



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
February 4, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler, Eiref (arrived 7:03 p.m.; departed 8:57 p.m.), Ferrick (Chair), Kadvany (Vice Chair – arrived 7:06 p.m.), O'Malley, Onken, Riggs

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner; Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. Housing Element – Community Workshops – January 29 and 30, 2013

Planner Rogers said two Community Workshops recently held on the Housing Element were well attended. He said on March 5 there would be a City Council study session on the Housing Element Update, and on March 12, the City Council would provide direction on rezoning needed to effectuate the Housing Element.

- b. 1976 Menalto Avenue – City Council Appeal – February 12, 2013
- c. 2200 Sand Hill Road – City Council Appeal – February 12, 2013

Planner Rogers noted two applications approved by the Planning Commission in 2012 that were appealed to the City Council. He said appeals of the use permit, variance approval, and heritage tree removal permit for 1976 Menalto Avenue and the standby generator approval for 2200 Sand Hill Road would be considered by the Council at their February 12 meeting.

Chair Ferrick noted that Commissioner Eiref had arrived.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. CONSENT

- c1. Approval of minutes from the January 7, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Ferrick to approve the minutes as submitted.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Kadvany not yet in attendance.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

- D1. Use Permit/Sepi Agah/1011 Seymour Lane: Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot depth in the R-1-S (Residential Suburban) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Perata said staff had no additional comments.

Commissioner Kadvany arrived.

Public Comment: Mr. Jack McCarthy, project designer, said the existing structure was in poor condition and they intended to demolish and rebuild. He said they had sent letters and full plan sets to the adjoining neighbors. He said the only concern expressed was about the street, a private road.

Chair Ferrick asked if they had talked to the neighbors about the street. Mr. McCarthy said that the property owners on the street were responsible for the street. He said any damages done because of construction would be repaired; he noted the street was in poor repair, and they would need to work with the neighbors on the project.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs commented on the size of the proposed home, number of gables, fake shutters that would not close, stone surface applied to the entry wall, and an odd mix of French Chateau style with composition shingles. He acknowledged the proposal was the applicant's ideal home design and since the City had no design guidelines, this project met the written criteria in the zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Eiref said he had similar reservations about the project but there had been no correspondence from the neighbors nor were any present this evening.

Chair Ferrick asked when the letters and plan sheets were mailed to the neighbors. Mr. McCarthy said he mailed those prior to the City's first announcement of the project application as he did not want the neighbors to hear first from the City about the project,

as he wanted them to bring questions or concerns to him. Chair Ferrick noted that would have been about two to three weeks ago.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if any of the neighbors had expressed concern about the narrower windows proposed for this house, noting they seemed very narrow. Mr. McCarthy said there had not been any.

Commissioner Onken noted the footprint was substantially smaller than the previous house and other homes in the neighborhood, and thought that was a satisfactory tradeoff for the height and bulk. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Bressler seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Bressler to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

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 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 Jack McCarthy Designer, Inc., consisting of 11 plan sheets, dated received January 18, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 4, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, 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 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*** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the plans to identify the location and size of an appropriate heritage tree replacement, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and City Arborist.

Motion carried 5-0-2 with Commissioners Eiref and Riggs abstaining.

D2. Use Permit/Michael Davis, D&Z Design Associates, Inc./1325 Garden Lane:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and subsequently construct a new two-story single-family residence including a basement with light wells that encroach into the required interior side yard and rear yard setbacks on a substandard lot with regard to lot width, lot depth and lot size in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district. One heritage pear tree measuring 16 inches in diameter, one coast live oak measuring 10.5 inches in diameter, and one two-pronged bay laurel measuring a total of 18.5 inches in diameter are proposed for removal as part of the project.

Staff Comment: Planner Grossman said there were two additional pieces of material for the Commission. She said the same materials were available to the public at the rear table. She said one was a letter from a Menlo Park resident received by staff this morning and the other letter from the applicant's geotechnical engineer in regards to the excavation. She said the square footage for the garage on page 2 of the staff report should read 573.1 noting it was correct on the first page of the staff report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Onken asked about the side setback noting that the basement stair and hand railing would encroach in the side setback. Planner Grossman said that was not something that required a variance request for an encroachment into a setback. She said the use permit would allow excavation eight feet into in the required 15-foot side setback.

Commissioner Riggs said it appeared that Tree #7, a Coast Live Oak, was to be removed. He said on sheet A1.0 and A1.1 of the larger plan set there was a tree schedule and it indicated Tree #7 was a Canary Pine. He asked for confirmation of the location and type of Tree #7. Planner Grossman said the arborist confirmed that Tree #7 was a Coast Live Oak.

Public Hearing: Mr. Michael Davis, D&Z Design Associates, said the property owners were also present. He said there were large heritage trees on the property including a sycamore tree on the left, and oak and laurel trees in the front. He said they wanted to preserve those trees and the design had a slanted wall at that location to save the sycamore tree. He said they moved the garage to the shorter property line side of the house and put the master bedroom in the back corner. He said they held a meeting with neighbors to review design proposals. He said nearly all of the most adjacent neighbors attended. He said they kept the second story design to a minimum so that it was only 25% of the first floor footprint. He said there were two bedrooms and two bathrooms on the second story and the windows in the bedrooms only look to the front yard with higher windows to the rear or back of the property with sill heights at five-foot eight-inches above the floor. He said a large window at the stairwell was screened by the sycamore tree. He said the distance from the second level to the rear home was 79 feet and to the left side was 40 feet, He said they would have two 24-inch box ornamental pear trees replacing the trees to be removed from the back of the property. He said there were quite a few more trees proposed in their landscape plan.

