



# CONNECTMENLO

menlo park land use & mobility update

## **Menlo Park General Plan and M-2 Zoning Update General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary**

---

*General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) Meeting #6 was conducted on March 25, 2015 (6 – 8:30 pm) in the Oak Room of the Arrillaga Family Recreation Center at 700 Alma Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025.*

### **GPAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Peter Ohtaki, City Council (Co-chair)  
Harry Bims, At-Large  
David Bohannon, At-Large  
James Cebrian, Parks and Recreation Commission  
Kristin Duriseti, Environmental Quality Commission  
Adina Levin, Transportation Commission  
Ray Mueller, City Council (Co-Chair)  
Roger Royse, At-Large  
Katherine Strehl, Planning Commission  
Michele Tate, Housing Commission  
Matthew Zumstein, Bicycle Commission

### **CITY STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PRESENT**

Justin Murphy, Assistant Community Development Director  
Deanna Chow, Senior Planner  
Nikki Nagaya, Transportation Manager  
Amanda Wallace, Economic Development Specialist  
Leigh Prince, City Attorney's Office  
Charlie Knox, PlaceWorks  
Eric Panzer, PlaceWorks  
Yiu Kam, PlaceWorks

## **MEETING PURPOSE**

The primary purposes of the meeting were to: receive GPAC comments on the Existing Conditions Reports; review the outcome of the March workshop and open house; refine the Draft Preferred Alternative map; and discuss the community programs survey.

PlaceWorks Principal Charlie Knox welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting presentation.

As the presentation progressed, Charlie Knox solicited feedback from the GPAC members and members of the public on the various topics of the meeting. See the project website for a copy of this presentation: [www.menlopark.org/connectmenlo](http://www.menlopark.org/connectmenlo).

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

### COMMENTS

Committee members and members of the public were asked to provide feedback on: the Existing Conditions Report, the community programs survey, and the Draft Preferred Alternative map, and then make a recommendation to the City Council and Planning Commission.

### GPAC COMMENTS

For the community programs surveys, is it possible to view a breakdown of respondents to see what proportion are Menlo Park residents versus non-residents or property owners?

*Consultant / City Response:* The real time voting exercise on March 12 did not include such identifying information, but the paper and online surveys will allow respondents to identify which neighborhood they live in.

Given that not all Menlo Park residents have or regularly use computers, it is important to use paper surveys and to go door-to-door, especially in the Belle Haven Neighborhood. Different neighborhoods will require different approaches to outreach.

*Consultant Response:* The community programs survey has been translated into contextually appropriate Spanish and the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC) has been and will continue to be involved in in-person efforts to distribute and administer surveys. This is the same community group that participated in the Belle Haven community visioning process. PCRC has visited local stores, as well as the Belle Haven library as part of the community outreach process for the General Plan Update and M-2 Area project. In the previous survey exercise, over 170 responses were received, indicating a relatively high level of community participation.

Some people have had trouble accessing or using the online survey.

*Consultant Response:* The consultant team will work with residents to determine what if any technical problems are occurring with the survey and will correct them as quickly as possible.

Some of the prioritizations from the community programs survey may be overlapping. The survey does not adequately reflect how priorities are ranked between rather than just within categories. The limitations of the technology should be noted.

*Consultant Response:* Decision was made to include community programs in specific categories to make the survey more usable, rather than simply having one long list. Additionally, the survey includes a question that asks respondent to rank all of the categories, which provides another dimension of information to help indicate priority projects across categories. Ultimately, the goal is to present council with data that is readily understandable and can help inform their decision. Using the categories helps to simplify the understanding of the rankings and better equips the council to consider bundles of programs. Additionally, the survey process is not strictly scientific and is attempting to balance the length and complexity of the survey with the quality of the information received and the maximization of participation. Finally, members of the public are encouraged to provide their top priorities across categories in the comment box at the end of the survey.

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Given that development at the proposed scales is unprecedented in the M-2 Area and Belle Haven neighborhood, the City should be soliciting more detailed comments from residents.

*Consultant/City Response:* At previous workshops, the land use alternative maps have included comment cards on the back that allowed participants to provide detailed responses. These comment cards have been scanned and transcribed and their content is available to the public.

What are the existing and proposed commercial land uses in the M-2 Area?

