



## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** 6/3/2019  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.  
**City Council Chambers**  
**701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025**

### A. Call To Order

Chair Andrew Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

### B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes (Chair), Chris DeCardy, Michael Doran, Katherine Strehl

Absent: Camille Kennedy, Henry Riggs (Vice Chair), Michele Tate

Staff: Fahteen Khan, Contract Assistant Planner; Ori Paz, Assistant Planner; Kyle Perata, Principal Planner; Tom Smith, Senior Planner

### C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Kyle Perata said the City Council at its June 4, 2019 meeting would consider the proposed budget and the Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

### D. Public Comment

There was none.

### E. Consent Calendar

#### E1. Approval of minutes from the May 20, 2019, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Chris DeCardy noted on pages 21 and 22 references to “shock clock,” which should be referenced as “shot clock.” Planner Perata said he would confirm all instances and do a global edit.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Michael Doran/DeCardy) to approve the minutes from the May 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting with the following modifications; passes 3-0-1-3 with Commissioner Katherine Strehl abstaining and Commissioners Camille Kennedy, Henry Riggs, and Michele Tate absent.

- Pages 18 through 22, replace “shock clock” with “shot clock” globally.

### F. Public Hearing

#### F1. Use Permit/Chris Dolan/119 Baywood Avenue: Request for a use permit to demolish an existing

single-family residence and a detached garage and construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached front-loading one-car garage and adjacent uncovered space on a substandard lot with respect to lot area and width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. Two heritage-size tree of heaven trees are proposed for removal. **Continued by the Planning Commission at the May 6, 2019 meeting.** (Staff Report #19-042-PC)

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Ori Paz said staff received additional correspondence after the publication of the staff report, which had been forwarded to the Commission by email earlier in the day and were available for the public on the table in the back of the Council Chambers.

Applicant Presentation: Chris Dolan, project sponsor, said new modifications to the proposed project included an increase to the first floor porch parapet, creation of an architectural wing wall, addition of green wall on the garage, addition of an awning over the first floor patio door, modification of the landscape plan with the addition of a front yard courtyard, recess of the garage door further into the structure, changing the glass garage door to solid wood, and stepping the garage back some. He provided a visual timeline of the neighbor outreach they had done.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Doran said the project was much improved since the Commission last saw it. He said he particularly liked that the garage was pushed back from the street.

Commissioner Strehl said the project was supportable and that she appreciated the work done to improve the project.

Commissioner DeCardy said he appreciated the work done on the project since the Commission last saw it.

Chair Barnes said the project was well done and supportable. He asked about the fence and its potential impact for visibility of the neighbor's driveway. Planner Paz said that the fence actually dropped in height noting fences in front setbacks were limited to four feet in height.

Chair Barnes said the design improvements were arduous but made the project much better for the neighborhood. He said for the record that there was no bias against the proposed modern architecture. He said it was more the siting of the garage and the layout as well as the manufacture's choices about the type of design that were problematic. He moved to approve; Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Barnes/Strehl) to approve the project as recommended in Attachment A to the staff report; passes 4-0 with Commissioners Kennedy, Riggs, and Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Connect-homes, consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received May 29, 2019 and approved by the Planning Commission on June 3, 2019, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
  - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
  - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
  - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
  - g. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services, LLC. on June 21, 2018. Revised April 24, 2019.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
  - a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall provide an updated site plan and landscape plan identifying the species of the two proposed street trees at the front, subject to review and approval of the City Arborist.

- F2. Use Permit/Flury Bryant Design Group/958 Hobart Street:  
Request for a use permit for excavation within the required right side setback for a basement light well and rear setback for a mechanical automobile turntable, in association with a new one-story residence with a basement in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) district. ([Staff Report #19-043-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Contract Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan said staff had no additions to the written report.

Commissioner Strehl confirmed that the project was a residential home noting that its square footage was small.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl asked how many vehicles would be stored in the garage. Mr. Flury said the homeowner would store three vehicles.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (DeCardy/Doran) to approve the project as recommended in Attachment A to the staff report; passes 3-0 with Commissioner Strehl abstaining and Commissioners Kennedy, Riggs, and Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Flury Bryant Design Group, Inc., consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received May 22, 2019, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
- g. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Wayne Tree Expert Company, Inc., dated February 12, 2019.

