



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 5/14/2018
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 7:03 p.m.

B. Roll Call

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

Staff: Azalea Mitch, City Engineer; Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner; Tom Smith, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the minutes for the April 23, 2018 Planning Commission meeting lacked the adjournment time. He said staff determined the meeting had adjourned at 11:25 p.m. and this change would be made when the minutes were finalized. He said the City Council at its May 8, 2018 meeting reviewed the Ravenswood Grade Separation Project and directed that Option A, which would create an underpass for vehicles at Ravenswood Avenue and no other intersection changes, be pursued with some additional direction that the City continue to try to collaborate on a trench alternative with other cities. He said at the Council's May 22 meeting, it would review the Planning Commission's recommendations on the Guild Theater Project that included amendments to the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan.

Commissioner Katherine Strehl asked about the June 5, 2018 required training for commissioners and if commissioners were not able to attend. Principal Planner Rogers said that staff was getting clarification about options for commissioners unable to attend the training on that date, and would get back to the Commission. Commissioner Strehl said she had replied to the email about the training that she was not available. Chair Goodhue said for the record she had done the same.

Commissioner Henry Riggs said he recalled that the City Council in its consideration of grade separation also directed staff to investigate fully elevated crossings at least at Oak Grove Avenue and Ravenswood Avenue, and report back to Council. He said the idea was to keep that option open but to proceed with Option A.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the April 23, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (John Onken/Andrew Barnes) to approve the minutes with the following modification; passes 7-0.

- Adjournment time added as 11:25 p.m.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Manzoor Ghori/1010 Hollyburne Avenue:
Request for a use permit to partially demolish, construct a new addition, and perform interior modifications to an existing single-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The existing residence is nonconforming with respect to the required right and left side setbacks and the daylight plane. The value of the proposed work exceeds the 75 percent new work value within a 12-month period and therefore requires a Planning Commission approval of a use permit. ([Staff Report #18-047-PC](#))

Applicant Presentation: Fatima Saqib, project designer, said they would remodel most of the existing home and add 491 square foot, which exceeded 75% nonconforming valuation and required a use permit. She said the nonconforming walls and roof would remain and the addition would be at the rear of the house. She said the home would have four bedrooms and three bathrooms. She said the existing single-car garage would remain.

Chair Goodhue noted she had not asked for staff comment.

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Matt Pruter said there were no additions to the written staff report.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said this was a very modest addition to a single-story family residence within the capacity of the house and yard. He said the Commission was seeing the project because the existing home was over the setback lines and he did not see that exacerbated by this addition. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Strehl said she agreed that this was a modest addition that did not exacerbate the nonconforming setbacks and daylight plane. She seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Strehl) 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. 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 Satellite Studio consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received April 30, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 14, 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 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 Urban Tree Management, Inc., dated received March 14, 2018.

F2. Use Permit and Variance/Karen Xu/812 Woodland Avenue:
Request for a use permit to add a second floor, as well as conduct interior modifications to a single-family residence that would exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period. The project also includes a variance request for the residence to have a left side setback of three feet, where the requirement is five feet for both the first and second stories. The subject property is in the R-1-U (Urban Residential) zoning district.
Continued to a future meeting.

F3. Use Permit Revision/City of Menlo Park/333 Burgess Drive:
Request for a use permit revision to use and store hazardous materials on site for use with an emergency well previously permitted at the City's Corporation Yard. The materials will either be

stored within an existing building or within a separate storage tank on site and will be used to help ensure safe drinking water during an emergency. The subject site is located in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-048-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers said Azalea Mitch, City Engineer, was expected but had not arrived yet. He said the Commission could continue the item until later on the agenda. Chair Goodhue said she would continue the item.

Prior to moving to consideration of item F3, Commissioner Strehl said during the General Plan Update they had a conversation about use permits for use and storage of hazardous waste materials not coming to the Planning Commission if approved by all of the regulatory agencies. Principal Planner Rogers said in the ConnectMenlo General Plan Update process there was a change for the area of the City closest to the Bay for life sciences and light industrial type users of hazardous materials to make it an administrative permit. He said the regulations for the Public Facilities District were not changed.

Chair Goodhue went to the next agenda item F4 at around 7:16 p.m.

- F4. Use Permit & Architectural Control/NMSBPCSLDHB/40 Middlefield Road:
Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a new single-story office building, approximately 3,600 square feet in size, on a vacant lot in the C-4 (General Commercial) zoning district. The proposal includes a parking reduction request to provide 12 spaces where 22 spaces are required, which represents a ratio of one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area. The project includes a dedication of approximately 1,700 square feet of right-of-way along Middlefield Road associated with a plan line. ([Staff Report #18-049-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers said that Senior Planner Tom Smith was the project manager for this item and would arrive soon. In the interim, Mr. Rogers said there was a colors and materials board that would be passed around, and several items of correspondence received since publication of the staff report. He said those had been printed and distributed to the Commission at the dais, and without exception, they were all opposed to the project.

Commissioner Onken recused himself from consideration of this item.

Staff Comment (continued): Senior Planner Smith apologized for his delay. He said in the introduction of the staff report it mentioned that there were properties on Clover Lane that were adjacent to the lot at its rear. He said in correction that one of those properties was fronting onto Baywood Avenue and was directly behind the proposed project site. He said as mentioned by Principal Planner Rogers they had received 14 additional letters since the packet was distributed, all of which opposed the project, and one additional piece of correspondence from the applicant.

Applicant Presentation: Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, said he would present the proposed project on behalf of his clients, Granum Partners, both of whom were present. He said that Elizabeth Hughes, the project's TDM expert, was also present. He said the proposed project was located in the C-4 (General Commercial) zoning district that allowed for 0.4 Floor Area Ratio (FAR), and they were proposing 0.36 FAR. He said the height allowed in the C-4 was 30-feet and they were proposing a height of 19-feet. He said the only setback required was along Middlefield Road where there was a plan line. He said they would be dedicating land at that plan line to the City. He said a mix of uses was permitted in C-4 including retail, medical, and professional offices. He said

they were restricting the project use to professional and investment type offices and had worked closely with staff for several months to reduce the impact of the building. He said the parcel was 11,590 square feet at the corner of Middlefield Road and Woodland Avenue and would be reduced to about 9,900 square feet with dedication of almost 1,700 square feet uncompensated to the City as a result of the plan line along Middlefield Road. He said the surrounding properties included the Willows neighborhood to the east, Willows Market to the north and some office buildings there and across Willow Road. He said across Middlefield Road was the former Sunset Magazine campus and Palo Alto and San Francisquito Creek to the south. He said currently the parcel was vacant and surrounded by a chain link fence. He said their project statement was to create a new, modern 3,584 square foot office building that responded to the site, respected the context, embraced sustainable design practices, and enhanced the living and working experience in Menlo Park.

Mr. Hayes said they were proposing a one-way entrance from Middlefield Road into the parking lot and an exit onto the existing one-way service road with right-turn only onto Woodland Avenue. He said at the request of the neighborhood and through Planning, they had reduced the landscape wall between the Willows Market and their site from six-feet to three-feet high for the last 35 feet as it headed toward the service road to provide more visibility for vehicles coming in and out of the Willow Market as well as for the delivery trucks. He said they were asked to remove the tree they had planned in response to neighbors' concerns over visibility.

Mr. Hayes said this property was highly visible entering into Menlo Park from Palo Alto on Middlefield Road and needed to be a very interesting, high quality building. He said the building would have stone on the frontage along this section of Middlefield Road, which was described by neighbors as noisy and chaotic, and glass and windows on the side facing the creek. He showed images of the proposed building and described it as modern rustic, kind of simple, casual, and understated with lots of natural light, warmth and quality materials, and using metal tracery kind of like the limbs of trees. He said the building would have an entrance on the front and the back of the building to address the street and also the parking lot in the rear. He said the common lobby would be sky-lit. He said to the left of the lobby were the utility rooms, showers, toilet facilities, changing room, as well as a large break area. He said essentially the whole left side of the building was dedicated to the amenities. He said they did not yet have a tenant but expected having about 2,500 square feet of office space. He said the stone would be chiseled limestone and the glass would contrast with dark bronze window frames.

