



## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 3/23/2020

Time: 7:00 p.m.

GoToWebinar.com – ID# 613-613-691

### A. Call To Order

Chair Andrew Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes (Chair), Chris DeCardy, Michael Doran, Larry Kahle, Camille Kennedy, Henry Riggs (Vice Chair)

Absent: Michele Tate

Staff: Deanna Chow, Interim Community Development Director; Judy Herren, City Clerk; Ori Paz, Associate Planner; Tom Smith, Senior Planner

Judy Herren, City of Menlo Park, City Clerk, reviewed procedures for communicating in the webinar meeting for the Commission, public and staff.

### C. Reports and Announcements

Interim Community Development Director Deanna Chow said the City Council would virtually meet on March 24, 2020 for a Closed Session and a discussion on sheltering homeless people. She said the Council would virtually meet again on March 26, 2020 and receive for acceptance the Annual Housing Element Report due April 1, 2020 to the state and consider a modification to the City's Tenant Relocation Assistance Program to allow for rental assistance.

Commissioner Michael Doran asked if the Planning and Building Departments were open. Ms. Chow said City facilities were closed. She said staff was working toward the provision of remote Planning and Building permit services for the public.

Chair Barnes asked if residential construction was considered essential services. Ms. Chow said the state guidance was to allow all construction. She said county guidance was to allow construction for housing, emergency situations, and public works. She said the City Council on March 19, 2020 held a Closed Session following which the City Manager's guidance was that all construction in the City would cease. She said some exceptions such as for emergency situations might be requested through the City Manager's Office and Emergency Operations Center.

### D. Public Comment

There was none.

## E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the February 24, 2020, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Ms. Herren asked for public comment; there was none.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Henry Riggs/Chris DeCardy) to approve the February 24, 2020 minutes as presented; passes 6-0 with Commissioner Michele Tate absent.

## F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit & Architectural Control/West Bay Sanitary District/1700 Marsh Road:  
Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a new warehouse building for vehicle and equipment storage at an existing sanitary sewer district facility on an U (Unclassified) parcel. ([Staff Report #20-018-PC](#))

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

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs noted the difference between industrial architecture for this project and architecture for park buildings at Bayfront Bedwell Park. Planner Paz said the subject property was located apart from the park and the proposed building was looked at for consistency to existing buildings on the subject property, and was believed acceptable.

Commissioner Doran asked if the building was subject to architectural control. Planner Paz said it was.

Commissioner Larry Kahle said the flood elevation was 11 feet and the building was sited less than that. He asked why the building could not be elevated to meet the flood elevation requirement. Planner Paz said the applicants had discussed that with City Engineers. He said the applicants had indicated that a future project would be coming to address flood protection and they were aware of the risk associated with building at the levels they were proposing with this project. He said the applicant might more fully clarify the question.

Applicant Presentation: Rich Laureta, Freyer & Laureta, engineering consultants, introduced Phil Scott, District Manager, and Bill Kitajima, Project Manager, West Bay Sanitary District. He presented an overview of the Sanitary District. He noted that the District owned a flow equalization and resource recovery facility at 1700 Marsh Road. He said the proposed project was to place a new metal warehouse at the site to securely house District equipment that was currently stored at the site, noting vandalism and theft the District had experienced there over the last five years. He said the project would not result in any additional traffic as the equipment was already being stored at the site. He said the District would continue to schedule trips to the site during off-peak hours to avoid traffic. He said the building would be at the same elevation as the existing storage building and the pump maintenance building. He said the District was in the project description phase of a future project to flood protect the entire facility. He said the site also served as the District's Flow Equalization Facility for sewage transmission and was visited and worked on daily by staff, a function that would continue as it had for the last 40 years.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the existing metal building would remain. Mr. Laureta said it would. Commissioner Kahle said they were adding vents as a flood protection measure. He asked why

they were not raising the pad elevation to get the building out of the flood zone. Mr. Laureta said there were some grading issues that would come along with doing that as the building was about 40 feet away from the edge of the pond. He said they understood the risks with the proposed project but the future project would flood protect the entire facility. Commissioner Kahle said what he heard was they did not want to raise the pad for the building because of the additional grading as they did not want to do that so close to the pond. Mr. Laureta indicated that was the reason. He said the pond was part of the existing facility and they would be doing a flood protection project for the entire site in the future. Commissioner Kahle said he thought there was enough land on the site to make the grading work but he understood the explanation.