Ms. Edith Rubison, Menlo Park, said she was not opposed to the project. She said she had made an error in her letter to the Planning Commission, because she had not received a notification about the project from the City on November 21, 2012. She said a neighbor showed her the notification card on January 31, 2013, which was the evening before which she had to file a final letter for the Commission. She suggested tightening up City procedures for submitting notice of application to residents. She said the light well encroached beyond the legal recommendation for the setback and she was concerned there might be some resultant damage from that excavation to either her home or pool. She said she would like assurance from the builders or owners that they would be fully responsible for any damage that occurred. She said the applicants proposed to tear down a fence that enclosed a pool in her front yard. She said her homeowners' insurance policy requires that the pool always be enclosed. She said when they took down the fence she would want them to enclose the pool securely. She said about one third of the heritage sycamore hung over into her property. She said the prior owners used to trim the tree routinely every two years so it was not a nuisance to them or her family. She said sycamores of that generation get a fungal disease characterized by constant leaf drop. She said leaves and twigs constantly fall into her pool keeping the filters clogged. She requested since the sycamore was not proposed for removal that it be pruned severely beyond what was typical as it had not been pruned in 10 years because the property owners had been severely ill.

Mr. David Takamoto said he was representing Ms. Maggie Young, who was out of the country. He thanked Mr. Steve Douglas, Bob Taylor Homes, for explaining the project well at a neighborhood meeting. He said the proposed project was fine noting the two story element was toward the front of the lot. He said their main concerns were views and screening. He said regarding the rear fence that Ms. Young would like the same design but the fence replaced. He said a nine-foot tall hedge was indicated on the rear property line, and they wanted to know what type of hedge it would be and how tall when first installed. He said that the 24-inch box trees would grow to 40-feet tall but asked how tall they would be initially. He said Ms. Young has allergy and asthma problems and was concerned with the excavation and dust.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Ferrick asked about the postcard notification for the project. Planner Grossman said they did the standard notification process for the project and she had verified that Ms. Rubison's name was on the application notices. She said Ms. Rubison had sent comments on November 17, 2012 and on January 30, 2013 that she had not received the project notifications. Planner Grossman said Ms. Rubison's property was within the 300-foot radius for the seven-day notice and the public hearing notice. She said unfortunately sometimes the notices get lost in the mail. She said fortunately Ms. Rubison was able to present written comments for the Commission to consider.

Chair Ferrick asked about the sycamore tree. Planner Grossman said she had discussed with Ms. Rubison and the applicant that there was a process for expanded pruning through a Heritage Tree Removal Permit for pruning in excess of 25% of the tree canopy. She said she discussed this with the City arborist who indicated that he could not recommend approval for a request for removal as the sycamore tree was in good health. She said landscape plans were not required for single-family residences. She said the site plan indicated there would be three heritage tree replacements as required by the heritage tree removal ordinance. She said the applicant was aware that a nine-foot hedge would not be permissible except through a special acceptance through use permit process, and they had indicated they were amenable to a seven-foot high hedge or fence in that location to comply with zoning ordinance requirements.

Chair Ferrick said Mr. Takamoto had also asked about the 24-inch boxed trees' initial height. Mr. Davis said those would be 10-foot in height. Chair Ferrick asked if he had discussed the rear fence with the neighbors. Mr. Davis said excavation dirt would be removed daily and not piled, and there was a dust control ordinance with which the builders would comply. He said they would like to have further interaction with Ms. Young and Mr. Takamoto in terms of the fence style. He said two of the 24-inch box trees would be planted in the rear and would screen the view as they grew to their 40-inch height. He said the pool would be enclosed at all times. He said regarding the basement along the left side that they were seven feet away from the property line and the letter the Commission received this evening was from the geotechnical engineer

assuring there would be problem to Ms. Rubison's home. He said the light well size was to allow light to the basement and to meet ventilation and egress codes. He said the sycamore tree was in good health and the subject property owner had spoken with Ms. Rubison about hiring a tree surgeon. He said if the pruning that was needed exceeded the 25% limit on the canopy removal then a heritage removal permit would be sought.

Chair Ferrick said the letter from the geotechnical engineer did not give full assurance and asked who would be responsible if there was damage to the neighbor's property from the excavation. Mr. Davis said it would be the builder and subject property owners' responsibilities.

Commissioner Riggs noted he was looking at the wrong plan set related to the Tree #7 earlier and apologized. He asked about requiring pollard pruning of the sycamore. Planner Grossman asked that the City Arborist be allowed to review what pruning would be needed and how significant.

Commissioner Riggs said regarding excavation for the light well that the problem was not the distance to the setback but excavating to place the forms for the retaining wall. He said it would help to know what the shoring method would be or the Commission could state what the minimum distance would need to be for any grade cut.

Mr. Steve Douglas, Bob Taylor Homes, said the plan would use shoring of either stitch piers or I-beams, and either steel plates or timbers. He said it would be a totally vertical cut. He said they would need a couple of feet even with that as they would need to lay drain rock and pipe to waterproof the wall. He said that dashed line was shown on the plan to show the extent and was at about four and a half feet. Commissioner Riggs said from his perspective that addressed the concerns.

Commissioner Riggs said he appreciated the integrity of the style noting the concrete roof tiles. He said the neighborhood however was characterized by wood siding but noted that the City did not have design guidelines for style. He said this home was designed with consistent materials and details so he was inclined to support it.

