



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
January 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, Eiref (arrived 7:26 p.m.), Ferrick (Chair), Kadwany (Vice Chair), O'Malley, Onken, Riggs

Chair Ferrick noted that Commissioner Eiref was delayed but would arrive later.

**INTRODUCTION OF STAFF** – Momoko Ishijima, Planner; Jean Lin, Associate Planner; Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

### A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### A1. Update on Pending Planning Items

- a. Facebook West – City Council Term Sheet Review – January 22, 2013

Planner Rogers said the City Council at their January 22, 2013 meeting reviewed and approved in concept a proposed term sheet for a Facebook West development agreement. He said staff was now preparing the formal development agreement language. He said the Planning Commission would consider the proposed development agreement at their second meeting in February with review by the City Council slated for March.

- b. Housing Element – Community Workshops – January 29 and 30, 2013

Planner Rogers said on January 29 and 30 there would be community workshops on the Housing Element. He said that the presentation would be the same for both workshops.

- c. 1976 Menalto Avenue – City Council Appeal – February 12, 2013
- d. 2200 Sand Hill Road – City Council Appeal – February 12, 2013

Planner Rogers said the remaining two report items were use permit requests the Commission had approved recently that had been appealed to the City Council. He said both appeals were scheduled for the Council's February 12, 2013 meeting.

### B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

## C. CONSENT

### C1. Approval of minutes from the December 3, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Ferrick noted corrections to the minutes that had been emailed to staff prior to the meeting.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the minutes with the following modifications:

- Page 7, 6<sup>th</sup> line from top: change “5-0 with Commissioners Bressler and Onken voting in dissent” to “5-2 with Commissioners Bressler and Onken voting in dissent.”
- Page 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from bottom, 1<sup>st</sup> line: change “Commissioner Kadvany noted that His property was close to the 500-foot radius of the subject property and he needed to recuse himself.” to “Commissioner Kadvany then noted, prompted by Staff, that his property was close to the 500-foot radius of the subject property and he needed to recuse himself.” Then move this paragraph to the top of page 12.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

### C2. Approval of minutes from the December 17, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Ferrick to approve the minutes with the following modifications:

- Page 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph from bottom, 1<sup>st</sup> line: change “fund” to “finance”.
- Page 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line: change “Commissioner Riggs suggestion...” to “Commissioner Riggs’ suggestion...”

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

## D. PUBLIC HEARING

- D1. **Use Permit/Qui T. Son/1062 Del Norte Avenue:** Request for use permit approval for interior remodeling and construction of first- and second-story additions to an existing nonconforming single-story, single-family residence on a standard lot in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban) zoning district. The project would exceed 50 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period and requires approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission.

Staff Comment: Planner Ishijima said there were no additions to the written report.

Public Comment: Mr. Phil Nyugen introduced his wife, Anna Lee, the property owners, and said that they wanted to add a 700 square foot second story for a master bedroom and a nursery. He said they had canvassed their neighbors for their input and consent for the project.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner O'Malley said he supported the project proposal, and moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Kadvany seconded the motion.

Commissioner Onken asked if the cottage office in the rear with the garage was counted as a secondary dwelling unit. Planner Ishijima said it was a permitted accessory structure in which part of the garage had been converted into a recreation room but it was not a second unit. Commissioner Onken asked why only a covered parking space was being required. Planner Ishijima said typically if the parking was nonconforming that with this type of remodel/expansion project proposal applicants were not required to bring parking into conformance.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Kadvany to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

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 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 I-Mark Design Group, consisting of seven plan sheets, dated received January 9, 2013, and approved by the Planning Commission on January 28, 2013, 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.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

**D2. Use Permit/Core Development Services for T-Mobile/2882 Sand Hill Road:** Request for a use permit revision to modify an existing wireless facility, including the replacement of two panel antennas and the addition of two panel antennas mounted on the rooftop of an existing office building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research, Restrictive) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Ishijima said there were no additions to the staff report.

Public Comment: Ms. Gimbar Ketema, Core Development Services, said she was representing T-Mobile. She said the proposal was for the modification of an existing wireless facility located at 2882 Sand Hill Road and included the replacement of the two existing antennas with three antennas, all to be located on the rooftop of an office building. She said that drawings, photo simulations, and coverage maps had been distributed to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Onken said it seemed that the new coverage would be less than the existing coverage. Ms. Ketema said the antenna upgrades were intended more for data capacity. Commissioner Onken asked if the antennas were adversely affecting the telephone coverage. Ms. Ketema said she could find out but the project was to increase data capacity.

