



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 7/30/2018
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), Susan Goodhue (Chair), Camille Kennedy, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl

Absent: Drew Combs, John Onken

Staff: Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner; Tom Smith, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council at its upcoming August 6 meeting would hear the second readings of the ordinance adoptions for updating the community amenities requirement for bonus level development in the residential mixed-use zoning district and tenant anti-discrimination language added to the City's municipal code.

D. Public Comment

- Steve Golden, downtown Menlo Park, said that residents in the downtown were unhappy with the 765 University Drive project previously approved and under construction. He said the building's third floor and proximity to the street would not fit well in the neighborhood context and was inappropriate for the surrounding area.
- Aldora Lee, downtown Menlo Park, said she had concerns too about the 765 University Drive project. She said in reviewing the documents related to the approval of the project she found that relevant aspects of the project such as height and setbacks had not been addressed when the project had been approved.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the July 16, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Henry Riggs/Katherine Strehl) to approve the minutes of July 16, 2018 as presented; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Drew Combs and John Onken absent.

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Evelyn Li/1031 Almanor Drive:

Request for a use permit to construct a new attached secondary 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 remodeling and additions (including a new second story) to the existing single-story, single-family nonconforming structure on a substandard lot with respect to lot area and width. The proposed additions 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. ([Staff Report #18-067-PC](#)) *Continued from the Planning Commission meeting of July 16, 2018*

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

Applicant Presentation: David Pruitt, project designer, introduced Dr. Evelyn Li, the property owner. He said that Attachment A, under 3.a referred to Satellite Studio and that should read “David Pruitt Designs.”

Dr. Li said she purchased the house in Menlo Park with the thinking an addition was possible as the lot was advertised at 6,500 square feet. She said the lot was actually 5,900 square feet and as that was less than the required 6,000 square feet, the project required a use permit.

Mr. Pruitt said the project was designed so that the primary and secondary dwellings would have private backyard space. He said the staff report provided good detail on the project.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Pruitt said they planned to do double-paned windows with one window pane and not individual small panes.

Replying to Chair Goodhue, Mr. Pruitt said the front elevation had divided light windows with dividers inside between the panes.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl said she was concerned with tandem parking and the one-car garage as the number of bedrooms suggested there might be more cars needing parking. She asked if they had thought about widening the driveway so one car could park on it and still allow room for the car in the garage to exit. Mr. Pruitt said Dr. Li was willing to widen the driveway.

Chair Goodhue said like Commissioner Strehl she was concerned with the number of bedrooms proposed and parking. She said she would like to see the front windows have more authentic treatment. She said she supported having a secondary dwelling unit.

Commissioner Riggs asked the applicant about the entry way. Mr. Pruitt said the owners wanted a modern style entry with columns and covered. Replying further to Commissioner Riggs, Mr. Pruitt said the entry way roof would have a 2% slope that would drain via a scupper down the column.

Commissioner Riggs expressed concern with the quality of materials noting the stucco trim indicated. Mr. Pruitt said the owners wanted a modern looking home, which was why they went for stucco with sharp edges. Commissioner Riggs expressed concern with the lack of details regarding the windows. He said the front windows appeared to have interior dividers. He said this was the lowest quality type window, which for him was not approvable. Mr. Pruitt said they were trying to make the project cost-effective. He suggested the Commission might condition different windows in its approval.

Commissioner Riggs said the left side elevation showed two small boxes above the gables but not what those were. Mr. Pruitt said those were vents. Replying to Commissioner Riggs' questions about the materials for those, Mr. Pruitt said the materials would be specified moving forward through the building permit process. Commissioner Riggs said that simple drawings could be acceptable if the intent to use high quality materials was clearly present. He said with this project he did not see that intent. He said the overall forms were acceptable. He moved to continue the project to come back with trim details and exterior element identification.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes' question about potential arbitrariness in a secondary dwelling unit being allowed on a less than 6,000 square foot lot, Principal Planner Rogers said the Commission was asked if the use permit findings could be made. He said the act of asking for a use permit was not the basis for denying a use permit. He said that any denial should be based on something that would be detrimental to the property in the vicinity or the city as a whole, causing damage to public health, safety and welfare. He said this project was requesting a use permit but was not requesting a variance. Commissioner Barnes asked whether it was common knowledge that people owning less than 6,000 square foot lots could request a secondary dwelling unit through the use permit process. Principal Planner Rogers said in general the City probably had room for improvement in delivering knowledge about what was and was not possible with planning regulations. He said he thought the ordinance was clear that waiver from regulations, except for subdivision and density, could be requested through the use permit process.

