



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 11/5/2018
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Susan Goodhue called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes (Vice Chair), Drew Combs (arrived at 7:08 p.m.), Susan Goodhue (Chair), John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl, and Camille Kennedy

Staff: Kaitie Meador, Associate Planner; Ori Paz, Assistant Planner; Kyle Perata, Acting Principal Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Acting Principal Planner Kyle Perata said the City Council at its October 23, 2018 meeting approved the second reading of the EV Charger ordinance. He said it also reviewed the 840 Menlo Avenue appeal, denied it, approved the project, and approved the relocation of the loading zone for Draeger's Market onto Evelyn Street. He said the Council at its November 13, 2018 meeting would hear the Conditional Development Permit and the Use Permit and Architectural Control applications for the 180-200 and the 220 Jefferson Drive projects that the Planning Commission had reviewed and recommended for approval at its October 22, 2018 meeting.

Commissioner Katherine Strehl asked when the continued 555 Willow Road project would return to the Commission for review. Acting Principal Planner Perata said in 2019 but the date was not set at this time.

Replying to Commissioner Andrew Barnes, Acting Principal Planner Perata said his understanding was the decision on the relocation of the Draeger's loading zone onto Evelyn Street was final.

Chair Goodhue noted for the public's benefit that item G1 on the agenda, which was a study session on 555 Willow Road, was continued and would be noticed and heard in 2019. She said that members of the public who had wanted to comment on that agenda item might still do so under D. Public Comment for items not on the agenda.

D. Public Comment

Peter Carpenter, Menlo Park, said regarding the proposed Hampton Inn project at 1704 El Camino Real that the Park Forest neighbors had worked hard for many years to find a compromise with the property owner and had agreed to support the proposed project with underground parking. He said

the property owner significantly changed the proposed project that was presented at the October study session to a much larger development with ground level parking only. He questioned the Commission comment for neighbors to work on a compromise with the property owner as that had occurred previously and was then disregarded by the property owner. He said neighbors were opposed to the October project proposal regardless of any cosmetic changes that might be made. He questioned how removing the underground garage and reducing development costs was a public benefit. He said the Park Forest community would support the project previously proposed with underground parking.

Chair Goodhue noted that Commissioner Drew Combs had arrived at 7:08 p.m.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the October 22, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner John Onken made suggestions to edit the minutes.

- Page 5, 2nd paragraph, modify as follows “Commissioner Onken said he appreciated the work that they had done and the money they ~~would invest~~ **were about to spend.**”
- Page 5, 2nd paragraph, modify as follows “He said the Commission’s ~~remit~~ **remit** was to consider architectural control...”

Commissioner Henry Riggs made suggestions to edit the minutes. He said he also wanted to have Item E2 pulled off the consent calendar.

- Page 5, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line, modify as follows “He said as an example ~~inside~~ **outside** the house they were proposing marble tile **for the entry paving.**”
- Page 7, Item 4.c, project-specific conditions, modify “Simultaneously with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an alternate window sample for casement, **single hung** or double hung.”

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Riggs) to approve the October 22, 2018 minutes with the following modifications; passes 7-0.

- Page 5, 2nd paragraph, modify as follows “Commissioner Onken said he appreciated the work that they had done and the money they ~~would invest~~ **were about to spend.**”
- Page 5, 2nd paragraph, modify as follows “He said the Commission’s ~~remit~~ **remit** was to consider architectural control...”
- Page 5, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line, modify as follows “He said as an example ~~inside~~ **outside** the house they were proposing marble tile **for the entry paving.**”
- Page 7, Item 4.c, project-specific conditions, modify “Simultaneously with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an alternate window sample for casement, **single hung** or double hung.”

E2. Architectural Control/Chris Kummerer/1326 Hoover Street: Request for revisions to an architectural control permit that was approved in April 2018 for modifications to the exterior materials and balcony railings on an existing 10-unit multi-family building located on a standard lot in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-091-PC](#))

Commissioner Riggs said he had no issues with the proposed architectural control. He questioned the use of deodar cedar as the replacement trees for the two pines being removed. He said that species was very undesirable in the region. Assistant Planner Ori Paz said the applicant had reviewed the City's list of acceptable heritage tree replacement species. He said the pine trees removal was part of the original architectural control approval, and this revision did not include any additional heritage tree removals.

