



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 7/16/2018
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 7:02 p.m.

B. Roll Call

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

Staff: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner, Fahteen Khan, Contract Assistant Planner, Mark Muenzer, Community Development Director, Tom Smith, Senior Planner, Chris Turner, Planning Technician

C. Reports and Announcements

Community Development Director Mark Muenzer announced that effective July 1 the Office of Housing and Economic Development was moved from the City Manager's Department to the Community Development Department. He said that replacing the outgoing manager of that Division was in process. He announced that Deanna Chow had been promoted to Assistant Community Development Director and would oversee the Planning Division. He recognized newly hired Planning Technician Chris Turner.

Principal Planner Chow said the City Council at its June 19 meeting heard an ordinance for RMU BMR and suggested its adoption with an added study to look at whether there was any affordable change level of median income for small projects. She said they also heard an anti-discrimination ordinance related to Section 8 housing so landlords could not discriminate against tenants using that type of monetary compensation.

Commissioner Katherine Strehl asked about people displaced by the 2008 recession in Belle Haven and if the BMR ordinance was changed to allow those who moved out of the area to still have eligibility for BMR units. Ms. Chow said that the City Council considered amending BMR Guidelines at its June 19 meeting and read the section related to displaced residents due to economic reasons and the eligibility criteria for BMR application.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

Commissioner Strehl said she would abstain from approving the two sets of minutes as she was

not at either meeting. Chair Goodhue said she would abstain from the June 4 minutes item as she was not at that meeting. She noted modifications to the minutes from Commissioner Riggs. Ms. Chow said in addition to Commissioner Riggs' suggested changes to the June 18 minutes that staff added a condition 6.a to the approval of 1911 Menalto Avenue by the Commission.

- E1. Approval of minutes from the June 4, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (John Onken/Henry Riggs) to approve the minutes of June 4, 2018 with the following modification; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Goodhue and Strehl abstaining.

- Page 11, 4th paragraph, 2nd line: replace "115 amps outlets" with "15 amps outlets"

- E2. Approval of minutes from the June 18, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Andrew Combs/Camille Kennedy) to approve the minutes of June 18, 2018 with the following modifications; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Strehl abstaining.

- Page 18, 1st paragraph, 1st line: replace "material was wood veneer..." with "the sample board picture was not for panel size, size would be per renderings, it showed material was wood veneer..."
- Page 20, 1st paragraph, 3rd line: replace "80 to 85 parking" with "80-85% parking"
- For 1911 Menalto Avenue item approval, add Condition 6a: Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans showing cladding other than stone for the residence on Parcel "B", subject to review and approval by the Planning Division

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit and Variance/Jiawei Zhu/188 Elliot Drive:
Request for a variance to reduce the subdivision ordinance front setback from approximately 50 feet to 35 feet. The proposal includes a request for a use permit for additions and interior modifications to an existing one-story single-family nonconforming structure on a standard lot in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district that would exceed 75 percent of the existing value within a 12-month period for a single-story addition and remodel. Three heritage tree removal permit applications are associated with the proposed project. ([Staff Report #18-065-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Contract Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan clarified that two, rather than three, heritage tree removals were associated with the proposed project.

Applicant Presentation: Chiawang Yeh, project engineer and architect, said they were requesting a variance for the lot width noting it was located at the corner of a curved street, and the property width increased toward the rear. He said the additions would be done in the middle of the lot to prevent impact to neighbors.

Chair Goodhue opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Peter Colby, Menlo Park, said he had wanted to comment on the proposed development at the

corner of Cambridge Avenue and El Camino Real but arrived after public comment. He commented on the heritage tree removal application process and information on a consultant to assist in a revision of its associated ordinance. He said he did not think the City's heritage tree protection ordinance was being taken seriously.

Chair Goodhue closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken asked for staff clarification of the variance request noting it was specific to the setback mandated in the City's subdivision ordinance but which was not in the zoning code. Ms. Chow said as the property was located on a cul de sac and of a certain size, it required review of the setback. She said often times for this type of property the setback was greater than the 20-foot front setback typically required. Commissioner Onken said he did not understand why that ordinance was being applied to a lot that was not being changed or subdivided. Ms. Chow said the City had been consistent in treating use permit applications according to the subdivision ordinance and applying its setback requirements in situations where the lot already existed.

