



# PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 27, 2006  
AGENDA ITEM C1 AND D1

<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>2825 Sand Hill Road</b>	<b>APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER:</b>	<b>The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University</b>
<b>EXISTING USE:</b>	<b>Vacant</b>		
<b>PROPOSED USE:</b>	<b>Office, Hotel and Associated Facilities</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS:</b>	<b>General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Conditional Development Permit, Environmental Review</b>
<b>EXISTING ZONING:</b>	<b>C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research District, Restrictive)</b>	<b>PROPOSED ZONING:</b>	<b>C-4-X (General Commercial, Other than El Camino Real – Conditional Development District)</b>
<b>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	<b>Professional and Administrative Offices</b>	<b>PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	<b>Retail/Commercial</b>

## PROPOSAL

The applicant is proposing to construct a 170,000-square-foot hotel facility comprised of 120 guest rooms, five villas, a restaurant, spa, fitness center, and a 100,000-square-foot office complex on a 21-acre vacant site at 2825 Sand Hill Road adjacent to the Sand Hill Road/Interstate 280 interchange. The proposal requires the approval of the following requests:

- **General Plan Amendment:** Change from Professional and Administrative Offices land use designation to Retail/Commercial land use designation;
- **Rezoning:** Change from C-1-C (Administrative, Professional and Research District, Restrictive) to C-4-X (General Commercial – Conditional Development District);
- **Conditional Development Permit:** Establish specific uses and development regulations and review architectural designs;
- **Heritage Tree Permit:** Remove two heritage size trees; and
- **Environmental Review** of the proposed project in the form of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The proposal requires review and recommendations by the Planning Commission on the General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Conditional Development Permit, Heritage Tree Permit, and EIR. The City Council is the final decision-making body on these applications.

## BACKGROUND

The proposal appeared before the City Council on May 24, 2005 for a study session and then subsequently before the Planning Commission for a study session on September 19, 2005. At both meetings, the study session allowed the applicant to present the proposed project and receive comments raised by the City Council, Planning Commission, and members of the public.

At the City Council study session, the Council expressed general support for the proposed project and was interested in keeping abreast of the progress of the project. The Council was interested in learning more about the fiscal implications of the project, particularly the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT). In response, the applicant has submitted a fiscal analysis for the proposed project. The City is conducting an independent review of the applicant's fiscal study. Staff anticipates that the peer review will be available in late March 2006 and the fiscal impact study will be presented to the City Council in April 2006.

At the City Council meeting, several members of the public also expressed support for the proposed hotel at the subject site. Additionally, several nearby residents raised concern about traffic and the change of appearance of the site.

On July 28, 2005, staff conducted a scoping session on the Environmental Impact Report during the 30-day circulation of the Notice of Preparation, which identified the preparation of an EIR for the proposed project. The purpose of the scoping meeting was to receive input on the content to be analyzed in the EIR. Staff received both written and verbal comments from members of the public and various local and regional agencies. Many of the comments related to traffic, noise and aesthetics.

On September 19, 2005, the applicant presented the project to the Planning Commission at a study session. The Commission generally supported the proposal in concept and provided comments on various issues, including lighting, signage, the streetscape and architectural details and pedestrian accessibility. Members of the public also provided comments and raised concern about traffic and aesthetics.

Over the past several months, the applicant has worked to refine their proposed plans and address comments raised by the Planning Commission. Revised plans, which address some of the items, are included as Attachment B. The applicant will further address items at the Planning Commission study session component of the February 27, 2006 meeting.

## **ANALYSIS**

### Process

The purpose of the February 27, 2006 public hearing on the proposed project is to give both the public and the Planning Commission an opportunity to comment both on the Draft EIR that has been prepared for the project and the project itself. Therefore, this staff report contains both a general description of the project and a summary of the issues discussed in the Draft EIR. The first part of the meeting will be to review and receive comments on the Draft EIR during the 45-day public comment review period. Comments received during the public hearing on the Draft EIR will be responded to as part of the Final EIR. The response to comments in the Final EIR will be reviewed at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting. The second component of the February 27, 2006 meeting will be a study session on the proposed project. The study session will focus on the proposed project, including the uses, the site design, architectural features and landscaping plan. Comments received on the proposed project can be considered by the applicant for inclusion within the project prior to the Planning Commission's recommendation and City Council action. A separate Planning Commission meeting will be scheduled at a later date, anticipated in late May or early June 2006, and it is at that meeting that the Commission will provide a recommendation on the project, including the Final EIR, to the City Council.