F3. Use Permit/Sally and Barry Karlin/308 Arbor Road:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story residence and detached garage, and construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage and a basement on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. One heritage sized Siberian elm tree is proposed to be removed as part of the project. ([Staff Report #19-044-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Chris Turner said staff had no updates to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Replying to Commissioner DeCardy, Mr. Turner said the applicant would be responsible for the removal and replacement of the three trees in the public right of way. Commissioner DeCardy confirmed with Mr. Turner that the City Arborist would be the approving entity for the replacement tree type and planting location.

Applicant Presentation: Barry Karlin, project applicant, said he and his wife wanted to build a beautiful home in the Allied Arts area, noting they had previously lived there. He said their goal was to have a style and design that fit the area. He said they reached out to all of the neighbors and most were supportive.

Commissioner DeCardy noted the removal of a heritage elm tree to accommodate the light well and asked if they had looked at a design that would have preserved the heritage tree. Mr. Karlin said the tree in question was in very bad shape and the City Arborist recommended its removal. He said they would replace with a heritage tree near where the existing tree was. He said that also met that side neighbor's desire for a shade tree over their property.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl said the project seemed to maximize to the allowable development on the property. She said she was concerned that the second story was not setback from the five-foot setback. She said the project seemed boxy and massive.

Recognized by the Chair, Jim Malikski, project architect, said the lot was very narrow with a buildable area of 40 feet. He noted that bedrooms 1 and 2 were setback and the second floor was designed so it did not line up with the first floor. He said it was sounder structurally to have the first and second floor walls line up or at least parts of it. He said they tried to solve the massing toward the front, so the home was not as big there. Commissioner Strehl said that the second story was stepped back for bedrooms 1 and 2 but that the house still looked big. Mr. Malikski said they lowered the plate height on the second floor from eight to seven feet and had dormer windows for interest on the side.

Chair Barnes noted the neighborhood outreach and response. He said he had no reason to disapprove the project. He moved to approve; Commissioner Doran seconded the motion.

**ACTION:** Motion and second (Barnes/Doran) to approve the project as recommended in Attachment A to the staff report; passes 3-1 with Commissioner Strehl opposing and Commissioners Kennedy, Riggs, and Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by J Maliksi & Associates Architecture, consisting of 17 plan sheets, dated received May 13, 2019, and approved by the Planning Commission on June 3, 2019, 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 Mayne Tree Expert Company, Inc., dated January 21, 2019.

F4 and G1 are associated items with a single staff report

- F4. Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Scoping Session/Rich Truempler/162-164 Jefferson Drive: Request for a conditional development permit amendment, architectural control, below market rate housing agreement, and environmental review to construct a new four-story office building, approximately 249,500 square feet in size, and a new four-story parking structure. The new office building and parking structure would be constructed on a parcel with two existing four-story office buildings, each of which is approximately 130,000 square feet in size. The property is located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. The total existing and proposed office development on the parcel would be approximately 510,000 square feet of gross floor area with a total proposed floor area ratio (FAR) of 88 percent for the project site. The proposal includes a request for an increase in height and FAR under the bonus level development provisions in exchange for community amenities. ([Staff Report #19-045-PC](#))

**Transcript prepared for item F4.**

## **G. Study Session**

- G1. Study Session/Rich Truempler/162-164 Jefferson Drive: Request for a conditional development permit amendment, architectural control, below market rate housing agreement, and environmental review to construct a new four-story office building, approximately 249,500 square feet in size, and a new four-story parking structure. The new office building and parking structure would be constructed on a parcel with two existing four-story office buildings, each of which is approximately 130,000 square feet in size. The property is located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. The total existing and proposed office development on the parcel would be approximately 510,000 square feet of gross floor area with a total proposed floor area ratio (FAR) of 88 percent for the project site. The proposal includes a request for an increase