*Consultant Response:* This question will be covered in depth as part of the discussion of the Draft Preferred Land Use Alternative map. The proposed land uses would potentially allow 2.5 million net new square feet of commercial space above what is currently allowed, with approximately two-thirds being office. Life science uses could potentially expand from 500,000 square feet, as currently planned, to 1 million square feet.

There currently appears to be a great deal happening in the M-2 Area, and it could therefore be helpful to think of three different communities in the area. These different communities could be Facebook east and west; the area west of Chilco Road, and the area east of Willow Road. Although what happens in each of the three areas may be different, all three of these communities should be self-sustaining.

*Consultant Response:* Feedback from the GPAC has significantly impacted what is being shown in the Draft Preferred Land Use Alternative, especially in the Bohannon area (west of Chilco). The economic feasibility of various uses and features have been discussed at previous workshops. Specifically, it has been determined that although more than one grocery store and pharmacy would not be feasible, there is sufficient demand to support two additional hotels in the Bohannon area.

When visual simulations are created, they should be as realistic as possible, and it appears the current simulations include a number of errors with regard to existing features or open space areas, and also show unrealistic street configurations for Willow Road.

*Consultant Response:* The visual simulations are not final, but will be reviewed in detail to ensure that the existing features shown comport with what is currently on the ground. Additionally, the street treatments shown are consistent with the preferences stated by the GPAC and are believe to be potentially realistic, even with existing physical constraints.

Placing housing near workplaces can potentially reduce commute trips and prevent new residences from adding to congestion on Willow. Nevertheless, Menlo Park will continue to shoulder traffic that is traveling between areas outside of Menlo Park, including traffic from areas being developed in Redwood City and overall traffic on the Dumbarton Bridge.

*Consultant Response:* If travelers think of Willow differently and not just as the way to get between the Dumbarton Bridge and Highway 101, in part because of changes to the character of the street, this could be part of the solution in concert with preventing commute trips by placing housing near employment.

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

At a recent presentation by Jeff Tumlin of Nelson\Nygaard, congestion was discussed from an entirely different perspective from what is customary. There are radical ways through which congestion on Willow could be dealt with, including by changing for what and whom Willow Road is prioritized for. If the character of the street is changed to support modes other than single-occupancy vehicles, this could help address traffic, especially during peak times.

Unless the Peninsula undertakes radical new approaches to housing and affordable housing, service employees are very likely to be commuting the M-2 Area by car from the East Bay.

Along Willow Road adjacent to the Mid-Pen housing site, there is currently an access road. This access road should be considered for creative new uses, such as a local-access bypass for Willow, or as a bicycle or pedestrian access route.

*Consultant Response:* There are continuity issues that could affect the ability to use the access road in these manners, but this could be studied in greater detail, including at the upcoming Transportation Commission meeting.

*Mid-Pen Response:* Mid-Pen is trying to decide how to address the street frontage along its Willow Road sites, with the goal of creating more secure sites, while also providing ground floor amenities on the 1300 block. Changing this to a pedestrian or bicycle cut through could negatively impact the ability to make the new housing site secure or the ability to incorporate retail frontage.

How can the land use, zoning, and/or design standards require a variety of building heights and modulations to avoid monolithic structures?

*Consultant Response:* As part of this process, design standards, which could require a variety of setbacks, heights, and other design aspects to increase variety, will be prepared for the Council's consideration.

As previously discussed, eighty percent of traffic passing through the Willow Road corridor is regional. Therefore the planning process must be realistic in terms of what can be achieved in terms of traffic by having people live in the M-2 Area. With current infrastructure, it would not be possible to accommodate the envisioned level of potential development. However, turning Bayfront into a true freeway is a project that could potentially serve to address these issues and divert traffic off of Willow and out of the Belle Haven neighborhood. Nevertheless, since these are regional problems, the fixes should be regional or State responsibilities rather than that of Menlo Park alone. Unfortunately, Menlo Park does not have the power to compel its neighboring municipalities to participate. In any event, support for increased development potentially is strongly contingent upon adequate improvements to infrastructure.

*Consultant Response:* Turning Bayfront into an freeway all the way to Marsh Road is one approach, but it is important to keep in mind that such increases in capacity can induce demand that results in renewed congestion. It is therefore also important to consider other creative solutions such as ultra-light rail, or new carpool lanes on the Dumbarton Bridge. If the impacts of new development would overwhelm existing infrastructure, and the creation of something like a true freeway at Bayfront would serve to mitigate it, this will become apparent during the EIR process.