Chris Kummerer, CKA Architects, Menlo Park, project architect, said the two pines approved for removal were to be replaced with two incense cedars. He said if the staff report indicated deodar cedar there was a mix up. He said he had wanted another species than incense cedar, but the City Arborist sought something that was more conifer as there were pines in the area. He said they had compromised on incense cedar.

Commissioner Riggs said that incense cedar was probably less objectionable than deodar cedar. He said the most important factor was species and soil compatibility. Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Mr. Kummerer said they would prefer more choice in selecting replacement trees, if his client wanted to select a different conifer.

Commissioner Riggs asked if commissioners wanted to give the applicant some flexibility around the tree species choice. Chair Goodhue said she could support. Commissioner Riggs moved to encourage staff to reconsider the applicant's preference and allow some flexibility in the replacement tree selection.

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

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

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by CKA Architects, consisting of ten plan sheets, dated received October 19, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 5, 2018 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, Recology, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - f. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Advanced Tree Care, on February 24, 2018.

4. **Approve the architectural control, subject to the following project-specific condition:**

- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall have the flexibility to propose alternative heritage tree replacements subject to the review and approval of the City Arborist.***

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Jake and Katya Mizrahi/1834 Doris Drive:
Request for a use permit revision to make changes to the approved roofing material, add a first floor window and a second floor skylight, and change the eave structure on the southwest side elevation for a new two-story residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. In addition, a heritage size street tree is proposed for removal. The original use permit was approved in May 2017. ([Staff Report #18-092-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Corinna Sandmeier said she had no additions to the written report.

Applicant Presentation: Steve Simpson, project architect, said they were requesting several things that were mostly related to try to get more light into the house including adding a window and a skylight. He said the eave structure referenced in the staff report was an overhang projecting five feet off the side of the house that was pulled back to four feet to allow more light into the dining room and the light well. He said the house was originally approved with a standing seam metal roof. He said their intent had been for a more classic look rather than a contemporary, look, so they wanted to use a composite shingle roof instead. He said they spent time to get a high-quality roof and a color palette very similar to the previously approved roof color. He said the property owners had wanted to keep the magnolia tree in the front but thought now there might be a better solution for the site. He said much of that related to the driveway and how it would need to go into the house. He said magnolia's have a very shallow root system and were hard to pave around. He said paving over the roots would cause a berm in the front of the property. He said driving over that would probably cause harm to the tree in the long run. He said recently PG&E came to the site and said they had a new policy of not doing work under a tree canopy. He said where the gas line was proposed there was no way to run the line, so it was not under the canopy of the tree. He said the house was plumbed to that side so a solution to move the line to the other side of the property was not reasonable. He said they had a landscape architect review and currently were proposing to replace the magnolia tree with a field dug olive tree 14 to 15 feet tall. He said they were open to different species noting a tree with deep roots was desirable. He said three or four feet of the street was located on the subject property.

Commissioner Onken confirmed that the house was basically the same volume and design. Mr. Simpson said there was one more window added on the front first floor.

Commissioner Barnes said the staff report on page 3 called out that the City Arborist was not supportive of removing the tree unless additional information was provided by the applicant. He asked staff to provide more context. Senior Planner Sandmeier said the City Arborist indicated that the tree was a street tree, so its removal needed his approval. She said the Arborist had asked the applicant to provide more information. She said the Commission was asked to provide feedback on the expanded driveway proposed should the tree be removed or to keep the driveway as originally approved to remain regardless of the tree.