in height and FAR under the bonus level development provisions in exchange for community amenities. (Staff Report #19-045-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Smith said staff had two questions with one about the parking ratios and whether the Commission found either parking ratio alternative acceptable. He said regarding the bird-friendly guidelines waiver request the Commission was asked to weigh in on whether additional information or further clarification was needed to act upon that request when the project entitlements came forward.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl asked how many employees were anticipated in the new building. Mr. Truempler said it was one employee per 125 square feet. Planner Smith said he recalled the estimated employee count was in the Initial Study. Commissioner Strehl confirmed housing mitigations would come later after studies were done. She said the biggest concern was the infrastructure and the transportation infrastructure in particular that supported development in the ConnectMenlo area. She said with adding more employees and not sufficient housing that traffic became much more of a bottleneck. She said that not only impacted the residents of Belle Haven and East Palo Alto but other parts of Menlo Park significantly. She said she hoped the City could move forward with a more significant infrastructure plan to help alleviate the traffic and make investments that would help. Planner Smith said the employee count was one employee per 125 square feet, which equated to just under 2,000 employees.

Commissioner DeCardy said it would be helpful to know what the project would look like without the need for the bird-friendly guidelines waiver and the impacts to the applicant in terms of cost, design or some other area that made following those problematic. Mr. Truempler said it was cost and also the pleasantness of the employee spaces. He said typically ceramic gridding was done for bird-friendly glazing. He said if it was not required, they would like to avoid it, but they understood the need to study it. He said they asked for a waiver because according to the bird safe design guidelines their project was not near the area where birds would be affected.

Commissioner Strehl said she appreciated that the applicant had downsized the garage although it and the building were still significant in size. She said she supported a 2.5 parking space per 1,000 square feet ratio as opposed to the 3.0 space per 1,000 square feet as she thought that everything would be needed to eliminate vehicle trips in addition to infrastructure improvements.

Commissioner DeCardy asked about the parking space reduction and if they had looked at it in terms of mitigating the entire set of additional trips or parking through other shifts in the current TDM plan. Mr. Truempler said the EiR would study these things more specifically. He said as a developer they preferred the higher parking ratio and part of that related to the occupancy of the building. He said they would have to have a significant TDM plan just for the building to live at 3.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet with the anticipated employee count. He said they wanted their development to have an appropriate amount of parking and for cost benefit analysis they would prefer the 3.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Chair Barnes said the current project proposal was well-conceptualized for the parcel in the size and locating of the building as well as the scale, massing and screening perspective of the parking garage. He said the proposed building would be homogenous with the existing two buildings that

were also well designed. He said the 2.5 parking ratio per 1,000 square feet was better for the community in terms of reducing car trips. He said based on the anticipated employee count that a robust TDM program would be needed at that parking ratio. He said he did not like below ground parking in the Bayfront area and thought eliminating it and using the 2.5 parking ratio was the best idea.

Chair Barnes asked staff to explain the bird safety guidelines. Planner Smith said for this relatively new office zoning district there were bird-friendly guidelines for development. He said the guidelines had an exemption request that would allow for a waiver from those standards. He said as part of the Initial Study a biologist did a study of the proposed design of the building and determined the building would follow the majority of the guidelines except for not having more than 10% non-bird-friendly glass on the building. He said he thought the applicant's intent was to design the building in a way that was completely compatible with the other two buildings on the site that were constructed prior to these bird-friendly standards being in place. He said the first request by the applicant was to exceed the 10% non-bird-friendly glazing. He said the second request was regarding building corners as well as railings. He said the proposed building had balconies and the corners were transparent glass. He said the railings would have the fritting pattern that made it easier for birds to distinguish the glass. He said that was one of the things the biologist had mentioned would help birds to be able to distinguish the railings, but the corners of the building would be glass. He said the biologist indicated the vegetation on the site was low quality and not likely an area where large numbers of birds would be nesting, so it seemed the incidence of bird strikes would be relatively low for this building.

Chair Barnes asked if staff had a position on the waiver. Planner Smith noted that he was not qualified as a biologist. He said a professional biologist performed the study as part of ICF's review for the Initial Study. He said they peer reviewed the study and felt comfortable with it as well. He said staff would rely on the two professionals' opinions and concur with it unless the Commission had a different opinion or requested more information.