Commissioner Kadvany said there was a great deal of information about electric and magnetic fields created by the equipment but he said he could not understand what the health risk exposure was. Ms. Ketema said the fields were not harmful. She said the information was intended to state that the project would conform to regulations and would remain at a harmless level, with no occupational hazard.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said the difference between the existing antennas and the proposed antennas besides their greater width was that they would protrude considerably from the mounting surface. Mr. Rodney Barnes, Program Design Group, architects, said the reason for the stand-off was because these antennas generate heat and to function effectively needed greater stand-off than the previous antennas. He said equipment that used to be alongside the antennas was now incorporated into the antennas, which made them bigger and wider. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with the applicant that the antennas were painted to match the buildings behind them. He said the roof plan indicated antennas were only on one face but the antenna plan indicated that they were on two faces. Ms. Ketema said that the antennas were on two faces.

Commissioner O'Malley confirmed with the applicant that the changes would not be visible from the street.

Commission Action: M/S O'Malley/Onken to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make necessary findings, pursuant to 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 safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or general welfare of the City. *(Due to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) preemption over local law regarding concerns over health where the proposed facility meets FCC requirements, staff has eliminated the standard finding for "health" with respect to the subject use permit.)*
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 Core Development Services dated received January 8, 2013, consisting of five plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on January 28, 2013 except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
  - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all County, State, and Federal regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division that are directly applicable to the new construction.
  - d. If the antennas or any portion of the antennas and associated mechanical equipment discontinue operation at the site, the antennas and associated equipment shall be removed from the site within 30 days.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Eiref absent.

**D3. Use Permit Revision and Architectural Control/Stoecker and Northway Architects/1340 Willow Road:** Request for a use permit revision and architectural control to construct a new 2,000 square foot performing arts classroom building and outdoor amphitheater at an existing private high school located in the M-2 (General Industrial) zoning district. The location of the proposed performing arts building and outdoor amphitheater would occupy the area currently designated for 46 landscape reserve parking spaces, reducing the total number of parking spaces from 92 to 46 spaces.

Staff Comment: Planner Lin said a colors and materials board had been distributed to the Commission, and noted there were no additions to the written report.

Public Comment: Ms. Jessi Phillips, San Francisco, a drama teacher at Mid-Peninsula High School, said there was no facility for school drama productions and this proposed project would provide a dedicated space for the performing arts. She said what was currently an acting class could be expanded to include other areas such as lighting, sound and set design. She said this would be a benefit for school community.

Ms. Megan Biglow introduced Ms. Sarah Cobbett and said they were both students at Mid-Peninsula High School. She said she was in the acting and drama program, and Ms. Cobbett was in the music program. She said it would be really great to have a larger facility as currently only about one-third of the student population was able to fit in the classroom for performances. Ms. Cobbett said the music class was currently located between the American Sign Language and the Spanish classroom. She said to have a dedicated facility would improve the learning environment. Ms. Biglow said that currently only about six to seven people can fit in the classroom.

Chair Ferrick noted the arrival of Commissioner Eiref to the dais.

Ms. Andrea Thurber said she was the parent of a current student and an alumni parent. She said the Mid-Peninsula School attracted students from all over the Bay area. She said in 2004 there were no performing arts programs at the school but over the years students have been given the opportunities to learn an instrument, singing, and acting. She said having a facility would enhance the existing programs and perhaps even allow for a dance program.

Mr. Doug Thompson, Head of School at Mid-Peninsula High School, said that they wanted to accommodate students with space to accomplish better the work they were already doing. He said they were not trying to expand anything but to provide a space for the students who were already contributing performing arts to the school to be able to do so more effectively.

Chair Ferrick closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Onken noted information on the increased number of visitors for different events and asked where the nearest crosswalk was on Willow Road.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Thompson said there was a crosswalk at Ivy Street.

Commissioner Kadvany said the landscape reserve parking would be eliminated and asked about future parking needs.

Mr. Thompson said they had never gone beyond their current parking needs and that even using a portion of the land for development would leave ample land if landscape reserve was needed.

Commissioner Riggs said under the use permit the school currently could increase the student body by 39 students, and asked if that occurred, how the parking would be addressed. Mr. Thompson said there was not adequate space at the school to add 39 students and he did not anticipate ever adding that many students. He said if they did however there was San Francisco Public Utilities Commission land in the back for which they had an agreement for parking and could add more.

Commissioner Onken said this area was the site of the City's economic engine and while they would not want to do anything to upset the balance there he wanted it noted that this proposed building would provide a building with attractive architecture in the industrial landscape.

Commissioner Onken moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Chair Ferrick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Eiref asked about conditions 5.b and 5.d and if the applicant were comfortable with those restrictions. Mr. Thompson said the conditions were fine.

Commission Action: M/S Onken/Ferrick to approve the item as recommended in the staff report.