Commissioner Combs said he did not think the subdivision ordinance had been applied to all use permit applications and asked why it was for this project. Ms. Chow said it applied to lots on a radius where the curve was less than 100 feet and was a unique setback requirement.

Commissioner Riggs asked about restrictions on the amount of paving in the front of a lot. Ms. Chow said in the past for secondary dwelling unit there had been a limit on the amount of paving. She said she did not think there was a maximum percentage required for pavement unless it was in an R-3 zoning district that would have a landscaping and/or parking requirement. She said usually impervious surface requirements were with stormwater management. She further clarified for Commissioner Riggs that the R-1-U zoning district did not have aesthetic guidelines for the front of the lot.

Commissioner Onken said the proposed additions were minor and the only conflict was removing two heritage trees in the middle of the site. He said the site was well screened and he did not see a problem with the loss of the two trees in deference to the addition to the house. He said the additions proposed did not increase the existing house's encroachment into the front setback, and the garage mostly aligned with the neighbor's garage. He said he did not think granting the variance would set any precedence for neighbors and was particular to the subject property. He moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said he tended to be very strict regarding variance requests. He said he found the variance request for this project acceptable as it occurred within the parcel without increasing its footprint or visibility to the front.

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 the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of variances:
 - a. The hardship at 188 Elliot Drive is caused by the combination of the property being a narrow lot and irregularly shaped and the placement of the existing house on the lot. The subject site, is not a typical, rectangular-shaped lot, but rather a pie shape with a narrow curved front. The hardship is unique to the property, and has not been created by an act of the owner.
 - b. The variance is necessary to create a conventionally sized, functional space while preserving a usable rear yard. Additionally, the proposed front entry encroachment would help create a focal point for the front entry and reduce the prominence of the existing two-car garage at the front left side of the house, while providing a 30-foot front setback where 20 feet is typically required in the R-1-U zoning district. This encroachment would allow for typical modifications that other conforming properties would be able to more easily achieve with a standard 20-foot required front setback.
 - c. The proposed project would be modest in size and remain a single-story residence, and all other development standards would also be met. As such, granting of the variance for proposed front yard encroachment would not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property.
 - d. The variance request is based on the nonconformance of the existing structure as it encroaches into the required front yard setback due to the unique condition of a narrow, pie shaped lot. This variance would not typically apply to other properties in the same zoning district as the situation is unique to this site.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area. Hence, a finding regarding an unusual factor does not apply.
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 use permit and variance subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Chiawang Structural Engineering, Inc., consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received June 28, 2018, 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 Dsoto Tree & Arborist Services dated June 5, 2018.

F2. Use Permit/Evelyn Li/1031 Almanor Drive:

Request for a use permit to construct a new secondary dwelling unit attached to the rear of an existing main dwelling unit on a lot less than 6,000 square feet in size in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposal also requests a use permit for a remodel and additions to the existing single-story, single-family nonconforming structure on a substandard lot with respect to lot area and width. The proposed addition would exceed 50 percent of the existing floor area and the value of the proposed work would exceed 50 percent of the existing value within a 12-month period. The proposed project is considered equivalent to a new structure. *Continued to the July 30, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.*

F3. Use Permit/Church of the Pioneers Foundation/900 Santa Cruz Avenue:

Request for a use permit to operate an afterschool youth program and office use associated with a religious facility in and around a former bank building in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district, primarily on Thursdays and Sundays, with limited office uses on other days of the week. The project also includes a request to hold up to four events for church administrative purposes per year that could be located inside or outside of the building. *Continued to a future Planning Commission meeting.*

Chair Goodhue said Commissioner Combs and she would need to recuse themselves from item G1 noting Commissioner Combs' employment with Facebook and her past representation of Facebook.

Vice Chair Barnes conducted the remainder of the meeting in the Chair's absence.