A significant number of people coming over the Dumbarton Bridge are going to Palo Alto, which has a three-to-one jobs to housing ratio. Palo Alto is also interested in reducing the amount of driving because of the stress it puts on its roads and parking facilities. Redwood City has likewise taken steps toward implementing a traffic impact fee for Transportation Demand

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Management (TDM) services. Could future study look in greater detail at the extent to which traffic is going through specific neighborhood communities, and create targeted programs in collaboration with neighborhood communities?

*Consultant Response:* Low-tech solutions to some of these problems are currently available, such as improved signal timing. Irrespective of other potential traffic fixes, the advice of Jeff Tumlin of Nelson\Nygaard was to create a sense of place and the services that the community wants, and then to plan around that for the purposes of traffic. The purpose of a General Plan Update, especially one so geographically focused is to determine what sort of sense of place the community wants to create. If Willow Road is perceived as a place to be rather than just a place to get through, behaviors may shift. This will not on its own solve the problem, but could bring benefits to the area.

It is questionable whether this sense of place can be created if the problem of traffic has not been solved. It is imperative to be realistic about the role of infrastructure.

*Consultant Response:* A vision of Bayfront as a freeway is not necessarily incompatible with creating a sense of place in a new neighborhood surrounding Willow.

Specific comments have been received indicating that the signs indicating Willow Road as a route from 101 to the Dumbarton Bridge should be removed. Could this change be done separately and expedited ahead of the start of the interchange project?

*Consultant Response:* Caltrans is incorporating these comments as part of its work on the Highway 101/Willow interchange project. As they replace signs as part of this project, they will be seeking outside guidance. It is likely that if the project is requested to be done separately ahead of the interchange project, it is likely that Caltrans would respond that this is too expensive and request that the City of Menlo Park fund the project instead.

It is important for the new blocks created in the M-2 Area to not be super blocks and instead be at a pedestrian scale, incorporate an inviting pedestrian orientation overall, and provide connectivity for walking and biking. In addition to having a finer pedestrian grid than a roadway grid, pedestrian areas should incorporate attractive amenities such as high quality landscaping and benches.

*Consultant Response:* The current visual simulations include paseos and bicycle infrastructure that may not be readily apparent at this level of detail. The streets will be designed to discourage excessive vehicle circulation and promote a “park once” strategy. For pedestrians, it will be possible to walk around each of the buildings pictured.

The number of housing units being proposed has increased significantly since the start of the project. The proposed number of units can't be supported by the infrastructure and public services in the surrounding area, especially with regard to education and school capacity in the Ravenswood District. It is likely that parents will end up driving their children to private schools and/or to other extracurricular activities. Transportation problems should be fixed before any rezoning takes place.

What is being proposed on the 1300 block of Willow in the Preferred Land Use Alternative?

*Consultant Response:* The rendering reflects input from Mid-Pen with regard to the height and bulk of structures. The proposal for this area would be comparable to the program from the 1200 block of Willow. It was understood that due to the sensitivity of adjacent single-family homes, there would only be three stories at the rear of the site, but that the front of the site could include up to four stories with ground floor retail or services. The rendering also reflects the anticipated 24-foot utility easement along Willow.

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Although new housing could contribute to new impacts, there is a benefit to having housing instead of industrial and employment uses since housing tends to generate less traffic on its own. Additionally, by adding housing to these areas, there is an opportunity to create a sense of place and improve the quality of life for Belle Haven residents.

With 4,500 new units and two people per unit, this would result in 10,000 new residents in the vicinity of Belle Haven. Even if eighty percent of these people do not drive to work, this will still create a significant amount of new traffic.

New development will create property tax increments that can help fund improvements for the area. New development in the area also reflects an opportunity to improve the Ravenswood school district, which has just completed a study of its needs for capital improvements.

At earlier points in the process, there were discussions of using transferrable development rights (TDR) to limit the scale of new buildings in certain areas. Using this approach could provide economic incentives while at the same time limiting and regulating growth. The Draft Preferred Alternative being presented appears to max out the building envelopes, including as part of a desire to increase the amount of square footage for life sciences. Given that there are new approaches for things such as computational genetics, why is it necessary to devote so much space to life sciences? Pursuing an increased development program in life sciences is a cause for concern because it is possible that changes in the economy or public opinion could lead us to regret these development decisions in the future.

