



PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Regular Meeting
October 28, 2013 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 ([absent](#)), Eiref (Vice Chair - [absent](#)), Ferrick, Kadvany (Chair), Onken, Riggs, Strehl

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner; [Arlinda Heineck, Community Development Director](#); Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

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.

A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. Housing Element Steering Committee Meeting #3 – October 21, 2013
- b. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Initial Review - City Council – November 12, 2013

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 and items listed under Consent. 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.

C1. [Approval of minutes from the September 9, 2013 Planning Commission meeting](#)

COMMISSION ACTION: M/S Riggs/Strehl to approve the minutes as submitted, 5-0, with Commissioners Bressler and Eiref absent.

C2. [Approval of minutes from the September 23, 2013 Planning Commission meeting](#)

COMMISSION ACTION: M/S Riggs/Kadvany to approve the minutes with the following modification, 5-0, with Commissioners Bressler and Eiref absent.

- Page 26: Delete entire 4th paragraph (starting “Commissioner Onken...”)

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D1. [Development Agreement Annual Review/Facebook, Inc and Wilson Menlo Park Campus, LLC \(East Campus\) and Giant Properties, LLC \(West Campus\)/1 Hacker Way \(East Campus\) and 1 Facebook Way \(West Campus\)](#): Annual review of the property owner’s good faith

compliance with the terms of the Development Agreements for the Facebook East Campus and West Campus (Facebook Campus Project). **COMMISSION ACTION:** M/S Ferrick/Riggs to find and determine upon the basis of substantial evidence that the property owners have, for the period between October 2012 and October 2013 complied in good faith with the terms and conditions of the Development Agreements; 4-0 with Commissioner Onken recused and Commissioners Bressler and Eiref absent.

- D2. Use Permit Revision/Phillips Brooks School/2245 Avy Avenue:** Request for a use permit revision to increase the maximum student and staff populations, from 276 to 320 students (an increase of 44 students) and from 50 to 58 staff (an increase of 8 staff), at an existing private school in the P-F (Public Facilities) zoning district. The proposal includes associated amendments to existing conditions to allow the proposed school population increase until July 31, 2032, and to modify the trip cap monitoring requirements. **COMMISSION ACTION:** M/S Ferrick/Riggs to approve the item with the following modification; 5-0, with Commissioners Bressler and Eiref absent:

Revise condition 3g (second paragraph): If the annual traffic count shows that actual outbound trips exceed the trip limitation, the applicant shall prepare a plan of additional transportation demand management measures within 60 days in order to bring the trips into compliance and shall implement this plan within ~~90~~ 60 days of its preparation. At the end of this ~~90~~ 60-day implementation period, the City shall conduct a supplemental traffic count, with the cost of that count, \$975.00 (adjusted annually starting in 2014 per the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers in the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose area), reimbursed by the applicant, to confirm compliance with the trip count threshold.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS

- E1. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan/Initial Review:** Initial evaluation of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, which was approved in 2012. As specified by Chapter G (“Implementation”), the Planning Commission and City Council will conduct an initial review of the Plan one year after adoption, with ongoing review at two-year intervals thereafter. This review is intended to ensure that the Plan is functioning as intended, as well as to consider the policy-related implications of various Plan aspects. Depending on the results of the initial review, potential modifications may be formally presented for Planning Commission recommendation and City Council action at subsequent meetings. Any such modifications may require additional review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). **Continued from the meeting of October 7, 2013** **COMMISSION ACTION:** At this meeting, the Planning Commission considered a process/content recommendation prepared by the Chair. A preliminary version of this recommendation had been attached to the staff report, although a slightly edited version was distributed at the meeting. The Planning Commission opted to conduct a detailed review of all elements of the Chair’s process/content recommendation that could be addressed at the October 28, 2013 meeting (i.e., everything except for Section D “Middle Plaza & ECR SE Zone”), and to defer other topics to the November 4, 2013 meeting. The Planning Commission specified that the topics addressed on October 28 would not be reopened on November 4.

At the October 28, 2013 meeting, a majority of the Planning Commission favored the following recommendations, excerpted from the Chair’s submittal. With one exception (shown in ~~strikethrough~~), the Commission did not alter the wording as suggested by the Chair. Fuller summaries and vote tallies for all items will be provided when the City Council reviews these topics.

