



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 10/22/2018
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 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

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

Absent: Camille Kennedy

Staff: Fahteen Khan, Contract Assistant Planner; Kaitie Meador, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Acting Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Acting Principal Planner Kyle Perata said the City Council at its October 23, 2018 meeting would conduct the second reading of the EV Charger Amendment Ordinance and review the appeal of the 840 Menlo Avenue project as well as the location of the loading dock. He said the Council would also receive an update on the Dumbarton Rail Corridor via a report from SamTrans and an update on the Transportation Master Plan from staff. He said Council was also expected to release a Notice of Funding Availability to developers for affordable housing proposals.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

Chair Goodhue said that Commissioner John Onken would need to recuse himself from item E2, due to a potential conflict of interest. She said the Consent Calendar items would be considered separately to accommodate his recusal. Commissioner Onken said he would abstain from the approval of the minutes as he was not at the October 8, 2019 meeting.

E1. Approval of minutes from the October 8, 2018, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Katherine Strehl/Henry Riggs) to approve the consent calendar with modifications to the minutes as provided by Commissioner Andrew Barnes; passes 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Onken abstaining and Commissioner Kennedy absent.

- Page 16, 3rd full paragraph, 1st line, insert *that the neighbors' opinion after Commissioner Barnes said* to read: "Commissioner Barnes said *that the neighbors' opinion* that the view from the east was problematic was less persuasive to him."

E2. Architectural Control/Panteha Healey/1701 Stone Pine Lane:
Request for Architectural Control for exterior modifications to the front entry and garage door materials and to incorporate cedar siding on a portion of the front façade on an existing single-family, two-story town house in the R3 (Apartment) Zoning District. ([Staff Report #18-086-PC](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Strehl/Riggs) to approve item E2 as recommended in the staff report; passes 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Onken recused and Commissioner Kennedy 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. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.
3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans provided by KNR design studio, consisting of six plan sheets, dated received October 5, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on October 22, 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, Recology, 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. 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. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Yui-Tak Lee/341 Terminal Ave:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story single-family residence and construct a new two-story single-family residence and a secondary dwelling unit on a substandard lot with respect to width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. *(Continued by the Planning Commission at the 8/27/18 Planning Commission meeting. (Staff Report #18-087-PC))*

Applicant Presentation: Yui-Tak Lee introduced himself and his wife Joanne Lin as the property owners of 341 Terminal Avenue since 2013. He said he was an engineer and his wife an oncology nurse, who recently started at Stanford Hospital. Ms. Lin said they now had two young boys, a rescue cat and dog, and two other pets, which was a substantial increase to the size of their family when they first moved into the home. She said their project was to create a home that met their needs. She said they knew their neighbors well and enjoyed participating in the annual block party. She said historically the Belle Haven neighborhood was blue collar and largely remained so. She said they wanted to build a beautiful house respecting the roots of the neighborhood by keeping the outside house finishes nice yet humble and not ostentatious.

Mr. Lee said they had worked over the last few years saving money where they could, so they could build their dream house. He said they had a substantial budget and contingency funds. He said with the current unstable economic and political times, they were greatly worried about rising costs. He said they moved out of their home in May expecting to begin construction over the past summer incurring extra costs for living elsewhere and plan revisions. He said since the previous review of the project he and their designer had done several revisions to try to address the Commission's concerns. He said they hoped the Commission would approve their project as now proposed.

Staff Comment: Contract Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan said there was a materials board for the Commission's review.

Commissioner Onken asked where the white porcelain tile would be used. Mr. Ivan Mak, project designer, said the white tile was for the wainscoting below the main entrance, both sides of the garage, and the front porch.

Commissioner Combs noted the staff report addressed the changes made to the project since the Commission last reviewed it and asked if the applicants wanted to comment further about their proposal. Mr. Mak noted that the roofline had been very simple, and in response to Commission comment, they had added a ridge line to create interest, as shown on A4, elevation 1, on the right-hand side. He referred to the top left corner on elevation 3 for further detail on the roof modification. He said the Commission had concerns with the windows to be used. He said working with staff there was interest in having different sized and shaped windows. He said that they would add trim around all the vinyl clad windows to make them more interesting and an accent color on the window frames. He said he lowered the height of the wainscot for uniformity on the two garage walls, the two pillars at the front foyer, and the sidewall. He said they added windows on the garage doors. He said they would keep the finished stucco but add color for interest as shown on the materials board on the exterior walls to coordinate with the tiles. He said they improved the landscaping in the front yard and eliminated one of the two driveways originally proposed to add landscaping on the right front. He said the parking for the secondary dwelling unit would be in front of the garage. He said additional trees and landscaping were added to the backyard.

Mr. Lee said Mr. Mak had also addressed a roofline and door on the side elevation that seemed to run together.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Lee said the secondary dwelling unit was under the maximum size of 640 square feet.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the roof slope noting the plans indicated 1 to 6. He asked if Mr. Mak meant 2 to 12. Mr. Mak said yes. Commissioner Riggs said the drawings were drawn at 4 and 12 and asked which, 2 and 12 or 4 and 12 was intended. Mr. Mak said he would defer to the drawings on the elevations.