Mr. Simpson asked whether the City Arborist knew the tree was not in the City's right of way but was located on the subject property and was a privately-owned tree. Chair Goodhue asked staff to address. Senior Planner Sandmeier said the City Arborist had a citywide plan of street trees and that was the information he had given staff. She said their understanding was the project could move forward without the removal of the tree. She said should the City Arborist receive additional information on why the tree's removal was necessary that could move forward separately. She said the use permit revision request was for the changes to the house and driveway design.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the driveway. Senior Planner Sandmeier said the driveway was 10 feet wide at the curb cut under the original use permit approval. She said that could remain or if the City Arborist approved removal of the tree the driveway could be expanded to a 24-foot wide curb cut or a reduced curb cut. Commissioner Barnes said the Commission was asked to decide before the City Arborist finally decided about the magnolia tree. Acting Principal Planner Perata said essentially the overall approval of the project included the retention of the magnolia tree. He said however if the City Arborist allowed for the removal of the magnolia tree would the Planning

Commission support a driveway expansion up to a 24-foot wide curb cut, which was the maximum permitted.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Simpson said the driveway was narrow with the original design as the tree was in front of the garage. He said apparently PG&E had a new policy about working around trees both above and below ground. He said they were trying to schedule PG&E to run the gas line to the house and were told they could not run it because of the tree being there.

Commissioner Combs said the applicant had made a point about the tree being on the subject property and confirmed with staff that regardless of where it was located the City Arborist was the decision maker regarding its removal because it was a heritage tree.

Commissioner Onken clarified with staff that a replacement tree would be planted in a different location than the existing magnolia tree.

Commissioner Riggs said he understood a street tree was any tree located within five feet of the street noting that he had two trees on his property that he had to maintain as street trees. He confirmed with staff that the magnolia tree was the only tree on the front of the property.

Replying to Chair Goodhue, Senior Planner Sandmeier said part of the use permit revision request was to expand the curb cut and the driveway. Mr. Simpson said if the tree were removed, they could do a more conventional driveway but with the tree there the driveway had to go around it. He said a 24-foot wide or 20-foot wide curb cut would be fine with them.

Commissioner Camille Kennedy confirmed that if the tree remained the driveway would remain as approved and the house would need to be replumbed for the gas line to come into the other side away from the tree. She said if the tree was removed the house could have a gas line run as currently plumbed and the driveway could be designed to a more conventional width.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes said he supported the request for the design changes. He said if the City Arborist approved the heritage tree removal, he would support a 20-foot driveway curb cut.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Acting Principal Planner Perata said the City Arborist was reviewing the applicant's request to remove the magnolia tree. He noted that the Planning Commission was not able to direct the City Arborist to approve the tree removal request. He said they thought it would be beneficial for the applicant and the project to bring the use permit revision requests to the Commission sooner than later with the possibility of a driveway change if the tree removal was approved.

Commissioner Onken said if the Commission approved a driveway that would run over the space where a tree currently was that they were deeming the tree would be removed with the approval of the use permit revisions. Senior Planner Sandmeier said it could be part of a motion that if the tree was not approved for removal that the project's original driveway design would be in effect.

Commissioner Onken moved to approve the use permit revisions as recommended in the staff report and the expanded driveway contingent upon City Arborist approval of the removal of the magnolia tree.

Commissioner Riggs said he could not support the logic that the tree would need to be removed to save the applicant money from running the gas line further. He said typically one-third of a tree's roots might be removed during a given season without harming it, noting he had to do this twice. He said regarding paving over roots and creating a high point causing water runoff toward the house that similarly he had had to put a drain in front of a garage door to solve that. He said the Doris Drive street frontage had few street trees and he could not support losing one or replacing it with an inferior species in terms of canopy and height. He said he did not find the argument against having to back out from the garage a distance substantial enough to require loss of the tree. He said the other changes such as the roof, eave adjustments and addition of a window were attractive and easy to support. He said he could not second the motion.

Commissioner Barnes said he would second the motion. He asked if Commissioner Onken favored a 24-foot or 20-foot driveway. Commissioner Onken said as proposed at 24-feet. Commissioner Barnes said he would prefer a 20-foot driveway. Commissioner Onken revised his motion to approve a 20-foot driveway. Commissioner Barnes seconded the amended motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Barnes) to approve the project with the following modification; passes 6-1 with Commissioner Riggs opposed.