### Existing Site

The 21-acre triangular shaped site is located in the southeastern quadrant of the Sand Hill Road/Interstate 280 interchange and is undeveloped grassland area. Office buildings are located to the east and north, across Sand Hill Road, Interstate 280 is located on the west, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) is located to the south. The topography of the site contains a gradual downward slope, heading towards the freeway, with an approximate 50-foot grade differentiation between the east and west sides of the property.

The site has some unique features. Along the west side of the property, adjacent to Interstate 280, two wetland features exist. One feature has been identified as a ephemeral blue-line creek on the northern portion of the site (lowest point of the site) and the other feature is a drainage swale that runs from south to north on the west side property line. Both of these contribute water to the San Francisquito Creek. The proposed project could result in the loss of wetlands and be an adverse impact. The Draft EIR, however, includes mitigation that addresses the impact such that there would be no net loss of wetland acreage.

The site is accessed from an existing traffic signal/intersection on Sand Hill Road, which is commonly referred to as Addison-Wesley due to a former long-term tenant. The intersection would be the primary ingress and egress from the site, which is also shared with the five adjacent office buildings to the east, which are located on Stanford-owned land. Four of the five buildings are on a sublease from Addison-Wesley's long-term land lease that expires in September 2025 and Stanford manages the fifth building. Access and circulation will be further discussed in the Analysis section of this report.

### Proposed Project

The proposed project is the development of a 170,000 square-foot hotel and its associated facilities and a 100,000 square-foot, multi-building office complex on a 21-acre site. The site plan integrates the various components into one comprehensive development. The site plan incorporates multiple structures connected through a series of pedestrian linkages. The hotel and villas would be situated on the southeastern portion of the site, closest to the existing office complex on the adjacent property. The new office buildings would be located closest to the Sand Hill Road/Interstate 280 Interchange on the opposite side of the site. The common facilities, including a spa, fitness center, and restaurant, would be centrally located on the site, and available for use by hotel guests, office employees or members of the public. The applicant intends to own and develop the property and manage the office complex. It is anticipated that a private hotel operator would manage the hotel. At this time, the applicant does not plan to enter into any long-term ground leases.

### General Plan Designation and Zoning District

The site currently has a General Plan land use designation of Professional and Administrative Offices and the property is zoned C-1-C (Administrative, Professional

and Research District, Restrictive). The proposed office component of the project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning district. However, the hotel and related facilities are not explicitly identified in the General Plan and the uses are not currently permitted in the C-1-C zoning district. In order to construct the proposed project, the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations would need to be changed. The appropriate designations would be the C-4 (General Commercial – Other than El Camino Real) zoning district and the Retail/Commercial General Plan land use designation.

Under the base C-4 zoning requirements, any new construction requires a use permit regardless of whether or not the use is permitted. The proposed project would require a use permit for the construction of the hotel, office, personal service and restaurant uses. In addition, the hotel and the provision of alcohol associated with the restaurant, which are conditional uses, would require approval of a use permit.

As proposed, the project would not meet all the development regulations of the base C-4 district. The applicant would be requesting two exceptions through a Conditional Development Permit and the corresponding “X” Conditional Development District overlay. A Conditional Development Permit allows for flexibility in meeting all development regulations, except for density and floor area ratio. In consideration of the C-4-X zoning district, the applicant would be proposing that several development regulations be established through the conditional development permit to accommodate the proposed hotel and office project.

