staff to explain how the item came before the Commission this evening. Principal Planner Chow said staff believed the proposed revisions were substantially in conformance with the prior project approvals, and had conveyed that determination to the Commission through the substantial conformance process. She said through that process any Commissioner not in agreement with staff's determination of substantial conformance could request the item be considered on the Commission agenda for decision. She said in this instance Commissioner Riggs had made that request. She said if the Commission found that the proposed revisions were not in substantial conformance, the applicant might proceed with the project as formerly approved or request revisions and return to the Commission for an architectural control hearing.

Commissioner Onken said the window treatment seemed to be a concern and not just because of the change from a nail-in to a push-in section but the change from aluminum clad to vinyl clad. He asked if they had priced aluminum clad replacement windows for retrofit. Mr. Walton said they

spent a substantial amount of time looking but there was not an aluminum clad vinyl window that was made for a retrofit. Commissioner Onken said there were aluminum clad wood windows and aluminum clad aluminum windows. He said a like-for-a-like substitution to keep the project as similar to what was approved before might simply be addressed by the window treatment. He said there was not a window sample for them to compare. Principal Planner Chow said there was a sample that could be retrieved from the office. Mr. Walton said there was a comparative picture on the back of the package. Commissioner Onken said the last page in the Commission's packet was an elevation looking at garage doors.

Commissioner Kahle said he did not feel strongly either way about the proposed changes. He said he appreciated Commissioner Onken's suggestion regarding a like-for-like window treatment noting vinyl had a negative connotation. He said he would like to keep the windows in the same family as approved previously. He said the stucco was unfortunate but with the asbestos he was willing to let that go.

Commissioners looked at the samples for the vinyl painted retrofit window and the originally proposed aluminum nail-on windows.

Commissioner Riggs moved that the proposed revisions were not substantially in conformance with the previously approved project noting significant changes to the exterior walls, windows and stair towers. He said he would like to see a proper presentation and know that west Menlo Park residents had the ability to see and speak on the proposed changes. Chair Combs seconded the motion.

Commissioner Onken said given the scope and size of the project that it would be helpful to have larger drawings and architectural control. He said he thought most of the proposed changes were fine but supported doing the process suitably as suggested by Commissioner Riggs.

Commissioner Strehl asked when the Commission might expect to see the project revision proposal. Principal Planner Chow said staff would need to work with the applicant on a project submittal. She said with that and pending projects for the Commission's consideration that it might be next year.

Chair Combs said he understood Commissioner Riggs and Onken's concerns but did not think ultimately he would vote against the proposed changes. He said he could not support a motion that the proposed changes were not in substantial conformance with the previously approved project and needed to be brought back for an architectural control hearing.

Commissioner Kahle said he would recommend that the applicant look strongly at alternatives to the vinyl painted windows as part of looking at the whole project.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Combs) to make a finding that the proposed revisions were not in substantial conformance with the prior project approvals and that an architectural control hearing be held to consider the proposed revisions; fails 3-4 with Commissioners Riggs, Onken and Kahle supporting and Commissioners Barnes, Combs, Goodhue and Strehl opposing.

Commissioner Strehl moved to make the finding that the proposed revisions were in substantial conformance with the previously approved project. Commissioner Goodhue seconded the motion.

Recognized by Chair Combs, Commissioner Andrew Barnes asked the makers of the motion and the second to consider a modification to find that the project proposal was in substantial conformance except for the window choice of a vinyl clad painted window and that the applicant seek an aluminum clad window retrofit more similar to the windows previously approved. Commissioners Strehl and Goodhue accepted the modification.

Chair Combs confirmed that the applicant would seek a retrofit aluminum clad window for review and approval of Planning staff.

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Goodhue) to make a finding that the proposed revisions were in substantial conformance with the prior project approvals with the exception of the vinyl clad retrofit windows and that the applicant seek an aluminum clad type retrofit window treatment submitted for planning staff's review and approval; passes 4-3 with Commissioners Barnes, Combs, Goodhue and Strehl supporting and Commissioners Riggs, Onken and Kahle opposing.

Chair Combs said Commissioner Goodhue and he needed to recuse themselves from consideration of item G1 due to conflict of interest, noting that Commissioner Kahle would Chair the remainder of the meeting.

