



PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Regular Meeting
September 24, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bressler, Eiref, Ferrick (Chair), Kadvany (Vice Chair), O'Malley, Riggs, Yu ([arrived 7:36 p.m.](#))

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner; Momo Ishijima, Planner; Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager; Kyle Perata, Assistant Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner; [Leigh Prince, City Attorney's Office](#)

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Under "Reports and Announcements," staff and Commission members may communicate general information of interest regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. No Commission discussion or action can occur on any of the presented items.

1. Update on Pending Planning Items
 - a. Housing Element
 - b. 151 Commonwealth Drive and 164 Jefferson Drive – City Council – September 18, 2012 (*postponed*)
[Staff also mentioned the pending City Council Planning Commissioner interviews, tentatively scheduled for October 2, 2012.](#)

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - [None](#)

Under "Public Comments," the public may address the Commission on any subject not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Commission. When you do so, please state your name and city or political jurisdiction in which you live for the record. The Commission cannot respond to non-agendized items other than to receive testimony and/or provide general information.

C. CONSENT

Items on the consent calendar are considered routine in nature, require no further discussion by the Planning Commission, and may be acted on in one motion unless a member of the Planning Commission or staff requests a separate discussion on an item.

1. [Approval of minutes from the August 20, 2012 Planning Commission meeting](#)
COMMISSION ACTION: M/S Ferrick/O'Malley to approve the minutes with Kadvany correction distributed in advance; 6-0, with Commissioner Yu absent.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

1. [Use Permit/1024 Windermere Avenue/Sandoval Esequiel](#): Request for a use permit for interior remodeling and the construction of first- and second-floor additions to an existing single-story, nonconforming single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and lot size in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 50

percent of the existing floor area, and is considered equivalent to a new structure. The project would also exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period and requires approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission. **COMMISSION ACTION:** M/S Kadvany/Eiref to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; 6-0, with Commissioner Yu absent.

2. **Use Permit/Western Allied Mechanical Inc/1 Casey Court:** Request for a use permit for the outside storage of equipment, non-hazardous materials, and vehicles associated with sheet metal and pipe fabrication for an HVAC business at an existing building, located in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. As part of the project, the applicant is requesting to apply the use based parking guidelines for office, and warehouse/manufacturing uses. A total of 21 parking spaces would be provided, consistent with the recommend number in the use based guidelines, where 54 parking spaces would be required by the M-2 district standards. The applicant is also requesting approval for the use and storage of hazardous materials for sheet metal and pipe fabrication. All hazardous materials would be used and stored within the building. **COMMISSION ACTION:** M/S O'Malley/Bressler to approve the item with the following modification; 7-0:

Add condition 4c: The use permit shall expire 10 years from its effective date (October 10, 2022) unless an extension is approved by the Planning Commission.

3. **Use Permit Revision/Misako Hill for Sprint/2005 Willow Road:** Request for a use permit revision to modify an existing wireless facility, including the replacement of two panel antennas and the addition of four remote radio units (RRUs) on a 42-foot monopole, and the modification of the ground mounted equipment cabinets, located within a Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) substation site. **COMMISSION ACTION:** M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; 7-0.

E. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

1. **Use Permit and Variances/Young and Borlik Architects/1976 Menalto Avenue:** Request for a use permit to demolish a single-story, single family residence and to construct two, single-family dwelling units and associated site improvements, on a lot that is substandard with regard to lot depth and area, located in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. Request for a variance to encroach into the required front and rear yards. As part of this proposal, two heritage trees are proposed to be removed. A 17-inch diameter valley oak in poor to fair condition, located in the middle, right-side of the property is proposed to be removed. In addition, a 19.5-inch diameter magnolia in fair condition, located in the rear of the lot is proposed to be removed as part of this application.

As a study session item, the Commission did not take action on the item. Commissioners provided individual comments including the following:

- Commissioner Bressler stated that the 12 foot depth generally appears unbuildable, but that any questionable variances would be heavily scrutinized. Commissioner Bressler was generally not in support of the requested variances.
- Commissioner Eiref stated that he was generally not in favor of the proposed variance requests, mentioning that the applicant should have reviewed the constraints in more detail prior to purchasing the property. Commissioner Eiref directed the applicant to explore using the footprint of the existing residence and to try to design without variances.
- Commissioner Ferrick mentioned that the Housing Element update is considering different setback requirements for secondary dwelling units, which could result in different and possibly greater impacts on the neighbors than the proposed development. Commissioner Ferrick stated that the tree is a concern, but that the existing house is closer to the tree than

the proposed structure would be; regardless, reorientation of the structure(s) should be explored to see if it could reduce the potential tree impacts. Commissioner Ferrick also stated that on-site parking would be self-regulating. Commissioner Ferrick also stated that she generally supports two units at the proposed smaller unit size.