*Consultant / Industry Representative Response:* Part of what has occurred recently as part of the planning process is a new sense that it is important to allow for a life sciences cluster that could have positive impacts such as increased revenue generation for the City and synergies with the other nearby uses. The current portfolio of life sciences uses in the M-2 Area includes five of the top 25 revenue-generating commercial ventures in Menlo Park. Menlo Park currently has a life sciences start up community. As those firms grow, they can go from 5,000, to 10,000, to 100,000 square feet of laboratory space. Approximately one-third of firms go from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet, and approximately one-third of those go on to 10,000 square feet. It is important to provide space for a range of firm sizes and to ensure that there are places where growing firms can move when they graduate to larger floor areas. Promoting creation of a cluster in this area would support the retention of existing firms, help create a critical mass of similar firms that promotes long term sustainability, and increase potential for future revenue generation. In part because Facebook has purchased a large amount of available land, without allowing for denser life sciences uses, it is likely that these firms will relocate to other cities across the region. Finally, Facebook considers life science uses to be a positive element to a symbiotic commercial community.

This approach to land use, development, and zoning represents something entirely new for Menlo Park. The City will have to carefully consider how this is different from past practice, including recent specific plans. How will these policies be articulated and how will new development subsequently be governed in a manner that ensures that promises to the community are fulfilled?

*Consultant / City Response:* New zoning could be flexible in certain respects and not in others. Given the uniqueness of the area and the planned approach, it will be necessary to ensure that zoning is designed to be clear, enforceable, and adaptable. Zoning designations will be about more than community benefits, but also the sort of activities and uses that are wanted.

The names being used to describe the various areas that are part of the M-2 Area do not adequately reflect the presence and desires of nearby residents. There should be a greater sensitivity to the people who live and work in these areas, including the hardships they face in having to deal with significant congestion to get around the city. 10,000 new residents will have negative impacts on traffic and on the ability of the Ravenswood school district to serve students. The Belle Haven and M-2 Areas will

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

need significant community programs and infrastructure far beyond what is proposed in order to make the area more self-sufficient and enable people to stay within the area for their needs.

Although the concerns of neighbors with regard to new housing are understandable, there are approaches that can help mitigate this problem. For example, unbundling parking costs from rental or ownership costs can help ensure that not every housing unit results in two new cars in the area. It is possible to create multi-unit housing that includes creative traffic solutions, such as shuttles. Shuttles are currently inadequate, so there is a significant opportunity to improve those services. Additionally, with more residents living in Belle Haven, new services and amenities will be attracted to the area. In a similar vein, new residents could help support and improve the Ravenswood school district. Although the Ravenswood district is currently experiencing problems, the staff and local leadership are doing tremendous work. Having residents and council members who are deeply invested in the quality and success of the district will help it to improve, benefiting all students. Redwood City and Mountain View were two cities with high housing costs that previously were seen as having underperforming school districts, but in a relatively short amount of time they have seen significant improvements. Parents are not all sending their children to private schools, and are instead sending their kids to public schools and working to ensure those schools improve. Involved parents and new residents are among those most likely to contribute to the improvement of the school district. With regard to housing, there is a tension between the provision of new and affordable housing and the impacts of new residents. There is a strong sense that there is not enough affordable housing in Menlo Park or in Belle Haven, but there is also concern that too much new affordable housing is being placed in Belle Haven. This project presents an exciting opportunity to incorporate affordable housing. The GPAC should be creative with regard to affordable housing and should consider diverse, previous unconsidered approaches to housing in Belle Haven.

The GPAC adopted guiding principles that included provisions about preventing displacement and creating housing that is affordable to people who work in the community. Housing affordability and displacement is also a health concern. People are displaced from their homes or neighborhoods face negative health outcomes, including those associated with longer commutes and less exercise. As the General Plan process continues, there should be a strong commitment among leadership to adopt policies that will support those values. Some potential policies include a no-net-loss policy for the Belle Haven neighborhood with regard to affordable housing. When the planned development takes place in the M-2 Area, there will certainly be new development in the Belle Haven neighborhood. Another policy approach would be to create fees that reflect the linkage between new commercial development and the need for affordable housing. San Mateo County is currently conducting a nexus study to enable the adoption of such fees. Another policy would be for housing in the surrounding areas to reflect the mix that currently exists in the Belle Haven neighborhood. Belle Haven and the M-2 should include housing that can accommodate and is affordable to everyone who works there, as well as families and seniors; this would include units at a variety of square footages and numbers of bedrooms. Unbundled parking costs are another strategy for improving housing affordability.