Commissioner Onken said he proposed adding a condition of approval to assure that when the permit was issued and construction began that the boundary treatment to the two new fences on either side were installed and completed before excavation started to address dust and other neighbor concerns. He moved to approve the findings with an additional condition of approval that before excavation occurred that new wood fences along the perimeter were complete and signed off. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion.

Planner Grossman suggested they confer with the applicant about the feasibility of that added condition.

Commissioner Onken said if they were stitch piling they did not need to trespass on neighbors' properties and at the least they should install temporary Harris chain link fence. Mr. Douglas said there were two distinct phases beginning with the demolition and tree removals which were located near the fences. Commissioner Onken suggested the extra mile for the neighbors would be to install the fences immediately after demolition and tree removal. Mr. Douglas said that would be more practical to do after the first phase and before excavation to build began.

Commissioner Riggs asked for a friendly amendment to have the applicant work with staff to have the sycamore tree pruned. He noted Ms. Rubison's concern about privacy screening and that the applicant had indicated a mature sycamore tree provided the screening. He said however that type of tree was deciduous and for half the year would have no leaves. He said Ms. Rubison's home looks directly at this project and has a clerestory that would face the upper story windows. He requested that new evergreen landscaping be coordinated along the property line.

Mr. Davis said he was confused as Ms. Rubison did not have privacy concerns. Commissioner Riggs said there was a mention in the staff report about privacy concerns for that adjacent site. He said it seemed that the second story would have an unabated view into the clerestory of Ms. Rubison's home. Mr. Davis noted he was speaking about the stair well area.

Chair Ferrick noted that Commissioner Riggs was looking at plan sheet A.5, left side, south side elevation.

Mr. Christopher Kinkle, landscape architect, said related to that side property line they have a general plan identifying where paving and planting areas were. He said there was a continuous four-foot strip along there. He said they intended to put shrubs and other plant materials to screen the fence and they could possibly plant some small trees. He said they certainly could work with the neighbor to choose plant material that would suit her comfort level.

Commissioner Riggs said his friendly amendment would be to install landscaping on the left side working with staff, and for staff to investigate pollard the sycamore. He said he supported the motion and amendment to require installation of fencing before excavation began.

Chair Ferrick confirmed Commissioners Onken and O'Malley's agreement with Commissioner Riggs' amendment. She noted the applicants' outreach to the neighbors, which was a model she wished everyone would follow.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/O'Malley to approve the item with the following modifications.

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 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 DZ Design Associates, Inc., consisting of 15 plan sheets, dated received January 22, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 4, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, 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 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. Concurrent with submittal of a complete building permit application, the site plan shall be revised to specify that the excavation for the sunken patio located within the rear yard setback shall not exceed 12 inches, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Concurrent with demolition permit submittal, the demolition plans shall specify that new permanent fencing shall be constructed along the left side and rear property lines at the conclusion of the demolition work, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit documentation verifying installation of the new permanent fencing along the left side and rear property lines, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***
 - c. Concurrent with submittal of a complete building permit application, the site plan shall be revised to include new evergreen landscape screening elements along the left side property line, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***
 - d. The applicant and adjacent left side neighbor are encouraged to review pruning options for the London plane tree (Tree #1) with the City Arborist and Planning Division. Permitted pruning of this tree may, concurrent with submittal of a complete building permit, be incorporated into the project plans and arborist report, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 7-0.

- D3. **Use Permit/Dan Rhoads/1330 Hoover Street:** Request for use permit approval for the demolition of an existing single-story, single-family residence and a detached garage and the construction of two new two-story, single-family residences on a substandard lot, in terms of lot width, in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. As part of this proposal, three heritage pine trees on the front left corner of the adjacent right-hand parcel (1326 Hoover Street) with diameters of between 22 and 27 inches are proposed to be removed.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said there was one additional piece of correspondence distributed to the Commission and available to the public. He said the letter was from Ms. Judy Lucia. He said he had spoken with her today about her concerns with the removal of trees on the adjacent property where she resides. He said the property owner of 1326 Hoover Street worked with the applicant for 1330 Hoover Street to have the trees removed as their root systems were causing buckling on both properties. He said the trees would be replaced.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Eiref said he thought that the tree removal on the adjacent property was an odd request. Planner Rogers said it was not a typical request but the 1326 Hoover Street property owner has had issues with the trees buckling the sidewalk and the subject property's driveway was also impacted similarly.

Commissioner Eiref said the neighbor was requesting a Heritage Tree Removal Permit which the City Arborist had reviewed and tentatively approved pending the Planning Commission's action on this use permit request.

Commissioner Kadvany asked if the heritage tree regulations had language related to root impact that was particularly injurious to sidewalks or was that a judgment of the property owner. Planner Rogers said there was language related to damage caused on properties by trees, and was one of the factors for consideration. He said the City Arborist was the deciding body with appeal rights to the City's Environmental Quality Commission and City Council. He said it does not have a required dollar amount or quantitative factor.

Commissioner Onken said on sheet A1.1 the tree schedule listed trees not on the property and were not really the project, and that should be noted.

Chair Ferrick said on sheet A1.2 there was a photograph of 1330 Hoover Street residence and asked if the trees shown in the third photograph down were the neighboring trees. Planner Rogers said that was the case.

Public Comment: Mr. Dan Rhoads, Borlik and Young Architects, said that the Heritage Tree Removal Permit for the trees on the neighboring project had been initiated by that property owner but had been co-signed by the applicants for the subject project. He said approval of this project however was not contingent upon the removal of the trees on the neighboring property. He noted that the property owners for both properties were present. He distributed an informational handout with photographs to the Commission.

