



# PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION REPORT

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 2009  
AGENDA ITEM C2

<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>100 – 190 Independence Drive and 101 – 155 Constitution Drive</b>	<b>APPLICANT AND OWNER:</b>	<b>Bohannon Development Company</b>
<b>EXISTING USE:</b>	<b>Offices, Research and Development (R&amp;D), Light Industrial, Vacant Land</b>		
<b>PROPOSED USE:</b>	<b>Offices and R&amp;D, Hotel, Health Club, Cafe and Restaurant, Neighborhood- Serving Retail and Community Facilities</b>	<b>APPLICATION:</b>	<b>General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Rezoning, Development Agreement, Architectural Control, BMR Agreement, Environmental Review, Tentative Parcel Maps, Heritage Tree Removal Permits</b>
<b>EXISTING ZONING:</b>	<b>M-2 (General Industrial)</b>	<b>PROPOSED ZONING:</b>	<b>M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park)</b>
<b>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	<b>Limited Industry</b>	<b>PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	<b>Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park</b>

## PROPOSAL

The Bohannon Development Company has submitted a proposal for a mixed-use office, research and development (R&D), hotel, and health club development on nine properties addressed 100 to 190 Independence Drive and 101 to 155 Constitution Drive. The proposal is currently branded as the Menlo Gateway project, although it has also been referred to informally as the Bohannon hotel-office mixed-use project. The proposed project would require the following actions:

1. **General Plan Amendment** to create a new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park land use designation, which would allow research and development (R&D) facilities, offices, hotels/motels, health/fitness centers, cafes and restaurants, and related commercial uses.
2. **General Plan Amendment** to change the land use designation of the properties from Limited Industry to Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park;
3. **Zoning Ordinance Amendment** to create a new M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park) zoning district and undertake associated modifications, in particular the creation of specific parking requirements for the M-3 district;
4. **Rezoning** the properties from M-2 (General Industrial) to M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park);
5. **Development Agreement** to create vested rights in project approvals, address implementation of the proposed design and infrastructure improvements in the project area, and specify benefits to the City;
6. **Architectural Control** approval of specific project plans for the construction of new buildings with a maximum of 955,170 square feet of gross floor area (137.5 percent FAR) and a maximum building height of 140 feet;
  - The Constitution Drive site would include two eight-story office buildings totaling 494,669 square feet; potential neighborhood-serving convenience retail and community facility space; and two multi-story parking structures;
  - The Independence Drive site would include a 200,000-square-foot, eight-story office building; a 171,563-square foot, eleven-story, 230-room hotel; a 68,519-square-foot health and fitness center; a 4,245-square-foot restaurant; potential neighborhood-serving convenience retail and community facility space; and a shared multi-story parking structure;
7. **Tentative Parcel Maps** (one on the Independence site and one on the Constitution site) to merge lots, adjust lot lines, and establish easements.
8. **Heritage Tree Removal Permits** to remove 40 heritage trees on the Independence site and 32 heritage trees on the Constitution site;
9. **BMR Agreement** for the payment of in-lieu fees associated with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program; and
10. **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposal.

In addition, the development review process includes the review of a Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA), which is currently available in draft form. Public comments on the Draft FIA are due in conjunction with the October 5, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

As a study session item, no staff recommendation on the requested applications is being provided, and the Planning Commission is not required to take any action as a body at this time. The study session provides an opportunity for the Planning Commission to become more familiar with the proposed project and for the applicant and staff to understand questions, ideas or concerns of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission's comments will be forwarded to the City Council.

## **PROCESS**

The Planning Commission study session on October 5, 2009 provides an opportunity to discuss the overall application and development program (including the architectural design and development regulations), the Draft FIA, and public benefit. This meeting follows an earlier Planning Commission public hearing on September 14, 2009 to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The intended outcome of the October 5 meeting will be for the Commission to review and comment on any aspect of the proposal aside from formal comments on the Draft EIR. Following this meeting, the City Council will hold a study session, tentatively scheduled for November 3, 2009, to consider feedback from the Planning Commission and to discuss the overall application and development program, environmental impacts and mitigations, the Draft FIA, and public benefit. This study session will be followed by a City Council regular business item, tentatively scheduled for November 17, 2009, to provide direction or parameters to guide the Development Agreement negotiations. Following the November 17 meeting, the City's consultants would prepare the final environmental and fiscal documents, which would include responses to comments received during review of the draft documents. Concurrently, staff and the applicant would negotiate a draft Development Agreement, which would be available for review by the general public and considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in early 2010.