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 SDG Architecture, consisting of 22 plan sheets, stamped received on October 25, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 5, 2018, 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

4. Approve the use permit, subject to the following project-specific condition:

- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans showing a 10.5-foot wide curb cut as approved by the Planning Commission on May 22, 2018 as part of the original use permit, or if the City Arborist approves removal of the heritage size Magnolia tree, an up to 20-foot wide curb cut may be incorporated into the building permit plan set, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Engineering Divisions.**

- F2. Use Permit/Chris Dolan/119 Baywood Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached one-car garage on a substandard lot with respect to lot area and width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-093-PC](#))

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

Applicant Presentation: Chris Dolan, project sponsor, said the existing home had been abandoned for over 25 years and was in extremely poor condition. He said they had met with adjacent neighbors and those across the street, who welcomed the replacement of the existing structures. He noted a street study they did along Baywood Avenue using photos. He said the subject lot had a cant in terms of the shape, so they pulled the garage to the left side to maximize the front and back yards. He said they were choosing an alternate means and method for construction. He said they would do a factory-built home that would reduce construction impact to the neighborhood. He said it also created a 70% reduction in waste.

Commissioner Onken asked how much the pre-built structure dictated the height. Mr. Dolan said each module was approximately eight to nine feet tall. He said in stacking those they sat on a stem

wall foundation to get the height off the finished grade. He said the modules were eight feet in diameter. He said they had to make sure they stayed within the setbacks. He said they added a porch and awnings to break up the façade and the garage would be constructed onsite.

Commissioner Barnes referred to Attachment E, the paragraph under the heading *Neighboring Properties* that indicated they had contact with neighbors at 106 and 111 Baywood Avenue. He asked if that was the extent of neighbor outreach. Mr. Dolan said they met with the neighbor to the rear after rats were seen when they cleared the subject property backyard of overgrowth. He said they worked with the neighbor to the left on cleaning and debris removal. Commissioner Barnes asked if they had shown the plans to neighbors. Mr. Dolan said when they purchased the property and began debris removal neighbors came over to see what was happening. He said they introduced themselves to the left adjacent neighbor, the neighbor facing the property, and another neighbor across the street and told them of their plans to demolish the existing structures and install a modular designed home. He said at that time they had not completed any of the renderings. He said through the City's neighbor notification process they received a neighbor comment that they did not like the modern style home proposed as it related to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed with the applicant that they would do extermination prior to demolition.

Chair Goodhue opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Joel Zott, 111 Baywood Avenue, said he was the adjacent neighbor. He said he supported the project. He said he thought they all were looking forward to a new neighbor and a great property in Menlo Park.

Chair Goodhue closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs referred to a rendering of the driveway and asked its width as it seemed to dominate the façade. Mr. Dolan said that it was 24-feet wide. Commissioner Riggs said he was not quite comfortable with a dominance of paving in small lots. He questioned the selection of a pistache tree for the front yard as in 20 years it would only have a five-inch diameter trunk. Mr. Dolan said it was used to break of the massing of the façade and garage. He said two street trees were also proposed to be planted. He said all were at the recommendation of the City Arborist. He said they were using two different materials to breakup the massing of the driveway. He said they needed the width to meet the guidelines for the turn radius into the driveway from the street, keep the house in close proximity to the front and have the uncovered parking space adjacent to the garage.

Commissioner Riggs said he recently had been researching factory-built housing. He said his concern was this was a relatively simple and traditional neighborhood and this proposed box structure was not as harmonious as what he would like to see.