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

Commission Comment: Chair Goodhue asked why they were not removing the second curb cut on the right. Mr. Mak said the Planning staff indicated the front looked too complicated, so he was simplifying it by keeping the semicircle and adding landscaping for interest.

Mr. Lee said they were keeping the curb cuts as that was a unique feature of the house and partially for financial reasons. Ms. Lin said the home had been owned by Onetta Harris and was called the old Harris house in their neighborhood, and that feature seemed unique to the house, so they thought it would be nice to keep it.

Chair Goodhue asked if the applicants had decided to not use grids on the windows. Ms. Lin said that she really did not like the look of window grids noting other homes in the area that did not have grids on the windows.

Commissioner Riggs said the material board had a picture of a tall house with a 12 by 12 roof, shingle siding, faux stone façade, and wooden garage doors. He said the proposed design did not have those features. Mr. Mak said it was just to show the effects of the combination of materials and not the actual design. Commissioner Riggs asked how the occupant of the secondary dwelling unit (SDU) would get from the parking space to the front door of the SDU. Mr. Lee noted the right side of the property to the backyard. Commissioner Riggs said there were plantings in that pathway and suggested they look at creating a clear path to the SDU.

Commissioner Riggs said the elevations showed a much-improved wainscot, and he appreciated the design solution. He said 24-inch white porcelain tile was surprising as the material for the wainscot and asked if they were sure about using that material. Mr. Mak said he thought so with the cost, ease of application, and with the colors. Commissioner Riggs said the vinyl windows were sliders and asked if they could do the vinyl windows without the sliders. Mr. Mak noted homes in the area had vinyl slider windows. He said they would edge all the framing for the windows and that would incur a great deal more cost to the owners. Mr. Lee said he believed most of the homes in the neighborhood had sliding windows and they did not want their home to stand out too much. Commissioner Riggs said he appreciated what they would do with the trim on the windows but cautioned against duplicating features only to duplicate. Mr. Lee said he agreed and that was why they tried to make other parts of the design nicer.

Commissioner Onken said he appreciated the work they had done and the money they were about to spend. He said the Commission's remit was to consider architectural control of a house in the interest of the neighborhood and the wider community, and not to save the applicants money. He said that using a \$6 per square foot kitchen floor tile on the exterior rather than something \$20 a square foot was minimal within the cost of the overall project. He suggested that was the wrong place to save money. Mr. Lee said that it was not just that area and that they were trying to save money a little here and there to contain the expense of the project.

Commissioner Riggs said that two senior architects on the Commission were making suggestions based on experience. He suggested there might be other areas they could change materials to help expense that would not hurt the design. He said as an example outside the house they were proposing marble tile for the entry paving and suggested they might have second thoughts about that after they moved into the home. He said they could save money by using decomposed granite for a great deal of their paving. He said they have a tankless water heater mounted high on the SDU wall. He asked that the tankless water heater be located no higher than the top of the neighbor's fence as it was an unattractive unit to look at.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve the project with stipulations regarding materials to have an alternative wainscot tile material to be presented to the Planning Division for review and approval and submit a window sample and an alternative to sliding windows to Planning Division. Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

Commissioner Barnes asked for clarification about the submittal of alternative wainscot tile material and samples of sliding windows and non-sliding windows. He asked if the applicant would have to do something different and what the deciding mechanism was. Commissioner Riggs said he thought it could be based on their comments made tonight and heard by staff. He said one of the least expensive materials designed for exterior wainscot was El Dorado stone but there were at least six or seven other materials in the Bay area. Mr. Mak asked for a specification for the window saying it was hard for them to choose any kind of vinyl window that would suit the Commission's taste. Commissioner Riggs said to work with a window supply company noting he expected they would have more vinyl windows than sliders and get samples. He said he would leave it to them to provide either a casement, double-hung or single-hung window with some eye for aesthetics and what the property owners would like to see in their home.

Commissioner Barnes asked who would make the decision on the materials. Commissioner Riggs said staff. Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Planner Khan restated the conditions to clarify: the

external waterless water tank on the secondary dwelling unit should not be higher than the neighbor's fence; the applicant should provide an alternative material to the white porcelain tile for the wainscot; and submit a window sample and a non-sliding window sample that could be vinyl but single-hung, double-hung or casement. Commissioner Riggs noted that the Commission's preference has tended to be for narrow vinyl. He asked if adding "such as El Dorado stone" to the condition for the exterior wainscot material was helpful. Ms. Khan said it was. Commissioner Strehl as the maker of the second said that was acceptable.

Commissioner Onken said part of the issue with vinyl slider windows was they were easy to break into and suggested they might be much happier with casement windows.

Commissioner Combs asked in clarification if the Commission was saying the current proposed porcelain tile for the wainscot and sliding vinyl window were unacceptable. Replying to Mr. Mak, Commissioner Riggs said if the window was high and narrow in height for instance above the shower then a slider window was practical. He said otherwise consistency in the window type was the desire.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to approve item F2 with the following modifications; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner 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 iTeam, consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received October 15, 2018 and approved by the Planning Commission on October 22, 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.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific condition:

- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the external tankless water heater on the exterior of the secondary dwelling unit at or below the height of the neighboring fence, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
- b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating an alternate material for the porcelain tiles on the front facades wainscoting, such as but not limited to Eldorado stone, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**
- c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an alternate window sample for casement, single hung or double-hung vinyl windows, and revise the window design to remove the sliding windows, except for smaller windows such as bathroom windows, which may continue to use sliders, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.**

Chair Goodhue said that Vice Chair Barnes would conduct the hearings for F2 and F3 on the agenda as she would recuse herself due to her past representation of Facebook and Commissioner Combs was recused due to his employment with Facebook.