Mr. Hayes said they were requesting a parking reduction as an administrative permit from the six spaces per 1,000 square feet for typical office use to one per 300 square feet or 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet. He said that would reduce parking from 22 spaces to 12 spaces and played to a TDM program well as it was shown that reducing parking reduced the need for people to drive. He said they were proposing a robust TDM plan including onsite showers, additional bicycle parking both inside and outside of the building, commuter kiosk, and guaranteed ride home program. He said the TDM program mitigated all 11 peak hour trips, with five in the morning and six in the afternoon. He said other projects in the area that they either worked on or knew about utilizing similar parking ratios included an office building at 250 Middlefield Road with a parking ratio of one per 289 square feet, 100 Middlefield Road on the corner of Middlefield and Willow Roads with a parking ratio of one per 279 square feet, 70 Willow Road, which was a project his firm did years ago, with a parking ratio of one space per 342 square feet, and 64 Willow Road, a building his firm also did, with one space per 298 square feet. He said their proposal was one space per 299 square feet. He noted the uses in those buildings of private equity firms, venture capital, private family trusts, and foundations were the uses they had limited this project to.

Mr. Hayes said their clients had agreed to the conditions recommended by staff that parking for employees, clients and visitors of the building must be managed onsite with the provided 12 parking spaces and no offsite parking was permitted on adjacent parcels or within residential neighborhoods. He said that would need to go into the lease agreement giving his client some enforcement ability. He said there would be no medical or dental uses, physical therapy, psychiatrists, or other medical use in the building. He said no computer or mobile device companies and no hardware development companies would be allowed on this site. He said permitted uses would be limited to professional services with low customer client volume such as accounting, investment, and private equity firms or family foundations excluding banks and retail type banks and legal offices.

Commissioner Strehl said she appreciated the information on traffic that was sent out to the Commission that day. She said she was not convinced of the truth of those numbers as she lived in the Willows. She said at any time of day at Middlefield Road and Willow Road, or Middlefield Road and Woodland Avenue these intersections were busy. She said a more comprehensive look at traffic would have been helpful. She said the intersection at Middlefield Road and Willow Road was the fourth worst intersection in the City and had a lot of traffic at all times of day and the evening. She asked the length of the lease on the property. Mr. Hayes said 33 years. She asked if the applicants had any dialogue with the City about this property and the possible difficulties for developing it prior to acquiring the property lease.

Greg Eger, Granum Partners, said they had a planning meeting with the City before they bought out an existing lease, and confirmed for Commissioner Strehl that they understood some of the challenges with the site.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Senior Planner Smith confirmed that the City did not have any minimum requirements in terms of a lease for development of a property.

Commissioner Riggs said he had done a site layout for Granum Partners in approximately 2015. He asked staff how well TDM programs for smaller projects had worked in the City. Principal Planner Rogers said it was hard to generalize noting some larger companies had good success probably due to greater economies of scale but that was not to negate a smaller tenant accomplishing the same results. He said some advantages of being a smaller scale establishment were for more control and observation of issues.

Commissioner Riggs commented on the peak hour trips for the project with five in the morning and six in the evening noting that the office would close at 6 p.m. He said he expected for 12 employees that at least three-quarters of them would leave around 6:00 p.m., and suggested the trip count for the evening might actually be nine or 10 cars. Senior Planner Smith said the applicant's TDM consultant might answer that more thoroughly but he knew they used the standard Institute of Transportation Engineers' numbers to reach that conclusion.

Mr. Hayes said their understanding of the hours of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. was that was when the business was open. He said it did not mean a principal or an executive was not in the building after or before those hours. He said he envisioned owners of the business arriving earlier in the morning and earlier in the afternoon or staying late.

Commissioner Riggs said that enforcement of TDM, traffic counts and parking outside the lot would

be required. He asked if the owners knew that they would need to disclose this to prospective tenants. Mr. Hayes said he did not want to speak for the owners but he thought those conditions would need to be in the lease such that business operations including parking would need to be conducted onsite and not offsite.

Commissioner Barnes asked staff about the enforcement mechanism related to condition 5a.i that limited all parking to be onsite whether for employees, clients, or visitors. Senior Planner Smith said they included conditions i. through v. with input from the City Attorney. He said the intent was to look at these comprehensively in terms of the allowed uses as well as the parking and to include that in the deed or lease agreement for the site. He said this was intended as information for whoever occupied that building as they would need to manage those twelve spaces. He said the Commission could weigh in on those conditions or add measures if they wanted but enforcement would mainly happen through complaints from the neighborhood. He said a potential control mechanism was to require the applicant to return to the Planning Commission for a use permit review if there were a number of complaints or concerns made about its use including parking. Replying further to Commissioner Barnes, Senior Planner Smith said use permits had been given and then revisited by the Planning Commission after a certain period of years. He said there could be conditions added at a later date and mechanisms to address parking if that was an issue. He said they thought the additional restrictions on uses would go a long way toward managing parking onsite.

Commissioner Barnes referred to plan sheet A1.2 calling out 2 parking spaces. He said space #2 was for clean air/van pool/EV and space #6 was for EV only. He asked if in the event the tenant did not have any EVs whether that space would be unoccupied and if that allotment was prescriptive due to the TDM. Senior Planner Smith said he believed those were added as part of the TDM and they would be restricted spaces. He said those may also be related to building code requirements.

Commissioner Barnes asked where a delivery might occur for a tenant in the proposed building. Mr. Hayes said that most likely would need to occur in the driveway and would block circulation to the back part of the parcel.

Commissioner Camille Kennedy said she was requested as a new Planning Commissioner to visit the site and had. She asked if they had considered any other systems such as stackable systems to have more parking or flexibility for deliveries. Mr. Hayes said the site was very constrained with a very small footprint after the land dedication so they had looked at an on-grade parking solution from the beginning. He said they could do a lift system but they were ugly and you would not want them exposed. He said also it took more time to use those systems for parking. He said they really thought limiting the use was the best way to manage the parking with the parking reduction request that the City had allowed on other applications. Commissioner Kennedy asked if they would have one tenant or whether there would be subdividing of space. Mr. Hayes said it was conceived as one tenant.

Commissioner Drew Combs asked about the dialogue and process for neighbor outreach for the project. Mr. Hayes said the outreach began after they realized the sensitivity of the neighborhood to the project and that was after they had submitted for design review. He said the community sent numerous emails after that submittal. He said they proceeded with the design and scheduled a meeting with the community in February 2018. He said his clients reached out to Willow Market and Applebee Preschool and met with them. He said they then sent out a community-wide mailing announcement for a community meeting. He said that was held in a building on Willow Road and

three community members participated.

Chair Goodhue asked about the concept of the dedication and whether that was required whoever the applicant or whatever the proposal. She said lines on the schematic seemed to block off the lane and asked if that was actual or what the City was requiring. Mr. Hayes confirmed Chair Goodhue was referring to the rendering and said those lines were only indicating the right of way. Senior Planner Smith said the use permit request triggered the dedication. He said any project along a plan line that requested a discretionary permit would need to dedicate land.

Commissioner Strehl asked how many employees were anticipated. Mr. Hayes said for venture firms the number of employees could range from three or less people per 1,000 square feet. Commissioner Strehl asked if all the parking spaces were filled by employees where visitors and clients would park. Mr. Hayes said these type of companies typically did not have a lot of customers coming especially if they were a private family foundation or such. He said they would have 12 parking spaces to manage. He said the estimated number of employees did not mean they all would be parking cars noting their TDM plan. Commissioner Strehl said one thing not in the TDM program was whether the tenant would be required to make Caltrain or SamTrans passes available to employees for free. Mr. Hayes said the applicants indicated that was something they would consider and make it an obligation for the tenant. Commissioner Strehl said she had gone to the site and met with neighbors. She said she knew the operator of the Willow Market. She said the property line for this parcel extended into the alley and asked if the alley size would be reduced. Mr. Hayes said it would not. He said they were building to the property line and would not go into the alley. Commissioner Strehl said where their driveway went toward the alley there was a round curve and she was concerned whether or not that curve was wide enough for people to make that turn. She said she also was concerned with people disregarding the one-way alley.

Chair Goodhue opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

Chair Goodhue said the first speaker, Nick Sharma, had six minutes as Brook Frewing donated her three minutes.

- Nick Sharma, owner of the Willow Market, said he was committed to his business, his customers, and community, and understood the arguments both for and against the development as proposed. He said as a business owner his concern was not whether this was an appropriate proposal but if his business would be inordinately impacted by it. He said the traffic and parking conditions at the short block of Willow Road and Woodland Avenue were very challenging. He said to continue to meet those challenges he needed the following conditions of approval for this project: 1) no electrical power interruption for the Market's three faced refrigeration systems; 2) no service road blockage at any time for the Market's patrons, Applebee Preschool parents, and delivery trucks entering and exiting Willow Market parking lot; 3) installation of a keep clear pavement sign on Middlefield Road to allow safe entrance across Middlefield for Applebee Preschool, the Willows Market, and the 40 Middlefield Road driveway; and 4) the northwest corner of the 40 Middlefield Road parcel designed so 48-foot delivery trucks were able to make turns in and out of the Market's parking lot to access the service road and delivery dock as had been the practice since 1956.