A comprehensive listing of past public meetings and milestones associated with the proposal is included as Attachment C. The public outreach and Development Agreement negotiation process, constituting all meetings from the July 2009 Community Meetings onward, was reviewed and approved by the City Council in April and June 2009. The process recommendation was the result of focused work conducted by the project's Council Subcommittee, made up of Council Members Cohen and Fergusson. The Council Subcommittee will continue to have an active role throughout the remainder of the process, including by providing of oversight and advisory services during the Development Agreement negotiation.

## **STUDY SESSION ITEMS**

### **Development Program**

The Development Program covers the various applications and requests that comprise the proposed project. A brief summary of the components is summarized below. The Study Session provides the Planning Commission to comment on the Development Program. The applicant has submitted an information packet, which is included as Attachment D.

**General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment**

The applicant has proposed the creation of a new General Plan Land Use Designation (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park) and Zoning District (M-3 Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park), which would be applied to the project sites. The proposed amendments are included as Attachment E.

The following is a summary table comparing the development standards of the existing M-2 and proposed M-3 zoning districts.

**Development Regulation Comparison**

	<b>Proposed M-3 District Requirements</b>	<b>Existing M-2 District Requirements</b>
<b>Lot Area</b>	0 sf min.	25,000 sf min.
<b>Lot Width</b>	0 ft. min.	100 ft. min.
<b>Lot Depth</b>	0 ft. min.	100 ft. min.
<b>Setbacks</b>		
<b>Front</b>	0 ft. min.	20 ft. min.
<b>Rear</b>	10 ft. min.	0 ft. min.
<b>Sides</b>	5 ft. avg.	10 ft. avg.
<b>Height</b>	140 ft. max.	35 ft. max.
<b>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</b>		
<b>Office</b>	100% max.	45% max.
<b>Hotel</b>	24% max. additional	Not applicable
<b>Other</b>	13.5% max. additional	10% max. additional
<b>Total</b>	<u>137.5% max.</u>	<u>55% max.</u>
<b>Coverage</b>	45% max.	50% max.
<b>Paving</b>	0% min.	0% min.
<b>Landscaping</b>	0% min.	0% min.

In addition to the creation of the proposed new M-3 district, the applicant is proposing to undertake several associated amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, such as the creation of use-based, shared off-street parking standards specific to the M-3 district. More information about the proposed parking standards is available in the draft Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), which is excerpted as Attachment F. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments would also include additions and changes to a number of definitions.

The proposed M-3 maximum office FAR of 100 percent would be larger than what is permitted in any of the existing commercial zoning districts, which have maximums of between 20 and 50 percent. The proposed M-3 total maximum FAR of 137.5 percent would be larger than any other existing commercial district, with the exception of the C-3 (Central Commercial) district, in which an FAR of 200 percent may be permitted by use permit, provided the required parking for the square footage above the 100 percent FAR is provided on site or on nearby private property. In practice, this parking requirement

can be difficult to meet on smaller downtown parcels, and has had the effect of keeping recent C-3 development at or near 100 percent FAR. The proposed maximum height of 140 feet would be larger than any other base zoning district (the R-4 High-Density Residential zoning district currently allows the greatest maximum, 40 feet). However, projects that qualify for a Conditional Development Permit (CDP) may propose heights greater than the base zoning requirement, with no specific limit. Staff has prepared a matrix comparing the proposed project with other projects of interest, both within and outside the City (Attachment G).

The proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments have been tailored to allow the specific development application, and represent the project sponsor's preferred approach. Staff has reviewed the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments for basic technical compliance and has suggested modifications that have been incorporated by the project sponsor. Staff (including the City Attorney) is planning to conduct another round of detailed review of the proposed amendments, and may present additional analysis on the approach at a future meeting. There may be refinements or modifications that would permit the same development program and fit within the Draft EIR parameters, but which interact better within the existing ordinances, or establish clearer direction for future development applications. The Planning Commission may comment at this meeting on the overall method by which the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance would be amended.