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 CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
  - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
  - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
  - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
  - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. 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.
4. Approve the architectural control and use permit revision subject to the following **standard** conditions:
  - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Stoecker and Northway Architects, dated received on January 23, 2013, consisting of 17 plan sheets and approved by the Planning Commission on January 28, 2013, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
  - b. Prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant shall comply with all sanitary district, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, Recology, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
  - c. Prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant shall comply with all requirements

of the Building Division, Transportation Division, and Engineering Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- d. A utility plan showing the exact location of all meters, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, back-flow prevention devices, etc., that are being installed outside of the building and provisions being made to screen such equipment from view, shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Division and Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.
  - e. Concurrent with the submittal a building permit, the applicant shall submit a plan for construction safety fences to be submitted and approved by the Building Division. The construction safety fence shall be installed around the periphery of the construction area.
  - f. Concurrent with the submittal for a building permit, an outdoor lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Engineering Division and Planning Division.
  - g. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 12.48 (Salvaging and Recycling of Construction and Demolition Debris) of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, and is subject to review and approval by the Engineering and Building Divisions.
5. Approve the architectural control and use permit revision subject to the following ***project-specific*** conditions:
- a. The use permit is valid so long as the lease between Mid-Peninsula School, Inc., and the City and County of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for use of the Hetch Hetchy right-of-way remains in effect.
  - b. Prior to issuing a building permit, a deed restriction shall be recorded against the property, whereby should the lease between Mid-Peninsula Education Center and the City and County of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for use of the Hetch Hetchy right-of-way be terminated, the performing arts/theater building must be demolished, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and City Attorney.
  - c. The maximum allowable student population on the site shall be 175 students, with a total maximum allowable school population of 200 including students and staff. Any increase to the allowable school population shall require approval of a use permit revision by the Planning Commission.
  - d. The high school use shall maintain a class start time of 9:30 a.m., with classes concluded by 3:15 p.m., on Mondays through Fridays. Faculty shall arrive by 9:00 a.m. and depart after 4:00 p.m., and administrative staff shall arrive prior to 8:00 a.m. and depart after 5:00 p.m. The following school activities are allowed to occur outside of these hours and days:



Event	Frequency/ Day(s)	Hours	Anticipated Attendance
School Assemblies	1 to 2 times per month	Normal school hours, between 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.	150 to 160 people per event
Drama or Musical Performances	Approximately 10 times throughout the year, Fridays and Saturdays	6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.	100 to 120 per event
Parent Education Evenings	3 to 4 times throughout the year	7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	15 to 20 people per event
Open Houses	Twice annually, Saturdays in October and in April	10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon	30 to 50 people per event
Family Barbecue	Annually, Sunday in September	2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.	180 to 200 people
Back to School	Annually, Wednesday in late September/early October	6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.	100 people
Arts Festival	Annually, Friday in May	6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.	150 people
Graduation	Annually, Saturday in early June	4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.	550 people

Non-maintenance of this or other similar staggered schedules approved by the Planning and Transportation Divisions shall be reason for revocation of the use permit.

- e. The applicant is responsible for informing the Planning Division regarding any changes to agreements to use parking on adjacent sites. The loss or changes to these agreements will result in the need to reduce the number or type of events that may be held at the site.
- f. Trees in the vicinity of the construction project, particularly the row of pine trees along the northern property line, shall be protected pursuant to the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance and Tree Protection Specifications.

Motion carried 7-0.

## E. STUDY SESSION

- E1. Study Session/Architectural Control and Environmental Review/300-550 El Camino Real/Stanford University:** Request for architectural control and environmental review for a new mixed-use office, residential, and retail development on an 8.43-acre site in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. *No actions will take place at this meeting, but the study session will provide an opportunity for the Planning*

*Commission and the public to become more familiar with the proposal and to identify potential questions and concerns.*

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers noted the interest in the proposed project (Project) evidenced by the number of people in attendance. He said this Project was the first one under the City's adopted El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan (Plan). He said there were areas the Commission needed to consider related to that Plan. He said the staff report provided considerable information on the Project. He encouraged community members to avail themselves of the information in the Project page on the City's website. He said there had been correspondence received that indicated some lack of familiarity with the topics discussed during the planning process for the Plan including statements about what Stanford has promised or not promised and which was not believed to be factually accurate.

Commissioner Onken recused himself from the dais but per the City Attorney's direction was permitted to sit in the Chambers and hear the presentations and comments.