Vice Chair Barnes said the staff report for F2 and F3 was the same number, and that they would receive public comment on both at the same time, but the items would have separate Commission action.

The Planning Commission opened F2 and F3 concurrently

- F2. Conditional Development Permit Amendment/Facebook, Inc./180-200 Jefferson Drive: Request for an amendment to a Conditional Development Permit (CDP) to decrease the parking ratio; modify on-site circulation for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists; modify the site landscaping plan; increase the amount of building coverage to construct transit shelters; add gross floor area for new guard shacks; and construct related infrastructure for the tenant's proposed inter-campus tram and shuttle operations. As part of the proposed site circulation changes, nine heritage trees

are proposed to be removed. The proposed site circulation changes would include modifications to the adjacent property at 220 Jefferson Drive, which would require a use permit and architectural control. Both properties are occupied by a common tenant and located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-088-PC](#))

- F3. Use Permit Revision and Architectural Control Revision/Facebook, Inc./220 Jefferson Drive: Request for use permit and architectural control revisions to decrease the parking ratio; modify the site circulation for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists; and modify the site landscaping to accommodate the tenant's proposed site circulation modifications for its inter-campus tram and shuttle operations. As part of the proposed site circulation changes, five heritage trees are proposed to be removed. The proposed site circulation changes would include modifications to the adjacent property at 180-200 Jefferson Drive, which would require a conditional development permit amendment. Both properties are occupied by a common tenant and are located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-088-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Acting Principal Planner Perata said these were two public hearing items that needed to be opened concurrently due to the interrelated nature of the overall project. He said the 180-200 Jefferson Drive project had a conditional development permit (CDP) that the applicant was requesting to amend as part of the overall project and that required City Council action. He said the use permit revision and architectural control revisions request for 220 Jefferson Drive typically could be approved by the Planning Commission but with the comprehensive nature of the overall project the two parcels should be reviewed concurrently by City Council with one public hearing for both and separate Council actions. He provided a brief background on the two separate parcels of 180-200 and 220 Jefferson Drive with a CDP for the first parcel and a use permit and architectural control for the second parcel. He said the overall campus was part of Facebook's broader campuses within the Bayfront area, and was very adjacent to the West Campus and the Commonwealth Corporate project. He said essentially the projects were for a shuttle and tram stop predominately located on the 180-200 Jefferson Drive site and overall circulation changes that affected the overall parking and heritage trees on both properties as well as a slight increase in gross floor area (GFA) on the 180-200 Jefferson Drive site, which was within the overall maximum 45% permitted by the zoning and previous CDP. He said the proposal was modifying the circulation to enter and exit shuttles and trams on Jefferson Drive with the exception of a right-turn in only on Chilco Street. He said the recommended actions were Attachment A for 180-200 Jefferson Drive and Attachment B for 220 Jefferson Drive. He said if the Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council, the Council would review for approval at its meeting of December 13. He said the proposed heritage tree removals were reviewed and recommended for approval by the Environmental Quality Commission at its meeting on September 26.

Applicant Presentation: Danielle Douthett said she and Mandy Spain were project managers for Facilities for Construction for Facebook. She showed slides of the present shuttle and tram stop and how that was creating some traffic turning onto Chilco Street. Noting that 45% of Facebook employees use alternate transit, she showed a slide of the proposed shuttle and tram stop path that eliminated the left turn onto Chilco Street.

Commissioner Onken asked if they knew how many people used cars to travel within the campuses during the day. Ms. Douthett said that trams and bicycles were available for intra-campus travel during the day. She said she believed the majority of employees used either the trams or bicycles.

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

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said he appreciated the applicant and staff moving on this change to at least the internal circulation. He noted the loss of 157 parking spaces and asked if what remained was within the required amount of parking under the zoning. Acting Principal Planner Perata said the proposed parking ratio for both sites would be within the rezoned office building district, the O district. He said as discussed in the staff report that was not a standard that would apply to either project directly noting the previous use permit was under the M-2 zoning on the 220 Jefferson Drive site but there was a parking reduction request for use-based parking for that site. He said the CDP on the 180-200 Jefferson Drive site allowed for some flexibility in parking on that site. He said both sites were evaluated under the O zoning district for consistency.

Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Ms. Douthett said the property owner is Bohannon and the ground lease provided Facebook control of the property.

Commissioner Riggs noted the loss of mature heritage trees but observed removal of such trees was permitted if needed for a project. He said this was a significant project.

Commissioner Onken said trying to make a move to a more integrated office park allowing for more public transit and reducing parking equated to reducing more cars on Willow Road or Bayshore Expressway, which was desirable. He said he could support the proposals and they were useful for whomever in the future would occupy those buildings.

Vice Chair Barnes said he would refer to the staff report as he made his comments. He said he found it very helpful and would limit single-occupancy vehicles in facilitating more efficient shuttle and tram circulation through the site as those were key features of the TDM program. He said also if Facebook's robust TDM program did not meet its objectives that these approvals were conditional and could be removed in effect if not done as prescribed. He said for those reasons he could support.