Commissioner Onken said the roof plan showed the 1.5 by 12 for the main building and the garage like a flat roof at half-inch. He said he did not see what would happen with rainwater on the garage. Mr. Dolan said it would slope to the downslope side to a scupper and downspout. Commissioner

Onken said it was sloping in each direction and asked where it would scupper out. Mr. Dolan said they would do the most appropriate configuration. Commissioner Onken referred to the main rendering. He said the scale of it seemed to show the new residence smaller and further back than the reality as compared to the site plan. Mr. Dolan said the site plan D04 showed the actual massing of the house was set back three-quarters away from the neighbor's adjacent garage. He said what was seen was the massing of the front porch, which was about halfway next to the garage. Commissioner Onken said the neighbor's garage was a mass very similar to the project garage. He said yet the project garage was closer to the front and appeared to only be large enough to accommodate a mini vehicle whereas the neighbor's garage was a two-car garage.

Commissioner Onken said he supported using modular housing, but he thought the proposal had issues with its fit on the site and within the neighborhood. He suggested they might extend the front porch height past where the first floor and second floor split as that might increase the dominance of the ground floor and reduce the top heaviness of the second floor. He said he thought the garage would need to have some kind of parapet or something when the roofs were resolved. He said as proposed the garage was more massive and dominant than was expected. Mr. Dolan said the neighbor's garage was on a corner lot and its house was extremely long, that it was much more massive in appearance than what their house would be.

Commissioner Barnes said the applicant referred to the vernacular of the garage. He said such a prominent freestanding garage was not represented in the neighborhood. He said he was concerned with the proposed garage's prominence, location and incorporation into the site. He said he also had a concern with the neighbor outreach. Mr. Dolan said the plans were provided through notice of the City and their neighbor at 111 Doris Avenue shared them on NextDoor. Commissioner Barnes said he would have liked to have seen a more robust outreach with all neighbors with adjoining property lines.

Referring to the garage comments, Mr. Dolan said the front setback line ran at an angle. He said for the garage and the parking to work with that cant they put the garage on the left side to pull it as close to the street as possible. He said the garage engaged with the residence for egress, use and practicality of exiting the garage onto the front porch. He said they looked at bringing the house forward more and reducing the width of the front porch but pulling the façade too close to the front street would have been too much massing. He said they felt that engaging the garage with the front porch and stepping the front façade back further reduced the vertical massing from the street.

Commissioner Riggs asked staff whether a garage had to be attached to be in the front of a lot as this proposed garaged seemed to only be tangentially connected. Assistant Planner Paz said the definition of "structurally attached" was "sharing common loadbearing members." He said early on they took this question to the City's Building Official Ron LaFrance, who confirmed that the proposed construction would be considered structurally attached. He said that the garage would be integrated into the factory-built porch unit informed the Building Official's finding that the garage was structurally attached.

Commissioner Combs said he was concerned with the proposed contemporary design as it was not present in the surrounding area. He said he also had a concern about neighborhood outreach. He said though that the neighbors in this area turn out when they have an issue with a project. He said he had to assume that there was neighbor support noting the one public commenter tonight or there was indifference to it and an unwillingness to come out on it.

Commissioner Strehl said the neighborhood was a very active one noting Commissioner Combs' observation about the neighbor turnout in opposition of 50 Middlefield Road. She said in this instance that there was no objection seemed to indicate that their silence was acquiescence or approval. She said she would have a hard time voting against the project.

Commissioner Onken said he thought the project just needed a bit more attention to address the boxiness of it.

Commissioner Barnes said the staff report on page 2 under Design and Materials said the Commission might wish to discuss whether a direct pedestrian connection should be provided between the main entry and the public right of way. He asked what staff's viewpoint was. Assistant Planner Paz said providing a direct pedestrian access would connect the project to the street. He said it was not required as there was nothing in the zoning ordinance requiring it. He said it was the fit and integration within the neighborhood that they were asking the Commission to weigh in on. He said it was the pattern in the neighborhood and it would soften the façade of the garage.

Commissioner Barnes said he would support continuing the project and would ask the applicant to visit with the neighbors and show the plans and provide a record of that.

Commissioner Strehl said her home was accessed up the driveway to the front door and did not have a direct path to the front door from the street. She said there were a number of homes like that in the area.

