



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 8/13/2018
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 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Drew Combs, Susan Goodhue (Chair), John Onken, Henry Riggs, Katherine Strehl

Absent: Andrew Barnes (Vice Chair), Camille Kennedy

Staff: Theresa Avedian, Senior Civil Engineer; Fahteen Khan, Contract Planner; Kyle Perata, Acting Principal Planner; Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council at its August 6, 2018 meeting had the second reading and ordinance adoptions that addressed R-M-U BMR Community Amenities and anti-discrimination policy to protect renters, specifically related to the use of Section 8 vouchers and other subsidies for payment of rent. He said the Council also held a special meeting earlier today on a charter measure for the ballot, and that the outcome of that should be forthcoming. He said the Council at its August 28 meeting would hear an appeal of the 840 Menlo Avenue project related to the issue of Draeger's loading dock and an ordinance introduction related to Electric Vehicle Chargers.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

Commissioner Henry Riggs asked that items E2 and E3 be pulled from the consent calendar.

E1. Approval of minutes from the July 30, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Katherine Strehl/Riggs) to approve the minutes of July 30, 2018 as presented; passes 3-0-2 with Commissioners Drew Combs and John Onken abstaining and Commissioners Andrew Barnes and Camille Kennedy absent.

E2. General Plan Consistency Review of Right-of-Way Vacation/Michael Johnston/815 Bay Road: Planning Commission review for consistency with the General Plan related to the proposed vacation of 1,470 square feet of public right-of-way adjacent to 815 Bay Road. ([Staff Report #18-070-PC](#))

Commissioner Riggs commented that a layperson would have had trouble understanding this application. Senior Civil Engineer Theresa Avedian asked if that was due to the staff report or exhibits. Commissioner Riggs said the exhibits were challenging to understand. He suggested that the staff report could have helped clarify the exhibits better.

Commissioner Combs asked why this action was being taken separate from the redevelopment of the property. Ms. Avedian said that abandonment could proceed as a separate instrument, and she thought the applicant wanted to know the certainty of it prior to developing a proposal.

Commissioner Combs said the right of way was in disrepair and asked if the City had any plans for the tip of the parcel that would remain with the City. He suggested it was a great opportunity for some sort of landmark sign recognizing the Flood Triangle neighborhood and would have liked something like that included with the item before the Commission this evening. Ms. Avedian said the City was the owner and responsible for maintaining the land or tip. She said engineering staff specifically looked at adding a bicycle lane. She said if one was added around Van Buren Avenue and the tip, staff found no impact from vacation of the right of way. Replying further to Commissioner Combs, Ms. Avedian said she thought there was enough room for a sign. Commissioner Combs asked if the City would do cleanup prior to vacating the right of way. Ms. Avedian said the applicant had indicated he wanted to maintain the area and she did not think the City would do anything prior to the vacation to clean the area. Commissioner Combs confirmed with staff that there was nothing in the proposed vacation that would obligate the property owner to better maintain the area.

Commissioner Combs said for the record that he had a problem with the proposed item, that it was on the consent calendar, and that it should have had greater due diligence taken in its processing.

Commissioner Riggs noted two other areas in the City that volunteers had planted with drought resistant plants and kept clean of trash. He suggested that was a possibility for the remaining part of land that would stay with the City. He said if the City was vacating the land it seemed it could be conditioned such that irrigation water could be provided to the entire 60 feet. Ms. Avedian said she could look into that. Commissioner Riggs said there could be a condition that the 30 foot area be maintained in a clean and planted status.

Commissioner Combs said he did not disagree substantively with the application request or even the proposed abandonment by the City but he thought given the land's current condition and the proposed vacation it was an opportunity to improve the entry to the neighborhood.

Replying to Chair Goodhue, Principal Planner Rogers said that the question was not whether the Commission thought the vacation of the right of way was a good idea or not or what the landscape condition was but rather whether the vacation would conform to the General Plan.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Goodhue) to determine that the vacation of right-of-way conforms to the General Plan; 4-1-2 with Commissioner Combs opposed and Commissioners Barnes and Kennedy absent.

Commissioner Combs said related to his opposition that the Commissioners were appointed as lay people to provide a review of items as that review the community would provide. He said if this was only whether it conformed to the General Plan that the Commission did not need to see it as there were people more expert on the General Plan that could make that decision. He said the meeting was a public forum for all issues related to items presented to the Commission.