The project would require an exception to the parking and height requirements of the C-4 district. The parking requirement for the C-4 zoning district is six spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area regardless of use. With a total gross floor area of 270,000 square feet, the parking requirement would be 1,620 spaces. The applicant is proposing a total of 590 parking spaces based on the proposed uses and the City's Parking Reduction Guidelines. Staff would note that through the adoption of Phase II of Commercial Streamlining, the Zoning Ordinance allows for requests to reduce the amount of required parking spaces for specific uses. In regard to the building height exception, the maximum height allowed in the C-4 district is 30 feet. The proposed plans show office building heights approximately 38 feet in height. These exceptions and all elements requiring a use permit would be covered through the conditional development permit.

The following table provides the density, floor area ratio, building coverage, paving and landscaping percentages, number of parking spaces, setbacks, and height requirements under the existing C-1-C zoning district and the proposed underlying C-4 zoning district with a comparison to the proposed project.

**Table 1**  
**FAR, Building Coverage, Paving, Landscaping, Parking, Setbacks and Height Comparisons**

	<b>C-1-C District</b>	<b>C-4 District</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	
<b>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</b>	25%	40%	28.9%	
<b>Building Coverage</b>	20%	No Maximum	18.9%*	
<b>Paving</b>	N/A	N/A	22%	
<b>Landscaping</b>	Minimum 30%	Minimum 5%	59.1%	
<b>Parking</b>	1,080 spaces 4 spaces per 1,000 sf	1,620 spaces 6 spaces per 1,000 sf	590 spaces (Approximately 1 per 300 sf for office, 1.1 spaces per 1 room, 6 per 1,000 sf of restaurant, 5 per 1,000 sf for personal service)**	
<b>Setbacks***</b>	Front: 75 ft. Side Corner: 75 ft. Interior: 30 ft. Rear: 40 ft.	N/A	<u>CDP****</u> Front: 75 ft. Side: 40 ft. Rear: 40 ft.	<u>Building*****</u> Front: 75 ft. Side: 60 ft. Rear: 45 ft.
<b>Height</b>	35 Feet Maximum	30 Feet Maximum	38 Feet Maximum	

\* Excluding covered porch areas

\*\* Generally Based on City's Parking Reduction Guidelines

\*\*\* Front = Sand Hill Road, Side = Shared Property with 2725 Sand Hill Road and Rear = Interstate 280

\*\*\*\* The CDP setbacks refer to the project-specific development standards.

\*\*\*\*\* The Building setbacks refer to the proposed setbacks from the building to the respective property lines.

### Hotel and Associated Facilities

The hotel would consist of 120 guest rooms and five villas. The guest rooms would be configured within 15 different one-story and two-story buildings and designed in clusters around courtyards. Guestrooms range in size from 542 square feet for a typical king room to 3,550 square feet for a three-bedroom villa. The typical size guestroom would be approximately 550 square feet and each unit would contain a private veranda. Each of the five proposed villas would be one-story and contain two or three bedrooms with a private patio and pool.

The project has integrated several common pool and patio areas to provide open space, and relaxation and recreational opportunities. A full service restaurant, spa facilities and fitness center are additional public amenities proposed within the project. The

restaurant and spa will be open to the general public and it is anticipated that access to the fitness center would be limited through private membership.

### Office

The proposed office complex would be comprised of four two-story buildings located around a central landscaped courtyard in the northwestern corner of the site. The total square footage of the office complex would be 100,000 square feet. Previously, a five building option was presented to the Planning Commission study session. The four and five office building options are described in the DEIR to provide environmental clearance for either scenario, but the applicant has decided to pursue the project with four office buildings. The applicant intends to target tenants whose business is similar to those existing on Sand Hill Road, and it is anticipated that multiple tenants would likely occupy the buildings.

### Architecture and Materials

The design of the project is inspired by California ranch style architecture, which is generally consistent with the architectural style of nearby buildings along the Sand Hill Road Corridor. With low-pitched gabled roofs, long and narrow form to the building, and open patios, the buildings reflect elements of the ranch style. The applicant proposes to use high quality building materials that feature natural colors and finishes such as exposed wood rafters and trim, wood balconies and railings, and stone veneer accents. The exterior of the buildings would be finished in either cement plaster or board and batten siding. The roof would be either cedar shake or cedarlite concrete tile. The materials would be consistent with the California ranch style and be compatible with other buildings in the area.