Chair Barnes said the project was the right one for ConnectMenlo. He said whether ConnectMenlo was right for Menlo Park was a different discussion that was being taken up by the City Council. He said he was inclined to go with the biologists' opinions regarding the bird-friendly guidelines waiver request.

Chair Barnes closed the study session hearing.

## **H. Informational Items**

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

- Regular Meeting: June 24, 2019

Principal Planner Perata said for the June 24 meeting, it appeared the 1704 El Camino Real hotel project would come back for the Commission for review as well as a study session and EIR scoping session for 111 Independence Drive, and a study session for the neighboring 115 Independence Drive project.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Planner Perata said the 201 El Camino Real project would tentatively be planned for one of the July meetings.

- Regular Meeting: July 15, 2019
- Regular Meeting: July 29, 2019

**I. Adjournment**

Chair Barnes adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Kyle Perata, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on June 24, 2019

**From:** [K Amar Murugan](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** 119 Baywood  
**Date:** Saturday, June 1, 2019 9:52:42 PM

---

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I reside at 130 Baywood Avenue in Menlo Park and write in support of the request for a use permit to construct a new home at 119 Baywood Avenue. I encourage the Commission to approve the application for the following reasons:

1. Redevelopment of the lot is desperately needed. We have lived on Baywood Avenue for more than a decade at the dilapidated home currently at the location is not only a neighborhood eyesore but also a magnet for illicit activity, rats and other nuisance.
2. While the style of the proposed residence is decidedly modern, there are a number of other modern homes in the Willows neighborhood. 505 Concord and the recently sold 422 Concord come to mind. The recently built modern home on Willow and another under construction on Woodland are also very modern. Although I and my neighbors may wish see a more traditional home built on the lot, the petitioners have done much to accommodate and revise their plans to in response to neighbors' concerns. We are fortunate to not live in a subdivision of cookie cutter homes with HOA guidelines. Architectural variety adds to the character of a neighborhood.
3. The property owners should be free to build the home of their choice that meet the City's building codes and is within reason from a design perspective, which the proposed plan appears to be. Moreover, the new office building approved for 40 Middlefield next to the Willows Market is also modern. This home would only be one structure away. Architectural standards should be applied in a similar manner, whether the project is commercial or residential.

Thank you.

regards, Amar

Amar Murugan  
130 Baywood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA

**From:** [Lauri Hart](#)  
**To:** [Paz, Ori](#)  
**Cc:** [Jamie McGrath](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach  
**Date:** Monday, June 3, 2019 11:41:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [CMP\\_Email\\_Logo\\_100dpi\\_05d92d5b-e8e3-498f-93a6-d0da509bd602111111111.png](#)

---

My husband and I feel that any issues we had have been addressed. The current plan for the garage location is clearly the only workable one for the site. We see no reason that approval of the plan should be held up any longer.

Lauri Hart  
111 Baywood Ave, Menlo Park, CA 94025

On Mon, Jun 3, 2019 at 9:52 AM Paz, Ori <[OriPaz@menlopark.org](mailto:OriPaz@menlopark.org)> wrote:

Hi Teddy,

I can confirm that, as Jamie mentioned, the minimum required driveway width could not be achieved for the detached garage option due to the width of the lot and the height of the structure relative to the daylight plane.

I also wanted to let you know that staff will forward the correspondence received since the report was published to the Planning Commission. Please let me know if there is any additional information that you would like relayed. You are also welcome to attend the meeting this evening, at 7pm in the City Council chambers to share comments then.

Sincerely,

Ori



**Ori Paz**  
Assistant Planner  
City Hall - 1st Floor  
701 Laurel St.  
tel 650-330-6711  
[menlopark.org](http://menlopark.org)

**From:** Jamie McGrath [mailto:[jmcgrath@cvlending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 1, 2019 8:48 PM  
**To:** Teddy Spiller Wilson <[teddyswilson@earthlink.net](mailto:teddyswilson@earthlink.net)>; Charles@CharlesJacob.com;  
Chris Dolan <[cdolan@cvlending.com](mailto:cdolan@cvlending.com)>; Nagendra Jayanty <[nj@cvlending.com](mailto:nj@cvlending.com)>  
**Cc:** Jessica Olson <[jessaolson@yahoo.com](mailto:jessaolson@yahoo.com)>; Lauri Hart <[lauriahart@gmail.com](mailto:lauriahart@gmail.com)>; K Amar  
Murugan <[amarmurugan@hotmail.com](mailto:amarmurugan@hotmail.com)>; Paz, Ori <[OriPaz@menlopark.org](mailto:OriPaz@menlopark.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach

