



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 1/23/2017
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

Agenda previously amended to delete item G2

A. Call To Order

Chair Katherine Strehl called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Drew Combs (Vice Chair), Susan Goodhue, Larry Kahle, John Onken, Henry Riggs (arrived at 7:06 p.m.), Katherine Strehl (Chair)

Staff: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner, Ori Paz, Planning Technician, Tom Smith, Associate Planner, Kaitie Meador, Associate Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Thomas Rogers said the City Council at its January 24 meeting would review the Planning Commission's recommendations on zoning ordinance amendments related to secondary dwelling units and child care facilities. He said if the Council approved the changes the ordinance adoption could occur at the Council's February 7 meeting. He said at the 24th meeting the Council would also consider the primary project actions for the Station 1300 project. He said if the Council approved those actions that it could then follow up with the development agreement ordinance adoption on February 7. He said also on the 24th agenda was an information item on the implementation of ConnectMenlo. He said the Council was tentatively scheduled to hold a special meeting on January 27 during the day for a goal setting session.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the December 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Larry Kahle/John Onken) to approve the minutes as submitted; passes 5-0-1-1 with Commission Goodhue abstaining and Commissioner Riggs not yet in attendance.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit Revision/Shannon Thoke/116 O'Connor Street:
Request for a use permit revision to add first- and second-story additions to an existing nonconforming single-family, two-story residence with a basement on a lot in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The previous use permit was approved by the Planning Commission on March 5, 2012. *Continued from the meeting of January 9, 2017 (Staff Report #17-005-PC)*

Chair Strehl noted that Commissioner Henry Riggs had arrived.

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Ori Paz said staff had no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Planning Technician Paz confirmed for Commissioner Kahle that work under the previous permit approval had been completed.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Shannon Thoke said she and her husband were the residents and property owners of 116 O'Connor Street. She said they completed their previous addition in 2013 and since then their family had increased. She said they would like to add 107 square feet to the first floor and 315 square feet to the second story to accommodate a full remodel of the kitchen and removal of the wall between the kitchen and living room. She said they were adding three feet to the side of the kitchen along the driveway area and adding a small pantry and exit where the current exit was currently located. She said they were adding a bedroom to the second floor and a hallway to access, which required moving the egress window in one of the rooms. She said they have a great deal of trees in the rear yard providing privacy for them and their neighbors.

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

Commission Comment: Planning Technician Paz confirmed for Commissioner Onken that the residence was not within the flood zone. Commissioner Onken said the previous project had been perfectly acceptable and he didn't see any problems caused by the proposed additions. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Susan Goodhue seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Onken/Goodhue) to approve as recommended in the staff report; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. 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 Michelle Miner Design consisting of 8 plan sheets, dated received January 11, 2017, and

approved by the Planning Commission on January 9, 2017, 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 documentation of a deferred frontage improvement agreement or plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections, or complete any future frontage improvements as deemed necessary by the City. The agreement or plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Engineering Division, and must be approved prior to the issuance of building a permit.
- f. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance

F2. Use Permit and Variances/Eugene Sakai/1199 North Lemon Ave:

Request for a use permit to demolish two existing one-story residences to build a new two-story residence with a basement on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. The project also includes a variance request for the residence to have a corner side (facing Croner Avenue) setback of eight feet, where the requirement is 12 feet, for both the first and second stories. In addition, one heritage coast live oak (25.3-inch diameter), in fair condition, at the front of the property, and one heritage flowering plum (19.4-inch diameter), in poor condition, at the left side of the property, would be removed. An earlier version of the project was previously reviewed and continued by the Planning Commission on August 15, 2016. ([Staff Report #17-006-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Tom Smith said there were no additions to the staff report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Kahle said the staff report indicated notches in the fence for pedestrian safety but he did not see those in the drawings. Associate Planner Smith said staff had discussed those with the applicant after the drawings had been completed. He said a condition was included to require the applicant to come back with revised drawings to provide at least two additional notches in the fence, each at least a foot and a half in depth, for pedestrian safety. Commissioner Kahle asked what length those would extend. Associate Planner Smith said the condition did not specify the width and suggested the Commission could amend the condition to reflect that dimension if it so desired.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Mina Chang, one of the homeowners of the subject property, said they had not had time to present the revised drawings with the two additional fence notches before the hearing. She provided rough sketches of the proposed changes for distribution to the Commission. She said a concern was expressed in their prior hearing before the Commission regarding the proposed location of the driveway. She said the new proposal moved the driveway to the N. Lemon side. She said they had previously asked for a setback variance for eight feet as it was a corner lot. She said they had discussed that with the affected neighbor and were now requesting a four foot variance on the Croner side of the lot where the requirement was 12 feet. She said they were not asking for a variance on the interior side. Mr. Eugene Sakai, project architect, said they had reduced the width of the house by two feet.