Commissioner Onken made a motion to approve both items. Acting Principal Planner Perata said staff would prefer if motions were made separately to recommend approvals to the City Council.

- F2. Conditional Development Permit Amendment/Facebook, Inc./180-200 Jefferson Drive: Request for an amendment to a Conditional Development Permit (CDP) to decrease the parking ratio; modify on-site circulation for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists; modify the site landscaping plan; increase the amount of building coverage to construct transit shelters; add gross floor area for new guard shack; and construct related infrastructure for the tenant's proposed inter-campus tram and shuttle operations. As part of the proposed site circulation changes, nine heritage trees are proposed to be removed. The proposed site circulation changes would include modifications to the adjacent property at 220 Jefferson Drive, which would require a use permit and architectural control. Both properties are occupied by a common tenant and located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-088-PC](#))

After staff comment, applicant presentation, public hearing, and Commission comment, Commissioner Onken moved to recommend approval.

Vice Chair Barnes confirmed the recommendation for approval was as stated in Attachment A. He directed staff to a typographical error in Attachment A that referred to 108-200 rather than 180-200, which staff indicated would be corrected.

Commissioner Strehl seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Strehl) to recommend approval of item F2 to the City Council as recommended in the staff report; passes 4-0-2-1 with Commissioners Combs and Goodhue recused, and Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Attachment A
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION –
Chilco Campus Shuttle and Tram Stop
(180-200 Jefferson Drive Parcel)

Environmental Review

1. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution that the proposed project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines,

Conditional Development Permit Amendment

2. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to approve the Conditional Development Permit Amendment for the Facebook Chilco Campus Shuttle and Tram Stop project located at 180-200 Jefferson Drive (Draft CDP included in Attachment H).

Heritage Tree Removals

3. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to approve the requested nine heritage tree removal permits for the parcel addressed 180-200 Jefferson Drive.
- F3. Use Permit Revision and Architectural Control Revision/Facebook, Inc./220 Jefferson Drive: Request for use permit and architectural control revisions to decrease the parking ratio; modify the site circulation for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists; and modify the site landscaping to accommodate the tenant’s proposed site circulation modifications for its inter-campus tram and shuttle operations. As part of the proposed site circulation changes, five heritage trees are proposed to be removed. The proposed site circulation changes would include modifications to the adjacent property at 180-200 Jefferson Drive, which would require a conditional development permit amendment. Both properties are occupied by a common tenant and are located in the O-B (Office, Bonus) zoning district. (Staff Report #18-088-PC)

After staff comment, applicant presentation, public hearing, and Commission comment, Vice Chair Barnes moved to approve Attachment B. Commissioner Onken seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Onken) to recommend approval of item F3 to the City Council as recommended in the staff report; passes 4-0-2-1 with Commissioners Combs and Goodhue recused, and Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Attachment B

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION Chilco Campus Shuttle and Tram Stop (220 Jefferson Drive Parcel)

Environmental Review

1. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution that the proposed project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines,

Architectural Control Revision

2. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to approve the findings for the architectural control revision for the Facebook Chilco Campus Shuttle and Tram Stop project located at 220 Jefferson Drive (Draft findings and conditions included in Attachment I).

Conditional Use Permit Revision

3. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to approve the Conditional Use Permit revision for the Facebook Chilco Campus Shuttle and Tram Stop project located at 220 Jefferson Drive (Draft findings and conditions included in Attachment I).

Heritage Tree Removals

4. Recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution to approve the requested five heritage tree removal permits for the parcel addressed 220 Jefferson Drive.

Chair Goodhue and Commissioner Combs returned to the dais.

G. Regular Business

- G1. Architectural Control/John Fong/725 Oak Grove Avenue:
Request for architectural control to perform interior and exterior modifications, including the addition of a mezzanine level to an existing one-story commercial building located in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposed exterior changes would include replacement of the existing siding with cement plaster and wood siding, reconfiguration of the main entry, new storefront windows and doors, and two new street trees along Oak Grove Avenue. ([Staff Report #18-089-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Kaitie Meador said a materials board was being circulated at the dais.

Applicant Presentation: Rob Zirkle, principal with Brick, said the project was located at the corner of Oak Grove and Chestnut. He provided slides of the current building and site plan. He noted a wonderful new building across the street at 1149 Chestnut with a warm and contemporary feel. He said the building immediately adjacent to this site at 1160 Chestnut was a much more traditional palette of stucco and warm colors. He showed the ground floor of the proposed renovation that

would retain the courtyard feature and widen it some to meet Specific Plan design for modulations. He said all perimeter walls would be kept intact and the window spaces. He showed the upper level plan for the addition of a mezzanine. He said the mezzanine would create a slight bit of usable space to the building and give additional height and prominence to it by providing a nice clerestory around the perimeter of the building to allow for natural light into the main space. He said entering from Chestnut would provide a nice view of the stair and mezzanine above and would be filled with natural light. He described the materials and how those referred to nearby buildings. He said the primary orientation along Chestnut faced due south, so they were integrating some vertical fins and some patterned aluminum within the insulated glazing cavity to provide some solar protection and also create some nice shadows in the interior of the building for an interesting aesthetic to the exterior as well.