### Landscaping

The project site contains 20 heritage trees, mostly eucalyptus and coast live oak, located on the perimeter of the site. Two heritage trees, a valley oak and Italian stone pine, are proposed for removal to accommodate a dedicated right turn lane on Sand Hill Road into the project site and associated street frontage improvements. Both of the trees are mature and in fair condition according to an inventory prepared by the applicant's arborist. The inventory, dated April 2005, includes an assessment of these two trees in addition to the other heritage trees on site and has been included as part of the technical appendices of the Draft EIR. The removal of the heritage trees would require a Heritage Tree Permit and would require a two to one replacement ratio.

In response to comments from the Planning Commission, the applicant has prepared a more detailed landscaping concept. The plan utilizes a mix of trees, shrubs, ground cover, perennials, native wildflower and lawn. A detailed plant list has been included on pages L.106 and L.107 of the plans. The project's street frontage along Sand Hill Road would contain a mix of coast live oak, deodar cedar, and Chinese pistache. The applicant also proposes a four-foot tall wood farm fence along the Sand Hill Road

frontage. The style of the fence is unobtrusive and is keeping in character with the proposed natural materials of the buildings. An enlarged detail of the Sand Hill Road frontage has been included on page L.108.

### Parking, Access and Circulation

Access to the site would be directly from Sand Hill Road at the existing Addison-Wesley signalized intersection. The entrance to the development is currently being used by an existing office complex located to the east that was approved in three phases, beginning in the late 1960s and most recently in 1996. The existing entrance would become a shared entry with the proposed project. When the fifth building of the existing office complex located at 2775 Sand Hill was approved in 1996, one of the conditions of approval was for further analysis of the access to the site when development occurred at 2825 Sand Hill Road. Staff, in conjunction with its traffic consultant on the Draft EIR, has determined that the existing median opening shall be closed upon development of the proposed project. The closure of the median would restrict left turns into the access road that leads to parking at the rear of the office complex and redirect inbound vehicles to a slightly longer and more circuitous route. The median closure would not impact vehicles exiting the site. The recommended closure of the existing median was based on safety and vehicular efficiency.

Once on the site, vehicular traffic would travel along a road around the perimeter of the site; however, the road would not create a full loop, except for emergency vehicle access. The applicant also proposes an emergency vehicle access off Sand Hill Road, but the public would not use this ingress/egress point. The applicant is proposing parking at grade and in a garage below the office building and spa and fitness center. The site would contain 590 parking spaces to serve all the uses. Valet service would also be available for hotel guests and restaurant patrons.

Besides vehicular circulation and access, the Commission was also interested in the proposed improvements for pedestrian access to and from the site and within the site. The applicant has indicated their desire to improve existing crosswalks at 1) the site's entrance between the east and west sides of the Addison-Wesley entrance and 2) across Sand Hill Road from the Addison-Wesley site to the north. Additionally, the applicant plans to improve the existing pathway located on the north side of Sand Hill Road across from the project to help improve pedestrian circulation and access to the site. These improvements would be in-lieu of constructing pedestrian facilities on the south side of Sand Hill Road in front of the project where there is less of a pedestrian destination. The plans do not yet reflect these concepts, but will be included in the final plans. An on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation diagram is located on page L1.02 of the plan set.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the proposed project, and was released for public comment on January 31, 2006. The public comment period

for the Draft EIR will end at the close of the business day on March 16, 2006. All verbal and written comments received, including comments from this Planning Commission meeting, will be responded to in the Final EIR, which will be prepared following the close of the 45-day review period. The Final EIR will be available at least 10 days prior to the Planning Commission's public hearing on the proposal. The Planning Commission will review the Final EIR as part of the Commission's recommendation to the City Council on the project.

The Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the project across a wide range of impact areas. The Draft EIR determined that the project would have a less-than-significant impact without the need for mitigation on the following impact areas: geology, soils, and seismicity; hazardous materials; land use; population and housing; and public services. Other impact areas in the Draft EIR, including aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; hydrology and water quality; and noise, were identified as potentially less than significant with the adoption of specific mitigation measures. Many of these mitigation measures are typical and often included with larger development projects. Some of the mitigation measures are site specific such as addressing the loss of wetlands. A complete list of these mitigation measures is included in Table 1-1 of the Draft EIR on pages 1-6 through 1-20.