Mr. Rhoads said the adjacent property was a two-story, 10-unit apartment building with an underground parking garage. He said that property currently has 22 Canary pines located around the perimeter on two sides. He said the size of the trees ranged from 22 to 27-inches in diameter and 50 to 60 feet in height. He said nine of the trees shared a common property line with the subject property. He said the root zones of Trees #1, 2 and 3 on the adjacent parcel were causing damage to pavement improvements there. He said for the subject property it was primarily the roots of Tree #2 causing significant heaving in the driveway. He said the concern was the long term stability of the proposed driveway for this project and the impact on the root zone of that tree and its health from the construction. He said Tree #2 had been the point of the outreach to the adjacent property owners and both sides were interested in the removal of the three trees. He said the first sheet of the handout was a color version of the Heritage Tree Removal Permit that provided more detail than the black and white version in the staff report. He said it demonstrated how heavily wooded that side of the property was. He

said the next sheet was an aerial view of the two properties noting considerable tree canopy and street tree canopy. He said there were four magnolia trees between the properties along the frontage, a mulberry tree mid-lot that would be preserved, and a ring of English laurels proposed for perimeter plantings to provide hedge screening for privacy.

Chair Ferrick asked if the laurels would be located where the three trees were proposed for removal. Mr. Rhoads said there was some desire to not have them planted in the same location because of the existing constrained nature and that some other species might work better there. He said they were also thinking that one of the trees might be planted on the subject property.

Chair Ferrick asked about the height of the street trees along the front of the two properties noting the resident's concern about resultant loss of shade and increased heat because of the tree removal. Mr. Rhoads said the four street magnolia trees were in the 35 to 40 foot height range.

Mr. Rhoads said the block was zoned R-3 and all of Hoover Street was the apartment district noting it was close to downtown. He said the area was quite mixed development with apartment buildings, condos and single-family residences. He said the lot was 9,200 square feet and was almost large enough for three units based on the density but the lot had a 35-foot width which made it substandard. He said to the left of the subject property was a 2,000 square foot, five-bedroom, two-story single-family residence from the 1930s era. He said on the other side was the 10-unit apartment with two to three bedroom units from the 1970s era. He said to the rear was the Menlo Park Inn, a two-story hotel, and a small sliver of the subject property that abutted to the commercial building on the corner of El Camino Real and Valparaiso Avenue. He said across the street was a five-unit development of attached and detached homes that share a common driveway court.

Mr. Rhoads said the project would be two new, two-story single family residences and would be compatible with the neighborhood. He said there would be a low roofline with the Cape Cod style noting the first story eave line lent scale to the sidewalk. He said the roofline was interesting but still allowed for full use of the second story space. He said the rear home was designed to be complementary but not exactly alike. He said the two garages were designed to mirror each other. He said they were able to take advantage of the deep lot and have pedestrian friendly streetscapes and put parking to the rear of the property. He said there was parking parity in that each residence would have a three-point turn and a straight turn, with one having a three-point turn to exit the garage and the other having a three point turn to enter the garage. He summarized that the project would be a complementary addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas Zula said he had sent an email that day to staff about his stand on the development project. He said other neighbors felt similarly about this project. He said as a neighbor at 1326 Hoover Street he objected to the plan to have large old heritage

trees removed for the convenience of the 1330 project. He said removal of the classical heritage trees would remove a wind break, a natural sun shade and furthermore would expose his home to more extreme temperature shifts. He said this would increase their heating and cooling costs. He said they were on the second floor and the new view from their deck after removal of the heritage trees would be of exposed telephone and power lines rather than green tree branches that provided natural shade, some measure of privacy and more moderate living conditions for their second story home. He said they did not object to the construction of a new home but the removal of heritage trees and the benefit they bring to the environment. He suggested the applicant explore alternative options that would not detract from the character of the neighborhood and the stable desirable neighborhood with respect for heritage trees. He said there was some discussion about replacement trees but it was not mentioned what type, where they would be located and when that would be accomplished. He said if there was a good solution that was fine. He said he wanted to reiterate that every neighbor he has spoken with did not want to see the trees removed as proposed.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner O'Malley said the three trees were not part of the subject property and he wondered why the Commission was being asked to make a judgment on those trees. Planner Rogers said one of the three trees spanned both properties, although trunks were on the adjacent property. He said the property owners of the two parcels have agreed on the removal of the trees due to the damage inflicted by the roots of the trees and future impacts to the project driveway and impact of that driveway on the tree. He said the Planning Commission could not formally act on Heritage Tree Removal Permits. He said however there were options. He said the Commission could approve the overall project at which time the Arborist could approve the Permit and there was an appeal process in place for that. Commissioner O'Malley said the Commission could act on the project and not act on the proposed tree removal. Planner Rogers said that was one avenue or there could be a condition related to keeping the trees and taking preservation measures.

Commissioner Kadvany said he looked at the trees and driveway and walkway and did not think the damage was excessive. He said they were attractive trees and were part of a row of trees that ranged from the front of the lot to the rear lot. He said also the paving was reparable. He said the request was reasonable but it had significant tradeoff. He said he liked that the building would not be dominated by the garage in the front and applauded the design. He said he also liked the parking courtyard. He said design standards might give the City more attractive homes like this proposed design.

Commissioner Eiref said he would leave the tree removal request to the City's Environmental Quality Control Commission. He said he liked the cottage design.

Commissioner Bressler said he wanted to thank the resident who spoke so eloquently about preserving the trees. He thought the Commission should use some of its

authority to preserve the trees. He said he agreed with Commissioner Kadvany on the trees.