- Cindy Hamilton, Central Avenue, said she traveled with her two children to and from the Market and Preschool on foot, bike and by car. She said the corner of the project into the service road was currently drawn too sharply to allow for the ingress and egress of Willow Market delivery trucks. She said she would like it redrawn so the curve followed the curve of the very last parking space on the subject parcel to create a curved angle rather than a sharp angle. She said that would allow trucks to make the turn if they need to and then back up and contribute to the safe drop off of children to the Applebee Preschool. She said as drafted it was also dangerous for pedestrians' ingress and egress as it required a sharp turn around that edge that required a vehicle to swing wider. She said when she biked she used the service entrance the wrong way as it was safer than taking her children onto Woodland Avenue and Middlefield Road, and thought other pedestrians and bike riders did the same. She said the project owner was asking for parking concessions and reciprocal concessions from them were appropriate to allow for the free flow of traffic as it had existed in this area for some time as it was only really impacting nonessential design elements. She said if the parking was curved on the project's currently sharp edge and the small green space removed that would provide parking for deliveries to the project site that would not block its entrance. She said she wanted to see concessions made that maintained the safety of this corridor.
- Loretta Lum said she and her husband owned the 60 Middlefield Road property where the Willow Market was located. She said Nick Sharma operated the store and had been their tenant since 2006. She said he had done a marvelous job operating a successful business that was an essential community amenity for the Willows, the Linfield Oaks neighborhood and beyond. She said as property owners they were supportive of the applicant's right to develop their land but their concern was the applicant's request to go beyond the rules. She said the request for a parking variance was not fully justified and its approval would have unintended consequences that would affect the entire neighborhood. She said on page 3 there was one crucial factor of the parking reduction request that was absent, and that was the proximity to residential neighborhoods, which had not been adequately addressed. She said to approve this project she felt the Commission needed to address the full extent of impacts this project would have on surrounding residents. She said in its current form the parking reduction request was deficient and not worthy of the Commission's vote to approve. She said she respectfully requested that the Commission request the applicant to modify the project to meet the required parking for this property in this congested location.

Chair Goodhue said the next speaker Heather Goudey had time donated to her by Joanie Giraudo and Betsy Campbell Barth.

- Heather Goudey said she was a Clover Lane resident and was also speaking for two to other Clover Lane neighbors, Betsy Barth and Joanie Giraudo. She said her property's back gate opened to the service road and into the Market parking lot. She said she had been excited to hear that a project had been proposed for this vacant parcel but that dissipated when she saw the initial proposal and the considerable parking reduction request. She said since her email to the Commission earlier this year she had spent time reading the detailed staff report and her position was unchanged. She said the project would not only change the character of the quiet residential neighborhood but materially impact the Willows Market and the Applebee Preschool's ability to conduct business. She said three of her neighbors had not received the communication about the community outreach meeting. She said that this project was immediately adjacent to a quiet residential neighborhood with no shared parking arrangements,

no available on street parking, and the surrounding land use was currently over parked. She said this meant any overflow parking would be pushed into the residential neighborhood. She said the applicant had stated the building would be for a professional office and understood the City had additional requirements regarding use. She said they were reasonable but did not account for growth or high capacity use that might happen over the 33 years left on the lease and that was unenforceable. She said the applicant stated that odd site geometry drove down the parking efficiency. She said that did not justify the right to develop a project without the capacity for needed parking on the site placing the burden for additional parking onto the residential neighbors. She said the applicant stated that the number of employees and customers were difficult to estimate and the intent was business with low parking demand. She said the intent was unenforceable and the needs and businesses might change over 33 years. She said the applicant stated the TDM measures met the mitigation for the 11 peak hour trips proposed. She said she did not think high end clients were likely to use those alternative transit options and were unenforceable. She said the hours of operation were 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., which was reasonable but unenforceable. She said regarding the driveway entrance from Middlefield Road that this would create another third left turn in a short distance. She showed some photographs of traffic at the area from that morning. She said regarding service road usability that today when Middlefield Road northbound traffic was backed up and blocking the entrance to Willow Market lot, cars often turned left on Woodland Avenue and the wrong way onto the service road to access the Market parking lot. She said angling the parking spaces to the left with access from the service road would change the conditions at the corner. She said the one-way service road was the sole exit point for residents at 111 Clover Lane. She said regarding the barrier wall that this was a precarious corner given the speed that cars take the corner as well as the truck sizes that needed accommodation. She requested that the Commission in its consideration of the use permit and parking reduction request preserve the residential character of this quiet family neighborhood and the usability of the service road between 90 Middlefield Road and Woodland Avenue. She asked that the eventually approved project plan would not exacerbate the existing traffic problems and would have inadequate onsite parking.

- Stephanie Woodworth said she agreed with previous speakers. She said she lived at 111 Clover Lane and was at the end of the service road right by 90 Middlefield Road. She said her garage and residential parking was only accessible through the service road. She said the idea of the service road being a right turn only onto Woodland Avenue was not the current configuration and should not be as it would not work for anyone in the Willows. She said the staff report made some conclusions that the parking reduction request was consistent with the guidelines. She said in thinking about the primary use of the building it seemed an aspiration and the intent for it to be a venture firm or family foundation. She asked if that use was enforceable and what would happen if that turned out not to be the use. She said she was right behind the Willow Market and 90 Middlefield Road and she had experienced people parking in front of her garage. She said regarding the proposed lease condition that visitors and employees are managed on the 12 spaces provided and no parking be allowed on adjacent parcels or in residential neighborhoods that the landlord would not be incentivized to enforce this contractual condition against its own tenant, which meant the residents would need to enforce that lease condition. She said she was also concerned about the existing use of the alley and traffic but those concerns had been well covered by other speakers.
- Joe Zott, 111 Baywood Avenue, said his property abutted the proposed development, and he was concerned about the parking. He said he rented a similar amount of office space with a

similar amount of parking for his company of 14 employees, and that he rode his bike and two others carpoled, but his parking was maxed out. He said luckily they were in a development where there were other tenants so they could sometimes park in other places. He said his company employees and visitors sometimes parked on residential streets. He said for the proposed project that 12 spaces would work on a good day but not on every day. He said his landlord occasionally complained to him about his firm's employees parking where they should not but they were a good tenant so the landlord did not push the matter. He said to move forward with this project would have consequences such as residential parking demand and additional traffic congestion.

- Lauri Hart, 111 Baywood Avenue, said they were pleased something would be done with the vacant dirt lot. She said their home's parking spaces were right along the service road and when the Market got busy and people needed spaces they parked and sometimes double parked into their parking area. She said if 40 Middlefield Road had empty parking spaces that people using the Market would use them. She said the way the building was configured there were probably five spaces on the service road where people were currently illegally parking on a regular basis that would be eliminated. She said that was five Market customers that would be pushed into the neighborhood to park or who would not stop at the Market as it was too crowded. She said there were three spaces on Middlefield Road that were striped and people parked in front of the existing driveway for 40 Middlefield Road. She said those spaces would go away with this project and parking would be pushed into the neighborhood or they would park illegally elsewhere in an area that already had significant parking problems.
- Christine Doniger, 118 Pope Street, said she had gone to the Willow Market for many years and she agreed with the problem with the service road and the delivery trucks. She said her issue was parking but wondered why the City needed another office building as the office building next to the Willow Market and the Sunset space had no tenants. She said if this project was approved she would like to see solar panels or some other mitigation for the environmental impacts.
- Jennifer Michil, Willow Road, said she was a property manager on Sand Hill Road. She said she was familiar with the project's architectural firm and many venture capitalists in the area. She said for the record she was pro-growth and development. She said she had issues with the proposed plan and thought that additional surveys and information were needed before the proposal could be brought forward for action. She said she was concerned about the loading dock for the Willow Market that was an existing use for that building. She said she did not think the applicant had taken into consideration the impact of their plan's configuration on the operations of the Willow Market. She said she had questions about the trash enclosure and access. She said she liked angled parking.
- Amar Murygan, 130 Baywood Avenue, said he was supportive of the property being developed and it looked like it would be a beautiful building. He said the request for parking reduction should be looked at more closely. He said while the applicant would like this building to be used by low-impact tenants he asked the Commission to objectively consider whether or not a venture capitalist firm or investment banking firm would be low impact tenants. He said such firms' board meetings tended to involve tens if not dozens of people. He said he thought the TDM needed to be looked at with some skepticism, and asked the Commission to consider how many venture capitalist executives would take a bus to work. He said if the project moved

forward he asked that the Commission have the developer and City address the intersection of Middlefield Road and Woodland Avenue to have a crosswalk there as that would greatly add to the safety of that intersection.