The Draft EIR identified that one of the environmental impact areas would have a potentially significant unavoidable impact as a result of the project. This is transportation and is explained in more detail below.

## **Transportation**

The transportation analysis considered impacts to signalized and unsignalized intersections, roadway segments, freeway ramps, transit, access and circulation, and parking. The analysis was based on a 100,000 square-foot office complex, 132 hotel rooms (120 hotel rooms plus 12 rooms from the five villas), a 160-seat restaurant, and a 16,100 square-foot fitness and spa facility.

### Intersection Traffic Volumes

The transportation section analyzed 28 intersections located near the project area and along the Sand Hill Road corridor, Alpine Road, Junipero Serra Boulevard, Alameda de las Pulgas and El Camino Real. The location, collection date, and source of each intersection count used in the EIR analysis is shown in Table 3.13-4 on page 3.13-22 of the EIR.

In the near term during the p.m. peak hour, the project would cause a 1.9 second per vehicle increase in average delay for all movements and a 1.0 second per vehicle average increase in average delay on the critical movements on the local approach to the State-controlled intersection of El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue. Without the project, the intersection operates at level of service (LOS) E in the near term. This

impact would be potentially significant because it exceeds the City's threshold of 0.8 seconds of vehicle delay during the p.m. peak hour.

In the cumulative scenario (2015), the project would change the LOS at El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue from D to E during the a.m. peak and would change the LOS from E to F during the p.m. peak with a 2.3 second per vehicle increase in average delay for all movements and 1.2 seconds of delay per vehicle average increase in average delay on critical movements. The impact would also exceed the City's threshold.

The Draft EIR identifies potential mitigation to reduce both the near term and cumulative scenarios. Mitigation to improve the intersection operations at El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue would require removal of parking spaces along El Camino Real and/or widening on El Camino Real to provide a third through lane in each direction. The widening of El Camino Real poses some constraints given the existing right-of-way limitations. The addition of lanes could result in property acquisition and potentially the loss of existing buildings and heritage trees. If undertaken, the improvement would reduce the average delay and would reduce the LOS from E to D in the p.m. peak hour in the near term.

The implementation of the identified mitigation measure may not be appropriate or feasible at this time. If the mitigation measure was not implemented, the impact at El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Roadway Segment Volumes

The DEIR concluded that traffic added to the street system by the proposed project would exceed Menlo Park criteria on 11 street segments of the 117 segments that were analyzed for the EIR. The impacted segments are the following:

- Middlefield Road, North of Willow (Minor Arterial)
- Monte Rosa Drive, North of Sand Hill (Local)
- Oak Avenue, North of Sand Hill (Local)
- Olive Street, South of Middle (Local)
- Ravenswood Avenue, El Camino Real to Middlefield (Minor Arterial)
- Sand Hill Road, East of Santa Cruz (Minor Arterial)
- Santa Cruz Avenue, East of Orange (Minor Arterial)
- Santa Cruz Avenue, North of Sand Hill (Minor Arterial)
- Santa Cruz Avenue, South of Sand Hill (Minor Arterial)
- University Drive, South of Santa Cruz (Collector)
- Willow Road, East of Middlefield (Minor Arterial)

The Menlo Park Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines include a set of impact criteria for minor, arterial, collector and local streets based on average daily traffic

volume (ADT). To determine if an impact was triggered, the daily traffic increases were compared to the City's impact criteria for its respective street type.