Commissioner DeCardy asked about the timing of the future flood protection project, what it would entail and its purpose. Mr. Laureta said they expected to accomplish a living shoreline along the north side of the site. He said the project would have an environmental impact review process which they anticipated would be completed later this year or early next year with construction expected mid-2021. Commissioner DeCardy asked what sea level rise projections they would use in the project planning. Mr. Laureta said the county's recommendation for flood protection was an additional three feet. He said the elevation of the existing levees was 10 feet. Commissioner DeCardy asked if the pad for the proposed building was the same elevation as the pond. Mr. Laureta said it was higher by about one foot.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Doran said he was underwhelmed by the architecture of the proposed building. He said staff's conclusion in the staff report was that the proposed building was in keeping with the existing industrial buildings and structures at the site. He said as far as that went, he agreed. He noted that the entire surrounding area of the subject project was rapidly changing and the site was directly across Bayfront Expressway from the Bohannon Development Class A office under construction, and very close to the Mia Hotel and another proposed hotel at Marsh Road and Haven Avenue as well as a new apartment complex on Haven Avenue. He said this site would be very visible to those projects. He said he would like to see something built that was compatible with the broader, greater neighborhood and what was being built there, expensive buildings with very nice architecture.

The City's IT staff person indicated that Commissioner Camille Kennedy was having audio difficulties.

Ms. Herren said because of feedback that all participants had to be muted and staff would control the microphones.

Commissioner Kahle said he appreciated Commissioner Doran's input. He said the site was industrial and he was not expecting too much from the facility. He said if the project were any closer to Bayfront or in an area in Bayfront Park that he would be more concerned. He said he visited Bayfront Park recently and this site was pretty far away and not very visible. He said he would prefer something more architecturally pleasing but he was not too concerned with what was proposed. He said he could support the project as proposed.

Commissioner Riggs said the proposed building and existing building would be visible from the Bohannon office project, Mia Hotel and the other proposed hotel. He said lacking input from the

Bohannon team it did not seem a large factor so he hesitated to ask for anything more in the way of architecture. He said he could support the project as proposed.

Commissioner Kennedy said she agreed with Commissioner Doran and understood Commissioner Kahle's viewpoint. She said the Commission held applicants to fairly high scrutiny in terms of architectural choices they were making. She said not that many decades ago that they looked at all public infrastructure as leading the way for their communities. She said letting public works off the hook for this project set a really bad precedent for future buildings even if they were industrial. She said this design fell very short of anything the Commission should approve even though it was in an industrial location, and if approved, it was not in her opinion worthy of the community within which it would be built.

Commissioner DeCardy said he appreciated Commissioners Doran and Kennedy's points and he agreed that public works projects should actually look good. He said for him a broader question was the longer term use of the site for its intended purpose. He said he did not believe that the projected sea level rise the applicants were using was in line with the latest understanding on the science of climate change. He said he felt like this project was out of sequence and that it would be better to understand the long term question first as opposed to the short term question. He said at least the short term solution should not be an enormous sunk cost if it ended up not being viable into the future. He said he was inclined to approve the project.

Chair Barnes said he thought the project was appropriate for its use and location. He said he understood the comments on the architectural control. He said with the distance associated with the building from who potentially would see it that he did not know what architectural elements would materially change the warehouse's appearance. He said based on the utility of the project, and how it was tucked into the site, he would move to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Doran said he was persuaded by Commissioner DeCardy's comments. He said if this was viewed as a temporary project than you would not want to spend more money on it than you had to. He said he hoped they would not be looking at this building for 50 years. He seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Barnes/Doran) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Kennedy abstaining and Commissioner Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the proposal is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
  1. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the other buildings on the unclassified site. The building will feature metal materials in a light gray color and will meet relevant Building Code separation between buildings, as there are no development regulations specified in the Zoning Ordinance.
  2. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City. The project would meet the demands of the existing sanitary district.