Chair Goodhue said the last speaker was Andrew Young with three minutes donated by Emily Young.

- Andrew Young said he represented his family at 503 Concord Drive and his father at 226 McKendry Drive. He said the Planning Commission should deny the parking reduction request because managing all parking onsite could not be enforced. He said the basis for the Commission's decision was the policy of administrative review of parking reduction requests that included eight factors. He said regarding the first factor that the applicant intended the use for private equity banking or private family office and that it was hard to estimate how many people would work there that his estimate was they could have 10 to 25 employees, and the use could easily reach 20 to 30 occupants at a time. He said staff was recommending that no offsite parking be permitted within adjacent parcels or the residential neighborhood at any time. He asked how that would be enforced, who would bear the penalties, and if there was a penalties schedule. He said he thought the TDM plan and parking management was flawed as no formal assessment was made of this project and only estimates were used. He said that the traffic in this area could not be estimated as Middlefield Road was an artery for commute traffic. He said he thought the TDM plan was flawed as it only estimated surrounding traffic, it proposed a number of ineffective parking reductions, there was no shared parking arrangements, no availability of on street parking and the surrounding use was a residential neighborhood that would suffer parking overflow from this development.
- Woodson Martin said the City had an urgent horrible traffic situation at this intersection and were now planning a large construction project there. He said he thought it was crazy to grant any exceptions to the rules to accelerate any project at this intersection while the City was in the midst of an emergency that it needed to focus on solving first.

Chair Goodhue closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes thanked the community members for taking the time to attend the meeting and share their views. He said in full disclosure that he lived fairly close to this parcel and visited Willow Market about 10 times each week. He said some of his neighbors' children attend Applebee Preschool. He said he was looking at the project objectively as to its applicability within the context of the parking reduction request. He said the Commission was looking at architectural control and the use permit which had a request pursuant to section 16.72.011 for parking reduction policy. He said the building was good looking and the applicant and lessee had gone to efforts to create a building that fit contextually with the site. He said this parcel was in C-4 and in that zoning district there did not seem a great deal of precedence for this type of parking reduction request. He said in looking at other parcels zoned C-4, it was clear to him there were some unique characteristics of this parcel. He said the other C-4 parcels abutted Willow Road with easy access and egress from those sites. He said for this site the service road was behind the property and it was contiguous with the intersection at Woodland Avenue and the challenges of Woodland Avenue as it continued into Middlefield Road meeting Willow Road. He said he did not see a salient reason for this site to have reduced parking. He said the staff report said that the parking requirement for the C-4 was six spaces per 1,000 square feet and if granted a

reduction project would be parked at 3.3 spaces per thousand, which was less than the 3.8 spaces per thousand under the Specific Plan whose properties also had access to public parking lots. He said the loss of the service road was very problematic as bicyclists tended to use it going the wrong way to get to the corner of Middlefield and Willow Roads. He said without that a circular vehicular pattern was created that made the entire corner even more dangerous, which was problematic for the community. He said there was incongruence with the parking ratio being requested and the impact to the community. He said without enforcement mechanisms for some of the conditions they were externalizing the monitoring of the activity on this site to the neighboring community whether for parking, use of the tenancy, or any future bad behavior on the site. He said he found granting parking reduction to place that onus on a community a difficult and extraordinary request.

Commissioner Strehl said she appreciated Commissioner Barnes' comments and found the arguments pretty compelling as well as the comments from the public. She said in the project area there were two existing businesses with a high volume of traffic. She said she was happy with the traffic for the Willow Market as it meant it was a very successful business not just for the Willows but for the City. She said she was concerned about the Applebee Preschool as its only access was from the service road for which the Lums had granted the opportunity for parents to park to drop off and pick up their children there. She said anything that would impede those businesses was very problematic. She said she liked the architecture of the proposed building but she had a hard time supporting any reduction in parking given the potential impacts to the neighborhood, the residents as well as Willow Market. She said the comments of the last speaker resonated with her about how the construction impacts could possibly be mitigated that would occur within the community and its interference with already serious traffic issues on Middlefield Road. She said until the traffic mess was fixed there it was hard to justify moving the project forward.

Commissioner Riggs acknowledged the public comments and presentation from Mr. Hayes, who had presented a very nice building. He said the question was how they could enable this applicant to build what for Menlo Park was a quite modest building on the leased property without undue impacts to the neighbors including neighbor businesses. He said there were specific issues they could address. He said it appeared that 48-foot delivery trucks for the Market had used part of this property for years. He said he would like to hear whether two neighbors could accommodate the cab of the truck being at the back end of the driveway for 40 Middlefield Road. He said he hoped the tree on the service road was rethought after they took care of some of the larger issues. He said he agreed that TDM efforts for this project were hard to envision. He it seemed highly likely that the tenant for this project would occasionally have a meaningful meeting and there might be 10 additional vehicles, which would probably be parked on Baywood. He said he was not sure there was a bicycle issue with the service road as this project would build a sidewalk all around the perimeter and bicyclists could use the sidewalk to get to Willow Market. He said that a keep clear zone on northbound Middlefield Road at the Willow Market driveway should be established with an extra 10-foot width to serve this building as well. He said enforcement was needed and would urge the City to assign a traffic officer at the location to ticket illegal turns. He said although this looked like a really good project, it was difficult to make the finding for reduced parking. He suggested that some additional parking be attempted on the lot to gain approval from the Commission. He said it would also help if there was some accommodation with the Willow Market for the truck access.

Commissioner Combs said at times there were food trucks in front of Willow Market and a large barbecue pit. He asked staff if that was permitted or fell under the normal use of that property. Senior Planner Smith said those type of activities should be regulated by a use permit and there

was not a use permit for those activities. He said the City had not received any complaints of issues so it had not required that. Commissioner Combs said they had gotten a lot of information about traffic and congestion in this area and they were possibly burdening this property owner with those issues when some of those might result from activities currently not permitted. He said one of the most honest questions asked during the public comments was whether Menlo Park really needed another office. He said the answer might be no but that was not the Commission's purview. He said this use fit within what the zoning allowed. He said the concern was the parking and whether the reduced parking request was something so outside of the norm the Commission should not approve the use permit. He said it seemed the potential impact of this project was significantly less than what it had been when a gas station had been located there with associated traffic and vehicles entering and exiting. He said by default they were suggesting constraining any real usage of the property. He said he did not see how they could get additional parking unless they raised the building and the question was whether that expense was worth it for the size building proposed on property leased for 30 years.

Chair Goodhue made note of the thoughtful comments from the public and interested parties for the project. She said she also lived in the Willows and traveled this corner multiple times per day. She pointed out that one of the renderings showed a car going the wrong way down the service road. She said the site was challenging and she did not know what the best use of it was. She said the proposed building was very nice and would make a good entrance to the Willows. She said like Commissioner Combs she wondered about the outreach. She said there were too many unresolved issues with the neighboring properties and parking concerns that she could not vote to approve the project as currently proposed.

Commissioner Strehl noted the suggestion for angled parking along the service road, which was not taken up by the project proponents. She said she thought angled parking spaces would discourage vehicles from coming in the wrong way on the service road to go into the parking lot from Woodland Avenue. She said other suggestions not meeting concession included not having such a sharp angle on the wall at the end of the project property line and the access road. She said in some ways it was unfair to both the applicant and people in the surrounding area that a study session was not held on this project.

Commissioner Riggs moved to continue the project with the direction that parking be increased or some arrangement for parking be made with a hypothetical nearby property or through staggered employee schedules. He said secondly for the project to allow some accommodation or compromise for delivery trucks for the Market and if not 48-foot trucks at least something between a bobtail and a long haul truck. He said separately the Commission might discuss urging the City to provide a crosswalk, a keep clear sign and enforcement. He said it was clear the Market brought traffic and parking that affected the neighborhood.

Commissioner Strehl said the motion seemed to work on the parking and with the Market. She said they also needed to try to address some of the concerns of the residents such as the angled parking that was suggested to discourage cars from driving in the wrong way on the service road. Commissioner Riggs said he was supportive of changes to the project that would address concerns and for the applicants to hold project meetings with the residents. He said that with angled parking both a parking space would be lost as well as 18-inches potentially off the side of the building. He said people running late would turn illegally onto the service road to grab a parking space, and the best solution was enforcement.