Is the large building shown along the east side of Chilco near Hamilton and existing structure? Would it be redeveloped as part of the new plan?

*Consultant Response:* This is an existing structure that would not be replaced as part of this plan; however, the interior would be renovated and reused by Facebook.

Is there sufficient demand for hotels in the M-2 area? How will these hotels be designed and will they be “aesthetically pleasing?” How could the City potentially benefit from taxes from hotel uses?

*Consultant / Property Owner Response:* There is significant pent up demand for hotel space in the M-2 area. People who come to visit or work temporarily at tech firms are currently using hotels along Highway 101 in Palo Alto, or even

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

further afield. Hotels produce transient occupancy tax, which is a high tax that can offer significant benefits for the city. Business travelers prefer to be near the businesses they are visiting. If you place hotels in the area, these travelers will have easier access to nearby businesses, which will encourage them to potentially walk or take shuttles as opposed to driving. Additionally, putting in hotels can help change the character of any area to create a better sense of place, as well as support surrounding retail and restaurants.

There is an understanding that new development can be a cause for concern, especially when it is a significant departure from what currently exists. It is important to remember, however, that the complete buildout of the adopted plans will be 10 to 20 years in the future. Additionally, the plan and individual projects will still be subject to the will of the residents of Menlo Park. The General Plan Update and M-2 Area project has had the positive effect of creating a great deal of interest and involvement from Belle Haven residents, and developers want to work with neighbors to create well-tailored projects and solutions for impacts.

It is very important for the process to prioritize the consideration of affordable housing and preventing displacement. Including affordable housing in projects and/or charging linkage fees are important approaches to consider. The overall amount of housing is another important aspect to consider: If there are 10,000 new jobs in the area, but only 2,000 new housing units, half of which are reserved as affordable housing, you'll have 10,000 people chasing 1,000 units on the open market and outbidding people who already live in the neighborhood. Having additional housing is one of the ways to protect housing affordability.

If the Dumbarton rail project is completed, providing quick access to Downtown Redwood City, some of the community programs targeted for Belle Haven could make use of facilities in Downtown Redwood City instead of less readily accessible portions of Menlo Park.

Assuming 4,500 units of housing and 5,300 jobs, with 1.25 employed residents per household allows for rough parity between jobs and housing. Incentivizing workers, including Facebook workers, to live in nearby housing rather than farther away will be very important to reducing impacts associated with traffic. Having the full development projections in context will make the potential tradeoffs and synergies more apparent.

Prior to the next GPAC meeting, there should be presentation slides created that are devoted to housing. When people are informed of 4,500 units of housing and see dramatic renderings, it makes them uncomfortable. Moving forward, it will be necessary to see more specific data about unit types and other expectations in order to reinforce the connection between housing and jobs, and the subsequent potential to alleviate traffic.

The increase in the number of housing units is a problem, especially since this area is already the densest part of Menlo Park both with regard to units and the number of residents per unit. The population increase associated with this new development will have significant affects with regard to the provision of water, sewer, and other public services, as well as broadband access and emergency response. Thinking about all of these problems holistically needs to be part of the process moving forward.

*Consultant Response:* All of these concerns will be integrated into the CEQA process, which considers all of these topics. The environmental analysis will begin as soon as the Council selects a Preferred Land Use Alternative.

Given that the Draft Land Use Alternative comes before City Council on April 7 and that the community programs survey is not complete until April 8<sup>th</sup>, won't the City Council have insufficient information to make a decision? Does the community programs survey address the scale of development or the placement of particular land uses?

*Consultant / City Response:* The community has been reviewing potential development along each step in the process. The City has provided comment cards on the backs of maps given to the public to solicit comments with regard to

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

future land uses, including building intensities. The community programs survey is related, but different than the land use map, which is the focus of the study session. The community programs survey seeks to determine how the community as a whole prioritizes the many ideas that were voiced during the process. The results will help determine which programs and projects should be funded first as a result of new development in the area.