Hi Teddy –

Thank you for the email. We attempted to make the rear garage option work but unfortunately there were driveway width and daylight plane code requirements that prevented this. For your reference and point of view, we prepared a street rendering of the house. You can see this in the attached. We hope to get the project approved so we can move forward to complete the project.

As far as the yard maintenance, I have been trying to get our landscaper to come out all week. He was supposed to be by today.

Thank you,

Jamie

---

**From:** Teddy Spiller Wilson <[teddyswilson@earthlink.net](mailto:teddyswilson@earthlink.net)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 31, 2019 3:49 PM  
**To:** Jamie McGrath <[jmcgrath@cvlending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com)>; Charles@CharlesJacob.com; Chris Dolan <[cdolan@cvlending.com](mailto:cdolan@cvlending.com)>; Nagendra Jayanty <[nj@cvlending.com](mailto:nj@cvlending.com)>  
**Cc:** Jessica Olson <[jessaolson@yahoo.com](mailto:jessaolson@yahoo.com)>; Lauri Hart <[lauriahart@gmail.com](mailto:lauriahart@gmail.com)>; K Amar Murugan <[amarmurugan@hotmail.com](mailto:amarmurugan@hotmail.com)>; Paz, Ori <[oripaz@menlopark.org](mailto:oripaz@menlopark.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach

Jamie,

Thanks for the update. We're extremely disappointed that the garage won't be moved back; I assume Ori will verify that the reason is a city daylight plane requirement.

As you know, most of us neighbors feel that the design is out of character with the rest of the street, so we cannot give support for the design, although if the city approves it, we must give our acceptance, however reluctant. Thank you for contacting us.

Teddy and Bob Wilson

P.S. Will you please see that the weeds on the property are cleaned up, and kept down in future? They are seeding all over the neighborhood and are a real nuisance. Thanks!

On May 28, 2019, at 11:04 PM, Jamie McGrath <[jmcgrath@cvlending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com)> wrote:

Dear Neighbor –

We continue to work with the City of Menlo Park Planning Department for project approvals. It was requested that we further modify the design to reduce the prominent garage. The below modifications were incorporated to the revised submission attached to this letter.

1. Relocated garage footprint by recessing the garage 8 feet back into the front porch footprint
2. Added 4-foot screen wall/ fence and modified landscaping to the front

With our last communication to you there was the potential for relocating the garage to the rear yard. Due to planning guidelines with required daylight clearances this option was not feasible.

In order to help move this project forward we ask that you extend your support for this modified design by sending us an email at [jmcgrath@cvlending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com). We are also available if you have any questions. I can be reached at 415-359-4482.

Thank you,

Jamie, Chris & Nagendra

<Baywood submittal package.pdf>

---

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

**From:** [Teddy Spiller Wilson](#)  
**To:** [Paz, Ori](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach  
**Date:** Monday, June 3, 2019 10:27:55 AM

---

Hi Ori,

Thank you so much for confirming what Jamie told us. We neighbors are very appreciative of your help. I'm afraid I can't attend the meeting, but I hope to be able to read about it afterwards.

Sincerely,

Teddy

On Jun 3, 2019, at 9:52 AM, Paz, Ori <[OriPaz@menlopark.org](mailto:OriPaz@menlopark.org)> wrote:

Hi Teddy,

I can confirm that, as Jamie mentioned, the minimum required driveway width could not be achieved for the detached garage option due to the width of the lot and the height of the structure relative to the daylight plane.

I also wanted to let you know that staff will forward the correspondence received since the report was publish to the Planning Commission. Please let me know if there is any additional information that you would like relayed. You are also welcome to attend the meeting this evening, at 7pm in the City Council chambers to share comments then.