The impact could be reduced to a less than significant level at all locations if the project was reduced to a level of development that would generate approximately 10 percent of the trips as currently proposed. Without this reduction, the impact could be significant and unavoidable. The EIR has identified mitigation of payment of a traffic mitigation fee, based upon gross square footage of the buildings, to be used towards capital improvement projects, such as adaptive signal timing technology on Sand Hill Road. Although implementation of the mitigation measure would help, it would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

### Off-Ramp Analysis

The addition of the project traffic would increase a.m. peak hour vehicle delay at the State-controlled intersection Interstate 280 off-ramp/Sand Hill Circle and Sand Hill Road. During the a.m. peak hours, the project would cause a 9.1 second delay per vehicle in average delay for all movements and a 13.3 second increase per vehicle in average delay on critical movements at the Interstate 280 northbound off-ramp/Sand Hill Circle and Sand Hill Road in the near term. In the cumulative scenario (2015), the addition of project traffic would cause a 13.1 second per vehicle increase in average delay for all movements and a 28.3 second increase per vehicle in average delay on critical movements. The State does not have a specific standard for impacts on State-controlled intersections already operating at LOS F without the project. However, the City of Menlo Park has determined that this is a significant impact, as it is standard practice in other jurisdictions such as Santa Clara County to assess a significant impact when a project adds more than four seconds of delay to an intersection operating at LOS F without the project.

To help reduce the impact to a less than significant level, the applicant shall apply for an encroachment permit through Caltrans for the conversion of the existing through lane from the northbound off-ramp of Interstate 280 to the east bound portion of Sand Hill Road to a through-right lane, including all the related intersection improvements. Because the Interstate 280 off-ramp/Sand Hill Circle and Sand Hill Road is a State-controlled intersection, the City does not have authority for reviewing or implementing these improvements. Approval of these improvements would be through Caltrans. The City recommends that Caltrans approves the mitigation measure, but also recognizes that in the event that Caltrans does not approve or allow implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potentially significant impacts could result in the near term and cumulative scenario for a.m. peak hours. Without implementation of the proposed mitigation, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

### Mitigated Traffic Impacts

The Draft EIR also identifies traffic impacts that can be reduced to a less than significant level where mitigation is implemented. Mitigation measures such as a construction

traffic control plan, a shuttle service between the project site connecting to local and regional transit services, and a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan have been identified to help reduce transportation impacts by providing alternative means of transportation methods and reducing the number of trips generated by the project.

## **Correspondence**

The City issued a Notice of Preparation of the EIR and received comments from nine members of the public and five agencies. The letters are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The letters raised issues related to such items as increased traffic, visual impacts associated with changes to the Interstate 280 corridor, and hydrology. These items have all been included as sections in the Draft EIR.

Since the release of the Draft EIR, the City has received one letter from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) (Attachment C). The letter provided general comments and also indicated that continued implementation of the General Plan could have cumulative impacts on services and facilities. PG&E would also like to include a discussion of electromagnetic fields (EMF) in the Draft EIR.

## **SUMMARY**

As stated at the beginning of this staff report, the purpose of the February 27, 2006 Planning Commission public hearing is to allow both the public and the Planning Commission an opportunity to comment on both the Draft EIR and the project. No recommendation is being provided at this time, as the Planning Commission will have another opportunity at a subsequent public hearing to provide a recommendation to the City Council on this proposal. Public comments received on the Draft EIR during the review period and public hearing will be addressed through the Final EIR.

In regard to the Draft EIR prepared for this project, the Planning Commission may wish to discuss whether the potential environmental impacts have been adequately discussed and addressed.

In terms of general comment areas regarding the project itself, the Planning Commission may wish to provide comments or direction on the proposed landscaping plan, the architectural design of the buildings, and access improvements.

---

Deanna Chow  
Senior Planner  
Report Author

---

Justin Murphy  
Development Services Manager

## **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Public notification consisted of publishing a legal notice in the local newspaper and notification of owners and residents with a 300-foot radius of the subject property. In addition, notices were mailed to residents and property owners of the Sand Hill Circle area and properties located between Sharon Park Drive and Sand Hill Road. Notices were also sent to members of the public who requested to be notified of this project. No formal action will be taken by the Commission at the meeting.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Location Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Letter from Pacific Gas & Electric, dated February 3, 2006.

## **EXHIBITS TO BE PROVIDED AT MEETING**

- Model
- Colors and Material Board

**Note:** Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicant. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicant, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps and drawings are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

V:\STAFFRPT\PC\2006\022706\_\_2825\_Sand\_Hill\_Road\_EIR.doc