Mr. Steve Elliott, Stanford University, introduced the Project team that included Mr. Huiwen Hsiao, ArchiRender Architects, architect for the commercial component of the project; Mr. John Thatch, Dahlin Group, architects for the residential and retain component, and Gary Laymon, the Guzzardo Partnership, as the landscape architect. He said the proposal was developed under the Plan that had been developed and shaped by the community. He said the Plan defined allowable uses, tightly controlled all aspects of the development, addressed potential impacts and required those to be managed and mitigated to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Elliott said what they built would be with the community for decades to come noting the vacant dealership lots along El Camino Real, and welcomed the Commission and public's comments on the project. He noted that the City had taken five years to determine what was wanted in the City through the development of the Plan. He said the obsolete buildings on the subject property represented a market and an economy from the 1960s. He said their proposed project was a commitment to the future of Menlo Park. He said their Rosewood Hotel project on Sand Hill Road was an example of their long term approach to quality development. He said the project was developed to meet the goals and guiding principles in the Plan. He said the proposed Project would clearly improve east-west connectivity, enhance public space, revitalize underutilized parcels and buildings, generate vibrancy, and provide residential opportunities and plaza sites. He said the Project offered a combination of property types with none dominating the project and were a mix of uses providing local serving medical, retail, and office, high quality residential opportunities, affordable housing opportunities, and world class office space, all of which were in high demand in Menlo Park. He said nearly half of the Project's square footage was for housing and would attract diverse demographics. He said the retail component at the middle plaza would activate the plaza and provide dining and retail opportunities close to housing and jobs. He said the improvements at the middle plaza and the entire length of El Camino Real along the Project would enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections. He said the medical office component would allow for valuable medical services to meet the local community's health care needs. He said the office space component recognizes the City of Menlo Park's position as the center of the venture capital industry, and would be state of the art, sustainable spaces that would contribute to Menlo Park's future as the home of the venture capital industry. He said the site would offer office workers residences located near transit and they would shop and dine in Menlo Park furthering the vision of the Plan. He said in addition to the Project improvements and benefits, the Project would also bring an increase in traffic. He

said the Plan had studied this as well. He said they understood neighbors' concerns about increased traffic. He said the Plan took into account the benefits of infill development located near transit and identified a number of traffic impact mitigations that they would need to contribute their fair share to in addition to paying Traffic Impact Fees and Construction Traffic Impact Fees. He said they would create a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce the Project's traffic.

Mr. Huiwen Hsiao, ArchiRender Architects, said he was the architect for the three office buildings. He said the entire project was based upon the Plan, which required maintaining the view corridor at each end of the avenues across El Camino Real from the site including Cambridge, Partridge, and Middle Avenues. He said this naturally created five development parcels on the subject property with two residential and three commercial sites. He said for the commercial sites they consolidated existing curb cuts into three major curb cuts with two main vehicle entrances, one at the end of Middle Avenue and the other at the end of College Avenue with a garage entry in between at Partridge Avenue. He said the overall configuration and traffic circulation followed well existing patterns to minimize impacts to the pedestrian linkage. He said along El Camino Real would be a 15-foot wide promenade, and that they were purposively proposing surface parking in the back along the train tracks to preserve a pedestrian-friendly frontage. He said the building design and façade modulation followed the standards and guidelines in the Plan. He said they were able to keep the building height at 60 feet and the façade height at 38 feet by stepping in the upper stories and scaling down the building mezzanine creating more usable outdoor space and terraces for the office users. He said entry to the office buildings continued open space from the 15-foot promenade. He said that the office complex would have three office buildings at three to four story heights. He said it would be office on top of the parking podium and most of the office parking would be underground. He said the design used a contemporary architectural vocabulary with high quality and high performance materials that would enrich the City's skyline and streetscape for many years to come.

Mr. John Thatch, Dahlin Group Architects, said their design was for two high end apartment buildings, and noted that the majority of parking would be underground or behind buildings. He said critical in this design was the creation of courtyard buildings to provide a view other than the train tracks or El Camino Real. He said that the design was providing connectivity to assist future consideration of connecting to Burgess Park east of the Project. He said the residential buildings created strong people place and put retail and office common areas off the residential area. He said there was 4,600 square feet of open space for the residences and modulations and features such as building breaks, terraces, and interesting facades used. He said the design was contemporary and played with the forms of the office space but introduced more materials including brick, plaster, paneling, and wood to create more residential character. He said for the El Camino Real frontage that the proposed Plaza was the core of the two buildings.

Mr. Gary Laymon, the Guzzardo Partnership, landscape architects, said they saw an opportunity with the Project to take the pedestrian linkage which currently was very broken and unfriendly and transform the office and residential frontage into friendly pedestrian environment. He said the Plaza areas would create engaging open spaces and provide people-oriented spaces. He said there was also the opportunity to enhance the pedestrian crossing at El Camino Real. He said that existing and substantial trees along the property lines and El Camino Real would be preserved. He said both of the residential buildings would have garden courts with the Plaza as the centerpiece. He said the courtyard would be one level above street

level and provide great amenities for residents including active and passive features such as water elements and seating in comfortable outdoor spaces. He said the Plaza area was carefully developed to both connect to the City and circulate internally. He said the Plaza would have distinctive features such as a focal point fountain and outdoor dining, and they would use a variety of paving materials for in interest and to support different functions.