G. Public Hearing

- G1. Conditional Development Permit Amendment, Development Agreement Amendment, and Environmental Review/Hibiscus Properties, LLC/301-309 Constitution Drive: Request for an amendment to a Conditional Development Permit (CDP) approved in November 2016 to modify the location, design, and footprint of Building 22 (Phase 2) of the Facebook Campus Expansion Project, construct an eight-story parking structure, allow for the retention of Building 305 during construction of Building 22, add an electrical vehicle charging facility for intra-campus trams, shuttles, and buses, and incorporate additional landscaping once Building 305 is removed. Building 22 would continue to meet the minimum setback requirements of the CDP; however, the building mass and footprint, along with the proposed garage, would be shifted toward the north of the site along the Bayfront Expressway frontage and the location and design of the potential connection between Buildings 21 and 22 would be modified. No changes to the hotel are proposed at this time, and the hotel would be reviewed through a separate future architectural design review, as set forth in the CDP. The proposed modifications would continue to comply with the minimum parking ratio, floor area ratio, building coverage requirements, and maximum height limits of the previously approved CDP, with the exception of specific elements (skylights and maintenance platforms) of the modified Building 22 that would exceed the 75-foot height limit for a total potential height of 97 feet. The CDP would also allow for the fire smoke ventilation fans on the roof to temporarily exceed the noise limitation of the Zoning Ordinance during weekly routine testing. The increase in building height and the extent of the proposed changes to the site plan and conditions within the CDP require an amendment to the previously approved CDP. The proposed CDP amendment would further refine the conditions of approval and set the applicable development standards for the proposed revised project. The proposed modifications to the Development Agreement would be limited to changes to ensure consistency with timing of benefits associated with the previously approved project and additional funds for city services. The project site is located in the O (Office) zoning district. The City Council certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as part of its approval of the project in November 2016. The proposed revisions were analyzed for consistency with the certified EIR. That analysis found that the proposed revised project did not result in new impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified impacts.

As a result an Addendum to the certified EIR has been prepared. Copies of the Facebook Campus Expansion Project EIR Addendum are available for review at the City offices. ([Staff Report #17-064-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Perata provided a brief overview of the project history noting the original project approval in November 2016 by the City Council included demolition of all onsite buildings associated with the TE Campus, Buildings 301 to 309 Constitution Drive, not including Building 23 as that was part of a separate project. He said with the demolition of the buildings the applicant was to construct two office buildings, a hotel, public open space, and a bicycle and pedestrian bridge over Bayfront Expressway. He said the project included a development agreement with negotiation for public benefit. He said the applicants subsequently made revisions to the proposed project in February 2017, which was primarily driven by the extended timeline for the tenant TE to remain within Building 305. He said the Planning Commission in May 2017 considered the proposed amendments in a study session with overall comments to the applicants. He said the plans before the Commission included applicant responses to the Commission's comments.

Senior Planner Perata said there were essentially three categories for the proposed revisions: site plan modifications, Building 22 design modifications, and some refinements to the conditions of approval and the development agreement. He said for the site plan the Commission was looking at modifications to Building 22's footprint to allow for the concurrent construction of Building 22 and the continued operations of Building 305 along with a new parking structure and a future EV charging facility after demolition of Building 305. He said for Building 22 specifically there was a height increase from the previous CDP to allow for the skylight and skylight equipment access platform to exceed the previously approved height. He said the rest of the roof would maintain the approved 75-foot height. He said a change to mechanical screening including using wire mesh. He said a proposed modification to the smoke exhaust ventilation system was to use the City's noise ordinance as opposed to the roof mounted equipment requirement of the zoning ordinance. He said refinements to the conditions of approval included mitigation measure Bio-1 from the ConnectMenlo General Plan update. He noted the mitigation measure was not applicable to this project but was voluntarily included by the applicant. He said that and other refinements would also apply to the development agreement.

Senior Planner Perata said for the overall revisions to the project and as part of the conditional development permit amendment (CDP) that the City underwent an environmental review process to analyze the proposed project against the approved project to see if there were any additional environmental impacts. He said a resulting EIR Addendum was prepared to document that essentially there were no new impacts or increase in intensity of impacts from the certified EIR that was part of the Council's November 2016 approval. He said the three areas of recommendation requested of the Commission to the Council was the environmental review, that the EIR Addendum was prepared and analyzed the Facebook expansion project and was considered by the Commission as well as the changes to the CDP and the development agreement amendment.

Senior Planner Perata said John Kadvany had sent in an additional email that afternoon raising concerns about the overall design of the garage. He said Mr. Kadvany initially raised concerns about Building 22 and clarified those in a subsequent email. He said those comments were made available to the Commission and for the public on the table at the back of the room.

Commissioner Onken asked about the zoning height and why it was not a variance instead of a CDP amendment. Senior Planner Perata said the CDP set all of the development standards for this property with the exception of density and intensity. Commissioner Onken confirmed with staff that the skylight was considered toward height but not the mechanical screening.

Commissioner Barnes asked if there was a visual representation of the skylight maintenance access platform. Senior Planner Perata said it was not on the 3-D model in the chambers. He said the applicant could correct him but he understood it was a mechanical platform, a wheel based platform with railing that ran on a track across the roof at between seven and 10 feet in height with 10 feet being its maximum height. He said the design was still being worked out. Commissioner Barnes said as it would add 10 feet to the building he would like to see what it would look like.

Applicant: Fergus O'Shea, Director of Campus Facilities, said that the architect would provide some clarification on the skylight. He said the skylight design had not changed since the study session. He said most of the presentation would focus on the comments made by the Commission at the May 2017 study session and that most of those comments centered on the parking garage. He said changes they made in response to the comments were to lower the parking garage into the ground by six feet and set the top of the garage back. He said they removed the green screen and made improvements to the landscape including tree heights and planters on the façade of the garage. He said they made revisions to the park to make it more functional for the public's use and events that would be held there. He said in terms of community benefits for the project that some of those under the development agreement had been implemented already and nearly all were in process of being implemented. He said they provided funding for the Dumbarton Corridor Study, which was released a couple of months ago, and was now moving forward into the next phase. He said the Workforce Housing Program provided 22 affordable living units at 777 Hamilton Avenue and 22 local teachers had moved into those apartments. He said the development agreement was amended to increase a contribution to the City's General Fund towards public safety.