Commissioner Strehl asked if they were adding office space. Mr. Zirkle said the building was office and the mezzanine was also office. He said the existing project was below the floor area ratio (FAR) for the property and the mezzanine would increase the FAR to maximum allowable. Replying further to Commissioner Strehl, Mr. Zirkle said he believed the building owners would prefer one tenant for the building. He said the GFA was about 7500 square feet and using a 200 square foot occupancy ratio that would equate to about 30 to 35 people.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the parking. Mr. Zirkle said parking was on both sides of Chestnut and connected by the building's breezeway towards the east from Chestnut and across the street in the public garage. He said the existing and proposed conditions had no onsite parking. Replying further to Commissioner Barnes, Mr. Zirkle said the parking fee assessment to provide improvements for public parking was based upon the 1.0 allowed on the property. He said the proposal was to achieve the 1.0 FAR that was possible on the property and which was the pretext for its contribution to the public parking.

Associate Planner Meador said in this zoning district the parking for the first 1.0 FAR was covered in the public parking and onsite parking was not required. She said they had also prepared a TDM that included additional bike parking and other things to further offset parking needs

Commissioner Barnes said the existing building was 5900 square feet and they were adding 1600 square feet. He asked if the TDM would absorb the parking need for the additional 1600 square feet. Associate Planner Meador said their TDM includes measures to reduce trips. She said the Specific Plan also determined that even with this additional square footage parking was not needed as the building was still under the first 1.0 FAR. Commissioner Barnes asked about a special assessment district. Acting Principal Planner Perata said there was not one to his knowledge in the downtown. He said the parking assessment district was a one-time payment for its creation decades before but was not an ongoing assessment.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the monitoring of TDM programs for implementation and success. Associate Planner Meador said during the building permit phase staff would review the TDM plan again with the Transportation Division to make sure it was being implemented into the actual design plans. She said during inspection staff would also confirm that they have those measures implemented into the building.

Commissioner Onken asked about keeping the existing walls. Mr. Zirkle said new construction was extremely expensive. He said also the building had good bones and was very reusable. He said there were many building features that could be repurposed.

Commissioner Riggs said the rendering showed 1200 Chestnut and asked if that had been 1184 in the past. Mr. Zirkle confirmed that was so. Commissioner Riggs referred to the proportion of the central entry and asked if it related to the Specific Plan's requirement for a major modulation. Mr. Zirkle said that was correct. He said for this view they would have preferred to have had the upper roof line of the upper story continuous and simplified. He said the width of the space between the buildings and the height above the major parapet line was all derivative of the major modulation. He said their favorite view of the building did not have the vertical slats.

Chair Goodhue opened for public comment and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Strehl asked what the TDM measures were for the project. Commissioner Combs asked if TDM plan was required under the Specific Plan. Associate Planner Meador said she would need to look up the TDM plan. She noted that TDM was required under the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Onken said he thought there was an unseen traffic impact of office buildings with multiple tenants such as this project. He said he would prefer one larger tenant with employees controlled and managed under its TDM. He said he thought the traffic impacts of the proposed building would be less than multiple tenant offices even though there was more square footage. He said it was a very nice project and a great improvement to the existing building.

Commissioner Riggs said that Lot 3 behind this building had extended parking hours. He said the project overall was attractive and met code. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report.

Replying to Commissioner Strehl, Associate Planner Meador said TDM was required by the Specific Plan as one of the mitigation measures. She referred to page I15 of the staff report that listed multiple different options that could be implemented. She said the applicant was implementing the bicycle storage, options for alternate transit as well as subsidies for alternate transit. Commissioner Strehl said she thought the public parking lot behind this building and the one across the street from it were both time-limited to three hours. She said both those lots were always packed. She confirmed with staff that employers get parking permits for their employees, so this building might have 20 to 30 people parking all day. She said her concern with the parking was not within the Commission's purview, but she hoped the City Council would act to have a downtown parking garage. She said the proposal was a radical improvement over the existing building. She seconded Commissioner Riggs' motion to approve.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to approve the architectural control as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

1. Make findings with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that the proposal is within the scope of the project covered by the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, which was certified on June 5, 2012. Specifically, make findings that:
 - a. A checklist has been prepared detailing that no new effects could occur and no new mitigation measures would be required (Attachment H).

- b. Relevant mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment I), which is approved as part of this finding.
 - c. Upon completion of project improvements, the Specific Plan Maximum Allowable Development will be adjusted by 1,718 square feet of commercial uses, accounting for the project's net share of the Plan's overall projected development and associated impacts.
 2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The development is consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, as verified in detail in the Standards and Guidelines Compliance Worksheet (Attachment F).
 3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Brick, Inc., consisting of 29 plan sheets, dated received October 9, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on October 22, 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, California Water Company, 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. 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.
 - e. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by David Babby, dated August 17, 2018.