Mr. Hayes said it would be helpful if the Commission defined what was meant by more parking. He said if it had to be six spaces per 1,000 square feet that the project would not work. He asked if it would make more sense to do something along the lines of the Specific Plan at 3.8 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Commissioner Riggs said he absolutely felt there should be some compromise about the parking and six per 1,000 square feet was unnecessary for a nonmedical office building especially with the additional restrictions the City Attorney had suggested.

Commissioner Strehl said when the project returned to the Planning Commission that a letter from the County of San Mateo should be included stating the property was cleared of any hazardous materials related to the use of the site as a gas station previously. She said that this project would not have as much traffic as a gas station, but the gas station had not been there for a long time and traffic conditions now were not what they had had then.

Commissioner Riggs said that he believed the building permit was subject to testing of soils during excavation.

Commissioner Barnes asked if the applicant had a preference for an up and down vote or a continuance of the project. Mr. Hayes said they would like to continue the project and try to meet the requirements as best they could.

Commissioner Barnes asked if Commissioner Riggs envisioned a full re-submittal or modifications as needed. Commissioner Riggs said that he did not know if that could be predicted. He referred to the bottom left wing of the building to the right of the driveway noting with its removal the applicant could accomplish three or four parking spaces, and that would put them beyond 3.8 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, but would bump the project into a two-story building requiring re-submittal. He said they might be able to get two more parking spaces without redesigning the building. He said also they might arrive at an alternative solution that would not constitute building additional parking physically.

Commissioner Barnes said he was supportive of the applicant doing something with this property, but would need considerable convincing that the project could have anything less than the regulated parking ratio of six spaces per 1,000 square feet. He said he was open to a continuance but not necessarily supportive of a project with a reduced parking ratio.

Commissioner Combs said he could support a continuance. He said his concern was how many parking spaces they would want added. He said he did not think more parking would solve all the issues neighbors were raising.

Requested by the Chair, Commissioner Riggs said his motion was a continuance to address parking with direction for a parking ratio within the range of three to six spaces per 1,000 square feet and for the applicant to be persuasive regarding the ratio brought forward. He said additional direction to the applicant was to address the corner of the site in some way to see if a compromise was available for delivery trucks for the Market.

Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion commenting that a number of items were addressed by the public, and a number of those could be dealt with through the motion made. She said there were other issues and suggested the applicant work with the Applebee Preschool and Willows

Market to make sure those businesses will continue to succeed. She said she did not want to restrict the re-submittal to just parking and the right angle.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to continue the item with the following direction, passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Onken recused.

- Increase the amount of proposed parking on the site to a ratio greater than 3.33 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) and less than 6 spaces per 1,000 square feet of GFA
- Address potential barriers at the northwest corner of the site that may impede deliveries to the Willows Market loading dock, including the location of the proposed site wall, landscaping, curbs, and other potential impediments to truck deliveries

Chair Goodhue noted at around 9:36 p.m. that the Planning Commission would return to Item F3: Use Permit Revision/City of Menlo Park/333 Burgess Drive.

- F3. Use Permit Revision/City of Menlo Park/333 Burgess Drive:
Request for a use permit revision to use and store hazardous materials on site for use with an emergency well previously permitted at the City's Corporation Yard. The materials will either be stored within an existing building or within a separate storage tank on site and will be used to help ensure safe drinking water during an emergency. The subject site is located in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-048-PC](#))

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

Applicant Presentation: Azalea Mitch, City Engineer, said a well was drilled last year as part of the City's Emergency Water Planning project. She said Phase 2 of the project involved a pump and generator. The disinfectant system for this required bleach and ammonia, small quantities of which needed to be stored onsite, and the request to revise the use permit was to allow this.

Chair Goodhue confirmed with staff that other hazardous materials were stored at the City's corporation yard.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Onken) 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. 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 consisting of nine plan sheets, project description letter, and hazardous materials information form prepared by the City of Menlo Park, dated received April 6, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 7, 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 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 applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.
 - d. If there is an increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site, a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials, or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.
 - e. Any citation or notification of violation by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, San Mateo County Environmental Health Department, West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Building Division or other agency having responsibility to assure public health and safety for the use of hazardous materials will be grounds for considering revocation of the use permit.
 - f. If the entity discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire unless a new entity submits a new hazardous materials information form and chemical inventory to the Planning Division for review by the applicable agencies to determine whether the new hazardous materials information form and chemical inventory are in substantial compliance with the use permit.

F5, F6 & F7 will be reviewed as one item, with a single staff report (Staff report was amended May 10, 2018)

- F5. Architectural Control and Use Permit/500 SC Partners LLC/506-540 Santa Cruz Avenue: Request for architectural control to demolish existing buildings and construct a new mixed-use development consisting of a café on the first floor, office space on the second and third floors, and three residential units on the fourth floor in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The project also includes a use permit to allow outdoor seating associated with the proposed café. As part of the proposed project, two heritage trees are proposed for removal. The proposal is coordinated with the 1125 Merrill Street and 556 Santa Cruz Avenue

proposals, and includes linked elements, such as access. ([Staff Report #18-050-PC](#))

- F6. Architectural Control/556 SC Partners LLC/556-558 Santa Cruz Avenue: Request for architectural control to demolish the existing building and construct a new mixed-use development consisting of retail space on the first floor, office space on the second floor, and four residential units on the third floor in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposal is coordinated with the 1125 Merrill Street and 506 Santa Cruz Avenue proposals, and includes linked elements, such as access. ([Staff Report #18-050-PC](#))
- F7. Architectural Control/Chasen Rapp/1125 Merrill Street: Request for architectural control to demolish the existing building and construct a new mixed-use development consisting of office space on the first and second floors, two residential units on the third and fourth floors in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. As part of the proposed project, two heritage trees are proposed for removal. The proposal is coordinated with the 506 and 556 Santa Cruz Avenue proposals, and includes linked elements, such as access. ([Staff Report #18-050-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Corinna Sandmeier said a recommended condition of approval was added 6.p due to a miscommunication between staff and the applicant. She said the condition required the parking layout for 506 Santa Cruz Avenue to be revised to a previous proposal that provided 63 parking spaces, which was the layout described in the staff report. She said the added condition also gave the applicant the option of providing additional information for staff review showing that the 57 parking spaces shown in the latest plan sets were sufficient. She said copies of six additional emails of support for the project received after publication of the staff report had been provided to the Commission.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Barnes asked about the structure of the Below Market Rate Housing (BMR) provided with the project. Senior Planner Sandmeier said the applicant was proposing to provide two offsite BMR units at 1162 El Camino Real, which the applicant had indicated he owned and proposed to develop in the near future as residential. She said the BMR agreement was structured to provide alternative plans should the 1162 El Camino Real residential development not occur or if the two units could not be provided there. She said the proposal was providing two BMR units rather than the one BMR required for the project mainly to make up for the delay in providing a unit, but which would provide the City with an additional BMR unit. Replying further to a question from Commissioner Barnes, Senior Planner Sandmeier said the applicant was basically allowed two years for the 1162 El Camino Real proposal to be approved, and if that did not occur then the applicant would pay an in-lieu BMR fee equal to the cost of providing two BMR units. She said a third option was the provision of one BMR unit at the project site.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed with staff that the BMR requirement was tied to the properties at 506 to 540 and 556 to 558 Santa Cruz Avenue and 1125 Merrill Street.

Commissioner Combs asked if there was precedence for a residential project to provide BMR units offsite to a future different residential project development. Principal Planner Rogers said he believed this was the first project with a residential component making that offer and which could conceivably include the BMR unit on the project site. He said there were projects wherein developers partnered with another project to provide the residential units and that included some Facebook projects and the Stanford Annexation project.

Commissioner Strehl said she believed this offer of two BMR units was a response to the Planning Commission from the study session as it wanted a unit onsite versus payment of an in-lieu fee as previously proposed by the applicant. She said they were now offering two BMR units offsite.