Sincerely,  
Ori

<CMP\_Email\_Logo\_100dpi\_05d92d5b-e8e3-498f-93a6-d0da509bd6021111111111.png>

**Ori Paz**  
Assistant Planner  
City Hall - 1st Floor  
701 Laurel St.  
tel 650-330-6711  
[menlopark.org](http://menlopark.org)

---

**From:** Jamie McGrath [<mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com>]

**Sent:** Saturday, June 1, 2019 8:48 PM

**To:** Teddy Spiller Wilson <[teddyswilson@earthlink.net](mailto:teddyswilson@earthlink.net)>; [Charles@CharlesJacob.com](mailto:Charles@CharlesJacob.com);  
Chris Dolan <[cdolan@cvlending.com](mailto:cdolan@cvlending.com)>; Nagendra Jayanty <[nj@cvlending.com](mailto:nj@cvlending.com)>

**Cc:** Jessica Olson <[jessaolson@yahoo.com](mailto:jessaolson@yahoo.com)>; Lauri Hart <[lauriahart@gmail.com](mailto:lauriahart@gmail.com)>; K

Amar Murugan <[amarmurugan@hotmail.com](mailto:amarmurugan@hotmail.com)>; Paz, Ori <[OriPaz@menlopark.org](mailto:OriPaz@menlopark.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach

Hi Teddy –

Thank you for the email. We attempted to make the rear garage option work but unfortunately there were driveway width and daylight plane code requirements that prevented this. For your reference and point of view, we prepared a street rendering of the house. You can see this in the attached. We hope to get the project approved so we can move forward to complete the project.

As far as the yard maintenance, I have been trying to get our landscaper to come out all week. He was supposed to be by today.

Thank you,  
Jamie

---

**From:** Teddy Spiller Wilson <[teddyswilson@earthlink.net](mailto:teddyswilson@earthlink.net)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 31, 2019 3:49 PM  
**To:** Jamie McGrath <[jmcgrath@cvlending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cvlending.com)>; [Charles@CharlesJacob.com](mailto:Charles@CharlesJacob.com); Chris Dolan <[cdolan@cvlending.com](mailto:cdolan@cvlending.com)>; Nagendra Jayanty <[nj@cvlending.com](mailto:nj@cvlending.com)>  
**Cc:** Jessica Olson <[jessaolson@yahoo.com](mailto:jessaolson@yahoo.com)>; Lauri Hart <[lauriahart@gmail.com](mailto:lauriahart@gmail.com)>; K Amar Murugan <[amarmurugan@hotmail.com](mailto:amarmurugan@hotmail.com)>; Paz, Ori <[oripaz@menlopark.org](mailto:oripaz@menlopark.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: 119 Baywood Neighbor Outreach

Jamie,

Thanks for the update. We're extremely disappointed that the garage won't be moved back; I assume Ori will verify that the reason is a city daylight plane requirement.

As you know, most of us neighbors feel that the design is out of character with the rest of the street, so we cannot give support for the design, although if the city approves it, we must give our acceptance, however reluctant. Thank you for contacting us.

Teddy and Bob Wilson

P.S. Will you please see that the weeds on the property are cleaned up, and kept down in future? They are seeding all over the neighborhood and are a real nuisance. Thanks!

On May 28, 2019, at 11:04 PM, Jamie McGrath

<[jmcgrath@cylending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cylending.com)> wrote:

Dear Neighbor –

We continue to work with the City of Menlo Park Planning Department for project approvals. It was requested that we further modify the design to reduce the prominent garage. The below modifications were incorporated to the revised submission attached to this letter.

1. Relocated garage footprint by recessing the garage 8 feet back into the front porch footprint
2. Added 4-foot screen wall/ fence and modified landscaping to the front

With our last communication to you there was the potential for relocating the garage to the rear yard. Due to planning guidelines with required daylight clearances this option was not feasible.

In order to help move this project forward we ask that you extend your support for this modified design by sending us an email at [jmcgrath@cylending.com](mailto:jmcgrath@cylending.com). We are also available if you have any questions. I can be reached at 415-359-4482.

Thank you,  
Jamie, Chris & Nagendra

<Baywood submittal package.pdf>

---

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.