Commissioner Riggs said staff had also prompted that the Commission might want to discuss if the 24-foot curb cut was an appropriate width. He said in effect the 24-foot width was two driveway spaces and a walkway. He said he did not want to say how the home should be entered but with this width driveway it was encouraging three cars parked and a rec room in the garage. He said regarding the architecture as contemporary and its dissimilarity in the area that he could not support it. He said if they continued the project, they had to be forthright about what should be changed to be supported. He referred to D0.2, the streetscape. He said that gave a sense of how the proposed home dominated the street, not because of overall square footage, but because of its façade. He said stacking modules of nine-feet would create sidewalls that were more imposing than a house with a roof peak six-feet taller. He said Commissioner Onken's description of the homes in the area as cute and small was very apt particularly in this end of the Willows.

Commissioner Combs asked if there was a motion on the table. Chair Goodhue said Commissioner Onken was going to make a motion, but it had not been made. Commissioner Onken moved to continue the project.

Chair Goodhue said she agreed with some of the comments. She said she preferred a direct pedestrian access from the street. She said regarding the neighborhood character that she thought the Willows was a neighborhood in great transition. She said she lived in the Willows and the homes going up across the street from her were neither cute or small. She noted the streetscape provided by the applicant that showed the neighboring homes. She said she thought 121 Baywood Avenue when it was built some years ago was out of scale to the street. She heard the boxy arguments, but she thought the boxy modular was something that was happening in the neighborhood. She said she loved the proposed garage. She said the neighboring house was

oriented to Woodland Avenue and the other was fronting on Clover Avenue. She said she would prefer a smaller width curb cut if it worked. She said the architecture could be finessed more but she was concerned that the City has no design guidelines. She said she did not support a continuance.

Commissioner Combs asked what direction would be given to the applicant.

Commissioner Onken said that discussion on architectural style was a red herring. He said the scale of a project was something the Commission was mindful of. He said the applicant's photo page demonstrated that there was any variety of architectural styles in the area. He said the other homes though tended to a smaller scale. He said he would like the architect to play with the scale of the main mass of the building moving the modules back in front, raising the porch height, and perhaps the porch didn't have to go the full width of the façade. He said he would like the project to address the slightly smaller scale of the neighborhood. He said he favored walking up the driveway as more planting was preferable in the front yard.

Commissioner Riggs said he would second the motion to continue. He said at least two or three of the Commissioners believed modern architecture had to be done sensitively. He said a product described as having limitations in shape indicated potential failure in the use of forms. He said the Commission had seen and been impressed with modern architectural projects.

Commissioner Combs suggested that they should provide general direction to the applicant.

Commissioner Strehl called for the vote and if it passed to then provide direction.

Chair Goodhue asked the applicant if he wanted more direction for a continuance. Mr. Dolan said that if the direction was to add certain elements to the front façade to break up the elevation that was one thing. He said if the direction was to step back the upper modules that was not doable. He said he would prefer they go to the vote.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Riggs) to continue the project with the following general guidance; passes 4-3 with Commissioners Barnes, Combs, Onken and Riggs in favor and Commissioners Goodhue, Kennedy and Strehl in opposition.

1. General guidance and comments for applicant consideration:
 - a. Explore options for reducing the perceived massing of the building by:
 - i. Increasing the perceived "weight" of the lower floor by moving up the height of the porch
 - ii. Add awnings/different material elements to soften the front façade
 - iii. Consider reducing the extent of the porch
 - b. Conduct additional outreach:
 - i. Contact the nearby neighbors and get sign off from them that they have seen the plans
 - c. Revise the garage:
 - i. Correct the roof pitch for proper drainage
 - ii. Prominence is problematic from a design perspective

- d. Reduce curb cut width:
 - i. Consider reducing the width from 24 feet to 20 feet

G. Study Session

- G1. Use Permit and Architectural Control/David Claydon/555 Willow Road:
Study Session on a request for use permit and architectural control review to demolish an existing nonconforming office building (currently vacant) and construct a 16-bedroom, three-story boardinghouse. The project site is located in the R-3 (Residential Apartment) zoning district, and boardinghouses are conditional uses in the R-3 zoning district. As part of the project, the existing restaurant building, which is a nonconforming use, would remain. The proposed project would include eight parking spaces devoted to the boardinghouse and five parking spaces for the restaurant, for a total of 14 on-site where 16 spaces are required. *Continued to a future meeting.*