A lot of residents are using the NextDoor website, which should be considered as an adjunct to the ConnectMenlo website. NextDoor allows people to connect with others in the neighborhood and to see what's going on in adjacent neighborhoods. The website is great for local issues, and could it be opened up for use in a broader conversation?

*Consultant/City Response:* The spirit and architecture of the NextDoor website are such that it is not a fully public forum, with visibility of topics restricted to certain neighborhoods. Having the site broadcast to the entire city or world at large about what is happening in a particular neighborhood would violate the spirit of the website. Nevertheless, the City has been making sure to post notices on NextDoor, so that people who use that site are informed of the process and upcoming meetings.

Building tall buildings right along Willow Road could result in undesirable urban canyons and could expose residents to impacts related to being adjacent to heavy traffic.

If the maximum allowed height is eight stories, there is a risk that all developments will attempt to max out at eight stories. Although it would be acceptable for life sciences to go to six stories, eight would be excessive. Is there a compelling reason for sites to be allowed to go to eight stories?

*Consultant Response:* Whether the GPAC is comfortable with six or eight stories people a, creating a successful, humane place will rely on design standards that inform the development pattern in such way that you can't have a monolithic structure. Heights could vary between four and eight stories with a six-story average, thereby allowing developments to have flexibility and create topography within their sites and the larger area. It will be important for the City Council to set a maximum development envelope so that the total amounts of new development can be evaluated as part of the EIR process. After the greater development potential is evaluated, these items will return to the GPAC, Council, and Planning Commission, along with zoning and design standards. Development could be dialed back at this point, but EIR analysis of more development promotes informed discussion of benefits.

Some members of the GPAC note an opposition to taller buildings and a discomfort with the expansion of life sciences uses.

Support for increased building height is contingent upon the content of design standards, especially with regard to massing and modulation and what the experience is for the pedestrian. A good pedestrian experience can help to mitigate impacts from sense of height.

Given that the process is considering significant increases to height and development potential, it is important that these increases in value not be given away. One approach would be to create local density bonus policies that allow for developers to include additional height only as a reward for providing some other amenity or supporting some community program.

This represents the one opportunity to evaluate the potential for the area at eight stories. If the EIR examines something less, it will not be feasible to go back and try to determine what economic or community benefits were foregone. There is no cost to the community in analyzing the greater potential. Other cities in the region are moving forward, and not taking a forward thinking approach could result in Menlo Park losing out. All options should be considered.

Design standards should be integrated into zoning, and the City Council should consider regulation of air rights to address building heights and variation in heights.

## GPAC MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Allowing eight-story buildings west of Chilco Street is very different from allowing eight-story buildings east of Willow Road. These areas are very distinct and it might be instructive to view the M-2 Area as three distinct areas, such as M-2a, 2b, etc. Rather than look at it as a single area, it should be seen as multiple areas and the zoning should reflect this.

Taller buildings may seem less imposing if they are mixed use and have attractive pedestrian-oriented uses at ground level. In any event, a uniform 8 stories would severely overburden the area. In any event, building heights must be varied, and 8 stories should only be an option for residential buildings.

*Consultant Response:* The GPAC could specify a range of acceptable maximum heights from 4 to 8 stories, with an average of six. These decisions will shape the Preferred Land Use Alternative that the City will use for the EIR Notice of Preparation, and the Preferred Alternative will not return to the GPAC for further consideration; however, goals, polices, and programs, as well as zoning standards and other regulations would come back before the GPAC. There is currently only one non-residential building expected to reach a height of 8 stories, all other potential 8-story buildings will be residential and this will be addressed through additional context in policies and zoning.

The following items were part of the GPAC consensus that was reached at the conclusion of the meeting (any dissent is noted below, but is not attributed to specific GPAC members):

- Potential development for life sciences uses should be expanded to the north side of O'Brien Drive from previous iterations of the Draft Preferred Land Use Alternative. *(One dissenter)*
- Permissible heights for structures for life sciences uses in the area east of Willow Road should range from 3 to 6 stories, with a 2-story maximum along O'Brien Drive adjacent to the East Palo Alto Border.
- In the area east of Willow Road, the maximum development potential associated with the Preferred Land Use Alternative to be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report should assume a range of building heights between 3 and 8 stories, with an average building height of 5.5 stories. 8 stories would be available almost exclusively for residential buildings. *(Several dissenters based on heights above 6 stories.)*