- E3. Sign Review/Ron Krietemeyer for Tarlton Properties/1305 O'Brien Drive, 1330-1360 O'Brien Drive, 1430-1440 O'Brien Drive, 1525 O'Brien Drive, and 1555-1605 Adams Drive:
Request for sign review for 11 monument signs on five parcels in the LS (Life Sciences) and LS-B (Life Sciences, Bonus) zoning districts which are located in the Menlo Business Park. For each subject property, two (or more) monument signs are proposed for one street frontage, where one monument sign per street frontage is allowed by the Design Guidelines for Signs. In addition, the proposal includes new business park entry signage with lettering that would exceed 18 inches in height. ([Staff Report #18-071-PC](#))

Commissioner Riggs said it was unclear whether the proposed 3-foot and 3-foot, 11-inch signage was for Menlo Park Labs, the master campus, or whether it would be allowed for each tenant.

Acting Principal Planner Kyle Perata said those sign heights were the branding signs for Menlo Park Labs. He said there were three on the corners of O'Brien Drive and University Avenue, Adams Drive and University Avenue, and O'Brien Drive at the curve. He said those were not tenant signage.

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

1. The project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings that the signs are appropriate and compatible with the businesses and signage in the general area, and are consistent with the Design Guidelines for Signs.
3. Approve the sign review subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by DES Architects and Engineers consisting of 12 sheets, dated received August 7, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on August 13, 2018, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. The applicant shall comply with all West Bay 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.
4. Approve the sign review subject to the following **project-specific** condition:
 - a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation of approval for the location of the applicable signs located within the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) right-of-way, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Neel Patel/1351 Delfino Way:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with a basement on a substandard lot with respect to lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for excavation within the rear setback for a basement lightwell retaining wall. ([Staff Report #18-072-PC](#))

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

Applicant Presentation: Pami Vyas introduced her husband Neel Patel. She said they moved to Menlo Park six years ago for the tree lined streets and the good schools. She said they have three children. Mr. Patel said they liked their block and neighbors very much, noting that neighbor children were similar ages to theirs. He said they were mindful of the neighborhood character as they developed a design and wanted to continue to have an open face to the neighborhood that they enjoyed already. Ms. Vyas said they spoke with most of the neighbors about their plans. She said a neighbor gave a support letter today and there were two such in the packet. She said no neighbors had made negative comments about their proposed project.

Gary Ahern, project architect, said the design was pretty straightforward and asked if the Commissioners had any questions about the proposed design.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the non-heritage tree being removed as its location was not specifically identified in the staff report. Mr. Ahern said he thought it was a four-inch trunk maple located in the center of the back yard lawn. Commissioner Riggs noted the lot was full sized and had an advantage in being more square than deep. He asked why an extra six-inch was needed. Mr. Ahern said they were basically six-inches into the rear setback for the staircase. Commissioner Riggs suggested the six-inch encroachment could be shrunk if the staircase was not quite so deep on the y-axis and was more on the x-axis and on the second story moving the bedroom and its gable more towards the property line. Mr. Ahern said the intent for the lower courtyard was as an activity room. He said that by turning the stairs he could make the courtyard a little larger and more inviting. He said the existing house encroached six inches into the rear property line. Commissioner Riggs said he thought things could be moved on the first floor or the basement level so that there was not an encroachment and the second floor plan could be made to accommodate that.

Commissioner Strehl asked about the windows. Mr. Ahern said they were double-paned and simulated divided lights with a spacer bar in between and grids on both sides of the windows.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said the excavation within the rear setback required a use permit. He said he found the encroachment of the basement stair a perfectly acceptable use of a piece of the setback.

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Riggs) to approve the item as presented in the staff report; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners Barnes and Kennedy 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 Focal Point Design, consisting of 14 plan sheets, dated received July 31, 2018 and approved by the Planning Commission on August 13, 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 Kielty Arborist Services LLC dated April 23, 2018, revised June 26, 2018

G. Regular Business

- G1. Handout/Process Review: Application Submittal Guidelines/City of Menlo Park: Opportunity for the Planning Commission to provide feedback on the primary handout that is provided to applicants for projects requiring for Planning Commission review. ([Staff Report #18-073-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers said staff had met with the Commission Chair and Vice Chair about what staff currently does that was helpful and what it might do better. He said they also discussed pending role changes in the City's organization. He said the Vice Chair had suggested whenever the Commission had a light meeting to consider agendizing something educational that allowed for two-way communication. He said staff immediately thought of the handouts given by Planning staff to the public. He said tonight they had agendized the Application Submittal Guidelines, which provided guidance for applications that the Planning Commission would review. He said the document was last revised in 2014, and would be changed in the future as the City's graphic standards were changing.