H. Regular Business

- H1. Architectural Control/Tom Barnds/2180 Sand Hill Road:
Request for an Architectural Control revision to allow exterior building modifications to an existing four-story office building including, new exterior building materials, the creation of a new outdoor patio, modifications to landscaping, and reconfiguration of the parking lot. The subject property is in the C-1-X (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive - Conditional Development) zoning district. The proposal includes a request to locate 33 parking spaces in landscape reserve. ([Staff Report #18-094-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Kaitie Meador said a materials board was provided for the Commission's review.

Application Presentation: Dawn Jenkins, DES Architects and Engineers, Redwood City, said they were the project architects. She said the building at 2180 Sand Hill Road was recently purchased by their clients, who wanted to do architectural and site improvements. She said their work included façade renovation to implement some higher quality materials and to create a more traditional look as well as to create more open space. She said the latter would eliminate a row of parking. She said they retained the required number of parking spaces by restriping the spaces to the current standards of the uni-stall size as opposed to the larger existing nine-foot stalls. She said they have maintained the existing emergency access. She described the proposed changes with a visual presentation.

Commissioner Onken asked if they had considered extending the screening material for the antennas around the entire building top. Ms. Jenkins said they had looked at that and found it seemed too heavy, so they put them where they were necessary. She said they broke the window pattern from one large window into three windows with a larger mullion that then projected up and connected to the cornice element where the antenna screening feature did not occur.

Commissioner Combs asked if the building was occupied by different tenants. She said the clients would occupy the offices on the top floor noting the current tenants' leases would soon expire. She said two tenants would remain during construction on the ground floor. Commissioner Combs asked why the patio space was desired. Ms. Jenkins said the desire was for a space to go outside,

eat lunch, or have a small meeting. She said it was not intended for large events noting the space was broken up creating more intimate spaces.

Chair Goodhue opened up the public comment period and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes moved to approve, and Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion. Commissioner Onken said the site needed signage attention as the site was easy to drive by without being able to access it easily after having done so. Ms. Jenkins said that they were doing a master signage plan separately.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Kennedy) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects + Engineers, consisting of 44 plan sheets, dated received October 29, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on November 5, 2018, 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 David L. Babby and dated April 26, 2018.
4. Approve the architectural control subject to the following ***project-specific*** condition:
- a. The applicant shall maintain a minimum of 219 off-street parking spaces, of which 33 parking spaces are in landscape reserve. Should landscape reserve parking stalls be needed in the future, either the applicant or the City may make a request, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and Transportation Division.

H2. Review of Draft 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Dates. ([Staff Report #18-095-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Acting Principal Planner Kyle Perata said staff prepared the draft 2019 meeting schedule for the Planning Commission. He asked if the Commissioners might review and see if staff had dates that potentially conflicted with school holidays or other holidays.

There was no discussion.

I. Informational Items

I1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Acting Principal Planner Perata said there were two meetings in December and not a second meeting in November. He said the December agendas were tentative at this time. He said expected projects for December agendas included a couple of multi-family development projects and EIR scoping session for a new research development building in the Bayfront area at 1350 Adams Court that the Commission had seen earlier in a study session.

Chair Goodhue confirmed with staff that Commissioner Combs and she would need to recuse themselves from the Adams Court item.

Commissioner Strehl asked when the 40 Middlefield Road project would be heard. Acting Principal Planner Perata said it likely would be on one of the two December meeting agendas.

Commissioner Onken asked when the Hampton Inn project would be seen by the Planning Commission again. Acting Principal Planner Perata said that was not tentatively agendized for either December meeting.

- Regular Meeting: December 3, 2018
- Regular Meeting: December 10, 2018

J. Adjournment

Chair Goodhue adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Kyle Perata, Acting Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on December 3, 2018