G. Study Session

- G1. Use Permit, Architectural Control, and Environmental Review/Chris Middlebrooks/
1105-1165 O'Brien Drive:

Request for a use permit, architectural control, and environmental review for the construction of a new five-story research and development (R&D) building, approximately 120,000 square feet of gross floor area in size, and a new five-story parking structure with 281 parking stalls on a two-parcel site with two existing one-story office and R&D buildings, to be demolished, in the LS-B (Life Sciences, Bonus) zoning district. The project will be pursuing bonus level development. As part of the project, nine heritage trees are requested for removal, as well as an administrative lot merger to combine the two existing parcels into a single parcel. A diesel emergency generator and hazardous materials storage bunkers for potential R&D tenants are also proposed at the rear of the project site. The future use and storage of hazardous materials, with the exception of diesel fuel, would require project specific administrative permits. ([Staff Report #18-066-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Tom Smith said on page 3 of the staff report in the discussion on building height it stated that the applicant was requesting a deed restriction on the height of the building at 1145 O'Brien Drive to bring down the maximum height of the proposed building. He said prior to the meeting he reviewed a refined building height diagram, and staff believed that the project would meet the average maximum height requirement without the need for a deed restriction process. He said the building on the site as designed currently would meet the requirements. He referred the Commission to the topics at the end of the staff report. He said as a bonus level development the project would need a use permit to allow the additional height and gross floor area being requested. He requested that the Commission look at the overall architectural design and materials, the design and integration of the parking structure with the main R&D building, the design and layout of the publicly accessible open space, and request for hazardous materials storage containers to be located outside.

Vice Chair Barnes said the parking range for the zoning district was 1.5 to 2.5 per 1,000 square feet and asked about the rationale for particularly the low end of the range noting the project was 2.36 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. Principal Planner Chow said the LS zoning district was created as part of the ConnectMenlo General Plan update with three new zoning districts standards replacing the former M2 zoning district. She said parking requirements were set per district previously and not by use so they changed that to be based on use. She said they also looked at parking requirement reductions in expectation of people's future changed behavior but keeping minimum parking requirements acknowledging people's continued use of vehicles. She said as part of ConnectMenlo that Transportation Demand Management programming (TDM) was added as a requirement and the project would reduce trips by 20% for what was typical for this particular type of use. She said potential opportunity existed in the area for creation of a Transportation Management Association and focusing on complete streets and multi-modal transportation that helped influence the lower range parking ratio.

Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Principal Planner Chow said the City has a settlement agreement with the City of East Palo related to the EIR for this zoning district. She said this project was seeking bonus level development and traffic specific analysis would need to be done for it.

Applicant Presentation: John Tarlton, Menlo Park Labs, introduced Elke McGregor with DES and Ron Krietemeyer, Chief Operating Officer and Head of Development and Construction for Tarlton Properties. He said they brought a design to staff and received feedback that they responded to in the current proposed design.

Ms. McGregor said the buildings were oriented east to west and would have wonderful views. She said it was a transportation-friendly building with a shuttle stop and proposed bicycle and walking

lanes around the building. She said in the front of the building was a small café that was open to the public. She said they would have a rooftop amenities space with a fitness center and open lounge for tenants and also for tenants of other buildings in the Menlo Park Labs. She said the parking garage had been enhanced with a screening aspect in front of it. She said it also had four stair towers for exiting from the rooftop. She said the back of the garage with a high space would allow a fire truck to drive right through the site.

Commissioner Onken said the stair tower had an elevator and was 25 feet above any elevator stop. He asked why a traction elevator would only need 14 ½ feet for overrun. Ms. McGregor said they were engaging the other three aspects of the building. She said they wanted the garage to speak the same language as the building and used the stair towers to bring in similar architectural features.

Commissioner Onken asked about changes recommended by staff and what the Commission was seeing as improvements based on those recommended changes. Senior Planner Smith said that the project was reviewed initially as a Design Review Team submittal and that had been quite a bit different from what was being proposed now. He said initially it did not have the curved frontage that followed O'Brien Drive but was a bit more rectangular. He said they also worked with the applicant on the parking structure design and the screening around the upper four floors of that. He said there were also changes to better screen with landscaping around the frontage with better clarification of what was publicly accessible open space and general site open space. He said also clarifications were made about the rooftop amenities space, the amenities provided and how the space would be utilized.