### ***Development Agreement***

The applicant is requesting a legally binding Development Agreement. A Development Agreement is a contract between the City of Menlo Park and a project sponsor that delineates the terms and conditions of a proposed development project. A Development Agreement allows a project sponsor to secure vested rights, and it allows the City to secure certain benefits. Development Agreements are enabled by California Government Code Sections 6584-65869.5. The City Council adopted Resolution No. 4159 in January 1990, establishing the procedures and requirements for the consideration of Development Agreements (Resolution No. 4159 is available upon request at City offices or on the project page). The resolution contains specific provisions regarding the form of applications for development agreements, minimum requirements for public notification and review, standards for review, findings and decisions, amendments and cancellation of agreements by mutual consent, recordation of the agreements, periodic review, and modification or termination of an agreement.

To date, the City has approved one Development Agreement, in 1991, for the Sun Microsystems campus at 1601 Willow Road along Bayfront Expressway. This agreement is available upon request at City offices or on the project page. Among other elements, the agreement specifies an overall term of 18 years, vests certain development rights (including the total square footage that could be constructed), and requires that the developer pay the City a guaranteed revenue stream (from which sales or use tax can be deducted).

Under the proposed M-3 zoning district, a Development Agreement would be a requirement for any M-3 development. The project sponsor has not yet proposed any

specific terms for the Development Agreement, such as a length of time for which the development rights would be vested.

Under the process approved by the City Council, the direct negotiation of a draft agreement with the applicant would be undertaken by a core team, consisting of the following:

- Business Development Manager David Johnson
- City Attorney Bill McClure
- City Manager Glen Rojas
- Development Services Manager Justin Murphy
- Public Works Director Kent Steffens

While the draft Development Agreement would initially be negotiated by a limited group (due to the complexity and technical content of such agreements), the draft would be released for public review, including a formal recommendation by the Planning Commission, and the full City Council may direct the core negotiation team to pursue revisions at any point before final approval.

As stated in earlier staff reports for this proposal, staff believes that the Development Agreement would have the following core principles:

1. Guarantees must be provided with regard to any public benefits; and
2. Construction of the hotel component must occur prior to any office construction.

In addition, negotiation of the draft Development Agreement would be informed by the following:

- Direction from the full City Council at a regular meeting, currently projected for November 17, 2009;
- Ongoing feedback from the Council Subcommittee;
- Input from additional staff members, such as the Finance Director, Community Development Director, and Police Chief; and
- Review from an independent development consultant.

The input from the independent development consultant is intended to provide the City with a more detailed understanding of the monetary value of the project approvals. The consultant would preferably be someone who has developed property or has extensive experience with the financials of a development project, especially one involving a hotel.

### ***Other Land Use Entitlements and Necessary Approvals***

The Menlo Gateway project requires other entitlements and City approvals as described below. The October 5, 2009 meeting provides an opportunity for the Planning Commission to ask questions and provide feedback regarding these requests as well.

### **Architectural Control**

The applicant has prepared detail project plans for architectural control review of the proposed structures and site improvements. The Planning Commission has received complete packages of the project plans and all of the project plans are available for viewing on the City's website. (Select sheets of the project plans are included as Attachment B). The project is targeting a rating of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold for the offices and Silver for the hotel and health club.

### Tentative Parcel Maps

The applicant is proposing to record Tentative Parcel Maps (one on the Independence site and one on the Constitution site), in order to merge lots, adjust lot lines, and establish easements. On the Independence Site, the five existing parcels would be merged into either one parcel or two parcels with the parking structure and either the hotel or the office building. On the Constitution Site, the four existing parcels would be merged into either one parcel or two parcels with one office building and one parking structure on each parcel. The consolidation of the parcels would be accomplished through parcel maps on the respective sites. In addition, the parcel maps would be used to establish and modify easements.