Commissioner Barnes said the City needed secondary dwelling units to be built. He suggested that if it was possible to build them on lots less than 6,000 square feet that there should be a programmatic approach for that. He said because this applicant thought to ask if they could build a secondary dwelling unit on a lot less than the regulation size allowable that they would receive special dispensation that others were not afforded the opportunity to have. He said that the possibility of building secondary dwelling units on lots less than 6,000 square feet should be made public knowledge.

Commissioner Strehl confirmed with staff that the project even without the secondary dwelling unit would have needed to come before the Planning Commission because it was on a nonconforming lot and a second story was being added. She also confirmed with staff that the two issues were a request for a use permit to do a second story and a secondary dwelling unit on a lot less than 6,000 square feet. She said if the project was approved that she did not think it would open the door to a flood of requests for secondary dwelling units on lots less than 6,000 square feet. She said it would be useful for the City Council to clarify whether more lenient regulations on secondary dwelling units was something the City should pursue.

Replying to Chair Goodhue, Principal Planner Rogers said revising secondary dwelling unit regulations was not included in the City Council's work plan. He said at this time a need to revise

those regulations was understood but staff had not been directed to allocate time on revising regulations.

Commissioner Riggs suggested the Commission might ad hoc take a vote to see if the Commission supported lowering the 6,000 square foot lot requirement for secondary dwelling units. He said for this project his motion was to continue the project to get more information on the exterior materials including the window details. Commissioner Barnes seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Barnes) to continue the project with direction; fails 2-3-2 with Commissioners Barnes and Riggs supporting, Commissioners Goodhue, Kennedy and Strehl opposing and Commissioners Combs and Onken absent.

Commissioner Strehl moved to approve the project on the condition that the applicant make changes to the window treatment in terms of using divided lights and the window framing, and increase the width of the driveway so a car be parked and allow space for another car to back out from the garage. She suggested this could either be done through staff review and approval or through the conformance memo process. Commissioner Camille Kennedy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the look of the window framing and direction to staff. Associate Planner Pruter said staff was clear on the Commission's direction. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with Mr. Pruter that meant the use of simulated true divided lights. Commissioner Strehl said to address Commissioner Riggs' concerns she would amend her motion to require the review and approval through the conformance memo process with the Commission. Commissioner Kennedy as the maker of the second supported the amendment.

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Kennedy) to approve the item with the following modification; passes 4-1-2 with Commissioner Barnes opposing and Commissioners Combs and Onken absent.

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 David Pruitt Designs consisting of 10 plan sheets, dated received July 16, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 30, 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 Davey Resource Group, dated received March 22, 2018.
4. ***Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:***
- a. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall address the following in the plan set, including detail drawings as needed:***
 - i. ***Specify that the gridded windows on the front elevation will use simulated divided lites (featuring interior and exterior grids, as well as a spacer bar between the glass).***
 - ii. ***Revise the window trim on all elevations to use a higher quality treatment than the previously proposed stucco trim.***
 - iii. ***Revise the driveway width to twenty (20) feet, to accommodate two cars on the driveway.***

The revised plans and elevations shall be preliminarily approved by the Planning Division and circulated via email to the Planning Commission through a condition review email. The revisions shall be fully approved prior to issuance of the building permit.

Replying to Chair Goodhue, Principal Planner Rogers said that the topic of square footage requirement for secondary dwelling units was not on the agenda and recommended that the Commission not discuss the topic further due to requirements about meeting notices. He noted that

the Commission's discussion during the consideration of the use permit for 1031 Almanor Drive reinforced the direction that Commissioners had given staff previously.

- F2. Use Permit and Variance/Whitney Peterson and Kyle Larson/947 Lee Drive:
Request for a use permit to determine the Floor Area Limit (FAL) for a lot with less than 5,000 square feet of developable area, and for the construction of a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district. In addition, a request for a variance for construction of a first-story encroachment of 10 feet into the required 20-foot rear yard setback. ([Staff Report #18-068-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Pruter said a comment on the project had been received by staff that day, was provided to the Commission and available to the public on the table in the rear of the Chambers.

Questions of Staff: Chair Goodhue said the staff report referred to the 2012 proposal. She said that proposal was dated 2011 but the Commission had taken action on the previous proposal in 2012. She confirmed with staff that action defined the proposal as 2012.