Commissioner Onken said the plans showed the curved front façade more faceted than the rendering which showed a smoother curved plane. Ms. McGregor said the façade bumped out with the idea of having a two-story lobby in the entrance as open space and a balcony overlooking that giving the opportunity to have a more impressionable space in the entry of the building. Commissioner Onken said plan A14a showed a level 4 with a smooth surface and they did not have any plans for above that. Ms. McGregor confirmed that levels 3, 4 and 5 all had the smooth façade. She said only the first two floors had access to the lobby area. Commissioner Onken said the plan for level 3 showed a bump out. Ms. McGregor said that needed to be corrected to show it flush with the two floors above it.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed the curtain wall spanned south and southwest and expressed concern with heat gain. He asked about their solar control plan. Ms. McGregor said they were working with two different consultants with the goal of keeping the view. She said one LEED point was for views from the interior of a building out to all different aspects and for all interior space to feel connected to daylight. She said conversely they did not want to have hot spots at the front of the building. She said they were doing studies with DVG&L that showed where the hot spots were expected and how to change to remove those. She said they were looking at shading devices that were both interior and exterior. She said they were looking at the optimal depth of the fins and would look at the sun effect every time of the year to avoid the hot spots and get the best in shading and provision of natural light. She said they were also doing a study of the heat gain in the interior that told them what type of glass was needed to minimize the air conditioning load. Commissioner Riggs said it sounded like there would be more fins and light shelf than currently shown.

Vice Chair Barnes opened the public comment period.

Public Comment:

- Diane Bailey, Director of Menlo Spark, praised the design for its environmentally sound planning and the developer in particular, whom she thought had been extremely sensitive to environmental standards and oft times an early adaptor of new green technology. She said they were concerned with the plan for a diesel generator and wanted to encourage exploration of alternatives. She said solar micro grids had grown in popularity because of the plummeting pricing of battery energy storage. She suggested the City begin thinking about when to phase out diesel or other fossil fuel generators and move toward alternative emergency power solutions. She suggested with the attention being given to shuttle and bike routes and alternatives to driving to look at a lower parking requirement for the site.

Vice Chair Barnes closed the public comment period.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken asked the applicant about the expected tenancy, whether single or multi-tenant. Mr. Tarlton said they wanted capacity for either as it was unknown what tenancy they would get. He said in the current tenant environment it seemed somewhat likely that they would have more than one tenant for this building. Commissioner Onken said he asked as he thought the elevator strategy was strange with four elevators remote from each other. He said of course people were encouraged to use stairs. Mr. Tarlton said that was a bias of his. He said some of the elevators were for freight and not people. He said the elevator at the garage was for the amenities space and necessarily needed to be separate from the rest as they would have members of the broader Menlo Park Labs community using that amenities space. He said the elevator for the main building was intentionally not the most prominent vertical transportation feature while the stair was intentionally prominent and would have beautiful views.

Commissioner Kennedy said she particularly liked the architectural feature of the towers as it brought the eye to a final conclusion that was not dull. She said it also served to create a separate entrance for the greater Menlo Park Labs community. She asked if there was any flexibility in the use of the parking if they found over time that space was wasted as people were using other transit options. Mr. Tarlton said they had been somewhat successful in their alternate transit program and had a remarkable number of options for tenants if they chose to get to work in something other than a single-occupancy vehicle. He said they were in the midst of shifting the tenants' perspective of their own need for parking. He said that they were not at a 1.5 space per 1,000 square foot perspective yet. He said in the future they expected this parking garage would serve a parking need for other buildings in their portfolio.

Commissioner Strehl asked how many employees were expected for this building. Mr. Tarlton said on average their buildings have two employees per 1,000 square feet, and not counting the amenities space the estimate would be 200 employees. Commissioner Strehl said the increased density in the area was adding to the existing traffic problem there as well as along Willow and Bay Roads. She said during the General Plan approval process she had expressed that the City needed a plan for infrastructure to deal with added employment. She said she did not know if other companies were working with Facebook on a rail program. Mr. Tarlton said they were supportive of the rail project but they were working on what they thought was a nearer term solution, which was the adaptation of the Dumbarton Bridge for bus rapid transit. Commissioner Strehl asked if the screening for the garage was trees. Mr. Tarlton said there were layers of screening with trees, architectural fins, architectural woven metal mesh, and the tower itself that looked more like a

building and less like a garage. Commissioner Strehl confirmed with the applicant that the bocce and badminton courts were amenities for employees only and that they had not yet identified a community amenity. Mr. Tarlton said they would do outreach with the Belle Haven community to confirm what they had heard were their priorities. Commissioner Strehl suggested allowing limited public use of the sports courts. She asked if the rate for BMR had been determined. Senior Planner Smith said they had not gotten to that level of detail yet.