Commission Questions: Commissioner Bressler asked staff to put the plaza design from the Plan on the screen. Planner Rogers noted the Plaza concept was discussed in a couple of areas, but predominately in Chapter D – Public Space, page D45, but also in Chapter E, Land Use and Building Character, page E26. Commissioner Bressler said he would like the graphic shown as it was important for the public’s viewing. He said the Project’s proposed Plaza had three lanes of traffic running through it. He said there were also rumors that a car tunnel might be constructed in the location where there had been discussions for a bicycle/pedestrian tunnel. He asked if that would be allowed under the Plan. Planner Rogers said that would not be consistent with the Plan in any respect or the EIR prepared for the Plan.

Chair Ferrick asked about the percentage of commercial zoning for the proposed project. Planner Thomas said the staff report under “Specific Plan Allowable Development” referred to the EIR and what was studied as a likely build-out over the entire Plan area during the project time frame of 20 to 30 years. He said the Plan established a residential use net cap of 680 units and a non-residential use cap, including retail, office, and hotel, of 474,000 square feet. He said an evaluation of what this Project would use of the maximum allowable development, and estimated with the range of residential units, it would build from 20% to 23% of the residential use cap. He said the non-residential development for this Project was estimated to use 45% of the Plan’s development cap. He said during the development of the Plan the question had been raised and discussed as to whether this proposed Project would use too much of the nonresidential development. He said in those discussions it was noted the Project area was the largest vacant area within the Plan boundaries and one of the key opportunity sites.

Chair Ferrick said the Project had 96,100 square feet of medical office, and if that was a cap. Planner Rogers said that as proposed would be the maximum allowed. He said the applicant could pursue a Plan revision in the future which would require the Plan’s Program EIR be revisited for compliance, additional parking would need to be found, or some alternative means of compliance with parking. Chair Ferrick asked if the Plan traffic study included the study of this amount of medical office space. Planner Rogers said the traffic part of the Program EIR had projected different uses at different locations but did not bind certain sites to certain uses. He said it had evaluated what some likely options were and those had been translated into trips. He said in evaluating an individual project that it was less of a comparison of where the uses estimated might be on those or nearby sites and the exact uses proposed but rather evaluated if the studied trips generated from the site were similar to the trips generated by the discrete development project. He said a project might have an entirely different use than what was in the Program EIR but if the number of trips was the same or lower that could support compliance with the Program EIR.

Chair Ferrick said discussions for the Plan had specifically addressed parking ratio and asked if the parking ratio for the office building was the same as discussed for the Plan. Planner Rogers said if it was not then it would have to be. He said that not every regulation had yet been reviewed for the Project’s compliance under the Plan. Chair Ferrick asked what would result if there was too much parking. Planner Rogers said the Plan had an allowance for shared parking

and might be incorporated for any development and accounts for the potential for different uses for different parking demands at different times. He said usually office parking was needed during the day and residential parking needed in the evening. He said there was also the potential for parking to be saved in landscape reserve. He said the potential for spillover parking in neighborhoods would need to be considered, if landscape reserve is proposed.

Commissioner Eiref said community members had asked him whether Stanford would pay taxes on this Project. Planner Rogers said if Stanford used the facilities for education purposes, they could apply for a property tax exemption. He said that raised the question of whether support offices were also applicable under such an exemption. He said if this Project was used similar to the 2825 Sand Hill Road project as lease opportunity and for revenue generation there would be property taxes assessed.

Commissioner Eiref said he could not find requirements for senior housing in the Plan yet the desire for senior housing had been identified during the Plan development. Planner Rogers said the City Council in their review of the Draft Plan had given staff and the consultant direction to explore incentives and requirements for senior housing. He said they found through preparation of the final Plan analysis that the City's residential senior housing district had not functioned as ideally as it could. He said reducing the City's residential parking requirement was one way to encourage senior housing and that was in the Plan. Also increasing the limits for dwelling units and heights in the Plan incentivized senior housing. He said the City Attorney had advised that the City could not require or incentivize senior housing to the level at which it caused disincentive for family housing as related to Fair Housing laws. Commissioner Eiref summarized that there was interest in senior housing but nothing specifically in the Plan required. Planner Rogers said senior housing was included in the list of options for public bonus benefit for developers who wanted to achieve the highest level of density and floor area ratio.

Commissioner Kadvany said an issue of cut through traffic particularly through the Allied Arts area had been raised. He said in the proposed Project the signals were situated on El Camino Real so that it appeared there would be a straight through from the office buildings to Cambridge Avenue and through Allied Arts. He asked if that light could be signalized for just left or right turns only during peak trip times. Planner Rogers said he would need to confer with the Transportation Division. He said that during the environmental review process that would need to be addressed and if it were not supported there had to be evidence as to why it was not supportable.

Commissioner Kadvany said in the proposed Project that Middle Avenue had a single crosswalk and not two across El Camino Real, which was much like it was already. He said people wanted pedestrian improvement. Planner Rogers said the reason for that was to optimize the flow for cars but it was in the General Plan to pursue four-leg crosswalks on El Camino Real where none exists. He said traffic delays would need to be considered. Commissioner Kadvany suggested it could be limited to particular times of day. Planner Rogers said he had never seen a time-limited crosswalk.