Commissioner Onken said the garage and driveway had been put in the front but that meant removal of a Live oak. Ms. Chang said that the tree was in fair condition and there was not enough space for the driveway width if they were to build around it. Commissioner Onken asked about the tree replacement. Mr. Sakai said perhaps a sycamore but they were still discussing.

Chair Strehl opened the public hearing.

- Sue Kinder said she lived across the street from the subject property and that she had been at the previous hearing with a number of neighbors. She said it was good the applicants had reduced the home width by two feet but with the basement they would have over 5,300 square feet of livable space. She said she was upset that another heritage oak would be lost noting a prior owner of the property had removed a heritage acacia and other trees. She suggested they plant a replacement tree in the rear where their back windows overlook her pool and gazebo. She said she had also requested that the front entry be located on N. Lemon rather than on the side next to her garage noting the area was narrow and delivery trucks would create blockage. She said a 10-foot setback on the second floor of the project was appropriate.
- Tom Baker, N. Lemon Street, said his house has a 10-foot setback and the project would have 10-foot setback. He said he found the applicants amenable and he was not worried about the tree replacement. He said with the garage on N. Lemon that they could not really put the front door there as that side was not wide enough.
- Neil White, Croner Avenue, said his home was about three properties down from the subject property, and he shared the concern that circulation might be impacted indicating concern about pedestrian safety. He said the required setback was 12 feet and the variance request was for an eight foot setback. He said he could not visualize the fence notches and was concerned that fence would create an alley on Croner Avenue.

Chair Strehl closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said there seemed to be a forty foot setback on the N. Lemon side and asked why house was set so far back. Ms. Chang said because of the grade and hill noting that the existing two cottage homes and heritage tree were located similarly.

Commissioner Riggs asked if there was any restriction on seven-foot fences along a property line. Assistant Planner Smith confirmed for Commissioner Riggs that the restriction would only apply to the front setback.

Commissioner Riggs said there was a tall window in the stairwell on the east side facing the neighbor's home and that stairwell windows caused view problems. He asked if the applicants would consider glass that would obscure the view. Ms. Chang said they would be willing to consider that. Mr. Sakai said they would plant trees on that side of the property as well. Commissioner Riggs noted the long window on the side of the garage and asked if they would consider a different form. Ms. Chang said it was for light and they were not attached to the form. Commissioner Kahle asked about the glazing for the stairway windows. Commissioner Riggs said there were many textured glasses and the applicant might want to have all the staircase windows the same. He said he would want the obscuring glass from the first floor plate up, noting angle views. Ms. Chang said they were open to the idea.

Commissioner Kahle said he appreciated the thought put into the responses to the comments from the previous hearing such as moving the garage and driveway to N. Lemon. He said the notches in the fence was a great idea and he would like to see those two feet deep and as long as possible, perhaps eight to 10 feet long to give pedestrians safe passage on Croner. He said he liked how the fence was brought back away from the entry to make the entry more visible from the street. He said he appreciated the comment about the glazing for the stairwell window. He said the request for the four-foot variance for the setback was reasonable. He said he supported the project as proposed.

Commissioner Onken said regarding the concern about the glass on the stairway that he believed the neighbor's house on that side was a stone wall. He asked if there were windows on the neighbor's side. Assistant Planner Smith indicated that there were. Commissioner Onken said they had to make the findings for the variance request including this was a situation specific to this property and would not set a precedent. He said this site was generally buildable but they should be very mindful about the variance request. He said regarding the concern about traffic that two driveways would be eliminated from Croner Avenue. He said beyond the threat of delivery trucks he was happy the project was not encouraging more traffic or parking on Kroner. He said it was unfortunate that the oak in the front would need to be removed but that was not possible realistically with a two-car garage there. He said other than the loss of the tree the project was within the Planning Commission's guidance and the architecture had been consciously thought through with no objectionable views. He said they had dealt with the terrace on the rear of the house.