### Heritage Tree Removals

Based on the preliminary arborist report (available upon request), a total of 35 trees were identified on the Constitution site that would be protected under the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance as shown on project plan sheet CL2. Of those trees, a total of approximately 32 are slated for removal. On the Independence site a total of 55 heritage trees were identified as shown on project plan sheet IL2, with approximately 40 slated for removal. Almost all of the redwood trees along the US 101 frontage of the Independence site are proposed to remain.

### Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement

The applicant is proposing to pay the in lieu fee to comply with the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) housing requirements. Based on the current fees and calculating a credit for the existing buildings, the fee is estimated to be \$8,481,300. The BMR Agreement regarding the payment of fees would need to be reviewed by the Housing Commission.

## Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan

The applicant has prepared a Preliminary TDM Plan, which is included as Appendix J of the Draft EIR and available on the City's website. The TDM Plan includes the following items:

- Bicycle lockers and racks;
- Showers and changing rooms;
- Shuttle service;
- Subsidized public transit tickets;
- Subsidies for pedestrian/bicyclists who commute to work;
- Vanpool program;
- Preferential carpool and vanpool parking;
- Commute assistance center;
- Employee commute surveys;
- Alternative work schedules;
- Provision of on-site amenities;
- Guaranteed ride home program;
- Installation and maintenance of alternative transportation kiosks;
- Telecommuting; and
- Connections for non-motorized travel.

## Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA)

The City's independent economic consultant, Bay Area Economics (BAE) has prepared a Draft Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA), projecting the potential changes in fiscal revenues and service costs directly associated with development of the proposed project, as well as for the five alternatives that were defined through the EIR process. The Draft FIA also explores a number of related topics, including indirect revenues/costs from potential induced housing demand, as well as possible development pressures on nearby parcels. In addition, the Draft FIA analyzes one-time/non-recurring revenues (such as impact fees) and discusses potential additional opportunities for fiscal benefits. The Draft FIA was released in July 2009 and is available for public review at City offices and on the project page. The Draft FIA work was informed by a Council-approved scope of work and a public workshop conducted on July 30, 2008, at which the proposed assumptions and methodologies were presented and input was received.

## General Fund Impact of Proposed Project and Alternatives

The core of the Draft FIA is the estimation of annual General Fund revenues and costs associated with the proposal and the alternatives. The major annually occurring revenue sources include new property taxes, sales taxes, and transient occupancy tax (TOT, also known as the room or lodging tax). The Draft FIA projects that the project would generate annual stabilized revenues to the General Fund of \$2.15 million. The largest portion (60 percent) of these revenues would come from TOT, and the second-largest component (23 percent) would consist of property tax. For the analysis of expenditures, BAE interviewed department and agency heads to determine whether the estimation should be based on marginal costs (for example, if specific new facilities/equipment or personnel slots would be needed to serve the project) or on average costs (using the proportional increase in the overall Menlo Park service population represented by the proposed project and the alternatives). For the latter analysis, service population is defined as 100 percent of residents residing within a

jurisdiction plus 50 percent of employees, which reflects the lower demands for governmental services that are generated by employees compared to residents. The Draft FIA estimates that the proposed project would generate approximately \$485,000 in annually recurring General Fund expenditures. The largest portion of this (54 percent) would consist of increased personnel costs for the Police Department.

Subtracting the costs from the revenues, the Draft FIA projects a net fiscal impact to the General Fund of an annual surplus of \$1.67 million. The analysis of the alternatives projects modest net surpluses for Alternatives 1 (no project) and 2 (office build-out under existing M-2 zoning). For Alternatives 3 through 5, which consist of the hotel and health club as proposed, alongside a range of reduced-size office components, the analysis projects annual net General Fund surpluses of \$1.40 million to \$1.57 million, the largest portion of which is represented by TOT. The project sponsor has submitted a letter (Attachment H) questioning the assumption that the hotel and health club as proposed (specifically, the Renaissance ClubSport product) would be viable without the office square footage as proposed, stating that Alternative 3 would not support any hotel at all, and that Alternatives 4 and 5 would only support a smaller Marriott Courtyard type of hotel product. The project sponsor's letter includes correspondence from Marriott and PKF Consulting supporting the position that the office population would represent a majority of the health club membership and help generate demand for the hotel, albeit without detailed background information on how the precise proposed office square footage was determined to be necessary to support the hotel and health club. The Draft FIA's analysis of the alternatives as defined through the EIR process is in line with the assumptions and methodologies that were publicly discussed prior to the commencement of work. As part of the formal response to comments, BAE will analyze the supplemental information submitted by the applicant.