Craig Webb, Gehry Partners, project architect, said there had been very little change to the design of Building 22 other than a reconsideration of the mechanical equipment screening since the study session. He said they had made fairly major revisions to the parking garage in response to the concerns raised about the structure at the study session. He said the first image shown was of the entire TE campus. He said they did many massing studies to see how the buildings could fit on the site while maintaining Building 305 intact, noting that circumstance had somewhat driven the redesign of this portion of the site. He said the redesign increased the density along the Bayfront Expressway with a four-story building and a multi-story parking garage. He said it pushed the development north closer to the expressway and further away from the Belle Haven neighborhood. He said the publicly accessible park space now had a great deal more space around it in terms of green space versus being hemmed in by buildings.

Mr. Webb said at the study session they had agreed that the green screening proposed for the parking structure would empathize the massing of the garage. He said the changes they made to the garage design had addressed comments made and was an improved design. He said the garage was now six-feet lower and the photovoltaic (PV) array was pulled back 12-feet from the main façade of the structure. He said by removing the green screen off the façade the building was much more open and transparent. He said they worked with their landscape design firm to include larger trees next to the garage then proceeding to shorter trees along the expressway that would be located under PGE utility lines. He said they looked at keeping some planters on the façade of the garage. He said they would use poplar trees on the north façade due to issues of predation

from raptors into the wildlife refuge as poplar trees had a wider canopy spread and did not provide a perching opportunity for the raptors. He said on the south side where there was not an issue of predation they would use redwood trees that were much more columnar.

Mr. Webb said the intent of the design changes for the publicly accessible park space was to provide more accessible park space for the public than the previous design had. He said the bio-retention spaces had moved to the far left and this provided a whole new element of public access to this lawn space. He said they also worked on the shape and scale of the public plaza space and tested it for different public events that might fit into the space. He said the lawn space was opened up so it could be used in conjunction with the public plaza. He noted a public path that wrapped through the space where the bio-retention was located. He said the pathway leading to the multi-use bridge and the bridge itself were also publicly accessible. He said in summary that the plaza was publicly available for passive uses and on special occasions public events might happen in the space. He said the lawn was now dramatically larger and a great public amenity for passive recreation and events. He said the storm water treatment areas were a visual amenity as well and were in the southern part of the public space and extended under the multi-use bridge across to the Bayfront. He said public events they had tested included arts and crafts fair using temporary pavilions on the plaza, a food festival with a pavilion, food trucks and small music performances, and a movie night.

Mr. Webb said the introduction of large scale redwood trees along the south would mitigate the volume of Building 22. He said the ground plane landscape would come across and flow into what they called canyons of the building that would break the building down to smaller scale pieces. He said there were three pavilions in the Facebook space that would be outdoor shaded areas for dining and outdoor meetings. He said at the study session he had discussed the desire for an industrial aesthetic for Building 22 and how having some transparency of the mechanical equipment enclosures on the roof helped support that. He said in previous designs they had sheet metal screen walls and they felt that made the top feel very heavy. He said they thought some transparency in the pieces would really lighten the visual appearance of the building. He said originally they were proposing 1½-inch metal mesh vinyl coated in white. He said they did mock ups and found that a much denser ½-inch mesh would be more appropriate. He said the mesh was now in two layers and showed an image of what that would look like. He said they revised the rendering and provided an image of what they thought the mechanical equipment would look like. He said there had been questions about the atrium running through the center of the building. He said it was a big floor plate building and they put the atrium in the center for daylight access through all four stories. He said Commissioners had wondered how much daylight would actually reach the floor of the atrium. He showed a computer simulation of the day lighting. He said the pattern in the center was daylight penetrating all the way to the floor of the atrium. He said they had been working on a very large scale model of the atrium and provided some images of that. He said for the three buildings they had been interested in an interior urbanism where the conference rooms and smaller scale spaces inside the building created a cityscape inside the building. He said in Buildings 20 and 21 that was a very horizontal expression as those buildings were one-story. He said for Building 22 this was done in a very vertical expression with conference rooms stacked into towers that would create streetscape up the center of the building.

Commissioner Strehl asked about the maintenance device for the skylight. Mr. Webb said that it would be used to wash the skylight. He said there would be a rail on either side of the skylight with a platform. He said the platform would have a floor and two guide rails on the side. He said the device would be three to four feet tall, the height of guide rails, and would sit on one end or the

other of the building. He said the skylight was lower than the mechanical units and most of it was screened from view by those mechanical units. He said he did not think the gantry pieces would ever be seen from the ground and would typically be parked behind some of the mechanical units.

Vice Chair Kahle opened the public hearing.