Commissioner Kadvany said people were commenting over the last couple years about hot spots from the left turn onto El Camino Real from Sand Hill Road to Alma Street were occurring. He asked if that was reflected in measures of service levels. He asked how very local traffic problems might be addressed noting backups to the Safeway entry driveway. Planner Rogers

said the Middle Avenue and El Camino Real intersection was specifically reviewed in the Program EIR for the Plan. He said an identified mitigation to improve the overall operations was to create another left hand turn lane off northbound El Camino Real with an expanded Middle Avenue to provide a receiving lane for cars to filter into Safeway and farther down Middle Avenue. He said that would improve overall green light time and traffic flow. He said the payment of the Traffic Impact Fee represented payment for a fair share of traffic liability. He said he was unsure at the moment if the Sand Hill and Alma intersection was included in the Program EIR traffic analysis, although if not, additional analysis might be required with this project.

Commissioner Kadvany said he understood Stanford would like to consolidate the parcels to one parcel, and asked the status of that. He asked if small parcels were kept intact how that would affect the development as proposed. Planner Rogers said the applicant intended to merge the lots as permits could not be issued for structures that spanned property lines. He said potentially it could be two parcels with one for the residential component and the other for the commercial component. He said under the Plan implications that he did not believe there were any ramifications if the property was merged into a one-parcel development. He said edges of the site might impact the setbacks but building breaks were set for the areas opposite the west side avenues, and the Plan allowed consideration for the overall development in terms of floor area and density. Commissioner Kadvany asked about uses if they would change. Planner Rogers said if there was a single binding approval even if on several sites he did not think there was a Plan implication for consideration on a comprehensive basis and not a single site basis.

Commissioner Kadvany said there was a significantly sized parking lot for Big Five and Staples behind the Project's Building A. He said if that land was part of this Project it would open up many design amenities for it including the plaza area. He asked if Stanford had offered to purchase or lease that land or if the City Council had inquired.

Mr. Elliott said they had not had any discussions with the other property owner. He said the parking there was required for that retail shopping center. Commissioner Kadvany asked if that would help their project to have control of that land. Mr. Elliott said he thought not and noted utility situations just in splitting two properties.

Commissioner Riggs said if the Project was used for lease space would that require tax payments by Stanford. Planner Rogers said lease space would require reassessment for the improvements and there would be property tax revenue from that for Menlo Park. He said a reassessment for new buildings would be considerably higher than what they were paying now and reassessment for land, if that occurred, would be more modest.

Commissioner Riggs asked for clarification on page 9 of the statement: "projected that 65 units would be allowed on this site." Planner Rogers said the 680 residential unit cap in the preceding paragraph was established through the Plan process by modeling where they thought housing could be built. He said the Housing Element did its own analysis that was a little different in scope as it had started before the Plan was adopted. He said that process looked at different development scenarios and had not presumed every aspect of the Plan related to density, height and floor area ratio. He said the modeling portion of the Housing Element arrived at 65 units and also assumed 550 El Camino Real property lines would remain the same. He said the Plan was capped by the 680 housing units development allowance but a

Housing Element discussion would be incorporated in development project review going forward asking whether the action of potentially approving a project at a future time disadvantaged the City in regard to the Housing Element and if it contradicted assumptions made during the Housing Element modeling. He said the conclusion in the discussion in this report was that the approval of this project would not result in unanticipated Housing Element consequences.

Commissioner Bressler said it was important to get the information on the Plaza design from the Plan onto the projector screen and noted that eventually the Commission would need to do architectural control review. He said the plaza design presented to the public for this Project did not look anything like the plaza design that was part of the Plan. He asked if that would be grounds to reject the architectural review for the Project.

Planner Rogers said what was on the screen was from Chapter D which contained regulations for the improvement called the Burgess Park linkage open space plaza. He said the text was the binding regulation and gave brief description: open space amenity integrated with the El Camino Real pedestrian promenade publicly accessible eventually linking to the grade separated crossing, providing seating, places for small gatherings, and pedestrian bicyclist connections. He said with that were some sample photographs including the Homer Avenue bicycle tunnel in Palo Alto and a publicly accessible connection located in Portland, Oregon. He said chapter E also provided important standards and guidelines regarding building breaks and massing modulation on page E.3.4.1. He noted that the standard in the Plan was that the Middle Avenue break shall include vehicular access, public accessible space with seating, landscaping and shade, retail and restaurant uses activating the open space and a pedestrian/bicycle connection to Alma Street and Burgess Park. He said the visuals provided in the Plan were conceptual and examples of what could be done in terms of a public plaza. He said that it was the regulations that governed the actual plaza development and the drawing in the Plan was an option rendered conceptually.