### Special Districts

The Draft FIA also looks at the ongoing impact on special districts, in particular the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, which is projected to receive total annual revenues (primarily from property tax) of approximately \$554,000 from the proposed project. On the cost side, the Fire District is projected to have annual expenditures of approximately \$616,000, primarily due to staffing requirements for a new ladder truck needed to serve the proposed buildings of greater than three stories in height, leading to an annual net cost to the Fire District of \$62,000. The ladder truck itself is considered a one-time capital cost, estimated at \$1.0 million to \$1.5 million. The remainder of the special district analysis (such as for school districts and water/sanitary districts) projects positive net impacts, particularly for school districts, which would not see any direct student population increase. The project is located within the Redwood City Elementary School District, which would receive all of the property tax allocation for primary education.

## Other Analyses

The Draft FIA also includes a discussion of the potential for future land use changes in the vicinity of the project, in particular with office-only development at densities similar to the proposed project. With regard to the block that is located between the two project sites, these 12 parcels are not considered likely candidates for near-term redevelopment, due their relatively small size (average 1.3 acres) and disparate ownership, which would require land assembly for development. East of the project sites, some larger parcels (several owned by the project sponsor) include newer office buildings, which would typically discourage near-term redevelopment. Some of the other nearby parcels are occupied by owner/users that need facilities for business operations, which typically results in less interest in development, and other parcels are smaller and/or owned by different entities. However, the project sponsor does own a number of other parcels that are occupied by older industrial buildings and which could be considered candidates for redevelopment. Overall, the analysis determines that the long-term demand for higher-density office is likely, but constrained by land assembly issues, as well as the City's role in permitting General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments.

In addition, the Draft FIA discusses the potential indirect impact of induced housing demand, using the upper-end projection from the Housing Needs Analysis (included as an appendix to the Draft EIR), which states that the project could result in a 76-unit increase to the City's next Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The Draft FIA projects that if these units were actually developed and occupied, the revenues/expenditures would result in an annual net General Fund deficit of approximately \$68,000. Potential impacts to elementary schools would vary depending on which of four districts that serve the City the units were located in, ranging from a deficit of \$45,000 (Las Lomas) to a surplus of \$35,000 (Ravenswood).

## Comments

A key objective of the October 5 meeting is to receive Draft FIA comments, which will be included and responded to as part of the Final FIA. Aside from the letter from the project sponsor in reference to the alternatives, staff has not received any correspondence that is specifically in reference to the Draft FIA.

## Public Benefit

As noted earlier, the Development Agreement provides a mechanism for the City to grant a longer-term approval in exchange for demonstrable public benefits. In contrast to standard conditions of approval (such as payment of impact fees) or mitigation measures required through the EIR process (such as construction of intersection improvements), public benefits that are defined through the Development Agreement do not have to be directly correlated to a project's impacts or follow a standard formula. For the purposes of this discussion, public benefit is typically viewed as a distinct topic than those inherent attributes of the project that may be considered positive, such as the projected TOT revenue, although the characteristics of the overall project should be

understood and considered as part of the detailed discussion of public benefit options. The concept of public benefit is linked with the overall development program, in particular the size of the project. The proposed project, as the largest of the options under discussion, would offer the opportunity for the greatest amount of public benefit.

Under the public outreach and Development Agreement negotiation process approved by the City Council, the topic of public benefit is being considered in a three-phase approach:

1. **Idea Gathering** (July-August 2009) – Generate a broad range of public benefit ideas that are of interest to the community in relation to the proposal;
2. **Review and Prioritization** (September-November 2009) – Starting with the public benefit ideas generated by the community, the Planning Commission and City Council establish which ideas are priorities and provide additional suggestions, if needed; and
3. **Development Agreement Negotiation** (November-December 2009) – Using the priority public benefit ideas and City Council direction on the overall development program, negotiate Development Agreement with project sponsor.