- Eileen McLaughlin said she represented the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge. She noted that although the General Plan update did not apply to this project that staff asked Facebook to meet with her organization about mitigation measure Bio-1 under the updated General Plan. She said that measure would raise the level of biological resource protection the City would do for projects coming forward. She said Facebook met with them and they found that the development agreement, the language in the CDP, and an environmental assessment and biological opinion done subsequently by Fish and Wildlife Services for the pedestrian bridge covered all the biological resource protection needed for this project. She thanked Planning staff and Facebook for following through on this suggestion.
- Shani Kleinhaus, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, said her organization respected birds and provided education information regarding birds. She said with the occupying of Building 20 on the Facebook campus and Facebook's hospitality that her organization was able to do bird surveys on the campus and found an amazing diversity of birds there. She said Facebook shared with them bird safety design solutions and consulted with them about the efficacy of those solutions. She said Facebook's willingness to protect natural resources within the urban development was admirable. She expressed support for the project.

Vice Chair Kahle closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said he had a fair amount of concern about the parking garage. He said since the Commission saw this project proposal they had seen the parking structure for the Bohannon project constructed along Highway 101. He said as a Commissioner he felt that they had dropped the ball on that garage's design. He said they looked at the garage's impact on the internal streets but it was an eyesore along Highway 101. He said parking garages were needed and the question was whether to camouflage it with as much greenery as possible or just accept that it's a parking garage and squeeze as much height or less height as possible out of it. He said the proposed garage for Facebook had been compressed. He said the material was light-colored, fair face concrete on the outside. He wondered if there was a way to darken the grids slightly to make it a bit less visible. He said other than that the devices to add more greenery were successful. He said regarding Building 22 that he thought the white mesh would be more opaque as seen in the model and opposed to how it was shown in the rendering. He said he thought that was a good thing. He said the skylight, given that it was pretty much concealed by the mechanical penthouses, was a non-issue.

Vice Chair Kahle said he appreciated the lowering of the height and stepping back the solar canopy of the garage. He said in reviewing comments and correspondence he did not think they were so negative about the green screen that it had to be removed. He said he would like to hear other Commissioners' opinion about the green screen that had been removed.

Commissioner Strehl said she was glad Commissioner Onken brought up the garage associated with the Bohannon project as she thought it was ugly and very prominent from Highway 101. She said she thought this design was better and she appreciated that the height was lower. She said

she did not have an opinion one way or the other about the green screen. She said this proposal seemed to have a lighter feeling to it than the previous proposal, which had looked pretty dense and dark. She asked about nighttime lighting and any visual impacts from that. Mr. Webb said that they did not light their buildings at night even the major iconic ones. He said the lighting for the parking garage would be very functional in terms of navigating through the garage and fairly low keyed. He said there was a bird issue related to light and they had worked with Audubon Society on that. He said they would have shade covers for the skylight at night on Building 22. He said they looked at Building 20 and found that the shades on that skylight were always closed at night.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the average height of poplar trees. Chris Guillard, CMG Landscape Architecture, said they expected the initial height of the poplars when planted to be around 20 to 25 feet tall. He said over five to 10 years they would grow to 50 or 60 feet in height. Commissioner Barnes asked about life expectancy for a poplar tree. Mr. Guillard said that would vary but anywhere from 50 to 100 years depending on the conditions. Commissioner Barnes noted the parking structure was 72 feet tall so 22 to 12 feet of structure would be visible above the tree canopy. He said he liked the transparency of the current design. He asked about the math basis for how many planters would be on the side of the parking garage. He said he thought those were a nice accent and asked if there would be an opportunity to have more of them. Mr. Webb said they anticipated that it would take time for the poplar trees to grow and mature. He said the placement of the planters was to fill in while waiting for the trees to grow and to enhance the height of the trees. He said the placement was in concert with the tree canopy. He said many of the planters were placed at a height above and within where they expected the canopy of the trees. Commissioner Barnes asked if they were conservative, aggressive or spot on with the number of planters planned. Mr. Webb said the discussion at the study session was that there was too much planting on the garage façade making it more massive. He said he thought they were at the right amount to enhance the tree canopy but was open to discussion about the proposed number of planters. Commissioner Barnes said he would be open to adding more planters to the design to get the balance of transparency and a view of the infrastructure and more greenery to soften the façade. Mr. Webb said he thought they would be open to that. Commissioner Barnes asked about the concrete color and if it would soften the appearance of the garage. Mr. Webb said they had not specified a particular mix of concrete. He said Commissioner Onken had suggested that perhaps it should be darker. He said the concrete they were seeing on the site was a medium gray and that felt right. He said he would hesitate to make it any darker as the garage might get a somber feeling. He said he thought the natural concrete was the right way for the structure.