Chair Strehl said she thought the applicants had been responsive to the direction of the Planning Commission noting they had relocated the garage to the front. She said also the setback from Croner was currently three feet but would be eight feet. She acknowledged it would be a big house and a big change for residents along Croner but she thought the applicants had been very responsive.

Commissioner Goodhue said the applicants had responded to comments and direction and had reconfigured the proposed house significantly. She said she recalled that the oak tree in the front was not in very good shape. She said the landscape plan was well thought out and it was comforting that the property would be well landscaped even with the loss of the oak tree. She said she liked the garage window as broke up the mass of stone. She said she liked the notching idea for the fence. She questioned whether they needed a seven-foot fence and suggested they might want to lower it a foot as Croner was a narrow street. She also suggested softening the interface of the paving and the masonry at the bottom of the fence. She said it was a big house but she thought the architect had done a good job given the narrowness of Croner.

Commissioner Riggs said the horizontal fence and slats were indicated as six-feet tall on the landscape plans. He said on A3.1 the fence was called out at six feet. Commissioner Kahle said that dimension looked like it was to the windowsill and from finished floor and not from grade. Mr. Sakai said they had drawn the fence as seven feet on the A3.0 and A3.1 sheets.

Commissioner Riggs moved to make the findings for the variance request and for the use permit per the staff report with one modification for obscure glass in the stairwell from the first floor plate height from seven foot of the first story up.

Commissioner Combs thanked the applicants for their responsiveness. He said he had concerns with a large imposing structure replacing two cottages on a very small narrow street. He said that they were also were requesting a variance made this extraordinary in what would be allowed, which concerned him. He said he did not like how Croner would look after the building of the proposed home and thought it would be a detriment to that street and neighborhood.

Commissioner Kahle said he appreciated Commissioner Combs' comments. He said it was a large house and very well designed. He said he was glad to see the height reduced. He made the second to Commissioner Riggs' motion. He said regarding the garage window that Commissioner Riggs had suggested breaking it up with mullions. He said the master bedroom window could be used as a template for the garage window. He said on the east elevation was a large chimney on the second floor over the master closet and asked its purpose. Mr. Sakai said the chimneys on the project were basically for plumbing, furnace and water heater vents. He said with a metal roof he thought it was nice to not have to penetrate it with such vents.

Replying to Commissioner Combs, Chair Strehl said that Commissioner Riggs had requested obscure glass on the second story stairwell and that Commissioner Kahle had made a suggestion about making some division in the garage window.

Commissioner Kahle asked if they would see the drawing again to show the notches in the fence. Chair Strehl asked if that could come back to the Commission as a substantial conformance question rather than another hearing or whether staff could staff review and approve.

Assistant Planner Smith said staff's preference would be that the Commission's conditions be defined that staff could review and approve, or if the Commission preferred they could do the email substantial conformance process. Chair Strehl said her preference was for the conditions to be made for staff review and approval.

Commissioner Riggs said he would like to add a condition that plans be revised to add notches to the fence similar to the drawing provided subject to staff review and approval. He asked if notches circled trees at the property line. Assistant Planner Smith said one notch proposed was originally to do that. He said staff suggested also doing notches for enough space for pedestrians to step aside for traffic. Commissioner Riggs said he would defer to staff on that. Assistant Planner Smith asked about the obscured window on the second floor and whether that was on the interior side. He said if it was seven feet it might result in part of the first floor window being obscured. He asked if the intent was only for the second story window portion to be covered. Commissioner Riggs said the distance specification was due to the angle of view from a stairwell. He said if there was no mullion at seven feet that the obscure glass would have to go the next mullion. He said regarding the garage window that he commented as he did not believe it would be one piece of glass without any division. He said considering the quality of the proposed design he was satisfied with calling the window to the attention of the architect if Commissioner Kahle as the maker of the second agreed.

Commissioner Kahle said he agreed.