Commission Comment: Chair Goodhue said she did not think a Table of Contents was needed as it created the perception this was a long government-type document. She said the subject headings actually could serve in its stead. She said she would encourage white space for more comfortable reading and where it was feasible to present information in bullet points rather than narrative. She noted for instance to use bullet points for the description of Planning Commission meeting and information. She said that the Commission received project plans that did not have the streetscape view. She said she would like it highlighted up front in the handout that such things were required and the Commission expected that they be done. She said the document could explain also why certain things were requested.

Commissioner Onken asked when the City would do application submittals entirely digitally. Principal Planner Rogers said that the existing permit management system did not accommodate digital submittals. He said the City was implementing a new system, which would definitely facilitate electronic submittal of permit applications. He said they had already introduced more allowances for people to submit some information electronically but internally there were some workflow improvements needed to change to implement that fully.

Commissioner Onken noted the plan size of 24 by 36 inches, half size and then letter size, and that some applications could all be done on 11 by 17 inch paper. He asked if there was some type of barrier related to that. Principal Planner Rogers said the pre-2014 handout had a hardcoded number of plan sets per size. He said one of the changes made around that time was to remove

the number of sets and add text noting the number required would differ and advising the applicant to consult with the planners about that. He said in effect staff did accept that 11 by 17 inch plans for an application that was for a conditional use without any construction and no need to scale off the full set plans.

Commissioner Onken said the required survey process was in many cases expensive, onerous and unneeded. He said someone adding a small kitchen addition at the back of the property on a non-disputed parcel with no boundary issues or even perhaps topography would have to contract a surveyor for somewhere around \$8,000 to do this work. He said people's major complaint was the expense of building development. He said the more experts that needed to be hired the more painful the process was especially for applicants with smaller projects. Principal Planner Rogers asked what would trigger the need for a survey, if it was just neighbor complaint and whether that occurred when the project came before the Commission. Commissioner Onken said the Commission did not question the validity of the site plan and property conditions on most of the parcels they saw, and for which a survey was now required. Principal Planner Rogers said the requirement had been in place for many years and was due to previous Commission feedback regarding its need. He said if it were to change, future Commissions would have to be held to that and not then question why a survey was not done. He said they had looked at requiring only key elements on the survey but had not proved cost-effective as the expense was the surveyor's time.

Commissioner Onken noted the requirement for Menlo Park Fire District approval for new development. He said other cities were able to route drawings when they were out for consultancy to different departments and the fire district at the same time. He noted the City only had one fire district and asked if it could be included in the routing of the drawings for the life of the permit. Principal Planner Rogers said he understood that this process was the Fire District's preference as it was a separate agency with its own application process and review fees.

Commissioner Combs said all of his comments were on Section H describing the Planning Commission meeting information. He asked if "the project applicant is expected to attend the meeting..." could be clarified to indicate that it could be the property owners and/or project designer/architect that might present. He asked if in this section applicants might be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Planning Commission and the process. He said it could be a note or link to Planning Commission videos, or staff could find an ideal use permit development hearing and put that on YouTube for viewing. He also suggested letting people know that agendas have other items on them for hearing so that they might budget their time accordingly or make babysitting arrangements if needed. He suggested to let applicants know they could invite neighbors to attend the meeting and express support either in person or in written form. He referred back to the applicant presentation to suggest to them to do within 10 minutes or less and perhaps some other guidelines.

Commissioner Strehl said she agreed with comments made. She suggested the applicants be made aware they could reach out to individual commissioners to see if they had questions on the agenda application. She suggested making applicants for both discretionary and administrative development project approvals aware that the project was reviewed for context within and in the character of the particular neighborhood in which it was situated. She noted a project next to her home that looked like a dentist/medical office or Motel 6, and one across the street from Chair Goodhue's home that looked like a cruise ship. She said she did not think agreement could be

reached on design guidelines for residential development but they needed to communicate to applicants that their projects needed to fit in within the neighborhood context.