- f. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit a heritage street tree preservation plan, detailing the location of and methods for all tree protection measures. A heritage tree permit will be required to remove any heritage trees.
- g. Street trees shall be from the City-approved street tree species or to the satisfaction of City Arborist. Irrigation within public right of way shall comply with City Standard Details LS-1 through LS-19 and shall be connected to the on-site water system.
- h. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit all applicable engineering plans for Engineering review and approval. The plans shall include, but is not limited to:
 - a. Existing Topography (NAVD 88')
 - b. Demolition Plan
 - c. Site Plan
 - d. Construction Parking Plan
 - e. Grading and Drainage Plan
 - f. Stormwater Control Plan
 - g. Utility Plan
 - h. Erosion Control Plan
 - i. Planting and Irrigation Plan
 - j. Off-site Improvement Plan
 - k. Construction Details
 - l. Joint Trench Plan

The Applicant shall agree to furnish any additional engineering services or plans as required by the Engineering Division not mentioned herein.

- i. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit plans for: 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) dust control, 3) air pollution control, 4) erosion and sedimentation control, 5) tree protection fencing, and 6) construction vehicle parking. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Engineering, and Planning Divisions. The fences and erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing construction.
- j. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. A Hydrology Report will be required to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division. Slopes for the first 10 feet perpendicular to the structure must be 5% minimum for pervious surfaces and 2% minimum for impervious surfaces, including roadways and parking areas, as required by CBC §1804.3.
- k. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

- l. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation. As appropriate to the site and status of construction, winterization requirements shall include inspecting/maintaining/cleaning all soil erosion and sedimentation controls prior to, during, and immediately after each storm event; stabilizing disturbed soils through temporary or permanent seeding, mulching, matting, tarping or other physical means; rocking unpaved vehicle access to limit dispersion of much onto public right-of-way; and covering/tarping stored construction materials, fuels, and other chemicals. Plans to include proposed measures to prevent erosion and polluted runoff from all site conditions shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division prior to beginning construction.
- m. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit a finalized version of the Stormwater Control Plan, which shall provide stormwater treatment for the project site pursuant to the latest regulations specified in the San Mateo County C.3 Technical Guidance Manual. The Stormwater Control Plan shall include a written report identify existing and proposed project conditions, and all applicable source controls, and mitigation measures (i.e. bioretention areas, flow through planters, etc.) implemented to meet NPDES compliance.
- n. During the design phase of the construction drawings, all potential utility conflicts shall be potholed with actual depths recorded on the improvement plans submitted for City review and approval.
- o. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit engineered Off-Site Improvement Plans (including specifications & engineers cost estimates), for approval by the Engineering Division, showing the infrastructure necessary to serve the Project.
- p. The City will evaluate the condition of asphalt paving on Oak Grove Avenue and Chestnut Street, following construction and prior to final occupancy of buildings. If necessary, the City will require a grind and overlay of damaged pavement along the project frontage. All existing striping, markings, and legends shall be replaced in kind, or as approved by the City and Caltrans.
- q. All agreements shall run with the land and shall be recorded with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office.
- r. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall submit plans for construction related parking management, construction staging, material storage and Traffic Control Handling Plan (TCHP) to be reviewed and approved by the City. The applicant shall secure adequate parking for any and all construction trades. The plan shall include construction phasing and anticipated method of traffic handling for each phase.
- s. Prior to commencing any work within the right-of-way or public easements, the Applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the appropriate reviewing jurisdiction.
- t. All public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

- u. The Applicant shall retain a civil engineer to prepare "as-built" or "record" drawings of public improvements, and the drawings shall be submitted in AutoCAD and Adobe PDF formats to the Engineering Division prior to Final Occupancy.
 - v. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan, providing the location, architectural details and specifications for all exterior lighting subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - w. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all Public Works fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.
5. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:
- a. The applicant shall address all Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) requirements as specified in the MMRP (Attachment I). Failure to meet these requirements may result in delays to the building permit issuance, stop work orders during construction, and/or fines.
 - b. Prior to issuance of the building permit the Applicant shall amend the ingress, egress easement to allow the existing trash and utility structures to remain and a proposed storm water filtration planter. In the case that the easement is not amended, the trash and utilities would need to be accommodated within the building. The revised easement is subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division and City Attorney, and shall be recorded with the County of San Mateo. Documentation of recordation shall be submitted prior to building permit issuance.
 - c. Any nonstandard improvements within public right-of-way shall be maintained in perpetuity by the owner. Owner shall execute an Agreement to maintain non-standard sidewalks, bike racks, and planting strips if any. Agreement shall be recorded prior to final occupancy.
 - d. Prior to issuance of each building permit the Applicant shall pay the applicable Building Construction Street Impact Fee in effect at the time of payment to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director. The current fee is calculated by multiplying the valuation of the construction by 0.0058.
 - e. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Preparation Fee, which is established at \$1.13/square foot for all net new development. For the subject proposal, the fee is estimated at \$1,941.34 (\$1.13 x 1,718 net new square feet).
 - f. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit all relevant transportation impact fees (TIF), subject to review and approval of the Transportation Division. Such fees include:
 - i. The TIF is estimated to be \$8,246.40. The fee was calculated as follows: (\$4.80/s.f. x 1,718 new s.f. office). Please note this fee is updated annually on July 1st based on the

Engineering News Record Bay Area Construction Cost Index. Fees are due before a building permit is issued.