Commissioner Barnes said he appreciated that the PV array was pulled back from the edges. He said he liked the open space design and mix of hardscape and accessibility to lawn. He asked if dogs would be allowed in the area. Mr. O'Shea said they did not allow dogs on their campus but he thought they would have to allow people to take their dogs through the public space. He said he would need to look at the building code as to where dogs were allowed. He said if someone wanted to get to Bayfront Park with their dog they should be able to use the connecting pathway and bridge to do that but they would not have the public space considered a pet friendly area. Commissioner Barnes asked how organizations and communities would apply to use the space. Mr. O'Shea said requests would come to Facebook and access to the area would be provided.

Commissioner Riggs said the open space design looked great. He asked if there was an elevation drawing of Building 22 with a perspective from grade level. Mr. Webb said he thought the front elevation had the lowest perspective. He confirmed that Commissioner Riggs wanted to see the north, the Bay, side. Commissioner Riggs noted that the perspective on the front elevation was not

from grade level. He said the City's roof screening requirement for mechanical equipment was that the screen has to be as high as the top of the equipment. He said that under the CDP the building was 75-feet tall and would have another 10 feet of screening. He asked if there was any flexibility to allow the applicant to have a somewhat shorter roof screen to reduce the mass on the section they were hoping to make secondary to the building. Senior Planner Perata said through the CDP the Commission had the flexibility to recommend modifying the roof screen requirement as it related not just to the opacity part but to the overall height of the horizontal level. Commissioner Riggs said he recalled from several University of California projects that they would ask the applicant in addition to renderings to show views from the pedestrian level that roof screening would be defined by angles of view from realistic points of observation. He said if the applicant was interested he thought it would benefit the community if they could check those view angles. He said he was pretty sure that they could probably reduce the screening by a couple or even four or five feet.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the backup generator system expressing concern that it would be used during hot days with power outages that would disturb Belle Haven residents. He asked if the applicant was open to providing some acoustical treatment within the generator enclosure. Mr. Webb said the generator would be only used for emergency systems such as elevators, emergency lighting, and perhaps for freezers but not for cooling the buildings. Commissioner Riggs suggested some acoustic attenuation within the generator enclosures. Mr. Webb said they could look at that but he was not sure how to do that other than fully enclosing the generators. Commissioner Riggs said he could help with that solution.

Mr. Webb said that Facebook was committed to sustainability and toward that the project would generate as much PV energy as possible. He said the top of each of the mechanical units was covered with PV panels and the panels would sit on a structure that spanned all of the mechanical equipment. He said to pull the screening down they would have to eliminate the PV panels as there was no other way to span across the structure to provide the panels. Commissioner Riggs said the zoning code required the screen to be the height of the tallest mechanical equipment on the roof. He said he was asking whether the applicant could be allowed to lower the screening provided the sight angles allowed that. He said if the screen was a certain number of feet clear of the PV array then it would be possible to lower the screen if the City was open to it.

Commissioner Riggs said that Building 22 was the first multi-story building on the campus and noted it would have different seismic load. He asked if the foundation was significantly deeper noting pile drivers. Mr. Webb said the piles would be drilled. He said fortunately on the TE site that the soil improved from east to west so the bearing pressure of the pile would be better the further to the west. He said even though four stories it would not have significantly more piles than Building 20 which had less favorable soil.

Commissioner Riggs said in New York City and other large cities that maintenance equipment for skylights would be collapsible and then erected for several months. He said the request here was to keep the maintenance equipment erected. He said for context there were transmission towers every 500 feet or so and the frames might actually be aesthetically interesting. He asked what it would look like from the Belle Haven neighborhood as he did not think it would be seen from Bayfront Expressway. Mr. Webb referred to window washing platforms that were lifted up and down by davits on the side of a building. He said this building would have a tracking davit around its perimeter and those davits would fold down onto the roof of the building when not in use. He said the gantry that would span across the skylight would be similar to a window washing stage

and was an aluminum platform with guardrails. He said there would be a pipe rail on each side of the skylight that allowed the unit to track along the skylight. He noted Commissioner Rigg's reference to the transmission towers. He said have intentionally celebrated the industrial aesthetic. He said perhaps the gantry could be removed when not in use but they felt it was another piece in that same aesthetic that would not detract from the overall design. He confirmed that the high point of the skylight was 87 feet. Commissioner Riggs said he thought the staff report read that the skylight was 85 feet and another 10 feet was needed for the maintenance access equipment. Senior Planner Perata said the number in the staff report was correct and based on the information provided in terms of the railing, some separation there, and provided an approximate range of seven to 10 feet above the skylight. Commissioner Riggs said there was a lack of detail as to how much of the gantry would be visible. Mr. Webb said they had a detailed drawing of the gantry they could provide. Commissioner Riggs said the staff report indicated the gantry was about 95 feet in the air. Mr. Webb said they had drawings they could provide. He asked if there were any other details noting they were completing design development on the project the end of the following week, and there were a lot of detailed drawings. He offered to provide anything that would help clarify. Commissioner Riggs said he would like anything to help him get a sense of the view of the gantry. He said he would like the section through the mechanical and the roof screening noting that in case the roof screen was only 36-inches away from the mechanical units that his hope of helping them lower the screening would not materialize. Mr. Webb said they had a section of the gantry, which staff then distributed to the Commissioners at the dais.