Commissioner Riggs said the design was desirable and welcome. He said he felt regret that the deal was made to lose the pines. He said they were very tall and seemed to be very healthy. He said one tree was within 12-feet of the existing apartment building; the second tree in was about 16 to 18 feet from the foundation, and the front tree was perhaps 30 feet from the foundation. He said when a tree gets under a foundation that would break the building but when a sidewalk gets lifted that was not a reason to remove the tree. He said the sidewalk should be repaired. He expressed real regret that the three trees were proposed for removal and hoped the arborist would change his mind if not about all three trees at least about the two front ones. He said it was good to see an R-3 lot with two homes.

Chair Ferrick said she agreed with everything and did not want to hold up the use permit approval. She said she did not agree with removal of the three trees. She said there were alternative paving methods that might be more easily repairable. She said the buildings were very nicely designed and liked the parking turnaround solutions.

Commissioner Onken asked in terms of the Housing Element Update if this was an area for greater density or if it was built out as much as it could be. Planner Rogers said this project had to be considered under the current ordinance. He said he did not believe they had gotten to the specificity of infill strategies around the downtown area in the Housing Element Update.

Commissioner Eiref said the neighbor who spoke indicated that they did not know about the project until very recently. He asked about notification. Planner Rogers said the legal responsibility was to notify the property owners; he said in most cases they also have addresses for tenants/residents. Commissioner Eiref said he would like to put an amendment to encourage the applicants to preserve the trees. Planner Rogers said the Heritage Tree Removal Permits were made at the discretion of the City Arborist. He said when a project was development related the Arborist conducted an initial review and provided a tentative action to approve or deny the permit. He said the City Arborist then waits on the final decision until the Commission's action on the overall design because one of the factors in his final action was what the Commission had found. He said if the Commission made a condition to require a change to the plan to require that all three, two or one of the trees be retained that information would be incorporated into the City Arborist's decision.

Commissioner O'Malley asked what the resolution would be if the Commission placed that condition but the Arborist disagreed. Planner Rogers said he did not know if there was a precedent for that. He said appeal rights on Heritage Tree Removal Permits stand whether the Arborist approves the permit or whether it was something the Planning Commission saw or not. He said there were notices of proposed heritage tree

removals to neighbors and they could appeal the permit approval to the Environmental Quality Commission and subsequently to the City Council.

Chair Ferrick noted for the resident of 1326 Hoover Street that beyond whatever was decided by the Commission the residents could appeal the decision on the Heritage Tree Removal Permit.

Commissioner O'Malley said he agreed with the comments made about the trees.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings and approve the use permit with additional recommendation to the City Arborist to reconsider granting Heritage Tree Removal Permits for the front two trees. Chair Ferrick said Tree #2 had been identified as the most problematic tree. Commissioner Riggs said Tree #3 was closest to the apartment building and the foundation. He asked if Tree #2 was a construction problem because the surface root might be more seriously impacted. Planner Rogers said that was correct and the photograph submitted by the applicant showed buckling on the 1330 Hoover Street site from Tree #2. Commissioner Riggs said the reason he would like the City Arborist to reconsider was that in the last two years he (Commissioner Riggs) has removed a tree root from two different 60 year old ash trees that had significantly lifted adjacent sidewalk. He said he had done this with a certified arborist and as it was less than 1/3 of the root structure the arborist deemed that it would not destabilize the trees to remove the root. He encouraged the City Arborist to look at both trees as to whether some part of the surface root structure could be removed. He said he would keep his motion with the added recommendation to have the City Arborist consider keeping at least two of the three trees proposed for removal. He said there was modular paving that would actually roll over a disturbance like this.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the rationale to keep two out of the three trees. Commissioner Riggs talked about Trees #2 and 3. Chair Ferrick suggested recommending the Arborist reconsider all three proposed removals. Commissioner Riggs said that if the foundation question was not sufficiently supported he was willing to change his recommendation. He moved to make the findings and approve the use permit and request the City Arborist reconsider all three proposed heritage tree removals. Commissioner Kadvany seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Kadvany to approve the item with the following modification.

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 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 Young and Borlik Architects, Inc., consisting of 15 plan sheets, dated received January 28, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 4, 2013, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, 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 the 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 issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
 - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.
 - h. Heritage 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*** conditions:
- ~~a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan to include three new trees at 1326 Hoover Street.~~
 - a. The Planning Commission requests that the City Arborist reconsider the tentative approvals of heritage tree removal permits for Trees #1-3. If any of these permits are subsequently denied, the applicant shall, concurrent with submittal of a complete building permit application, revise the plans and arborist report to specify the retention of the trees and incorporate any necessary tree preservation measures. If any trees are approved for removal, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan to include an equivalent number of new trees at 1326 Hoover Street, simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application. All revisions shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.***

Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Eiref left the meeting.

- D4. Use Permit/Ginbar Ketema for T-Mobile West LLC/1597 Willow Road:** Request for the renewal and modification of a use permit for an existing wireless telecommunications facility mounted on a PG&E transmission tower and an associated equipment enclosure under the transmission tower. The scope of work includes replacing the existing four antennas with upgraded LTE antennas and installing two new antennas for a total of six T-Mobile antennas at the site in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district.

Commissioner Onken recused himself as he has done work for Facebook, the property owner of the subject property.