Applicant Presentation: Chase Rapp said he and his partner Brady Fuerst were the developers of the three projects and had brought updated plans reflecting the changes made after the study session with the Planning Commission on February 5, 2018.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, said he was presenting on behalf of his client, Prince Street Partners, and introduced Gary Laymon with Guzzardo Partnership, landscape architects. He said through the study session on February 5, 2018, they had general support for a shared site concept for all three projects and for a shared parking relationship among the three sites. He said they also had support for 556 Santa Cruz Avenue, the small building proposed next to the existing McDonalds. He said they had general support for 506 Santa Cruz Avenue, the corner building, for the first two floors and how the arcade was being handled with materials but the Commission asked for further study on the handling of the third floor through materials and articulation. He said the Commission requested further study on the major modulation, the main entrance, and how it related vertically to the building. He said for the building at 1125 Merrill Street, around the corner, the Commission asked for more studies regarding the scale and massing of it. He said an overall Commission comment was the expressed desire for more housing.

Mr. Hayes provided a visual overview of the surrounding location for the three sites. He said there were four existing driveway curb cuts for the overall plan, 10 street parking spaces, and a rather weak mixture of street trees and trees on the sites. He said about \$2.5 million would be spent on street improvements including sidewalk, curb, gutter and utility relocations to accomplish 15-foot wide sidewalks. He said new street trees included London plane or sycamore trees along Merrill Street and black oaks would continue as a consistent rhythm of trees along Santa Cruz Avenue.

Mr. Hayes provided a visual site plan of the 506 and 556 Santa Cruz Avenue sites. He highlighted the pattern of colonnade with numerous entry points at the building modulations and display windows between all the openings that he said would create a lively sidewalk along the two street frontages. He noted a small open space area on Merrill Street for outside dining directly across from the train station where there was also a building entrance. He said by the parking entrance was a roofed outdoor space also related to a building entrance. He said the main driveway coming off Santa Cruz Avenue went under the building at 506 Santa Cruz Avenue where a driver could take a ramp to two parking levels below grade or enter on grade parking for 556 Santa Cruz Avenue. He said access for 1125 Merrill Street would be at grade to on grade parking there. He said trash and recycling was a combined facility for 506 and 556 Santa Cruz Avenue and was located next to the same for the 1125 Merrill Street site. He said they were proposing a two-story space for a café inside 1125 Merrill Street that would serve as an accent piece to the structure. He said at the back of 556 Santa Cruz Avenue a landscape buffer with California laurel trees would also serve as a storm water treatment area. He said they worked with the residents directly across from side of the building to create this landscape buffer. He said there was bike parking on the street and under the building. He said staff had requested more bike parking and they have added that on the sidewalk. He said for 556 Santa Cruz Avenue they increased the housing by 33% from three units to four units with two two-bedroom units and two one-bedroom units. He said for the fourth floor of 506 Santa Cruz Avenue they had three residential units with two one-bedroom and one two-bedroom with outdoor terraces.

Mr. Hayes provided visual side by side elevations showing what they showed the Commission previously for 506 Santa Cruz Avenue. He said they kept the ground floor levels defined by the stone arcade, retail windows, and building entrances but strengthened it on the corner using that vocabulary on the section just to the right of the main building module. He said on the left hand side of the entrance above the driveway they previously had louvers, which were now replaced with windows. He said in the center at the major building modulation at the entrance they took two levels of office space and integrated those with a solar shading device in metal matching all the window frames, unifying those two floors. He said the fourth floor was pushed back 10 feet and had a reverse shed roof to provide a contrasting roof form to accent that building modulation. He said they removed the stone at the third floor and replaced with a lighter looking cement plaster and removed columns on the same floor to lighten its appearance architecturally. He said they now had a more expansive window line at the third floor that was protected by solar shades above it. He said on the other corner on Merrill Street they tried to deemphasize the stair and transition more toward the building at 1125 Merrill Street. He said they pushed the fourth floor back there and created an opportunity for a living wall.

Jess Field, Field Architects, introduced his father Stan Field, and provided a visual location overview for 1125 Merrill Street. He said they eliminated two curb cuts and placed the office use on the ground floor establishing the pedestrian avenue linkage between Santa Cruz Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue. He said as mentioned by Mr. Hayes that all of the trash and recycling would be picked up from the alleyway access easement. He noted the lobby entrance on the first floor to the residential units and office. He said the parking was located behind there with access through the lobby and short term bike parking was located adjacent to the outdoor café seating space. He said long-term bike parking was located inside the building. He said the second story would house a single-occupant business. He said terraces had been reduced on the north and south side of that floor. He said the elevator would stop at the third floor instead of at the fourth floor, which greatly reduced the massing along the smaller two-story building at 1145 Merrill Street. He said they created an elevator lobby with a unit facing north and one facing south, each of which had living space on the third floor and two bedroom apartments on the fourth floor with terraces north and south but smaller than in their previous proposal. He noted the green screen the length of the property line shared with 1145 Merrill Street, which the neighbors and landscape architect had discussed at length in a working session. He said one of the primary things from the study session led to the use of wood to accentuate the residential use and create a much more direct correlation to the horizontal wood siding of 1145 Merrill Street and the train station. He said another primary thing was the reduced floor and building height in response to concerns about the “looming” feeling of the previous proposal. He said the building mass was stepped back on the 1145 Merrill Street side. He provided visual perspectives of all elevations of the proposed building.

Chair Goodhue opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Fran Dehn, Chamber of Commerce, said that the project would not remove street parking and vehicles would no longer have to back out of 1125 Merrill Street to near misses on a daily basis. She said the project was solid and part of the effort to rejuvenate the downtown. She said the study session although not required as the original project met the requirements of the Specific Plan was important as it gave the team a time to present and to go public with the

project design for comment. She said the proposed design was handsome and repurposed the parcels with a creative response to the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan goals and Planning Commission comments. She said on behalf of the Chamber the request was to approve and move the project forward.

Chair Goodhue closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kennedy said she did a site visit with the applicants. She said the project welded together three unique properties into a great urban design, which was appropriate for both Santa Cruz Avenue and Merrill Street. She said the parking was the type of innovation and expense relative to the size of the project that the City would request.

Commissioner Barnes said he thought the applicants had done a fabulous job starting with the materials at the Santa Cruz Avenue site to the modulations and treatments. He said the Merrill Street building was really transformed and worked. He said he appreciated the addition of the housing unit. He said he supported the project.

Commissioner Onken said he echoed comments made by fellow Commissioners. He said the building closest to McDonalds was a successful design and an extra residential unit was welcome, balancing out the proposed scale for the site. He said the central building on the corner was literally text book for what the Specific Plan asked and well executed. He said 1125 Merrill Street was now a simpler and more elegant building. He said he would leave open to the applicant the choice of wood species. He said the building faced northeast so western red cedar would weather a little more slowly than if facing south, but eventually all wood after 10 years would be a silvery gray. He moved to approve to make the findings of the staff report including the BMR agreement and architectural control as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Strehl said she liked the project before and liked this project better. She seconded the motion and said the project would be a great addition to the downtown.

Commissioner Riggs said he was particularly impressed with Field Architects' response as it worked on several aesthetic levels. He said the residential units looked attractive. He said he definitely appreciated the improvements on the Santa Cruz Avenue buildings. He said on sheet A232 an area on the north side of the elevation was keyed as zinc panels but he thought that was probably painted stucco or such up against 506 Santa Cruz Avenue building. He said on the landscape plans only half of the tree species were within the matrix but presumably labeled correctly on L1.0. He said currently there was diagonal parking on Santa Cruz Avenue, which he tended to use when he has lunch nearby. He said those four parking spaces were reduced to two spaces, and asked if that was staff's guidance. Mr. Hayes said the angle for that parking became an issue when the sidewalk needed to be increased to 15-feet in width, which pushed all that parking into the driveway. He said they looked for ways to preserve the 10 spaces. He said they could relocate some spaces where a curb cut was eliminated. He said there were fewer spaces on the Santa Cruz Avenue frontage but in total there were still 10 on street parking spaces.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Strehl) to approve the three items with the following modification; passes 7-0.