Commissioner O'Malley said in a number of emails received and comments made he had heard a number of erroneous comments. He said the Commission's practice was to listen to the public and not comment on what they were saying but asked if perhaps the Chair should correct erroneous comments as they were being made.

Chair Ferrick said the Commissioners had received a number of comments on things not in the proposal and it was unknown what the origination of those comments was. She said the Commission had tried to clarify some of that with the questions asked of staff and the applicant. She said Commissioner Bressler made it clear that there had never been an intention on the applicant's part to create a car cut through from Middle Avenue to Burgess Park or Willow Road. She said in the Plan a bike and pedestrian tunnel had been identified as desirable but that was not part of this Project proposal. She noted that speakers would be limited to three minutes. She suggested that if speakers agreed with other speakers to say so to save on repetition. She noted some speakers were donating time to others and she was trying to organize those systematically. She asked speakers to be respectful of other speakers' opinions.

Public Comment: Mr. Marc Bryman, Menlo Park, said he was a relatively new resident in Linfield Oaks, and was very excited with the concept of bringing vibrancy to this area. He said it was important with the Project proposal to understand the civic center nature of it. He said what was done there would dictate what was done under the Plan and it was critical to take the time to insure that the Plan, which had involved so much hard work, would be fully realized. He said

he was in the real estate business and was excited with what development could bring to a City particularly for this City that was located in such an incredible part of the country and the world. He said there was every opportunity to be progressive and to lead the community and country in this vision. He said this was not just an infill project but would dictate what the community would be like for many years to come. He said it was important that the community benefitted from the project as much as the residents and medical providers that would be housed within it. He said the communal nature of it connecting Linfield Oaks and having a wide enough berth for pedestrians and bicycles and such as well as traffic impacts were important considerations, and he urged decision makers to not rush judgment and understand the specifics of this “mother” project under the plan.

Ms. Elizabeth Houck, Menlo Park, said the Project was too big and too ugly with too many impacts, too much traffic, too little benefit, too little tax revenue and too little protection from impacts to go forward. She said no matter what the traffic demand mitigation efforts were El Camino Real was a traffic disaster already. She said putting traffic on Middle Avenue was a disaster and that two turn lanes onto Middle Avenue would not help traffic leaving the Safeway parking lot. She said she knew that within a matter of years Stanford would put elevated tracks through to the Linfield Oaks neighborhood. She said Stanford lies and had told the City it was going to get a hotel and senior housing. She said she did not trust Stanford and certainly could not trust them for the next 30 years. She said the EIR was inadequate to study traffic when they did not know what the medical uses would generate. She said they might later convert all the office space to medical office space. She noted a plethora of vacant office spaces along El Camino Real. She said Stanford could have built this project for the last 10 years and had done nothing until the City gave them the keys to the City and the Allied Arts neighborhood. She said the residents of the Allied Arts neighborhood did not appreciate this and expected their City to help them and staff to do a better job protecting the residents and the neighborhood so that residents did not have to become traffic experts and pore through the thousand pages of the Plan. She said that Plan went against the General Plan and the plan for the El Camino corridor which called for revenue generating car dealerships. She said if the City ignored its General Plan for the Specific Plan that they should at least realize the impacts to the residents would be severe and important. She said plazas were nothing more than driveways with plants in this proposal. She said the applicant quoted the traffic, parking and revenue generation and sales tax for the Rosewood Hotel. She said move the hotel here and move the offices to Sand Hill Road. She said the bottom line was this was a too big development for the City, for the neighborhood in this year, or even 30 years from now. She said an EIR for the Project needed to be done center done now to include traffic analysis for Middle Avenue and University Drive, and throughout Allied Arts. She said it was incumbent on the Planning Commission and City Council to fix the flaws of the Plan.

Ms. Anne Moser, Menlo Park, said she was dismayed, despite Mr. Elliot’s remarks, at Stanford’s lack of concern for its neighbors specifically in the areas of traffic and housing. She said the expanded medical center would increase the need for housing not only for expensive units but importantly for the vast number of people who fell into the middle or lower income brackets. She said Stanford’s plans did not reflect this need. She said although proposed housing has increased in numbers it didn’t meet the middle or lower income needs and that the below market rate units did not address these needs. She said there needed to be affordable and senior housing in the project. She said the buildings as proposed would create a canyon effect and asked that they be stepped back or placed at an angle or broken into smaller units. She said they should require wide pavements for the sidewalks to give a feeling of space to minimize the



size of the buildings. She said when the land was used for car sales, Menlo Park had gained financially. She asked if medical and office buildings would generate income for Menlo Park, and there was a need to think about that.

Chair Ferrick noted that the sidewalk width for the project was 15-feet and that there were buildings breaks at each street crossing.