Staff Comment: Planner Grossman said color photo-simulation coverage maps had been provided to the Commission at the dais and were available to the public at the table on the rear table.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley asked about existing coverage and coverage after the work was done. He said it was difficult for him to look at coverage maps and see if there was any difference in coverage. He suggested for future reports that it be stated that the coverage was either increased or decreased by some percentage. Planner Grossman noted his comment and asked if it would be better for the Commissioners to get the color versions by email prior to the meeting. Commissioner O'Malley said the color copies were not clear to him. He suggested a

statement about coverage. Planner Grossman noted that in her experience coverage was not decreased but agreed a statement related to the amount of the increased coverage would be helpful, and could be added to the staff report.

Public Comment: Ms. Ginbar Ketema, Core Development Services, said she was representing T-Mobile. She said the work was proposed on a PG&E lattice tower on the corner of Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road. She said the scope of work included replacing the existing four antennas with upgraded LTE antennas and installing two new antennas for a total of six T-Mobile antennas.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Chair Ferrick said generally the towers were unsightly but these additions would not cause greater impact. She asked if the improvements were to support data. Ms. Ketema said that was correct. Chair Ferrick said she appreciated the antennas being put in fairly unnoticeable places. She made a motion to approve the use permit revision as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner O'Malley seconded the motion.

Commission Action: M/S Ferrick/O'Malley to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make necessary findings, pursuant to 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 safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or general welfare of the City. *(Due to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) preemption over local law regarding concerns over health where the proposed facility meets FCC requirements, staff has eliminated the standard finding for "health" with respect to the subject use permit.)*
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 4ground Design Group, Inc. dated received January 18, 2013, consisting of seven plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on February 4, 2013 except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all County, State, and Federal 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 that are directly applicable to the new construction.
- 4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
 - a. This use permit shall expire at the end of 10 years from the date of use permit approval unless extended by the Planning Commission. If the applicant desires to extend the use permit, the applicant shall explore and implement, to the extent feasible, the available technology and/or alternative locations to reduce the size and/or visibility of the antennas and equipment.

Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent and Commissioner Onken recused.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

- E1. Use Permit Review/Beverages & More, Inc./700 El Camino Real Suite 210:**
Request for a two-year review as required by the November 2010 use permit approval for the off-site sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits, and for on-site wine tasting associated with a retail liquor and specialty market. The review requirement is not a reconsideration of the use, but is a "check in" intended to provide an opportunity to respond to potential questions/concerns related to this use.

Commission Onken returned to the dais.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers said there were no additions to the staff memorandum and the Commission was not being asked to take any action.

Public Comment: Ms. Liz Menovich, Beverages & More, said she was available to answer questions. She said their store has been open two years and they believed that operations have gone well.

Chair Ferrick noted the applicant's letter had mentioned an armed robbery that had occurred in May 2011. She said it seemed to be part of a string of robberies in Menlo Park and asked if the applicant knew where the others had occurred. Ms. Menovich said she did not. She said their surveillance camera caught an image of the suspect and the police were able to use the image to apprehend the suspect. Chair Ferrick asked if there had been theft of inventory in the store. Ms. Menovich said there has not been.

Commissioner Onken said the original use permit consideration had been concerned with the use and an increase in crime. He asked if there was an identifiable trend. Planner Rogers said that was hard to specify and staff depended on the Police Department, which had been involved to direct what should happen going forward and not just for what had already occurred. He said they did not have any suggested

changes for the property's safety and security, which seemed to imply it was in the general accepted range for this location and type of use.

Chair Ferrick closed the public comment period.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kadvany asked if all of the spaces in the shopping center were leased. Ms. Menovich said it appeared today that the space next to their store was undergoing tenant improvements and it appeared all the other units were open for business.

Commissioner Bressler asked about sales tax revenue. Ms. Menovich said that information was considered confidential. Commissioner Bressler asked if there was any information on sales per square foot at this location.

Mr. Mike Lyons, District Manager for Beverages and More, said they were pleased with the sales at this store and believed it was providing the City good sales tax revenue.

Chair Ferrick said there had been considerable concern about this use permit but she was not aware of any anecdotal issues that had arisen over the two years.

Commissioner O'Malley said Bev Mo has been a good addition to the town and he did not think it had impacted an existing fine liquor store. He said the Bev Mo store was clean, parking was fine, and he did not think there was any crime issue.

The Commission did not raise any significant concerns or indicate a need for new/revised operating conditions.

F. STUDY SESSION

- F1. Study Session/Menlo Park Fire Protection District/700 Oak Grove Avenue and 1231 Hoover Street:** Request for a use permit, architectural control, lot merger, and environmental review to demolish an existing fire station (Station 6) and single-family residence, construct a new fire station consisting of a two-story firehouse and a detached vehicle storage garage, and relocate an existing carriage house from its present location on Middlefield Road onto the subject site. As part of the proposal, two existing lots will be merged into one lot, and the merged lot will be rezoned from the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan and R-3 (Apartment) districts to the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district with an associated General Plan map amendment to Public Facilities. Additionally, there will be a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to the P-F district to allow a higher floor area ratio for public facilities. *No actions will take place at this meeting, but the study session will provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission and the public to become more familiar with the proposal and to identify potential questions and concerns.*

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said there was one correction to the staff report, page 5, gross floor area section, second paragraph, third sentence, currently stated: “the sum of both vehicle areas is approximately 1,547 square feet” and should read “....2,550 square feet.” She said with this correction the floor area ratio (FAR) noted in the staff report was still accurate.