1. Make findings with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that the proposal is within the scope of the project covered by the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, which was certified on June 5, 2012. Specifically, make findings that:
 - a. A checklist has been prepared detailing that no new effects could occur and no new mitigation measures would be required (Attachment J).
 - b. Relevant mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment K), which is approved as part of this finding.
 - c. Upon completion of project improvements, the Specific Plan Maximum Allowable Development will be adjusted by 1 residential unit and 12,597 square feet of non-residential uses, accounting for the project's net share of the Plan's overall projected development and associated impacts.
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 development is consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, as verified in detail in the Standards and Guidelines Compliance Worksheets (Attachments F and G).
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 Below Market Rate Housing Agreement (Attachment I) in accordance with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program, subject to final review and approval by the City Attorney.
5. Approve the architectural control and BMR agreement subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Hayes Group Architects, consisting of 100 plan sheets, dated received May 7, 2018 and plans prepared by Field Architecture, consisting of 56 plan sheets, dated received May 7,

2018 approved by the Planning Commission on May 14, 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 requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all West Bay Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, California Water Company and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit a finalized version of the Stormwater Control Plan, which shall provide stormwater treatment for the entire project site pursuant to the latest regulations specified in the San Mateo County C.3 Technical Guidance Manual, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Stormwater Control Plan shall include a written report identifying existing and proposed project conditions, and all applicable source controls, and mitigation measures (i.e. bioretention areas, flow through planters, etc.) implemented to meet NPDES compliance.
- e. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction shall be implemented to protect water quality, in accordance with the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division. BMP plan sheets are available electronically for inserting into Project plans.
- f. Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) will be required for the development as a whole (three properties), addressing overlapping topics such as shared parking and access, stormwater treatment areas, and storm drains. CC&R's need to be submitted, reviewed by Planning, Public Works, and the City Attorney prior to building permit issuance. Easements, deed restrictions, or other alternate mechanisms may be used for these requirements, as specified by the City Attorney. The CC&R shall be recorded prior to final inspection.
- g. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for: 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) dust control, 3) air pollution control, 4) erosion and sedimentation control, and 5) tree protection fencing. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Engineering, and Planning Divisions prior to issuance of a building permit. The fences and erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing construction.
- h. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit plans for construction related parking management, construction staging, material storage and Traffic Control Handling Plan (TCHP) to be reviewed and approved by the City. The applicant shall secure adequate parking for any and all construction trades. The plan shall include construction phasing and anticipated method of traffic handling for each phase.
- i. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit a draft "Stormwater Treatment Measures Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement" with the City subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division. The property owner will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of stormwater treatment measures for the project. The

agreement shall be recorded and documentation shall be provided to the City prior to final inspection.

- j. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval by the Engineering Division. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. A Hydrology Report will be required to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division. Slopes for the first 10 feet perpendicular to the structure must be 5% minimum for pervious surfaces and 2% minimum for impervious surfaces, including roadways and parking areas, as required by CBC §1804.3. Discharges from the garage ramp and underground parking areas are not allowed into the storm drain system. Discharge must be treated with an oil/water separator and must connect to the sanitary sewer system. This will require a permit from West Bay Sanitary District.
- k. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit all necessary improvement plans and documents required by Caltrans for work associated with projects under Caltrans' jurisdiction. The plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Public Works Department prior to submittal to Caltrans.
- l. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit engineered Off-Site Improvement Plans (including specifications & engineers cost estimates), for approval by the Engineering Division, showing the infrastructure necessary to serve the Project. The Improvement Plans shall include, but are not limited to, all engineering calculations necessary to substantiate the design, proposed roadways, drainage improvements, utilities, traffic control devices, retaining walls, sanitary sewers, and storm drains, pump/lift stations, street lightings, common area landscaping and other project improvements. All public improvements shall be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division. The City will evaluate the condition of asphalt paving on Merrill Avenue and Santa Cruz Avenue, following construction and prior to final occupancy of buildings. If necessary, the City will require a grind and overlay of damaged pavement along the project frontage. All existing striping, markings, and legends shall be replaced in kind, or as approved by the City and Caltrans.
- m. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit joint trench drawings showing all applicable on-site lateral connections to overhead electric, fiber optic, and communication lines as undergrounded. The joint trench drawings shall be subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- n. During the design phase of the construction drawings, all potential utility conflicts shall be potholed with actual depths and recorded on the improvement plans, submitted for Engineering Division review and approval.
- o. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit all applicable engineering plans for Engineering Division review and approval. The plans shall include, but is not limited to:
 - i. Existing Topography (NAVD 88')
 - ii. Demolition Plan
 - iii. Site Plan (including easement dedications)
 - iv. Construction Parking Plan

- v. Grading and Drainage Plan
- vi. Stormwater Control Plan
- vii. Utility Plan
- viii. Erosion Control Plan
- ix. Planting and Irrigation Plan
- x. Off-site Improvement Plan (including Tie-Backs design)
- xi. Construction Details
- xii. Joint Trench Plan

The Applicant shall agree to furnish any additional engineering services or plans as required by the Engineering Division not mentioned herein. Additional information is provided in the comments below.

- p. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit plans to remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- q. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit plans for: 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) dust control, 3) air pollution control, 4) erosion and sedimentation control, 5) tree protection fencing, and 6) construction vehicle parking. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Engineering, and Planning Divisions. The fences and erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing construction.
- r. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of 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.
- s. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation. As appropriate to the site and status of construction, winterization requirements shall include inspecting/maintaining/cleaning all soil erosion and sedimentation controls prior to, during, and immediately after each storm event; stabilizing disturbed soils through temporary or permanent seeding, mulching, matting, tarping or other physical means; rocking unpaved vehicle access to limit dispersion of much onto public right-of-way; and covering/tarping stored construction materials, fuels, and other chemicals. Plans to include proposed measures to prevent erosion and polluted runoff from all site conditions shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division prior to beginning construction.
- t. Prior to building permit issuance, applicant shall submit plans for street light design per City standards, at locations approved by the City, subject to review and approval of the Transportation and Engineering Divisions. One new street light will be required. All street lights along the project frontages shall be painted Mesa Brown and upgraded with LED fixtures compliant with PG&E standards.

- u. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, submit a consent letter from SFPUC acknowledging the projects proximity to SFPUC water line and conditions/restrictions on construction activities and lateral crossing, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- v. The Applicant shall retain a civil engineer to prepare "as-built" or "record" drawings of public improvements, and the drawings shall be submitted in AutoCAD and Adobe PDF formats to the Engineering Division, prior to Final Occupancy.
- w. Street trees and heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the recommendations of the arborist report prepared by Henry Ardalan, dated February 17, 2018, and the letter prepared by Urban Tree Management Inc., dated April 18, 2018.
- x. Street trees shall be from the City-approved street tree species or to the satisfaction of City Arborist. Irrigation within public right of way shall comply with City Standard Details LS-1 through LS-19 and shall be connected to the on-site water system.
- y. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all Public Works fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.
- z. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan, providing the location, architectural details and specifications for all exterior lighting subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
- aa. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, a design-level geotechnical investigation report shall be submitted to the Building Division for review and confirmation that the proposed development fully complies with the California Building Code. The report shall determine the project site's surface geotechnical conditions and address potential seismic hazards. The report shall identify building techniques appropriate to minimize seismic damage.
- bb. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit a Geotechnical Report detailing on- and off-site soils conditions in preparation for the proposed tie-backs, subject to review and approval of the Building and Engineering Divisions.
- cc. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall design and submit all required engineering plans demonstrating that the proposed shoring tie-back / soil nails system does not adversely affect any existing or future utilities and/or any other City infrastructure, to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division. I-beams and appurtenances associated with the shoring plan, other than tie-back cables/soil nails, cannot be placed in the right-of-way (ROW).
- dd. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Applicant shall install reference elevation/benchmarks to monitor ground movement in the vicinity of the shoring system at the current centerline of San Antonio Street adjacent to the property before, during and after excavations, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division. The benchmarks shall be surveyed by a licensed surveyor and tied to an existing city monument or benchmark. The benchmarks shall be monitored for horizontal and vertical displacement

of San Antonio Road improvements. All Tie-Back systems shall comply with the City's Tie-Back Guidelines.

- ee. Prior to final occupancy, the Applicant shall complete, notarize, and submit a Tie-Back Agreement with the City obligating future owners to remove tie-backs or repair damages to the public right-of-way and bear all associated costs. This Agreement shall be subject to Engineering Division and City Attorney review and approval and must be recorded with the County of San Mateo.
 - ff. A complete building permit application will be required for any remediation work that requires a building permit. No remediation work that requires approval of a building permit shall be initiated until the applicant has received building permit approvals for that work. All building permit applications are subject to the review and approval of the Building Division.
 - gg. Prior to building permit issuance, all public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements, and the dedication of private easements, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division and recorded with the County of San Mateo prior to building permit final inspection.
 - hh. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit, the Applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board under the Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit (General Permit). The NOI indicates the Applicant's intent to comply with the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program, including a Storm Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The Applicant shall hire a state licensed Qualified Stormwater Developer (QSD) to prepare the NOI and SWPPP for the proposed grading and submit a finalized version of the documents to the Engineering Division.
 - ii. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the Applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division. The project is subject to the City' Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan is required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application. The landscaping shall be installed prior to final building inspection.
 - jj. Prior to final inspection, the Applicant shall submit a landscape audit report to the Public Works Department.
 - kk. All Agreements shall run with the land and shall be recorded with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office prior to final inspection, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
6. Approve the architectural control and BMR agreement subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. The applicant shall address all Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) requirements as specified in the MMRP (Attachment K). Failure to meet these requirements may result in delays to the building permit issuance, stop work orders during construction, and/or fines.