B. SCOPE OF PC ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL

3. Text for Specific Plan on *building remodeling and architectural control:* Specific Plan proposals for building remodeling or changes to site layout (e.g. parking) will be evaluated in terms of potential implications for the attainment of Plan goals, especially with regard to future neighboring development. Examples include pedestrian and bicycle

connectivity, shared public spaces, building access and parking. Remodeling proposals not meeting all Plan criteria should be presented to the Planning Commission for early feedback.

Comment: This text is motivated by recent experience with remodeling to the Mermaid Inn on ECR, for which the PC has tentatively approved (some changes required) remodeling without meeting the Plan sidewalk width standard. All such projects should be scrutinized carefully for precedents and opportunities.

C. PUBLIC BENEFIT AND ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL THRESHOLDS; PUBLIC BENEFIT CATEGORIES

1. Eliminate LEED certification as a potential public benefit.

Comment: LEED certification is not an appropriate public benefit category. High levels of LEED certification or the equivalent may be considered as supporting attainment of the Plan vision principle of healthy environment and sustainability.

G. INFRASTRUCTURE

Implementation recommendations for City Council action

1. **Infrastructure goals.** The City Council should identify major infrastructure goals to be pursued immediately in support Plan implementation including: **a) design and construction of a Middle Avenue bicycle/pedestrian tunnel and plaza; b) Downtown parking garage** (location/size TBA based on parking study). As partial or complete funding becomes available for **a)** or **b)**, funding goals and priorities should be adjusted accordingly.

Comment: A downtown parking garage has been recommended in the Specific Plan as a priority goal for implementation and is essential to Downtown development realizing Plan goals. A garage will take years to design and build whose planning should therefore be pursued immediately. Middle Avenue improvements and funding are uncertain and so is addressed here and below in the context of ECR SE.

2. **Revenue generation A.** The City Council should aggressively pursue revenue generation directed to funding of major Plan infrastructure goals improvements using a combination of financial instruments determined to be most effective over time, are fair to property owners and developers, and are relevant to changing economic conditions. **Such means may include, but are not limited to new building square footage assessment (e.g. \$x/floor area); public benefit contributions; bond measures and other means identified already in the Specific Plan.**

Comment: A downtown parking garage has been recommended in the Specific Plan as a priority goal for implementation and is essential to Downtown development realizing Plan goals. A garage will take years to design and build whose planning should therefore be pursued immediately. Middle Avenue improvements and funding are uncertain and also addressed in the context of ECR SE.

H. TRAFFIC & MOBILITY

1. City Council should direct the creation of an effective and financially efficient **Transportation Management Association** open to all offices, businesses and residences in the entire Plan area. The TMA mandate should include coordination, monitoring, reporting and improvement of Transportation Demand Management programs for participating businesses, offices and residences.

2. Specific Plan project development along El Camino Real should be accompanied by significant bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety improvements, particularly with

respect to a potential pedestrian/bike tunnel location; ECR north/south mobility; and ECR east/west crossings. ~~In addition to crossing, bike lane designs or controls described in the Plan, further options representing best practices or safety models should be considered, including four-way crossings.~~

Comment: A TMA can be instituted during the time that initial Specific Plan area projects are built out. Pending TMA creation, the city should pursue TMA goals using internal resources.

3. The Specific Plan should include provisions for: **a)** in-lieu parking fees to be applied to TMA funding; **b)** unbundling of commercial, in addition to residential, parking; **c)** ability for parking fees to be applied as employee parking “cash-out.”

Comment: Recent experience of Palo Alto and San Mateo to finance parking options show that provisions **a)** and **b)** need to be in place before projects are permitted. Provision **c)** has been shown effective in some cities at reducing parking demand by motivating cost-effective behavior rather than building additional parking stalls.

I. DOWNTOWN

1. The City Council should fund and implement pilot projects for the Downtown Paseo and sidewalk extension.

Comment: The pilot projects represent the fundamental starting point for public space improvements to activate the Downtown and should not be delayed.

F. COMMISSION BUSINESS – None

ADJOURNMENT – 12:01 a.m. (Tuesday, October 29, 2013)

Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Regular Meeting	November 4, 2013
Regular Meeting	November 18, 2013
Regular Meeting	December 9, 2013
Regular Meeting	December 16, 2013

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.