Applicant Presentation: Whitney Peterson introduced Kyle Larson. She said they lived at the subject property and were proposing a home with a request to determine floor area limit (FAL) to construct a new two-story home. She said they were also requesting a variance to encroach 10 feet into the required 20-foot rear yard setback. She said the property was 5,000 square feet but a neighboring easement across 131 square feet of the front yard made it 4,869 square feet of developable area. She said for 5,000 square foot lots that owners typically could propose homes up to 2,800 square feet and they were proposing a 2,450 square foot home. She said regarding the variance finding that the hardship was peculiar to the property that their property was oddly shaped, which made the buildable area only 1,091 square feet in a very narrow triangular shape. She said rectangular lots of similar 5,000 square feet of buildable area would have a buildable area of 2,400 square feet. She said regarding the enjoyment of property rights variance finding that if the variance was approved it would allow them to design a livable, efficient home comparable in shape and size with what neighbors would be allowed to do. She said regarding the variance finding that it would not be detrimental to adjacent properties that their rear neighbors had expressed no concern about the first floor rear variance and their current home was eight feet from the rear property line and with a variance would increase to 10 feet. She said regarding the variance finding that the conditions were not applicable generally to other R-1-U properties that the dimension and shape of their lot was not generally applicable to R-1-U properties as most of those generally have a more rectangular shape.

Ms. Peterson said six years ago they proposed a home to the Planning Commission that had considerable neighborhood opposition. She said despite changes made for the neighbors they had opposed the size of the proposed home, and the Planning Commission denied their use permit and variance request with a finding that the proposed home would be detrimental to the welfare of their neighbors due to the architectural style and 53% FAL. She said they now had an entirely different plan. She said also significant change in the neighborhood had occurred including a Commission approved project at 943 Lee Drive for a two-story home. She said they had talked with neighbors about this proposal and had assurances they would find more support this time. She said changes to the current plan based on neighbor input was the addition of a continuous roof line around the entire first floor to aesthetically break up the two-story effect, lowering the roof height by seven

inches, raising window sill heights on the north side of the home, and removing the one window on the southwest side. She said they hired an artist to do a perspective rendering for the neighbors. She said regarding the design and site layout they wanted a front façade that aligned and engaged with the curve of the cul de sac, which was important to the neighbors and Planning Commission with the prior proposal. She said they were proposing a detached garage and uncovered parking space. She said the variance request was only for the first floor and rear side of the home to try to impact as few neighbors as possible. She said they would have stained cedar shingle siding with wood trim and a gable entry port with a Dutch entry door, aluminum clad wood windows with divided lights, paved driveway leading to the garage with a trellis and wood garage door, and a symmetrical front façade with planter boxes.

Commissioner Riggs said six years ago they removed a heritage tree and did not replace it. Ms. Peterson said a very large branch from the tree fell in the night during a storm and they had to have an emergency removal of the tree. She said this was right after their previous proposal had been denied. She said in working with a city planner it was suggested that they wait until they built a new home to replace the tree.

Chair Goodhue opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

- Judy Citron, Menlo Park, said she fully supported the project and thought it would be a beautiful addition to the City and the neighborhood.
- Bruce Potrin, Menlo Park, said his home was at the entry to the cul de sac where the subject property was located. He said he appreciated the applicants' efforts to address neighbor concern and accommodate requested changes to their proposal. He said the proposal was a beautiful home and would add nicely to the neighborhood. He said in speaking with staff that he understood variance requests were approved based on the merits of such and did not set precedence. He said he supported the project.

Chair Goodhue closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes said that this proposal was a project where he could definitively see what its aesthetics and building elements were which he appreciated. He said he was fine with the FAL being determined as 50% and 2,450 square feet was reasonable. He said he could see from staff's findings for the variance that it was warranted in this case. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion, noting that the proposal was a beautiful home.