3. The proposed warehouse follows the pattern of development on the site generally and the use will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the larger neighborhood.
  4. The site is not required to provide parking spaces, however the warehouse will provide covered secure vehicle parking, and existing access as required in the applicable City Ordinances will continue to be provided.
  5. The subject site is not part of a specific plan area.
3. 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.
  4. Approve the architectural control and use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
    - a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by March 23, 2021) for the use permit to remain in effect.
    - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by Freyer & Laureta Inc., consisting of seven plan sheets, dated January 29, 2020 and approved by the Planning Commission on March 23, 2020 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
    - c. Prior to commencing any work within the right-of-way or public easements, the applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the appropriate reviewing jurisdiction.
    - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, California Water Company and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
    - e. 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.
  5. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
    - a. Unless deemed eligible for an exemption the applicant shall pay the City's Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) per Chapter 13.26 of the Menlo Park Municipal Code prior to building permit issuance. The current fee is calculated at the warehouse rate of \$2.91 per square foot for the new 5,200 square foot warehouse building (estimated at \$15,132.00 total) unless deemed eligible for an exemption by the Transportation Manager. The actual payment will be based on proposed square footage and fee in effect at time of payment, unless an exemption is granted. Please note this fee is updated annually on July 1<sup>st</sup> based on the Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index

Chair Barnes said Commissioner Kahle was recused from consideration of Item F2 due to the proximity of his residence to the subject property.

- F2. Use Permit and Variance/Alejandro and Caroline Goyen/11 Greenwood Place:  
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story residence on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The proposal includes a request for a variance to build within the required 43-foot, six inch front setback established by the Subdivision Ordinance. One heritage white birch tree has been requested for removal as part of the proposal. ([Staff Report #20-019-PC](#))

Senior Planner Tom Smith said two pieces of correspondence were received, which he displayed on the screen. He said one email was from neighbor Larry Kahle in which he expressed concern with the overall height of the proposed building and the floor to ceiling heights of 10 feet for the first floor and nine feet for the second floor. He said Mr. Kahle recommended nine feet for the first floor and eight feet for the second floor and that the vaulted ceilings on the second floor were allowed with the roof plan. He said Mr. Kahle's second recommendation was for wood windows rather than the vinyl windows shown in the plans. He said a second email received that day expressed concern with the overall height of the proposed residence and impacts on the neighboring property. He said he corresponded with the applicants the day before and they wanted to go with wood windows, which could be conditioned.

Applicant Presentation: Michelle Miner, project designer, said the design was a two-story Craftsman home. She provided a visual of the pie-shaped lot indicating its shape was challenging to fit a home on it. She said they were asking for a variance from the front setback requirement of 43.5 feet to approximately 21.8 feet to allow portions of the first and second stories of the proposed residence to be constructed within the required front setback. She said the two adjacent neighbors' homes were one-story. She said on one side trees would block any second story views and on the other side the project's windows had high sills. She said the height was under the maximum allowable height of 28 feet by one foot, four inches. She said the neighbor on the right wanted them to reduce the ceiling heights to nine feet on the first floor and eight feet on the second floor. She said he was the architect for 6 Greenwood Place and those walls were nine feet on both the first and second story. She said that lot was smaller than the subject property and the house was the same 2,800 square feet. She said he also was the architect at 15 Greenwood Place and she understood that first floor had a nine and a half foot ceiling height and the second floor had an eight and a half foot ceiling height. She said his request to reduce the ceiling heights to nine feet on the first floor and eight feet on the second floor did not seem reasonable especially given that the norm in today's world was higher ceilings.

Commissioner DeCardy asked what the hardship would be to reduce the ceiling heights or the necessity for the ceiling heights to be the height proposed other than the norm. Ms. Miner said she would not say there was a hardship but it was the desire of the property owners to have those ceiling heights. She noted they worked hard to keep the overall height below the allowable maximum, meet the daylight plane and comply with zoning regulations. She said her client interviewed a number of architects who had built in Suburban Park, who indicated they had done 10-foot ceilings in the area regularly. She said her client was quite confident she could have the ceiling heights she desired.

Commissioner DeCardy said the neighbor indicated the dormer on the proposed project would intrude into the daylight plane. Ms. Miner said zoning allowed for a dormer to intrude into the daylight plane. She said they did a neighborhood outreach meeting. She said she spoke with that particular neighbor at great length in November 2019. She said she did some solar studies that she emailed to that neighbor but never heard back until the correspondence received today. She said the solar study she did showed that shadowing would happen at a 14-foot distance. She said with that there would be little or no shadowing on the neighbor's house.