Commissioner Riggs said he did not recall being against the green screen on the garage façade but questioned how it would be maintained. He said at the study session that information was not fully available. He said in opening the agenda packet and seeing the proposed revised parking structure that he yearned for the green screen. He said they did not have the benefit of perspectives from a realistic view angle. He said from the perspectives provided that the parking structure because of its scale made it the dominant building in the rendering. He said the thought that that making it transparent would make the structure less dominant was not reading that way in the materials given to the Commission. He said the massing needed to be broken and he had wonderful examples of how to break up the massing of really large structures. He said potentially the façade could be jogged. He said he realized there was a parking count and that it might entail putting a floor of parking under something else. He said they would have one level below grade and suggested that level not have the same footprint as at grade and made twice the area of the first floor.

Commissioner Onken said the park even though public was Facebook property and that anyone who came onto that property were Facebook guests. He referred to the movie night and food trucks and asked about liability. Mr. O'Shea said that similar to other events around the City they would apply for whatever permits were needed and that rules and regulations for use of the park would be determined through an access agreement with the City.

Commissioner Onken said the skylight was in nine jagged sections so he did not see how the track would run over all of the sections. He said the skylight and gantry as far as he could tell would be lower than the mechanical screening. He said he appreciated comments about landscaping and whether a few more planters were added or guaranteeing the poplars were well established was very important for the appearance of the parking garage.

Commissioner Barnes said the staff report indicated the parking structure was lowered six feet below grade. He said Facebook's project description letter called out that the basement level

extended three feet seven-inches below the finished grade. Mr. Webb said the grading was somewhat complex as they were trying to stay above the water table. He said entering the garage you would go up onto the second floor of the garage. He said there was no exterior ramp to the first floor to prevent flood water from going to the bottom of the garage. He said to get to the first floor there was an internal ramp. He said the grading of the garage and the site in general had a lot to do with flood levels required. He said for example that the floor of Building 22 was required to be 13 feet above 0 datum. He said the general height of the site in the area varied from +8 down to +6 or so. He said they were doing a lot of re-grading with Building 22 to provide direct access out from the building to the landscaped area which meant the grading on the south side of the building was up to +13 from what currently was about +8. He said they were also doing some re-grading around the garage to deal with the flood issue as well as the building height. He said floor levels of the garage were approximately 10 feet noting some variation as one floor was required to have disabled parking so it was slightly higher.

Commissioner Barnes referred to the items for Commission's recommendations to Council. He said the development agreement amendment was approvable noting that the City did a good job with the associated timeline delay and the Transfer Occupancy Tax to be neutral for the City. He thanked Facebook for what was currently \$9 million toward public safety. He said the environmental review was in alignment and consistent with the previously approved project. He said regarding the CDP he thought it was perfectly approvable as it related to the merits of the project, the development standards and the associating phasing. He said that he thought the parking garage could use more planters that would serve to bring more green into it. He said he had no other comments on the project and supported its approval.

Commissioner Strehl said she had suggested to Commissioner Riggs that the applicant might consider the wire mesh for its mechanical screening in the context of the garage. She said she had some concerns about the lighting in the garage as she thought there were requirements for a certain amount of lighting and thought it would have some impact on the Belle Haven neighborhood. She noted the lighting of the large Millbrae parking center and at the airport. She said she did not know how to mitigate for that but it was an impact. She said her recollection about the garage was that some Commissioners were very concerned about the wall of green; she suggested they might have sent some mixed messages to the applicant. She said there were regulations about sea level rise. She said the project site area was prime for flooding because of sea level rise and asked the applicant to explain mitigation measures for that.

Mr. Webb said the City had set the floor level required for the buildings and that it had gone up for each of the buildings starting with Building 20. He said Building 20 was he thought +11 and Building 22 was now +13. He said they spent a lot of time on how to integrate the building into the landscape.

Commissioner Strehl asked if the park/plaza would be open at any time for people to go through it or whether there would be restricted hours. Mr. O'Shea said it would be open to the public at all times. He said he believed the bridge would be shut down during evening hours. He said the City's regulations for its parks would apply to this park. He confirmed with Commissioner Strehl that there would be security for the evening hours, and if the area needed to be shut down they would have the ability to do that. Commissioner Strehl said the additional public space was a public benefit and expressed her appreciation.

Vice Chair Kahle said he agreed that the Commission comments might have been conflicting but he did not think the removal of the green screen on the garage to the extent shown in the rendering was intended. He said he found between the original image and what was now being proposed that he missed all the greenery of the original proposed façade screening. He said it had a nice sculptural edge to it that set it apart. He said maybe between the complete all green sculpture and what was being proposed now there was some balance that could be found as to what was visible. He said the Commission had also commented on making the garage subservient to the other structures to an extent. He said looking at the rendering from the expressway he wanted to push the garage back a little more away from the Bayfront Expressway to highlight Building 22 and prospective hotel, and downplay the garage. He said he appreciated having the garage lower and stepping back the PV array. He said the mesh was a good feature and he hoped the transparency was similar to what they were seeing. He said in the rendering it looked like the mechanical equipment was lower. He asked if there was room that they drop those down as they seemed to add another story to the building. He said regarding the mechanical access platform he suspected it might be much smaller than what they were visualizing. He noted it would be behind mechanical screening and not seen on a regular basis. He said he appreciated the expansion of the public space. He said with the exception of the mass he thought it was a fantastic project and approvable.