- b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an updated LEED Checklist, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. The Checklist shall be prepared by a LEED Accredited Professional (LEED AP). The LEED AP should submit a cover letter stating their qualifications, and confirm that they have prepared the Checklist and that the information presented is accurate. Confirmation that the project conceptually achieves LEED Silver certification shall be required before issuance of the building permit. Prior to final inspection of the building permit or as early as the project can be certified by the United States Green Building Council, the project shall submit verification that the development has achieved final LEED Silver certification.
- c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a full shoring plan subject to review and approval of the Planning and Building Divisions.
- d. Prior to issuance of each building permit, the applicant shall pay the applicable Building Construction Street Impact Fee in effect at the time of payment to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director. The current fee is calculated by multiplying the valuation of the construction by 0.0058.
- e. 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.
- f. Any nonstandard improvements within public right-of-way shall be maintained in perpetuity by the owner. Owner shall execute an Agreement to maintain non-standard sidewalks and planting strips if any. Agreement shall be subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division and City Attorney and shall be recorded prior to final occupancy of the last building.
- g. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Preparation Fee, which is established at \$1.13/square foot for all net new development. For the subject proposal, the fee is estimated at \$25,691.68 (\$1.13 x 22,736 net new square feet).
- h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a maintenance plan for all street trees to ensure they are managed to maintain roof access and residential egress window access, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
- i. The on-street parking being installed as part of this project is within City of Menlo Park right-of-way and will be maintained by the City, will be publicly accessible to any users, and will not be reserved spaces for any specific property(s). The City cannot guarantee these parking spaces will remain and they may be removed as part of public improvements in the City right-of-way at a future date.
- j. The on-site Parking Puzzlers will be maintained and managed by the property management company of the property(s) and staff is required to be on-site at all times to address any issues that may arise. The operations of the Parking Puzzlers, including training of users and regulation of usage will be managed by the property management company. The property management team will be responsible for ensuring that those assigned to the

Parking Puzzler systems are using the system to allow the visitors and guests access to the standard spaces at all times.

- k. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for 506 Santa Cruz Avenue is estimated to be \$34,966.80. This was calculated by multiplying the fee of \$4.80/S.F. for Office by net new Office of 10,425 S.F. and \$4.80/S.F. for Retail by net new Retail of -4,388 (a net decrease in square footage provides a credit) and \$1,996.40/unit for Multi-family residential by net new Multi-family residential of 3 units. Please note this fee is updated annually on July 1st based on the Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index. Fees are due before a building permit is issued.
- l. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for 556 Santa Cruz Avenue is estimated to be \$13,686.00. This was calculated by multiplying the fee of \$4.80/S.F. for Office by net new Office of 7,452 S.F. and \$4.80/S.F. for Retail by net new Retail of -3,353 S.F. (a net decrease in square footage provides a credit) and \$1,996.40/unit for Multi-family residential by net new Multi-family residential of -3 units (a net decrease in units provides a credit). Please note this fee is updated annually on July 1st based on the Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index. Fees are due before a building permit is issued.
- m. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for 1125 Merrill Street is estimated to be \$12,758.00. This was calculated by multiplying the fee of \$4.80/S.F. for Office by net new Office of 4,366 S.F. and \$4.80/S.F. for Retail by net new Retail of -2,124 S.F. (a net decrease in square footage provides a credit) and \$1,996.40/unit for Multi-family residential by net new Multi-family residential of 1 unit. Please note this fee is updated annually on July 1st based on the Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index. Fees are due before a building permit is issued.
- n. The City has adopted a Supplemental Transportation Impact Fee for the infrastructure required as part of the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan. The fee is calculated at \$393.06 per PM peak hour vehicle trip. The proposed projects at 506 Santa Cruz Avenue, 556 Santa Cruz Avenue and 1125 Merrill Street are subject to a combined Supplemental TIF of \$29,086.44 for a total of 74 PM peak hour trips. Payment is due before a building permit is issued and the supplemental TIF will be updated annually on July 1st along with the TIF.
- o. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised historic resource evaluation for 1125 Merrill Street, reflecting the building changes since the initial evaluation, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. This may take the form of a supplemental letter/memo from the historic architect.
- p. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing 63 parking spaces at 506 Santa Cruz Avenue or a revised shared parking study demonstrating additional ULI credits to account for the mixture of uses that results in a requirement of 58 parking spaces at 506 Santa Cruz Avenue and 31 parking spaces at 556 Santa Cruz Avenue, subject to review and approval of the Planning and Transportation Divisions.***

G. Regular Business

- G1. 2018-19 Capital Improvement Plan/General Plan Consistency:
Consideration of consistency of the 2018-19 projects of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan with the General Plan. ([Staff Report #18-051-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Azalea Mitch, City Engineer, said the Five Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was provided in the staff report. She said the request was for the Commission to adopt a resolution finding that the CIP was consistent with the City's General Plan. She said for this year that their budget included 30 new projects for around \$23 million. She said many of those focused on maintaining the public infrastructure with investments in the water systems, roads, and parks. She said all of the projects were consistent with the goals of the General Plan in maintaining sustainable services and open space, and were consistent with the Specific Plan.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs asked what the fiscal year allotment was for repairing streets. Ms. Mitch said they were in the process of requesting to award the 2018 Slurry Seal project. She said they had estimated \$500,000 for that project and the bid came in much higher, so they were now requesting \$1 million for it for fiscal year 2017-2018. She said for next fiscal year they would do the \$3 million street resurfacing project.

Commissioner Onken asked about a new project, *The Welcome to Menlo Park Monument Sign*. Ms Mitch said this related to placing signs in specific parts of the City to say "Welcome" and to use the new updated logo. Commissioner Onken noted a proposal push in the City of San Carlos to invite designs for City welcome signs that apparently did not materialize. He noted the broadness of the City of Menlo Park geographically, and suggested examining where to place such signs might be served well with Planning Commission review. Ms. Mitch said she would mention to staff the idea of a competition and would bring back a preliminary proposal.

Commissioner Strehl asked if there was a plan for sidewalk improvements. Ms. Mitch said they were updating the Sidewalk Master Plan as part of the update of the Transportation Master Plan. Commissioner Strehl said quite a few people in the Willows walked in the street because the sidewalks were tripping hazards. Ms. Mitch said there was a program to address tripping hazards associated with the trees.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Riggs) to adopt Resolution No. 2018-01 determining that the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan's projects for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 are consistent with the General Plan; passes 7-0.

- G2. Nominate and recommend a commissioner to serve on the Heritage Tree Ordinance Taskforce. ([Staff Report #18-052-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers said the Commission was requested to nominate one of its commissioners to serve on a taskforce to update the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance. He noted on page 3 the body was to have no fewer than seven members and could have as many as 12 members. He said key considerations were interest and availability. He said page 4 had projected dates for the taskforce meetings.

Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Principal Planner Rogers went through the calendared meetings which for 2019 was mainly Wednesdays but apparently included a variety of days for the rest of 2018, including weekend days.

Commissioner Onken asked if nominations could be considered at the next meeting so the Commission could get a bit more information as to how many people would be on the taskforce and whether the schedule could be condensed as it seemed overly burdensome due to the length of time it was projected to meet. Principal Planner Rogers said the item could be brought back for the June 4 meeting at which time a nomination would be needed. Commissioner Strehl requested that the meeting dates be confirmed and to find out approximately how long meetings would run. Replying to Commissioner Combs, Principal Planner Rogers said he would also confirm whether the taskforce was viable if no Planning Commissioner was able to serve.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: June 4, 2018

Principal Planner Rogers said the June 4 agenda had a few single-family residential development projects, likely the return of the Electric Vehicle Charging ordinance, and possibly a presentation on proposed changes to the BMR Guidelines.

Commissioner Strehl said she would be absent from the June 18, 2018 meeting.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Principal Planner Rogers said the City Council reviewed the Specific Plan in April 2018 and directed that city commissions, in particular planning and housing, provide input. He said that could possibly occur at the June 18 meeting.

- Regular Meeting: June 18, 2018
- Regular Meeting: July 16, 2018

I. Adjournment

Chair Goodhue adjourned the meeting at 11:03 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on June 18, 2018