Public Comment: Fire Chief Harold Schapelhouman, Menlo Park Fire Protection District (District), said the District was primarily a consequence management public entity, and that most of their operations were based out of geographically located facilities. He said the proposed design and layout for this site was centered on providing rapid response of personnel and equipment 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. He said Fire Station 6 located on Oak Grove Avenue and Hoover Street was 60 years old and needed replacement. He said the District had hired a commercial real estate agent in 2007 to look for suitable locations in the area. He said the most desirable locations were determined to be already developed and their owners were not inclined to sell those properties to the District. He said if they were willing to sell the costs would be prohibitive and an inefficient use of public funds. He said Fire Station 6 was the third busiest station of the District’s seven stations and replied to over 1,000 incidents per year. He said it was the primary fire engine for downtown, the El Camino Real corridor, and into Atherton, west to Hillview and south to the Palo Alto border. He said the District provided fire protection and emergency services to Menlo Park, Atherton, East Palo Alto and parts of unincorporated San Mateo County and federal facilities including the USGS, VA Hospital, and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

Chief Schapelhouman said the review established that the best and most cost effective location for a new Station 6 was its current location. He said the challenge then was how to modernize the facility and improve operations noting they needed a larger footprint. He said they were able to buy a residential lot behind their lot on Hoover Street and to expand footprint and provide ability to have a drive through for the Station to allow personnel to take apparatus through the back of the Station rather than trying to back into the Station from Oak Grove Avenue. He said they also must insure there was room for the largest vehicle, bring fire sprinklers to code, integrate seismic safety features, and provide for emergency power. He said this was the second highest priority project for the District Board.

Mr. Tracey Savonell, HMC Architects, said this was a replacement facility and would include a lot merger with a residential lot to the west owned by the District and a rezoning of the merged lot to Public Facility (P-F). He said the facility was approximately 7,000 square feet, two stories, and included a drive through bay and a smaller back-in bay. He said there were living quarters on the second story, offices, emergency generator, a 500 gallon low to the ground fuel tank, vehicle storage for two decommissioned fire engines, and a relocated historic carriage house for community display.

Chair Ferrick closed the public comment period.

Commission Comment: Chair Ferrick asked if all the properties owned by the District have the P-F zoning. Planner Lin said she did not think so noting that one had recently been rezoned to P-F in the Belle Haven neighborhood. She said the main station on Middlefield Road was not in the P-F zoning district. She said the Alameda station was located in the County. Chair Ferrick asked if P-F zoning allowed for more FAR. Planner Lin said the advantage of the P-F district was that it allowed more flexibility in terms of the development standard, noting there were no setback or height requirements, and just an FAR limitation. Chair Ferrick asked what would happen if in the future the District wanted to vacate this property and residential or commercial use wanted to develop the property. Planner Lin said the P-F zone was intended for public facilities so if a non-public entity wanted to use the site they would have to get the site rezoned.

Chair Ferrick asked if there had been outreach to the Hoover Street neighbors. Chief Schapelhouman said there has been outreach and that a Board member and he had visited with neighbors on Hoover Street a few years prior with a flyer on what their plans were. He said they were purchasing the residential lot at that time. He said this was also the time of the economic downturn and they would do outreach again.

Commissioner Onken confirmed with Chief Schapelhouman that this would be an essential services building and said it would be under the oversight of the State architect. Chief Schapelhouman said it was not a state building and the District was its own entity and would manage the project. Commissioner Onken asked if there were design elements pertinent to the fact this was an essential services building. Chief Schapelhouman said it would be built to higher standards.

Commissioner Kadvany asked about the zoning ordinance amendment to increase FAR from 35% to 50% in the P-F district, and whether that would apply to all P-F districts. Planner Lin said the amendment would apply to all P-F districts. She said staff's recommendation was that a use permit would be required for projects in P-F zone because of the increased FAR. Commissioner Kadvany asked if they knew the implications of that citywide and if it was risk averse to allow that increase. Planner Lin said based on the feedback tonight staff would decide whether the FAR increase was appropriate. She said also they could do further analysis on its overarching impacts over the City. She said to be fair there were not that many P-F districts in the City. Commissioner Kadvany said it would be nice to know what was allowed in other cities. Planner Rogers said the overall philosophy of allowing the FAR but requiring a use permit was to consider impacts from P-F projects case-by-case. He said they would have to develop language for the amendment with the City Attorney and it would need to be part of this project's CEQA review. He said they would study and amend that as necessary and the Commission's input was valuable in crafting that.

Chief Schapelhouman said the District was comfortable with the FAR just applying to this project and not in general. He said to make this design work on this site this was what needed. He said the Downtown Plan provided for up to 85% FAR.

Chair Ferrick said on page 6 of the staff report was a comparison of standards. She said the front setback was cited as zero but on the drawings it was setback 16 feet. Planner Lin said the property has a plan line along Oak Grove Avenue and was 16-feet deep from the plan line, which encroaches into the property. She said the plan line was to plan for any future transportation improvements along Oak Grove Avenue. She said they were recommending for this project as they have recommended for other projects along Oak Grove Avenue for the building to be set back behind the plan line and the plan line would be where they measured from for the front setback.

Commissioner Bressler said the only issue that might come up would be with the residents at 1243 Hoover Street as the applicant would be parking along that neighbor's property line. He said as long as the final design looked quite similar to what was being presented he did not have any issues with giving the P-F zoning. He suggested verifying agreement with that neighbor.

Chief Schapelhouman said that was a good point noting the property had sold and the Fire District's development plans had not been disclosed to the new neighbors. He said in attempting to be sensitive to those neighbors the idea was to put the historically interesting and display case structures at the rear to create a buffer and also provide visibility for viewing.

Commissioner O'Malley confirmed with the Chief that the new ladder truck the District would eventually get would fit into the proposed structure at this site. Commissioner O'Malley asked about the number of visitors for the carriage house at its current location. Chief Schapelhouman said there not very many as it was located behind the station and could not be used and was hard to get to.