Commissioner Riggs said on survey requirements that he suspected staff would hear about any neighbor issues before the hearing, and that might be the right time to require a survey. He said the handout might state that a survey was often required and when particularly. He said regarding routing plans to the Menlo Park Fire Protection District that other cities did it. He said the Town of Portola Valley allowed for a separate check to be included for the other agency fees and handled all the routing of the project.

Commissioner Riggs referred to page 3 of 15 in the first paragraph, the third to last line, "Please verify that no future modifications will be requested in regard to building height..." He said that was perhaps unrealistic for an applicant at times and suggested wording "Please note that changes to the planning documents must generally return for another hearing to be approved." He referred to page 5, "Area Plan, Item C: All existing and proposed structures on the subject property and contiguous properties." He said he understood that staff did not expect the storage sheds to be documented on all the neighbors' properties or to get the exact shape of their neighbors' houses at the far rear corner but most applicants would not understand that. He suggested indicating showing all structures on neighboring lots within 20 feet of the subject property line or within 20 feet plus the setback from the applicant's property line. He asked if "Item E" regarding showing all trees and significant landscape and site features including driveways applied to adjacent parcels as well. He said that would seem to imply if a neighbor had a retaining wall in the rear of the property that the applicant would need to determine its location for this area plan. He asked regarding "Item F: Projects at or near a t-intersection should show the intersecting street" if that was not required for a conventional intersection. Principal Planner Rogers said the Area Plan by default for the classic corner property situation would include both streets. He said the t-intersection requirement was to account for a street making a beeline to a property. He said otherwise the instructions would not appear to require that. He said there was a sense where streets approach a property there might be a different perspective or consideration with driveway placement or other features. Commissioner Onken said many cities for area plans state to applicants to show the streets the property was on and always include the nearest adjacent street, which he thought was the best way to address. Commissioner Riggs said the example presented of an Area Plan was very useful showing what was needed and implying what was not needed.

Commissioner Riggs referred to Page 7 and "Item N: The building pad as well as the finished floor elevations were requested." He said he thought this only applied to slab on grade and those applicants not doing would ask about it. Principal Planner Rogers confirmed with Commissioner Riggs that he did not think that item was essential for him as a Planning Commissioner.

Commissioner Riggs referred to Page 9, "Item 5b: Floor plans-complete plans for all existing structures even if proposed to be demolished." He said he had been asked to label all the rooms on a building to be demolished, and asked if this was needed. Principal Planner Rogers said that was the question as they have had Commissions that expressed they benefited from understanding the existing context when someone wanted to compare current room location to future room location. He said if the Commissioners this evening said they did not see any benefit in this information, he believed applicants would be happy not to have to provide that information. Commissioner Riggs said complete plans was such a broad statement, and perhaps removing the word "complete" with a note that Planning staff would review the plans for existing structures.

Principal Planner Rogers said that as it was enforced it was mainly schematic plans so possible wording along those lines could help preventing people from doing too much identification.

Commissioner Riggs referred to “Item 7: Square Footage Calculation Plan” and suggested it would be great to see a sample. Principal Planner Rogers said there was a separate handout for that and at a minimum they could include a link to that. Commissioner Riggs suggested including an example for “Item 7c.” He referred to the Building Elevations requirement and questioned the need for a front elevation if a small addition was being made to the back only. Principal Planner Rogers said the wording might not be the best but between Item 7a and 7b there was some flexibility for elevations not changing. He said in practice a project coming to the Commission with only one elevation changing, might submit the other elevations in photograph form, and as noted mounted, readable and reproducible. He said that was challenging to do on side elevations due to angling and foreshortening.

Commissioner Riggs said item c defined different divided lights and asked at what point Planning staff advised applicants the Commission was unlikely to approve anything short of so called simulated true divided lights with the interior and exterior grids. Principal Planner Rogers said as soon as the plan set notations clarify the applicant’s intentions. He said it had to be reactive as there was not an ordinance or policy regarding windows. Commissioner Riggs said numerous things were not in Section 16 of the ordinance and suggested it might be better to advise such things up front in writing. He said it might be a reference that the Commission looked for quality windows. He said he was a bit worried that the Commission could be distracted by other issues on a project and neglects to do its normal review. He said he was open to prompting wherever possible. He asked for item b to note the sill heights if that meant for all proposed windows. Principal Planner Rogers said they meant it for all windows as the usage of existing rooms might change. Commissioner Riggs said he could see that point.