- ii. The City has adopted a Supplemental Transportation Impact Fee for the infrastructure required as part of the Downtown Specific Plan. The fee is calculated at \$393.06 per PM peak hour vehicle trip, with a credit for the existing trips. The proposed project is estimated to generate 23 PM peak hour trips, so the supplemental TIF is estimated to be \$9,040.38. Payment is due before a building permit is issued and the supplemental TIF will be updated annually on July 1st along with the TIF.
- g. As part of the building permit submittal, the plans shall include frontage improvements as shown on sheet C-2 of Improvement Plans dated 10/9/2018 prepared by Aliquot Associates, Inc. (Job No. 218098) include but not limited to:
 - i. Lateral connections to overhead electric, fiber optic, and communication lines shall be placed in a joint trench.
 - b. Overhead communication lines shall be placed underground along Chestnut Street frontage.
 - c. Existing sidewalk shall be removed and replaced along the entire project frontages per approved project plans.
 - d. Any frontage improvements which are damaged as a result of construction shall be replaced.
 - e. ADA compliant wheelchair ramp at corner of Oak Grove Drive and Chestnut Street shall be upgraded.
 - f. Two 24" box street trees shall be planted along Chestnut Street frontage.

G2. Architectural Control/Matt Matteson/1000 El Camino Real:
Request for architectural control to partially demolish an existing podium to perform waterproofing work on an existing below grade parking garage and install new site improvements. The proposed site improvements would include reconfiguration of the existing entry path and courtyard and modifications to the existing outdoor patio at the rear of the building. The proposal also includes the removal of seven heritage trees along El Camino Real. No other changes to the existing office building are proposed. The existing building is located in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. ([Staff Report #18-090-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Meador said a materials board was being circulated to the Commission at the dais.

Applicant Presentation: Matt Matteson, applicant, said he was a former resident of Menlo Park and now resided in San Francisco. He said he was the managing partner of the investment group that has owned the subject property since 1983 when it was constructed. He said having a landscaped area on top of a parking garage in 1983 was very innovative. He said the below grade parking allowed for significant parking to be hidden from El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue while giving the appearance of lush landscaping. He said a waterproof membrane was placed on top of the parking structure and that had been highly successful for 35 years. He said several years ago

they determined that the waterproof membrane had failed, partially due to age and partially due to the very invasive large root structures of the redwood trees now proposed for removal. He said water intrusion into a structured parking garage was very dangerous as it could allow the steel supports and steel tendons to rust and fail. He said if allowed to go on too long the structure would become unsound for use. He said after extensive research the only solution to keep the structure safe and extend its useful life was to remove all of the hard- and soft-scape on top of it, install new waterproof membrane and plant new landscaping and install new hardscape. He said they also would improve site lighting and use water technology that would highly reduce landscaping watering. He then presented some visual images of what he was referring to.

Ken Rakestraw said roots were intruding into the podium and the only way to access the podium was to remove the seven trees there. He said to replace the seven redwood trees they would plant 14 trees, a combination of six Brisbane trees located away from the podium and using root barrier, two London Plane trees in the sidewalk area that would complete the existing London Plane trees, a number of birch trees in the center where the main entrance was, and the 14th tree would be a Live Oak along Ravenswood Avenue spaced away from the existing redwood trees as they did not want to overplant the area and cause any failure to the existing remaining redwood trees. He said they would add two nonfruit olive trees in the front in planters and a maple tree in the back. He said they would remove high water use turf and use no-mow fescue that would wrap around the Ravenswood side as well.

Commissioner Onken confirmed with Mr. Matteson that the building exterior would be repainted. Mr. Matteson said the color would be a bit grayer with taupe in it and they would do some LED light retrofits.

Commissioner Barnes asked about the ground lease. Mr. Matteson said they have a 55-year ground lease with the City that started in 2015. He said that was after 35 years of the prior 55-year ground lease. Commissioner Barnes confirmed with Mr. Matteson that the proposal did not give any consideration to any future potential widening of El Camino Real or grade separation on Ravenswood.

Chair Goodhue opened for public comment and closed as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken said that he appreciated the work that needed to be done. He said the loss of the redwoods would have an impact, but the new landscaping would have lower water usage which was good.

Commissioner Barnes said he thought the changes would be positive for the appearance of the site as well as solving the structural concerns.

Commissioner Riggs said the proposal had many visual improvements. He said he was concerned that the plan did not allow for any future widening of El Camino Real. He said the last suggestion about El Camino Real widening indicated only two feet was needed. He said he prepared a plan moving the improvements two feet away from El Camino Real and gave to staff if the applicant was interested. He said he would be more comfortable supporting the project if the Transportation Division established what the alternative would be for widening El Camino Real and coordinated the tree placement with this project. He said the EIR for the Specific Plan, Mitigation Measure TR-7d, 4th bullet was to add a third northbound through lane on El Camino Real, which brought the unacceptable impact down to significant but unavoidable. He moved to continue the much-needed

improvement project to give staff time to address the mitigation issue.

Commissioner Strehl asked staff how long a continuance would delay the project. Acting Principal Planner Perata said if it was continued he was not sure if it could be on a future agenda before the end of the year given the number of agenda items and noticing requirements. He said continuing this to include Transportation, Planning and Public Works coordination could take time noting Assistant Director vacancies in Transportation and Engineering as well as the City Engineer vacancy.