Commissioner DeCardy asked if staff would ever deny a proposed two-story house that overall was within the allowable building height with 10-foot and nine-foot ceiling heights next to one-story homes because it was too tall. Planner Smith said if this proposal had only needed a building permit application staff would verify that the project stayed below the 28-foot height maximum. He said there was nothing in the zoning ordinance that said a two-story residential project surrounded by one-story homes should have a different height restriction.

Replying to Chair Barnes, Ms. Miner said that the plate height of 10 feet on the first floor and nine feet on the second floor was correct. She said that the ceiling height on the left hand side for the master bathroom was eight feet.

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

Commission Comment: Chair Barnes said the variance in the context of the project was fine. He said the applicant had made a concession on the window type from vinyl to wood. He said regarding the plate heights of 10 feet on the first floor and nine feet on the second floor that he thought a nine-foot plate height was a concession that the applicant could make on the project to have nine-foot ceilings on both the first and second story and which would reduce the overall height by one foot. He moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report inclusive of the variance request with two added conditions. He said the first was wood clad windows and the second was reducing the overall height by one foot.

Ms. Miner asked for clarification if the first floor ceiling height would be conditioned at nine feet reducing the overall height by one foot. Chair Barnes said the condition was to reduce the overall height by one foot but was not prescriptive where that one-foot would be removed. Ms. Miner asked if she reduced the first floor to nine feet whether she could make the left side nine feet instead of eight feet. She said that would still reduce the overall height one foot. She said she had a text from the property owner who indicated the reduction overall of one foot was acceptable.

Commissioner Riggs noted the property was wedged between two neighbors and that he could understand the neighbors' request for some reduction in height. He said he could support the motion's condition to reduce the overall height by one foot. He said that the master bathroom gable was lower than the plate height of the large second floor façade was a benefit to the design. He indicated he would prefer that be unchanged.

Commissioner Doran said the concern with the intrusion into the daylight plane involved that corner. He said if there was concern about the overall height of the building that concern was most acute on that corner. He said he would like if the building height was reduced overall by one foot to have that corner reduced by one foot as well.

Commissioner Riggs seconded Chair Barnes' motion.

Chair Barnes said the motion was to have the approval conditioned additionally on wood clad windows and reduction of overall height by one foot. He said as the maker he did not support the left side height being increased from eight feet to nine feet as requested by the project architect as that was an architectural detail. He said regarding Commissioner Doran's point he could not see reducing that to a seven-foot ceiling height but to maintain it at eight feet.

Commissioner Doran said he did not intend to have the ceiling height reduced to seven feet on the left side rather if the first floor ceiling height would be nine-foot that corner would also move one foot putting it exactly in the daylight plane where it was now. He said keeping the plate height at eight foot on that corner by reducing the first floor to nine feet would reduce the intrusion into the daylight plane on the left side.

Chair Barnes said he was not being prescriptive as to where the plate heights would be reduced in any one area. Commissioner Doran said he thought they had to be prescriptive. He said the maximum height of the building had to be reduced one foot but that would not reduce the intrusion into the daylight plane and they had to be prescriptive in that.

Chair Barnes said his motion was to reduce the overall height and did not allow for the increased ceiling height requested by the applicant for the left hand side master bathroom. Commissioner Riggs said with the stated motion the bathroom and its intrusion into the daylight plane would be stuck in space while the rest of the building lowered one foot. Chair Barnes said that was correct. He called for the vote. Commissioners Barnes, Kennedy and Riggs supported and Commissioners DeCardy and Doran opposed.