Commissioner Riggs referred to item e to show existing and finished grade on all elevations and structures whether for a flat site or a site inclined to slope toward the building pad if that could be done graphically and meet the requirement. Principal Planner Rogers said that item and the next were meant to verify a requirement and applied to their definition of height and daylight plane. He said he thought there had been cases that former Commissioner Pagee was particularly sensitive to where people in the flood zone did not do due diligence as to what needed to happen so the presentation to the Planning Commission and the constructed result was pretty different with what was happening with grade. He said these were prompts to staff to make sure people have done basic due diligence with what might have to change for grade. He said in most cases on flat sites, existing and proposed with the exception of some drainage were effectively the same. He had not heard particular complaints about that item but if the Commission felt it was superfluous they would take another look at it. Commissioner Riggs said only as it was one of the items that drove the need for the topographic survey. He said he would encourage on this and other items that if there were occasions when a requirement was needed that it not be a blanket requirement but have it indicated somehow that it might be required and why.

Commissioner Riggs noted sheet A14, “F: Completeness and acceptability” that the Planning Division will notify the applicant within 30 days” and remarked that 30 days was a long time added into an overall long process. He said if possible he would like to see that drastically reduced. He said some departments including the County, Los Gatos, and Los Altos determined completeness at the counter. He said he would like to see this accomplished at counter review.

Commissioner Onken said regarding simulated divided lights that without creating policy the handout could state for applicants to specify the exact type of divided light (true divided lights, simulated divided lights, etc.) they intended to use. He said related to Commissioner Combs' comment on process that there was a flow chart that could be referenced on this handout with advice on different things to do and when.

Commissioner Strehl asked why the City could not have acceptability of the application at the counter. She said if the applicant was notified in 30 days that the application was incomplete then that kicked the process in again and the resubmitted application might not be deemed acceptable for another 30 days. She said she agreed with the suggestion of a flow chart for the process as that would help the applicant. She said on page .7 under F, it said: "Provide existing and proposed fences, including heights and materials." She asked if staff or the Commission really reviewed fences other than for height. Principal Planner Rogers said height and property lines often were issues. Commissioner Strehl suggested fences be looked at to be "neighbor friendly" as there were good neighbor fences and those that were not good neighbor.

Commissioner Onken said the Commission saw a number of applications prepared to the handout requirements only and to the lowest possible standard. He said it was good that the City had this handout.

Chair Goodhue suggested grouping information by particular type of development so people could ignore things not applicable to their development. She noted single-family and multi-family residential development and CEQA.

G2. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule: Possible rescheduling of October 8, 2018 meeting due to Columbus Day conflict ([Staff Report #18-074-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Principal Planner Rogers said that Columbus Day was not a city administrative holiday but it was a Federal holiday. He said it was likely just missed when the original 2018 schedule for Planning Commission meetings was set. He said that October 1 was proposed as the meeting date instead of October 8 as it would keep meetings within the two to three week range. He said the Commission could consider moving the meeting to October 15, which would create back to back weekly meetings. He said the Commission could consider canceling the October 8 meeting but there were a number of things in the queue.

Commission Comment: Commissioners Strehl and Onken said that October 1 did not work for them. Chair Goodhue said it worked for her.

Commissioner Riggs said he did not have a conflict for meeting on October 8.

Chair Goodhue said that since October 1 did not work for two Commissioners that she was okay meeting on October 8.

Commissioner Onken said he preferred October 15.

Commissioner Combs said he was fine to meet on October 8, or to move the meeting to October 1 or 15.

Commissioner Riggs said he had no objection to October 15.

Commissioner Strehl said she had no objection to October 15 or October 8.

Principal Planner Rogers said it appeared with the five Commissioners present there was no hard objection to keeping the meeting on October 8 and alternatively with meeting on October 15. He summarized that two Commissioners present could not meet on October 1. He said staff would need to check with the individual Commissioners not present. He said they would try to finalize during the week, and get back to the Commissioners.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: August 27, 2018

Principal Planner Rogers said the August 27 agenda would have the Menlo Park Church use of the former bank building at 700 Santa Cruz Avenue for youth programs, a single-family residential project, and a study session for a third office building for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project that is currently Facebook-occupied, so the Commissioners with Facebook-related conflicts should plan to recuse from that.

- Regular Meeting: September 17, 2018
- Regular Meeting: October 8, 2018

I. Adjournment

Chair Goodhue adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on August 27, 2018