Commissioner Strehl said another lane onto Ravenswood with a grade separation would be complex. Commissioner Riggs said only two feet width was needed on El Camino Real for another lane and asked why this building having a 10-foot sidewalk was a benefit when Jeffrey's next door had a five-foot sidewalk.

Mr. Matteson said he understood Commissioner Riggs' concern. He said staff tenaciously fought for a 15-foot sidewalk in front of his building to comply with the Specific Plan. He said that was impossible unless all the heritage trees on that side were removed including the large trees decorated with lights at Christmas time. He said they were then unable to have a 10-foot sidewalk at the south end parking ramp of the parking garage because of the slope. He said the slope had to start north of there. He said he did not know of an alternative that gave a right-turn lane with only two feet. He said he has had extensive meetings with staff about grade separations and full loss of Ravenswood access to their parking. He said he did not know if either the grade separation or the added right lane would happen but meanwhile his garage was failing. He requested approval and if they ended up having to give up two feet of the new 10-foot sidewalk that was now eight-foot that was the least of their problems. He said the worst of his problems was a failing garage.

Commissioner Riggs said with that commitment that they did not need to delay the project. He said he would change his motion to approve the architectural control as recommended in the staff report with specific acknowledgment that they discussed that the City and the leaseholder would work together should there be a relocation of the sidewalk.

Commissioner Combs seconded the motion noting he was going to express concern with continuing the project to reach City resolution of the added lane.

Commissioner Riggs suggested the applicant consider treatment of the trees that might allow for relocation. Mr. Matteson said that they were adding two trees to an existing row of trees.

Commissioner Onken said he was supportive of the motion. He said even with qualifications about the right turn lane he did not see any way that this approval would prejudice anything having to do with that.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Strehl) to approve the architectural control as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

1. Make findings with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that the proposal is within the scope of the project covered by the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, which was certified on June 5, 2012. Specifically, make findings that:

- a. The project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
 - b. Relevant mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment G), which is approved as part of this finding.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
- a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
 - e. The development is consistent with the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, as verified in detail in the Standards and Guidelines Compliance Worksheet (Attachment E).
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 ASD SKY, consisting of 23 plan sheets, dated received October 16, 2018, and approved by the Planning Commission on October 22, 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, Caltrans, 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. 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.
 - e. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by SBCA Tree Consulting, dated July 24, 2018.

- f. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a heritage street tree preservation plan, detailing the location of and methods for all tree protection measures. A heritage tree permit will be required to remove any heritage trees.
 - g. Street trees shall be from the City-approved street tree species or to the satisfaction of City Arborist. Irrigation within public right of way shall comply with City Standard Details LS-1 through LS-19 and shall be connected to the on-site water system, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit, the applicant shall provide a completed checklist for Engineering Submittals with Building Permit Applications for review by the Engineering Division.
 - i. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading & Drainage plan if there are grading changes, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - j. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a detailed landscape plan and submit documentation of compliance with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code 12.44) if the project is replacing more than 1,000 square feet of irrigated landscaping, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - k. Concurrent with the submittal of a complete building permit application, if the project is creating or replacing more than 5,000 square feet of irrigated landscaping, per the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code 12.44) the irrigation system shall be designed with a separate water service, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
4. Approve the architectural control subject to the following ***project-specific*** conditions:
- a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit documentation of compliance with all Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) requirements as specified in the MMRP (Attachment G), subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. Failure to meet these requirements may result in delays to the building permit issuance, stop work orders during construction, and/or fines.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit documentation of compliance with the following requirements for the frontage improvements:
 - i. The Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan identifies adequate facilities for pedestrian access along El Camino Real. The specific plan identifies a 15-foot wide sidewalk with a minimum 10-foot wide clear walking zone and a minimum 5-foot wide furnishing zone measured from the back of curb. The City has agreed with a 10 feet sidewalk on El Camino Real frontage in order to preserve all trees unaffected by the other work proposed and maintain a consistent cross-section along the entire property frontage. However, a 15 feet sidewalk will be required with the future redevelopment of the site consistent with the vision of the Downtown Specific Plan.

- ii. Tree wells must be adjusted to four foot by six foot if feasible. Currently, the sidewalk is approximately eight foot wide measured from the back of curb to the property line. Therefore, a two foot PAE dedication to achieve the required ten foot wide interim sidewalk is required.
- iii. Any other frontage improvements which are damaged as a result of construction will be required to be replaced.
- iv. All street light and CCTV poles along the project frontage on El Camino Real must be painted Mesa Brown.
- v. Upon completion of the sidewalk improvements, the City will reimburse the developer fifty percent (50%) of the actual costs, not to exceed \$42,000.
- vi. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall submit plans for: 1) construction safety fences around the periphery of the construction area, 2) dust control, 3) air pollution control, 4) erosion and sedimentation control, 5) tree protection fencing, and 6) construction vehicle parking. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Engineering, and Planning Divisions. The fences and erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed according to the approved plan prior to commencing construction

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: November 5, 2018

Acting Principal Planner Perata said the November 5 agenda would have a couple of single-family development projects, some commercial properties and a study session on 555 Willow Road for a new boardinghouse.

- Regular Meeting: December 3, 2018
- Regular Meeting: December 10, 2018

I. Adjournment

Chair Goodhue adjourned the meeting at 9:24 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Kyle Perata, Acting Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on November 5, 2018