Commissioner Onken noted the comment about the diesel generator and alternative emergency energy backup systems. Mr. Tarlton said they were not aware of a battery backup system that was sufficiently large enough for the kinds of loads that would result from Life Science tenants. He said that two diesel generators were approved for two other projects in Menlo Park Labs area with one for Pacific BioSciences and the other for Grail. He said both were larger than a megawatt.

Commissioner Onken said in some ways this was a project with a parking garage having a building next to it. He recommended more screening for the garage. He said he did not think the tower at the corner had enough architectural value for it to be big and prominent. He thought it could be reduced in height or made physically lighter and more open. He said he thought the north and rear elevation needed the same care and attention as was given to the rest of the building. He said a question was posed about future repurposing of the parking garage. He said there was no repurposing with concrete ramped parking. He noted the traffic impacts and that those were covered under the EIR for the General Plan update.

Commissioner Riggs said he did not have a problem with building height as the area was zoned for it. He said he also did not have a problem with the tower and would defer to the architect and what was in mind for the overall image. He said regarding architectural design and materials that it was an R&D building in an R&D space. He said the LS zone was the City's revenue and innovation generator. He said its business model was not immediately compatible with expectations of making a charming village. He said whether the parking structure was integrated well with the rest of the building that it did not look like it was part of the same building but he thought it worked better expressing that it had a different function. He said the massing and circulation he thought were well done. He said he had no issue with outdoor chemical storage. He said regarding public open space that he could not connect with the linear entry plaza concept but would not dismiss it outright. He said he expected it would serve a limited pedestrian and bicycle population. He said he would like to see imagery of how this linear park could work. He said the large façade, which he expected to be broken up more than shown in the rendering with the fins and light shelves, was somewhat a monolithic space. He said the entry was not clear. He noted sheet A11 did not show entry doors into the lobby. He said he thought the entry needed more attention than pushing out the glass façade several feet. He said it would be difficult on this side of Hwy. 101 or anywhere in Menlo Park to approve 100,000 square feet when transportation was not at a decision level point for solution. He said he hoped the rapid bus transit moved forward on the Dumbarton Bridge.

Commissioner Kennedy said she was encouraged the applicant was looking at the particular structure as part of a larger ecosystem on O'Brien Drive. She suggested the applicant continue to look at how all their structures might work together better so to not have to bring forth another large structure needing a parking garage in the future.

Commissioner Strehl asked if future projects on O'Brien Drive by the applicant would have reduced parking requirements due to the large parking structure with this project. Mr. Tarlton said it was difficult to know exactly what they might bring forward after this project and the 1325 Adams Court

project that the Commission had seen recently. He said right now they had two buildings totaling 380,000 square feet that they intended to build upon approval. He said they were unlike an owner / user such as Facebook. He said for his firm the buildings were the income. He said they had to be careful not to bring more inventory of new buildings online than could be filled with the new ideas coming out of Stanford University and other academic institutions. He said as they promised during the ConnectMenlo process that over time and as the macroeconomic cycle and the cycle of venture capital into life science allowed they would try to build out a life science community that would have the specific gravity to be self-sustaining, which they estimated in the range of 3-million square feet.

Commissioner Strehl said this project was over parked with an estimated 200 employees and 281 parking spaces. Mr. Tarlton said the amenities space needed to be recognized as it would have its own parking demand including the potential for a company to have an event at the same time as the parking garage was being utilized by tenants in the building. Commissioner Strehl said with other projects the applicant brought forward on O'Brien Drive for redevelopment after this one the Commission would continue to consider this parking garage and its capacity. Mr. Tarlton said they were pushing in the lower parking ratio direction but they still had to build to today's market demand. He said as discussed from a use perspective this proposed garage would stand on its own but they could not promise they would not come back five years from now with a project that would have a garage. He said he hoped that site constraints would allow that garage to be less prominent than this and/or that they could reduce the parking need for that site in conjunction with their other sites noting their leases allowed them to move parking around as needed.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the projection of the east façade was an architectural benefit or a function of maximizing the number of spaces in the garage. Mr. Tarlton said the site was challenging as it was a rectangle with a curved corner. He said they wanted to accomplish a number of things with the garage including the rooftop amenities space and minimizing its height as much as possible. He said they realized the garage needed screening, which they had attempted to address. Ms. McGregor said this was a perfect size for a parking garage as it was at the minimum depth to have a sloped ramp that was not difficult to negotiate. She said making the structure shorter would make a fairly impractical parking garage. Vice Chair Barnes said the projection of the parking garage was prominent along O'Brien Drive and asked how bringing the projection back flush would work for the project architecturally. Ms. McGregor said they could do that but by bringing it back 30 to 40 feet they probably would need to add three to four levels to the parking garage to get the same amount of parking and make the space usable. She said doing that one side of the garage would not be parked but just ramped. She said originally they had a flat façade on the garage and did iterations to arrive at an interesting design. She said in approaching the garage as proposed the first thing seen would be the tower that was similar to the other towers and the vertical fins that were an architectural feature.