Commissioner Riggs said related to the parking structure that the green screen had been a good idea. He said he hoped that the façade could be partially green and he thought the wire mesh would work. He said they indicated the floor to floor height was 10 feet for the lower two floors to accommodate eight-foot tall accessible vans but the other floors could have less height. He said the planting of the poplars to screen the building while appreciated would not screen the prominent parapet line. He confirmed with the applicant that the poplars would be the deciduous variety, and the garage would be even more visible when the trees lost their leaves. He said there were still lingering concerns about the parking structure. He said the file found on the skylight maintenance access platform allayed his fears about that. He asked staff how they could advance the project when the Commission was not thoroughly convinced about the parking structure. Senior Planner Perata said the Commission was the recommending body and as part of its recommendation to the City Council suggestions and additions could be made. He said that those could then be considered by the applicant before the project went forward to the City Council.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the recommendation to City Council to make the findings and take the actions of approval for the Facebook Expansion Project with the added note that the parking structure be presented again with a reduction of its apparent massing and a façade treatment that mollified its scale. Commissioner Onken asked if the maker of the motion could include recommendations to the Council that the Environmental Review analyzed the proposed project for consistency with the Facebook Campus Expansion Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was certified in November 2016 and that none of the substantial changes have affected the EIR negatively and the Addendum to the EIR be accepted as is; and the amendment to the Development Agreement was consistent with the timing of benefits associated with the approved project and the provision of additional funds for city services. He said with those additions he would second the motion. Commissioner Riggs accepted the added language to the motion.

Vice Chair Kahle recognized Commissioner Barnes, who said his question preceded Commissioner Riggs motion. He asked about the timing of the hotel. Mr. O'Shea said that they needed to go through the design review process, find an operator, and had been talking with developers. He said they may have found a partner that they might bring forward early next year.

He said there was a timing issue around what the allowable Floor Area Ratio was for the site. He said they needed to be able to build the parking structure to accommodate the parking for Building 23. He said they have to wait for the demolition of Building 305 before they began the hotel construction. He said regarding the parking structure, greenery, and the gantry that they looked at 70 different schemes looking at the massing of this project. He said they found this solution was the best. He said they could not go underground too far because of the water table and environmental issues with groundwater. He said they have the parking structure set back as far as possible from the PG&E lines but on the south side end they were restricted by the existing 305 tenant and their lot line. He said on the east and west side they have a minimum building setback for Building 22 and a setback from the hotel parcel. He said they were restricted as to where they could fit the parking structure. He said regarding its height they looked at every way they could to lower the height on each of the floors. He said he did not think there was any more opportunity to lower the height. He said regarding the height limit that they were under 75-foot and the PV array was setback. He said in terms of massing and given where there were constraints on the four sides of the structure that this proposal was the best solution. He said regarding the greenery that one of the things they could do was rather than do a full green screen was look at adding additional greenery where appropriate with more planter boxes. He said that also might be a way of breaking down the perceived mass.

Commissioner Barnes asked if Commissioner Riggs would further define for his edification the concept of massing. Commissioner Riggs said he was not fully qualified to be educating. He said by massing he was referring to the blocks perceived. He said the minimum block for the parking structure was one big rectangle because it had all one front face. He said for Building 22 the massing was broken up a bit like the Specific Plan guided El Camino Real development with recessing of the continuous length of the façade and articulation or changes in shape. He said he did not think additional planters on the parking garage would break up the mass but make the sense of the scale of the parking structure more extreme.

Vice Chair Kahle said they appreciated the 70 iterations and lowering the garage height. He said he did not think the garage design was there yet and pushed the applicant to try once again to get something to fit the site as well as possible.

Senior Planner Perata said the motion on the table included making the recommendation on the environmental review and the amendment to the development agreement but the Commission's desire regarding the CDP amendment was further development of the parking garage. He asked if the Commission wanted to see the project back before it went forward to the City Council or for it to go forward to the Council with the recommendation of a change but not see it again.

Vice Chair Kahle said he did not think the Commission needed to see the project again. Commissioner Riggs said his motion was they were recommending approval of everything except the parking structure to the City Council. He said they did not want to slow the project down so suggested making the recommendation to the Council for an improved garage design. He said his alternatively he could recommend continuing the project. He said he did not know if that would benefit the project or the applicant. He said he would like to hear some guidance.

Principal Planner Chow said what she was hearing was that the Planning Commission was making a recommendation to approve the conditional development permit revisions, approve the amendment to the development agreement and find the addendum to the EIR was consistent with the previous EIR certified as part of the original Facebook Expansion project. She said the one

item that the Planning Commission had concerns with was the garage. She asked if they wanted that to come back for architectural control or to give staff the flexibility to work with the applicant for an approved garage building structure and then go through the building permit process.