- Commissioner Kadvany stated that when reviewing projects, the Commission tends to focus more on massing, quality of materials, and if the project is designed in a coherent style, not whether a specific style is appropriate for an area. Commissioner Kadvany stated the project was neatly designed and he believed that the project would generally fit into the neighborhood, and that the surface/material treatment would reduce the overall massing of the structures. Commissioner Kadvany mentioned that on-site parking could be a concern anywhere in Menlo Park, and he believes the residents will handle the on-site parking accordingly. In addition, Commissioner Kadvany directed the applicant to explore reducing the possible visual impacts of the parked vehicles through landscape elements and fencing. Commissioner Kadvany stated that he believes that the oak tree would not be negatively impacted by the development and he stated that he believes he could generally support the variance requests. In addition Commissioner Kadvany mentioned that he believes the smaller nature of the houses could be considered beneficial to the community.
 - Commissioner O'Malley said that he believed the variance argument seemed generally supportable and noted general support for two units at the site. Commissioner O'Malley stated that the architecture could potentially be more sensitive to the neighborhood.
 - Commissioner Riggs stated that this lot was a good example of why the City can consider variances. Commissioner Riggs stated that the variance should not result in a greater buildable area than typical lots. Commissioner Riggs also stated that two units were generally appropriate for the project site and that the City's parking regulations would be met by the development. Commissioner Riggs mentioned that the applicant should try to design the side yard setbacks closer to 20 feet, instead of the minimum ten feet to limit impacts to neighbors. He also mentioned that it might be appropriate to adjust the architectural style to this area, given the requested variances, and the concern from the neighborhood. Commissioner Riggs mentioned that the development was nicely designed but directed the applicant to consider pitched roofs, which might lower the plate heights. Commissioner Riggs also stated that the development should be sensitive to the oak tree.
 - Commissioner Yu stated that the property is peculiar and the Zoning Ordinance determination for flag lots does not appear to take into account the T-shaped nature of the lot. Commissioner Yu stated that the applicant should try to design the project to the setbacks that would be applied if the lot was a typical flag lot. Commissioner Yu stated that the target audience was younger couples and that it could be possible that two couples would share each house, which could lead to a parking problem on-site.
2. **Conditional Development Permit, Rezoning, Lot Merger, Development Agreement, Environmental Review/Facebook, Inc./312 and 313 Constitution Drive:** Request for a rezoning from M-2 (General Industrial District) to M-2-X (General Industrial, Conditional Development), Conditional Development Permit approval, and a lot merger to construct an approximately 433,555 square foot single-story building above an at-grade parking lot that would include approximately 1,540 parking spaces. The proposed structure would exceed the 35-foot height maximum in the M-2 district, but would comply with other applicable development requirements including setbacks, lot coverage and floor area ratio. As part of the project proposal, the applicant is seeking to remove 141 heritage trees in fair to poor health, and

heritage tree removal permits would be required. In addition, the applicant has applied for a Development Agreement, and the proposal is subject to environmental review to confirm that the project design would not result in environmental impacts that were not already identified in the Environmental Impact Report certified for the Facebook Campus Project by the City Council on May 29, 2012.

As a study session item, the Commission did not take action on the item. Commissioners were generally supportive of the project proposal and provided the following comments:

- Building size -
 - Consider ways to provide additional building articulation
 - Consider additional ways to incorporate human scale design elements
- Building design -
 - Consider ways to bring more natural lighting to the parking level
 - Consider the use of elements on the parking level to provide more visual interest. The use of art on the ceiling was suggested
 - Support was expressed for the green roof
 - Support was expressed for removal of the large parking structure (which was part of the previous site design)
 - Consider the transition from the parking lot to the first floor and ensure a good pedestrian experience
 - Consider the quantity of bike parking that will be needed and ensure sufficient bike parking is provided on the parking level and on the first floor
 - Consider the addition of a “pit stop” element on the Willow Road side of the campus to provide an opportunity for a local business to provide services
- Public benefit suggestions -
 - Consider requiring an on-going revenue stream requirement
 - Consider potential impacts to the educational system and the possible benefits Facebook could provide to the School Districts
 - Consider ways the applicant could contribute to the development of workforce housing
 - Consider utilization of the 1601 Willow Road term sheet as a template for negotiation of the West Campus term sheet
 - Consider ways the applicant could address transportation challenges within the City

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT – 10:50

Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Regular Meeting	October 15, 2012
Regular Meeting	October 29, 2012
Regular Meeting	November 5, 2012
Regular Meeting	November 19, 2012
Regular Meeting	December 3, 2012
Regular Meeting	December 17, 2012

Planning Commission meetings are recorded and audio broadcast live. To listen to the live audio broadcast or to past recordings, go to http://menlopark.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2.