Commissioner Riggs said the plan was unusual. He said the rendering implied the roof pitches were 8 and 12, and the drawings showed something considerably lower similar to a ranch home. He suggested that the approval allow for the applicants to reconsider the treatment of the corner boards. Commissioner Barnes accepted the modification to the motion as did Commissioner Strehl, the maker of the second to the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Strehl) to approve the item with the following modification; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Combs and Onken 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 the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of variances:
 - a. The hardship at 947 Lee Drive is caused by the combination of the property being a narrow, irregularly shaped lot. The subject site is not a typical, rectangular-shaped lot, but rather a pie-shaped lot 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 functional front, rear, and side yards. This encroachment in the rear of the lot would allow for typical modifications that other conforming properties would be able to more easily achieve with a standard amount of developable land. Further, this variance would not constitute a special privilege, as the variance request is merely allowing the applicants to have similar development capabilities as neighboring properties.
 - c. The proposed project would be modest in size and although it would be two stories in size, and all other development standards would also be met. In addition, the proposed project would provide a generally more compatible architectural style and generate a floor area limit (FAL) of 50 percent, which is less than the 2012 proposal FAL of 53 percent, and as such would have a reduced perception of bulk. As such, granting of the variance for proposed rear 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 unique, pie-shaped subject property and its restrictive amount of buildable area. While typical properties in the R-1-U zoning district contain a more rectangular lot shape and allow for more buildable area, the subject property’s more triangular shape allows it significantly less buildable area relative to overall lot size. 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. Thus, 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 Kohler Architects, consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received July 23, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 30, 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 applicants 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 applicants shall submit plans indicating that the applicants 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 applicants 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 Kielty Arborist Services, dated received April 19, 2018.
5. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following **project-specific** condition:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicants shall revise the site plan to show one replacement tree on site, to compensate for the loss of the heritage Monterey pine tree that was removed under a heritage tree removal permit in 2012. The revised project plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant may submit revised plans featuring the removal of the corner boards, or the painting of the boards to match the shingle color, for the proposed residence, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
- F3. Use Permit Revision/Tusker Medical/155 Jefferson Drive:
Request for a use permit revision to expand the usable gross floor area in which previously approved quantities and classes of hazardous materials would be used, all within an existing building on a lot in the R-MU-B (Residential, Mixed-Use, Bonus) zoning district. There would be no changes to previously approved quantities or classes of hazardous materials on the site as part of the project. ([Staff Report #18-069-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Senior Planner Tom Smith said he had no additions to the written report.

Applicant Presentation: Eric Goldfarb, Vice President of Research and Development and Operations at Tusker Medical, said they were established in 2016 and employed 29 people. He said they were conducting a clinical study in 20 sites in the U.S. and Canada to support their application to the FDA to obtain marketing approval for the medical device. He said they expected approval toward the end of 2019. He said they would need more space for manufacturing with approval of the device and also desired more space for R&D expansion. He said they had leased the entire building at 155 Jefferson Drive. He said their use permit revision was to expand the area where they could use previously approved types and quantities of hazardous materials.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Ellen Ackerman, Green Environment, said she was the environmental consultant to Tusker Medical and had prepared the use permit revision application. She said that the construction of a high school in the area was not a concern as the quantities of hazardous materials used by Tusker Medical were quite small compared to what companies such as Genentech or Gilead used. She said the use and storage was all internal and they did not even anticipate they would need an air emissions permit from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. She said it was unfortunate that the property had been affected by the rezoning and could not increase its chemical quantities.

Commissioner Barnes seconded the motion to approve as recommended in the staff report.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Barnes) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Combs and Onken absent.

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 project plans provided by Green Environment, Inc., consisting of five plan sheets, dated received May 30, 2018, as well as the Hazardous Materials Information Form (HMIF), dated received July 20, 2018, approved by the Planning Commission on July 30, 2018 except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

- b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. If there is a change in the location of the storage of the hazardous materials after this use permit is granted, the applicant shall apply for a revision to the use permit.
- e. There shall be no increase in the quantity of hazardous materials on the project site or the use of additional hazardous materials after this use permit is granted.
- f. 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.
- g. If the business discontinues operations at the premises, the use permit for hazardous materials shall expire.

G. Informational Items

G1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: August 13, 2018

Principal Planner Rogers said the agenda for August 13 would include review of a right-of-way abandonment for consistency with the General Plan, a comprehensive sign review, and a single-family development project. He said they wanted to hold both August meetings as there was only one September meeting due to holidays.

Commissioner Barnes said for the record that he was not impugning the reputation of the Planning Division when he used the narrative of walking into a planning department, talking to four different planners and getting four different answers. He said he was using it metaphorically and in reference to other cities.

Commissioner Kennedy said she would be returning from vacation on August 13 and if her plane was not delayed she would be at the meeting.

Commissioner Strehl asked for news on the Middlefield Road project at Willow Road. Principal Planner Rogers said the applicant was researching parking technology solutions and had requested contact information for neighborhood representatives, but there was no estimated hearing date. Commissioner Strehl asked about the former bank site for the Menlo Presbyterian Church project. Principal Planner Rogers said it was possible but still tentative for the August 27

agenda.

Chair Goodhue said she would be absent from the meeting on September 17.

- Regular Meeting: August 27, 2018
- Regular Meeting: September 17, 2018

H. Adjournment

Chair Goodhue adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on August 13, 2018