Vice Chair Barnes said he did not see justification for a 2.36 space per 1,000 square feet parking ratio with a 30% commute rate. Mr. Tarlton said right now they were at a provable 20% commute rate on average not including telecommuting. He said they could not assume that the amenities space would have a zero parking requirement. He said while there was an average requirement for two employees per 1,000 square feet they have disparity from one building to another. He said this proposal was their best attempt to balance the need to potentially accommodate a use in this building that was more administrative and had higher parking requirements than a building across the business park with lower parking needs.

Vice Chair Barnes said during the Commission's review of the applicant's other recent project there was discussion about the ability to put trip caps across Menlo Park Labs. He said the generalized response was that there were different tenants and they did not control them. He asked if the applicant had the ability to shift parking requirements through leases whether they would be amenable to trip caps across certain properties. Mr. Tarlton said they could provide good quality data on what was happening in the business park now and what had happened historically. He said there was a demonstrated density of employees they could show for over a period of time averaged across the entire Menlo Park Labs. He said they could also show that their internal and privately funded TDM was working and getting progressively better over time. He said that was the best they could offer at the moment. He said they would not be unalterably opposed to trip caps but they did not think those were the long term solution. He said the long term solution was a demonstrated commitment to progressively reducing trips through a coordinated TDM and a broader citywide and regional program.

Replying to Vice Chair Barnes, Principal Planner Chow said that a shared parking agreement between two properties owned by the same owner was possible. She said it would need to show this particular property was over parked. She said to the discussion now they might look at whether this project was parked appropriately or whether it needed to be less or more parked to accommodate a potential parking arrangement for a future building.

Vice Chair Barnes asked why the architectural elements of the garage did not extend to the ground floor. Ms. McGregor referred to A17 and that a certain amount of ground level transparency was required in the LS zoning.

Replying to Vice Chair Barnes, Senior Planner Smith said that the ground floor design was mentioned in the staff report, and staff would like the Commission's input on that.

Vice Chair Barnes said the change in design at the ground floor for the parking garage seemed abrupt and asked if they could look at that. Ms. McGregor said they could bring the screens down lower and provide more continuity to the building and bring architectural features down to a human level as well. Vice Chair Barnes said he would advocate for that.

Vice Chair Barnes said staff asked the Commission to consider if chemical storage should be approved now without knowing what would be there and for whom. He asked what the concern was. Senior Planner Smith said it was not a safety issue rather it was a question of how much chemical storage space would be needed at the rear of the site, and whether that space was truly needed or whether storage would be possible within the building. He said he thought defining that might best wait until a tenant was identified at which point they would go through an administrative permit process. Vice Chair Barnes said he tended to agree with staff to wait on that until tenant was identified. He asked if there was an advantage to including that in the design now. Ron Krietemeyer, COO for Tarlton Properties, said the idea of showing the area now and in the design they would bring back was to get the concept for outside storage approved. He said when they got a chemical list for a specific tenant they would need to do the administrative permit process anyway.

Commissioner Riggs said available parking in the structure for possible assignment of future project parking would need to be confirmed. He asked whether at such time they would state it had .8 parking ratio overage available since the minimum parking needed was 1.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet and the project was built at 2.36 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Principal Planner

Chow said they could if they wanted to build in what the parking ratio was for the site and say it was being over parked. Commissioner Riggs asked if staff would give consideration to the argument that on application and approval this project that though required at 1.5 parking per 1,000 square feet ratio it provided 2.3 spaces. Ms. Chow said she did not think 1.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet was necessarily a given and through discussion with the applicant and the transportation division a higher ratio might be more appropriate. Commissioner Riggs said for the next review of this project the Commission might indicate that they found the 1.5 parking ratio sufficient. Principal Planner Chow said if the Commission had guidance on how to treat the parking staff could move forward with the applicant on a garage design and parking ratio. Commissioner Riggs said he thought the Commission could help with a suggestion on that at the project's next hearing.