Chair Barnes asked staff if they needed any clarification of the approved motion. Planner Smith said the motion conditioned an overall reduction of height one foot and left open whether the bathroom gable changed and revising the plans to wood windows rather than vinyl windows. Chair Barnes said that was correct with no allowance for the bathroom ceiling height on the left side to increase.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Barnes/Riggs) to approve the item with the following modifications: passes 3-2-1-1 with Commissioners Barnes, Kennedy, and Riggs supporting; Commissioners DeCardy and Doran opposing, Commissioner Kahle recused, and Commissioner Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:

- a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of the City Council approval of the Subdivision Ordinance variance for the use permit to remain in effect.
  - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Michelle Miner Design, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received February 21, 2020, and approved by the Planning Commission on March 23, 2020, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. 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.
  - e. 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.
  - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove existing driveway and replace with a new curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscape. Additionally, the applicant shall replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
  - g. 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.
  - h. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company, dated February 20, 2020.
4. Recommend that the City Council make the following findings as per Section 15.32.020 of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to the granting of a variance to permit an approximately 21.8-foot front setback for the proposed residence:
- a. That the variance shall be subject to review relative to the development regulations for the R-1-U zoning district and other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and that the standard conditions of approval will assure that the adjustment thereby authorized shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the same vicinity;

- b. That the shape of the lot constitutes a special circumstances applicable to the subject property, and that the strict literal application of this title is found to deprive subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity, specifically the developable area would be excessively limited by the 43.5-foot front setback;
  - c. That the proposed size and location of the new residence would comply with the standard Zoning Ordinance setback requirements and follow the development pattern of the subject zoning district and therefore the variance, rather than the sections at issue in this title, actually carries out the spirit and intent of this title.
5. Recommend that the City Council approve the Subdivision Ordinance variance to permit a 21.8-foot front setback for the proposed residence.
  6. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
    - a. The effective date of the use permit approval shall be the date of the City Council approval of the Subdivision Ordinance variance. If the Subdivision Ordinance variance is not approved, the use permit approval shall not become effective and the applicant shall submit a revised project proposal that complies with the Subdivision Ordinance setback requirement, which may require Planning Commission review of a use permit.
    - b. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the project plans to indicate that all windows on the new residence will be wood clad, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division. No vinyl windows shall be installed on the residence.***
    - c. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the project plans to reduce the overall height of the residence by one foot and maintain the eight-foot reduced plate height of the gable in the area of the master bathroom on the west side of the residence, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.***

## G. Study Session

- G1. Study Session/City of Menlo Park/100-110 Terminal Avenue:  
Request for a study session review for future architectural control to demolish the existing Onetta Harris Community Center, Menlo Park Senior Center, Belle Haven Youth Center, and Belle Haven Pool, and construct a new multi-generational community center and library on a lot in the PF (Public Facilities) district. The proposal includes a future request for a use permit for the use and storage of hazardous materials including pool chemicals and diesel fuel for a backup generator.  
**Canceled**
- G2. Study Session/Andrew Morcos/165 Jefferson Drive:  
Request for a study session review for a future application for a use permit, architectural control, environmental review, and BMR agreement. The proposal includes demolition of an existing 24,300- square-foot office building and redevelopment of the site with approximately 158 multi-family dwelling units and a 14,422-square-foot commercial space with an above grade, three-story parking garage integrated into the proposed seven-story building, located in the R-MU-B (Residential Mixed Use, Bonus) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for an increase in height, density, and floor area ratio (FAR) under the bonus level development allowance in

exchange for community amenities. The proposal would also utilize the density bonus provisions in the BMR Housing Program, which allows density and FAR bonuses, and exceptions to the City's Zoning Ordinance requirements when BMR units are incorporated into the project. **Canceled**

Chair Barnes welcomed Commissioner Kahle back into the meeting.

Ms. Chow confirmed Chair Barnes' vote on item F1 was to approve.

## **H. Informational Items**

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

- Regular Meeting: April 6, 2020

Ms. Chow said the intent was to hold the April 6, 2020 meeting, which was expected to be virtual. She said staff was determining which items made sense to be on that agenda. She said she expected some single-family residential projects.

- Regular Meeting: April 20, 2020
- Regular Meeting: May 4, 2020

Ms. Herren noted callers on the line and asked if anyone wanted to comment on this item. There were no speakers.

Replying to Chair Barnes, Ms. Chow said that a portion of the project for 100 to 110 Terminal Avenue might come as a project and not a study session. She said the applicants for the 165 Jefferson Drive would consider whether to hold the study session at a future meeting or move to application submittal.

## **I. Adjournment**

Chair Barnes adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Interim Community Development Director

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on April 20, 2020