REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 9/14/2026
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 846 9472 6242 and
City Council Chambers
751 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Silverstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Ross Silverstein (Chair), Katie Behroozi (Vice Chair, remote, exited at 9:35 p.m.), Andrew Ehrich, Katie Ferrick, Nancy Larocca Hedley, Jennifer Schindler, Misha Silin

Staff: Matthew Ball, Assistant Planner; Matthew Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Sandmeier stated that the City Council will consider a resolution to make the Coleman Avenue pilot project permanent during their September 15 meeting.

D. Public Comment

Chair Silverstein opened public comment and closed it as no one requested to speak.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the August 24, 2026 Planning Commission meeting (Attachment)

E2. Architectural Control/Ana Maria Villa/1100 Sharon Park Dr., Unit 20:
Consider and adopt a resolution approving an architectural control permit to construct a wooden pergola, approximately nine-foot, four-inches in height, over an existing private roof deck for a residential condominium unit located in the R-3-A(X) (Garden Apartment Residential, Conditional Development Permit) zoning district. Determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures. (Staff report #26-039-PC)

Chair Silverstein opened public comment and closed it as no one requested to speak.

ACTION: To approve the Consent Calendar as presented; passes 7-0.

F. Public Hearing

F1. Architectural Control, Major Subdivision, Below Market Rate Housing Agreement/800 Oak Grove Owner, LLC/800 Oak Grove Ave.:
Consider and adopt two resolutions related to a project at 800 Oak Grove Ave. in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district to 1) approve an architectural control permit to demolish an existing surface-level parking lot, construct a new six-story, approximately 72-foot-tall multifamily residential building with 15 units, and convert and expand an existing two-story bank building into a two-story non-medical office building with a roof deck; approve a below market rate (BMR) housing agreement for the proposed project to ensure that one unit is designated as affordable to very low-income households and that the project applicant pays a BMR in-lieu fee to satisfy the remaining inclusionary housing requirement; and determine that this action is exempt from CEQA under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 130; and 2) recommend to City Council approval of a tentative subdivision map to subdivide the project site into 15 condominium residential units and one commercial unit. The ground floor of the new residential building would contain parking for the new units and the adjacent existing commercial building on the site, and the five stories above the parking area would contain the residential units. In addition to the one BMR unit (approximately 6.7 percent of the total number of units), the remaining fractional below market rate (BMR) unit value would be provided via an in-lieu fee payment. The proposed change of use and expansion of the existing non-residential building also requires a BMR commercial linkage in-lieu fee. The application is being submitted subject to the State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915 and relevant amendments), which permits concessions and waivers to the City's Zoning Ordinance requirements. The applicant is requesting concessions and waivers, as specified in the application materials. The proposed project also includes the removal of three heritage-size coast live oak trees. (Staff report #26-040-PC)

Associate Planner Matt Pruter and the applicant team presented the project.

Commissioners asked staff and the city attorney clarifying questions about state density bonus law.

Chair Silverstein opened the public hearing.

Public comments:

- Brian Schmidt (Menlo Spark) expressed support for an all-electric project and for the developer to include native plants in their landscaping.

- Anna Chase expressed concerns about the amount of parking provided and the proposed valet parking system.

- John McKenna voiced his support for the project and echoed an earlier commenter’s sentiments regarding electrification of the building.

Chair Silverstein closed the public comment period.

The Commissioners' discussion focused on the project's timeline and whether it was significantly reduced by excluding the CEQA process pursuant to AB 130. Commissioners also asked why the developer chose to provide for-sale units and discussed the rationale for the proposed unit sizes and count.

Commissioners discussed the utilities serving the building and how each component would be powered, as well as the reasons for the requested waivers and concessions.

Commissioners also discussed the office portion's roof deck and proposed amenities, as well as the infill nature of the project and the benefits of AB 130.

ACTION: Motion and second (Silverstein/Ehrich) to adopt a resolution approving the item as submitted; Passes 7-0.

G. Study Session

G1. Study Session/Mark Murray for Lane Partners/Parkline Phase 2 Masterplan Revisions: Request for a study session for revisions to the previously approved Parkline masterplan development project located at 201, 301 and 333 Ravenswood Ave. and 555 and 565 Middlefield Rd. The proposed revisions would increase the number of housing units from 800 to 1,082 units, consolidate the office/research and development (R&D) footprint, reduce the non-residential square footage to approximately 902,000 square feet of office/ R&D uses and add approximately 40,000-square-feet of retail uses, increase the office/R&D building heights, modify the design standards and guidelines, and redesign the site layout. The proposed revised project also includes modifications to the below market rate (BMR) guidelines to locate all for-sale BMR units in the attached townhome component, the definition of gross floor area as applied to the project, and number and type of emergency diesel back-up generators. The proposed revised project would require revisions to the approved conditional development permit (CDP), BMR housing agreement, vesting tentative map, and heritage tree removal permits. Review of the project will include analysis of the revised project's potential impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to determine if the revised project is consistent with the findings of the certified EIR for the approved project. Separate architectural control permits would also be required for the building design and site improvements. (Staff report #26-041-PC)

Principal planner Sandmeier and the applicant team presented the project.