Commissioner Onken said regarding chemical storage that he supported the outdoor storage concept noting this project's freight elevator was behind a two-hour fire wall. He said if the applicant wanted to reduce the parking the 36 parking spaces in the back 20 feet of the proposed garage could be removed and be only a ramp allowing the building to move back 20 feet. He said he thought the garage extended too far in front of the rest of the building. He said bringing the screening down to the ground for the parking structure where it could be grown up with vines or some type of vegetation was very desirable. He said he would like all the ribs and screens shown on the plans as the plans were not completely articulated as to what was going on. He said on the far right hand side of the building was a white bookend tower shown fairly prominent on the renderings but which looked to be two feet wide on the plans. Ms. McGregor said there was a discrepancy and the plans were correct. She said there would be a smaller corner there which she thought was four feet. Commissioner Onken said the size of the exit door seemed to be about two feet. He said part of the presentation was about the beauty of the tall white towers but that did not seem to be happening. Ms. McGregor said the tower on the right hand side was serving two purposes and was not intended to be as prominent as the other towers. She said it was to provide an end cap to the curved façade and a continuous façade all the way to the roof providing continuity for the roof screen. She said it was not an exit or elevator / stair tower. Commissioner Onken said the entry on the elevation was shown much more recessed and on the plan was shown about a foot deep. He asked if the rendering or plan were accurate. Ms. McGregor said they were working through different conceptual models. She said they still were trying to determine exactly what the depth of the perimeter of that was and what the face depth was. She said they did want the entry to come forward and to Commissioner Riggs' point they wanted a prominent entry façade. She said they would have the depths reconciled when they brought the project back for the next session.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if staff needed any additional direction. Senior Planner Smith said there was a good amount of clarification on the issues within the staff report. He said the entry plaza was raised above the street level with three stairways leading up to it. He asked if the Commission thought that made a sufficient connection to the street level or whether more connections were desired.

Commissioner Kennedy said she thought there was some other connection from the street level with bike and pedestrian paths all the way up and around so there were not just the stair walls and the ramp. Ms. McGregor said that was correct. She said there were three stairs and a ramp that extended from the shuttle area. She said the raised elevation was due to being in a flood zone.

Mr. Tarlton said there had been discussion about chemical storage. He asked if it was acceptable for their following application to show the location of outdoor chemical storage and what that structure would look like with the understanding there was not approval of whatever chemicals would be stored there. He said they were trying to get the Commission's feedback and conceptual approval of the way the site would operate.

Vice Chair Barnes said that outdoor chemical storage was indicated on the plans and asked staff if that was appropriate for now. Senior Planner Smith said he thought that would be fine. He said staff's main concern was the proposed location and that two structures were being proposed. He said if the applicant thought they needed two locations staff would like more information.

Ms. McGregor said they showed two chemical storage locations as they had seen that historically needed with other tenants. She said it depended upon the building's use. She said having the storage outdoors moved the chemicals out of the building and made it more accessible for the transportation of them. She said they showed the two locations to plan well for need but depending on the tenant they might not need both locations.

Commissioner Onken said they would see drawings of what the enclosures would look like. He said more importantly greater context was needed shown on the site plans as to the possible implications of the location of the generator and chemical storage to neighboring buildings.

Vice Chair Barnes asked the applicant to consider Commissioner Onken's idea about reducing the front extension of the garage by removing parking from the rear was feasible.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: July 30, 2018

Principal Planner Chow said at the July 30 meeting it appeared they would have two single-family residential development use permit requests and a use permit revision for relocation of chemical storage for a property in the rezoned RMU district. She said also potentially Public Works would have a right of way abandonment and general plan conformance item.

Commissioner Strehl asked when the office project on Middlefield Road next to the Willows Market was expected to come back to the Commission for review. Ms. Chow said they did not have a tentative date and the applicant was looking to resubmit its plans but staff did not have those yet.

- Regular Meeting: August 13, 2018
- Regular Meeting: August 27, 2018

I. Adjournment

Vice Chair Barnes adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Deanna Chow, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 30, 2018