Commissioner Goodhue confirmed that obscure glass would include textured glass.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Kahle) to make the findings for the variance request and use permit, and approve with the following modification; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Make the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of a variance:
 - a. The lot is substandard with regard to lot width and located on a corner with a 12-foot corner side setback. If the combined 22 feet of required side setbacks are taken into account, a new residence could be no wider than 19.34 feet, which is unusually narrow for a typical residence in the R-1-S district. These conditions represent a hardship unique to the property. This hardship was not created by the current owner.
 - b. Given the unusually narrow width of the lot, the granting of the requested variance would not constitute a special privilege to the owners. The width of the proposed residence would vary between 17 feet, 1 inch and 25 feet, 2 inches, which would still be relatively modest considering the width of a typical R-1-S-zoned residence.
 - c. The permitted encroachment would not be particularly detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare. The proposed residence would be set back over 41 feet from North Lemon Avenue and would not substantially impair the sight distance of drivers at the intersection of North Lemon and Croner Avenues. The proposed right side setback of eight feet would be an improvement from the current one-foot setback of the existing residence from Croner Avenue. Given that an interior side yard of 10 feet would be maintained on the east side of the property and Croner Avenue separates the subject property from the adjacent residence to the west, an adequate supply of light and air would be provided to adjacent properties.
 - d. The conditions upon which the requested variance would be based are specific to this property. The unusually substandard lot width and the subject property's location on a corner make the requested variance unique to this property and not generally applicable to other properties within the same zoning classification.
 - e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and thus a finding regarding an unusual factor does not apply.
4. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following **standard** conditions:

- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Studio S Squared Architecture, Inc., consisting of twenty-one plan sheets, dated received on December 17, 2017, and approved by the Planning Commission on January 23, 2017, 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.
5. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following ***project-specific*** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a construction phasing and staging plan demonstrating that vehicular ingress and egress from Croner Avenue will not be substantially impeded by the construction process. The construction phasing and staging plan shall be subject to review and approval by Planning and Building Divisions prior to issuance of the building permit.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall include no less than two additional notches in the proposed fence on the rear half of the lot (not including the proposed notch for the protection of a heritage oak). The notches shall be evenly-spaced along the length of the fence and have a depth of no less than one foot, six inches subject to review and approval by the Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit.
 - c. ***Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the plans to specify the use of obscure glass on the central***

stairwell windows on the east (left) elevation beginning at a height seven feet above the first-story finished floor to the top of the window(s), subject to review and approval by the Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit.

G. Regular Business

G1. Review of Determination of Substantial Conformance/Farnad Fakoor and Aria Vatankhah/755 and 763 Cambridge Avenue:

Review of the Determination of Substantial Conformance for modifications of elevations, doors, and windows to an approved use permit application for two new two-story residences located on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-2 zoning district. Review requested by Commissioner Kahle. ([Attachment](#))

Commissioner Kahle said the removal of the muntin bars was not in keeping with what the Commission had approved and that at least one of the main windows had now become a sliding glass window. He said he wanted the design to be as close as possible to what the Commission had approved and he wanted the wrought iron that was now proposed to be removed to be kept.

Commissioner Riggs asked if the changes were only to 755 and not to 763 Cambridge. Principal Planner Rogers said he had compiled the final documents. He said the two buildings looked quite a bit alike and he might have removed pages he thought were duplicates but were not. He said the existing design was comparable to what was shown on the front and comparable from one building to the other. He said he thought enough information was provided for the Commission to evaluate and make a determination.

Commissioner Riggs said there was a mysterious glazing note in red: "Note that all windows are double glazed in the area."

Chair Strehl said she forgot to introduce Kaitie Meador the project planner. She asked the applicant to come forward and explain why they had made the changes.

Farnad Fakoor introduced her husband Aria Vatankhah. She said regarding the windows that they had trouble with the company they ordered from as the windows the architect had designed were not standard and needed to be customized. She said rather than have grids on the windows they wanted clearer windows like other new homes being built in the neighborhood and to have all the windows super large. She said the door to the terrace was to have been very large French doors and they thought wrought iron around a four-foot deep terrace was too much. She said the second story sliding window mentioned was for practical reasons but they were willing to change to casement. She said on the rear they have French doors. She said they were not trying to make the design cheaper. She said they intended to live in the front unit. She said they would not have a backyard and thought to gain some open space in front which was another reason they wanted to drop the wrought iron around the terrace and plant greenery.