Commissioner Riggs said the project was asking for FAR, minimal setbacks, extra height, an emergency generator, and removal of an unspecified heritage tree. He said the challenge would be the setbacks. He said on Oak Grove Avenue the Commission has found it difficult defending the plan line and have arrived at some compromise. He said most of his attention however was on the Hoover Street elevation as this project would be a big change for this residential neighborhood. He suggested paying the most attention to the Hoover Street façade. He noted on sheet A.3 that they reconsider how the windows were addressed on the first floor to make them more compatible with residential design. He said the image on the rendering was like a police station with masonry walls and rigid windows. He said on the second story to consider a rearrangement of the five dormers by perhaps pairing them or using them in some other type of rhythm to break up that length of façade. He said on the Hoover Street side that parking was shown right against the fence which left no room for landscaping. He said that was the first abutment of the project with a residence. He said despite the parking

lot and fence separation insertion of landscaping space would be a plus. He said he thought it would be difficult to occupy the site and construct at the same time. He said there was no curb space on Oak Grove Avenue and with driveways on Hoover Street there were not many parking spaces. He said they would need to determine the staging and materials area. He said he would wait for the next time to really consider the carriage house noting it seemed to face the adjacent properties. Mr. Savonell said that the two masonry buildings faced the residences and was basically a display case for the historic elements. Commissioner Riggs suggested having a little concern for the south elevation that would face the new two story office building as those would have decks on the rear.

Chief Schapelhouman said he understood the comment about the windows on the first floor; he noted the second story was a dormitory. He said they arrived at the façade facing Hoover Street by engaging with the Menlo Park Historical Society. He said also they were trying to replicate the Menlo arches there. He said they would look at the parking. He said the radius needed for drive through bay would be an important point. He said they would try to achieve the temporary facility on the station grounds noting they had lost the space at 444 El Camino Real.

Commissioner Onken said he lived close to the Middlefield Road station noting a marshy area caused by water runoff from the station. Chief Schapelhouman said at the main station they disperse water through diffusion into St. Patrick's Seminary land but noted that system was not necessarily up to current standards. He said they would need a recovery system at the new station to wash the equipment at the back of the yard. Commissioner Onken said that would have to be clear on the application as he thought it would concern neighbors.

Commissioner Onken said he supported the look and tone of the design but agreed there were problems with the ground story fenestration. He suggested a three-dimensional model to help engage the public. He suggested putting more into the front façade as this would be an important building to the City.

Commissioner Kadvany encouraged them to look at more design elements and architectural details. He said the front roofline was very sharp. He suggested some trim work such as wood for the Hoover Street façade. He said the newer buildings on Oak Grove Avenue were very nice looking. He said he liked the support of the historical elements and perhaps some material or insignia that would tie in with that. He suggested some siding to break up the brick facades.

Chair Ferrick said she liked the front façade on Oak Grove Street because of the arches and thought that might be repeated on the Hoover Street side. She said she liked the brick. She said they might want to use awnings to soften the Hoover Street side. She liked the idea of the glass display case for the engine and the combination of the historical brick with the steel roof.

Commissioner Onken suggested they be careful with the drawings as now only half of the glass display case could be seen as the carriage house blocked it. He said on the front façade they needed to show the dormers in the elevation as shown in the back element.

Mr. Juan Balas, project manager for HMC Architects, said there was dialogue between the glass display and the carriage house, and develops a clearer marriage of the two elements. Commissioner Onken said inside the vehicle storage you would see that dialogue but the façade was different. Mr. Balas said he understood that point.

Commissioner Riggs said there might be more than one opinion about introducing gentle arches along Hoover Street but a less institutional look to that façade would be the key. He said there were a lot of nice forms.

Commissioner Bressler said there were still a number of vacant lots along El Camino Real and asked about the possibility of the District using those temporarily during construction. Planner Rogers said 1300 El Camino Real had new owners who were exploring options to revise their approved project but had not submitted anything. He said they had encouraged the District to open dialogue with those owners. He said the District could also start discussion with the adjacent property owners of the Derry Lane property.

Planner Lin asked if the Commission had comments on the proposal to rezone to a greater FAR and to not count the historical portions of the project as part of the gross floor area.

Chair Ferrick said she was looking at this next to the Specific Plan FAR and thought it was similar.

Commissioner Onken said he thought the portions should be counted and the FAR should be calculated accordingly.

Commissioner Riggs said his concern was FAR goes with the property. He said that the ERC zone had allowed for two different FARs. Planner Rogers said it had had overall 85% FAR with 45% maximum residential FAR and 40% maximum commercial FAR. He said in terms of the look and feel along this street the building mass and perception of mass was whatever the overall FAR was. He said the District's proposed FAR would be within the envelope of projects built in the prior ERC zone and today's Specific Plan area.

Commissioner Riggs noted a recent project on El Camino Real and Partridge Avenue that had two different zoned lots. He said the larger lot had different intensity than the smaller lot. He said if these lots were not merged and one was ECR that would have the firehouse fitting within a denser environment on that lot and the R-3 parcel would comfortably accommodate the smaller structures. Planner Lin said she thought

Commissioner Riggs was referring to the 389 El Camino Real project that had the 26 units with a mix of townhomes toward El Camino Real in a mixed development zone and detached and attached single-family residents in the R-3 district. She said she believed the FAR for that project was developed related to the separate zoning designations and their respective development standards. She said she did not think they blended any of the development standards in that development.

G. COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by Planning Commission on April 8, 2013