The public benefit discussion commenced with Idea Gathering exercises at the three Community Meetings in July 2009. These exercises consisted of community members providing input (via dots to establish general areas of emphasis and/or notes to provide additional context) on broad public benefit categories identified by staff. The Community Meeting exercises were complemented by an open-ended public benefit discussion at the General Commission Meeting on August 19, 2009, which was attended by representatives of the Bicycle, Environmental Quality, and Parks and Recreation Commission, as well as members of the general public.

As part of the Review and Prioritization Task, the public benefit input from the Community Meetings and General Commission Meeting has been reviewed by staff and the Council Subcommittee, and is available as Attachment I. The initial input has been filtered and consolidated, such as by providing an additional level of detail for overly general suggestions or by removing duplicate ideas. Where a public benefit recommendation was determined to already be part of another plan (such as the Redevelopment Implementation Plan) or more directly within another agency's purview, it has been removed from future consideration but included on the list for disclosure purposes.

For the meeting of October 5, the Planning Commission should:

1. Review the public benefit input list for overall completeness and accuracy;
2. Provide additional public benefit suggestions, if any key topics are missing; and
3. Individually rank the top 10 public benefit ideas, from 10 (most important) to 1 (least important).

Staff will tally the Commissioners' individual forced rankings to establish the Commission's overall priorities, which will be shown to the Commission at the October 5 meeting, prior to finalization. The Commission's priorities will then be presented to the City Council as one of several criteria for consideration. The Council will then conduct the final review and prioritization of the public benefit ideas, to be used during the Development Agreement Negotiation phase. This process will be informed by City Council direction on the overall development program. As noted earlier, the potential for public benefit is likely to be affected by the overall size of the project, and is subject overall to detailed negotiation with the project sponsor. The establishment of public benefit priority list will be used to guide the negotiation, but it should not be understood that some or many of the ideas may not be achievable.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 14, 2009 to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Menlo Gateway project. The public comment period ended on September 21, 2009, and the City received correspondence from 29 individuals and agencies/institutions, in addition to the verbal comments made at the September 14, 2009 meeting. All of the Draft EIR comments are available for review on the City website and will be responded to as part of the Final EIR. Some of the comments may address topics that are not directly related to the Draft EIR. The response to comments in the Final EIR will be reviewed at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting, which is projected to take place in early 2010.

## **RECOMMENDED MEETING PROCEDURE**

1. Introduction by Staff
2. Applicant Presentation
3. Questions of Applicant
4. Staff/Consultant Presentations
  - a. Draft FIA Overview: BAE
  - b. Public Benefits: Staff
5. Commission Questions of Staff/Consultant
6. Public Comment
7. Commission Rank Top 10 Public Benefit Ideas
8. Break (5 minutes)
9. Commission Comments
  - a. Development Program
    - i. General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments
    - ii. Development Agreement
    - iii. Architectural Control/Project Plans
    - iv. Other Land Use Entitlements and Necessary Approvals
  - b. Fiscal Impact Analysis
  - c. Public Benefit – Review Composite Rankings

---

Thomas Rogers  
Associate Planner  
Report Author

---

Justin Murphy  
Development Services Manager

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

Public notification consisted of publishing a legal notice in the local newspaper and sending an email update to subscribers to the project page for the proposal, which is available at the following address: [http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev\\_iac.htm](http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev_iac.htm).

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Location Map
- B. Project Plans (*select sheets – complete plans available for review at the City offices or on the City web site*)
- C. [Project Meetings and Milestones](#)
- D. Menlo Gateway Project Information Packet, Prepared by Applicant
- E. [Draft General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment](#)
- F. [Parking Analysis Excerpt from the Transportation Impact Analysis \(TIA\)](#)
- G. [Comparison of Other Projects](#)
- H. [Project Sponsor Comment Letter on Draft FIA, dated September 29, 2009](#)
- I. [Draft Public Benefit Ideas](#)

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

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

Color copies of Menlo Gateway Project Information Packet, Prepared by Applicant

## **AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT CITY OFFICES AND WEBSITE**

- Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared by PBS&J, dated July 2009
- Public Comments on the Draft EIR
- Draft Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by BAE, dated July 2009

V:\STAFFRPT\PC\2009\100509 - Menlo Gateway (Bohannon hotel-office).doc