Commissioner Combs asked about the person who prepared the design. Ms. Vatankhah said it was a designer, who had been recommended by friends.

Commissioner Onken said he was confused about the big window with the terrace in front. He said on the plan the window was setback and there seemed to be two pockets. Mr. Fakoor said that had been for the door but it was a fixed window now.

Commissioner Kahle said he now understood about the French doors and the wrought iron on the terrace, which was fine with him. He said if the windows needed to be changed to standard sizes that was fine but he did not understand why they needed to be clear without grids.

Commissioner Riggs said that all the changes proposed would save costs. He said regarding sizes that most all of the windows had been redrawn at the same sizes except for two deep French door groups, which had been shortened and that would save money. He said it was not unusual for window specifications to change with the manufacturer selection. He said that having deeper French doors at the front and back was better and suggested they look at a project on the 1200 block of Sevier Avenue.

Ms. Fakoor said their purpose was not to just save money but the French doors in the front were for the purpose of going onto the terrace. She said however the terrace was so small and with the tall entry door near that the French doors were not needed. She said she had stated for the record that they had a designer that was not a licensed architect. She said her husband worked with four companies all of whom had said the windows were oversized, custom windows. She said the cost would be five to six times more but proportionately for this size home to have a huge door and a small terrace was not appealing to them. She said it was an aesthetic decision as well as a financial one. She said also when they looked at where to put a couch that a fixed window served better than large French doors.

Commissioner Onken said that if the Commission looked at the proposed elevations as a new application whether they would insist that it needed to have a French door there. He said when the design came forward the first time it had been a jumbled and not well thought out design, but had been calmed down to something they found approvable. He said that it was not that much different from the approved design. He said the house was perfectly fine as proposed.

Chair Strehl said she tended to agree with Commissioner Onken.

Commissioner Kahle said the project was proposed as a Tuscan design and for that he would want to see divided lights, which had been promised when they approved the project.

Commissioner Goodhue said regarding divided lights that they should either have true divided lights or none. She said she would not want to see dividers just for the sake of dividers. She said she thought the changes proposed were gradations enough that the project was not so different from the original proposal.

Commissioner Kahle moved that the proposed changes were not in substantial conformance with the project previously approved.

Commissioner Combs asked if this motion was carried whether the Commission would need to provide direction and if the project would need to come back before the Commission. Principal Planner Rogers said the applicant would be able to apply for a use permit revision, but if the majority of the Commission had indicated they were not supportive of those changes then that might not be fruitful. He said if the Commission made a finding that it was not in conformance, and could be very specific about the elements that were not in conformance, then the applicant could revise the plans to address those for staff to review for conformance without further Commission involvement.

Commissioner Combs seconded Commissioner Kahle's motion.

Recognized by the Chair, Commissioner Riggs said Commissioner Onken had a valid point about the proposed changes and asked Commissioner Kahle whether the use of divided light windows would make the proposed changes acceptable. Commissioner Kahle said that it would. He asked staff to address divided and simulated divided lights.

Principal Planner Rogers said manufacturers did not use terms universally as to what simulated divided light windows were so the City made a determination that the best modern windows were those with grids on both the outside and inside, as well as a spacer bar between the two panes.

Commissioner Kahle said that major manufacturers did not make true divided lights anymore as there were too many seals that could be broken. He said he wanted to keep the simulated divided light windows.

Chair Strehl said there was a first by Commissioner Kahle and a second by Commissioner Combs to find that the changes were not in substantial conformance with what the Commission had previously approved.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Combs) to find that the changes were not in substantial conformance with what the Commission had previously approved; failed 2-4-1 with Commissioners Kahle and Combs supporting, Commissioners Goodhue, Onken, Riggs, and Strehl opposed, and Commissioner Barnes abstaining.

Chair Strehl noted that the motion failed and informed the applicants their revisions were therefore in substantial conformance.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: February 6, 2017
- Regular Meeting: February 27, 2017
- Regular Meeting: March 13, 2017

I. Adjournment

Chair Strehl adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on February 27, 2017