Vice Chair Kahle said they wanted the project to move forward. He said personally he would leave it with staff to work with the applicant on the garage design with substantial conformance email back to the Commission and move forward with the recommendation in the motion to go to the City Council without additional review by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Barnes said he could support the motion to have staff review and approve a redesign of the garage, and not have the project come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Strehl asked when the project was expected to be heard by the City Council and next steps. Principal Planner Chow said the City Council was expecting to consider the amendment at its November 7 meeting. Commissioner Strehl said that did not give the applicant much time to work on the garage revision. Principal Planner Chow said they could forward the Commission recommendations to the City Council and if they supported the Planning Commission's recommendations then staff would work with the applicant to revise the garage design.

Mr. Tim Tosta said he heard comments about the landscaping, comments about the planting on the façade, but that the way Commissioner Riggs described the proposed condition it seemed he was also opening up the possibility of changing the location or the building's overall design. He said dealing with facades, dealing with landscaping, and dealing with plantings were in one time frame. He said dealing with location and overall design and massing of the building was another. He asked if they were going to the heart of the building's form or were they asking for lipstick. Commissioner Riggs said it was the building form. He said massing particularly on a parking structure could not be adjusted without a change to the building floor plate. Mr. Tosta said he just wanted to clearly understand. Commissioner Riggs said he did not know if it would be helpful to have a commission subcommittee to work with staff to review an alternative design.

Senior Planner Perata said that could be added to the motion. Commissioner Riggs said he would be willing to be on the subcommittee. Commissioner Strehl suggested that the other subcommittee member not be an architect but a lay person. She said she recommended Commissioners Barnes and Riggs to serve on the subcommittee.

Commissioner Onken said he thought the issue was getting clouded. He said he thought this could be as simple as the applicant working with staff and staff using the substantial conformance review process. He said if any Commissioner still had an issue with the redesign it could be brought back to the Commission but he did not think a garage subcommittee was needed. He said he thought they should allow the applicant to look at the issues, send something back, and have it reviewed through the conformance review process. Vice Chair Kahle said they were trying to keep the project moving. Commissioner Onken said if they approved the motion on the table with the conformance review process with the garage that was the channel that usually worked.

Commissioner Riggs said he was trying to create a venue to solve without the revision having to come back before the Planning Commission as that was unlikely to occur before November 7. He said with the two iterations of the garage to this point either the Commission had not done a good job or one too many constraints was being held onto that prevented the applicant from making the

needed changes.

Vice Chair Kahle said he was loathe to create a subcommittee, and asked the applicant to respond to the idea. Mr. O'Shea said the motion as made would allow them to take all of the input into account and work with staff over the next couple of weeks before November 7 to make the changes to bring to Council.

Vice Chair Kahle asked if staff had a preference for a committee or not, or for substantial conformance review. Senior Planner Perata said that the substantial conformance review was a process in place that they could use. He said based on Commission guidance tonight that staff would review the modified garage design and make a recommendation with a memo to the Commission, in which case it might not have to come back to the Planning Commission for a hearing unless a Commissioner had a concern with staff's recommendation.

Vice Chair Kahle suggested setting aside the subcommittee and using the substantial conformance review.

Vice Chair Kahle agreed to Senior Planner Perata's request to clarify the motion and the guidance provided by the Commission before voting. Mr. Perata said the motion was to recommend approval of the project, that the environmental review and the addendum were done and consistent with the previously certified EIR, that the amendment to the CDP was approvable with the amendment to the Development Agreement with the understanding that the garage design needed further review by the Planning Division ultimately for substantial conformance review by the Planning Commission based on the following guidance from the Planning Commission:

- Overall massing of the garage structure and working to make it less apparent;
- The overall screening and treatment on the exterior façade; and
- Massing includes potential footprint modifications or modulation

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Onken) to recommend project approval to the City Council to include recommendations that the Environmental Review analyzed the proposed project for consistency with the Facebook Campus Expansion Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was certified in November 2016 and that none of the substantial changes have affected the EIR negatively and the Addendum to the EIR be accepted as is; the amendment to the Development Agreement was consistent with the timing of benefits associated with the approved project and the provision of additional funds for city services; and the Conditional Development Permit amendment was approvable with the understanding that the garage design needed further review by the Planning Division ultimately for substantial conformance review by the Planning Commission based on the following guidance from the Planning Commission; passes 4-1-2 with Commissioners Kahle, Onken, Riggs and Strehl supporting, Commissioner Barnes opposing, and Commissioners Combs and Goodhue recused.

- Overall massing of the garage structure and working to make it less apparent;
- The overall screening and treatment on the exterior façade; and
- Massing include potential footprint modifications or modulation

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: October 23, 2017 (canceled)
- Regular Meeting: November 6, 2017

Principal Planner Chow said that for the meeting of November 6 potentially would have a few single-family development reviews and the new Chrysler pump station. She said there were two substantial conformance memos that would be sent to the Commission next week for their consideration.

- Regular Meeting: November 13, 2017

I. Adjournment

Vice Chair Kahle adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on December 4, 2017