Commissioners asked clarifying questions of the applicant and staff.

Chair Silverstein opened the public hearing.

Public comments:

- Peter Lezak (McCandless office buildings) expressed support for the overall project but expressed concerns about potential traffic and congestion, and concerns about access to the project via Seminary Drive.

- Irakili Nadareishvili voiced concerns regarding the potential impact that Parkline and other proposed projects nearby may have on Menlo Park's schools and City services.

- Ana Melikishvili expressed concerns regarding the potential impact that a project of this scale would have on Menlo Park.

- Gail Gorton expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and expressed support for a buffer zone between the proposed single-family homes and the existing Burgess Classics homes.

- Sue Connelly expressed support for a buffer zone between the proposed project and the Burgess Classics neighborhood, for keeping Burgess Drive closed, and for ongoing collaboration between the developer and the neighborhood.

- Mollie Naber, vice president of housing development strategy at Midpeninsula Housing, expressed her gratitude for being chosen as the developer for the project's affordable housing component.

- Brian Schmidt expressed support for the efforts to make the project 100% electric and suggested several ideas to decrease the project's environmental impact.

- Josephine Gaillard voiced support for the project but echoed earlier comments regarding traffic impacts. She also indicated that she would like City staff to communicate what efforts will be made to alleviate traffic.

- Maria Yip, a resident of the Burgess Classics neighborhood, echoed earlier comments in support of a buffer.

- Susan Stinson, a resident of the Burgess Classics neighborhood, expressed frustration with the revised project design and voiced support for a buffer.

- Sally Cole asked the developer to consider adding more bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

- Peter expressed concern regarding the number of large development projects proposed in District 3.

- John McKenna expressed his support for the project and asked that the proposed athletic field use natural grass instead of artificial turf.

- Steven Peng echoed concerns regarding the increased number of housing units and traffic impacts.

Chair Silverstein closed the public comment period.

Commissioners discussed the reasons for the project revision, including community feedback requesting less commercial space and additional residential uses. Discussion focused on changes from the original proposal, including screening between the project and adjacent single-family homes in the Burgess Classics neighborhood.

Commissioners asked about potential City incentives that could support additional affordable housing. They also discussed potential synergies between Parkline and redevelopment of the former USGS site.

Commissioners expressed general support for the revised project and appreciation for relocating the open space area to create a more inviting space for the community.

Commissioners commented that the increased unit count may not be enough to address the City's housing needs. Commissioners also discussed potential traffic and congestion impacts.

Commissioners voiced support for a safer bicycle and pedestrian connection along Ravenswood Avenue in addition to the proposed paseo through the site. Commissioners asked staff about sequencing of the environmental review and whether the maximum parking ratio would change for any portion of the project. Commissioners also requested future public outreach about potential traffic reduction efforts.

Chair Silverstein conducted straw polls (unofficial votes) on various study session items to summarize feedback to the applicant. Commissioner Behroozi was absent during the straw polls but all other Commissioners were present. The following items were supported by a majority of Commissioners present:

- Balconies being solar ready, meaning the correct plug ins would be available on balconies for residents to plug in photovoltaic equipment.

- Not using artificial turf for all public open spaces, including the recreation area to be dedicated to the City.

- An adequate buffer, which could include open space or other means such as hedges, that would persist between Parkline and Burgess Classics.

- A protected bike lane along Ravenswood Avenue in addition to the proposed bike/pedestrian path along Ravenswood Avenue.

- Decoupling the construction of the detached single-family units from the construction of the townhomes, meaning the BMR units for the single-family homes would likely be constructed after the single-family homes, during the construction of the townhomes.

- The applicant's proposed modifications to the BMR Guidelines.

- Requiring the applicant to develop a plan to move away from the use of diesel back-up generators.

- Asking the City Council to direct staff to develop a comprehensive traffic management plan for the Middlefield Road corridor and communicating the plan to the public.

A majority of the Commissioners did not support limiting the height of the two-story single-family homes abutting Burgess Classics to 28 feet, and no Commissioners supported a requirement to enable a virtual power plant, which would require batteries within residences.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.

Principal Planner Sandmeier announced that the September 28 Planning Commission meeting will be held at the Belle Haven Community Campus.

- Regular Meeting: September 28, 2026
- Regular Meeting: October 5, 2026

I. Adjournment

Chair Silverstein adjourned the meeting at 11:18 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Matthew Ball

Approved by the Planning Commission on September 28, 2026