Chair Ferrick noted that Ms. Perla Ni, Mr. Kevin Sheehan, and Mr. Stefan Petry had donated time (although it was unclear from whom – perhaps Elizabeth Tse, Richard Dunn, Rachel Modena Barasch, Andrew Becker for whom there were speaker cards but they did not speak).

Ms. Perla Ni, Menlo Park, said she moved to the area about five years ago because of its family friendly nature and so their children could ride their bicycles to school. She said the need to save the current Menlo Park vision was part of the Plan discussions. She said what residents hold dear was that the City was a safe place to raise children, where people can walk and families can ride their bikes, a place where people cared about each other and had a human scale. She showed slides of children riding bikes in Allied Arts noting increasing cut through traffic because of traffic congestion on El Camino Real. She said her family lives on Yale Road and that drivers cut through Middle Avenue to University then up Cambridge and then down Yale Road. She said the Planning Commission had great powers and held the future of the City in their hands. She showed a slide listing the findings for architectural control the Commission is asked to consider for projects and highlighted that the general appearance of structures were in keeping with the character of the neighborhood, that development would not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City, that the development would not impair the desirability of occupation in a neighborhood, and that development was consistent with any applicable specific plan. She said for the Commission could require a supplemental EIR based upon the fact these buildings were proposed for medical use and perhaps academic offices which had not been studied in the Plan or such a massive concentration of buildings on a relatively small area of land. She said the size of the buildings were like four Home Depots concentrated one next to each other, one of which was five stories. She said there was no other five story building on El Camino Real from Menlo Park to San Francisco, plus they would be located across the road from very small retail places such as the Oasis and Kama Sushi. She said the City could call for a moratorium on medical use noting many cities have called for moratoriums on all kinds of specific uses. She said moratoriums can help cities plan for the types of development that would be harmonious, and not allow development inconsistent with the City's Plan.

Mr. Kevin Sheehan, Menlo Park, noted he had moved here recently and that he bikes with his children to school. He said due to recent construction he had witnessed increased traffic cutting through the neighborhood. He said there were assumptions in the Plan that needed to be looked at in detail. He said the community members were new to the process but were looking for a balance. He said there were some key players: the City that was looking for more vibrancy and did not want empty lots, applicants who wanted a viable successful project and the community who wanted safety and impacts including architecture addressed. He said they would like to know how best to participate and engage in a dialogue with the Commission and staff. He said a letter from Ms. Patti Fry in January discussed the Commission's powers and the questions needed to be asked such as the CEQA review and whether the EIR was adequate. He said some of the issues with the EIR was that 95% of the office space studied in that model for the Plan would be used by this one project. He said staff indicated the project would take

45% of the non-specific commercial use and 23% of the residential use. He said there was an imbalance between the residential units provided and the high traffic uses for the proposal. He said that was the balance they were seeking through a dialogue with the Planning Commission. He said that if the Plan was for 30 years that percentage of use by this one project was unfair to future developers. He said the concentration modeling looked at the traffic and the uses spread out over an area and did not do any cut through analysis – he said the study area was all lumped on one side of El Camino Real and did not include both sides of El Camino Real as the model suggested. He said all the traffic would go through Sand Hill Road and intersection 10 and neighborhood traffic effects were not studied. He said they would like as staff suggested participating in an investigation of that traffic. He said the Plan was spread over a larger area and this was concentrated and there was no traffic mitigation. He said dental and medical uses were three times other trip generation rates and that there were 11 trips for every thousand square feet of office space and 36 for the same amount of medical office space. He said the EIR had not looked at this type of concentration. He asked how the community could participate and work through the concerns that areas were not looked at and areas in EIR that did not correctly model and certainly did not extend to neighborhoods and the external ingress/egress to the City.

Chair Ferrick said that dialogue was participating in this public meeting and then meeting with Commissioners individually.

Mr. Stefan Petry, Menlo Park, said had concerns with traffic congestion, cut through traffic, and safety. He said El Camino Real was a mess at given times of the day and any disturbances on any of the bridges, highways, or Caltrain created total gridlock there. He said when people see a sea of red lights they start thinking about taking shortcuts and use Cambridge Avenue to get to University. He said to get to Ravenswood people cut through the Big Five parking lot. He said people get off at Middle Avenue and take University or Yale. He said there were all kinds of cut through traffic and the problem had gotten worst in the last few years and the City had not tried to solve the problem. He said the traffic from a project this size was not going to fit on the road. He said he did not think residents would be able to leave their garages to even get onto El Camino Real. He said the EIR and traffic volume measurement did not include College and Partridge Avenues nor University which was a minor artery in Allied Arts. He said the existing traffic volumes seemed outdated and did not reflect impacts of cut through traffic, and that actual street volume traffic had not been measured. He said much more detailed analysis of volume and cut through traffic was needed. He said he was concerned with the cumulative effect of a new crosswalk and reconfiguration of turn lanes and entry ways. He said traffic and safety had not been addressed, and had not heard from the applicant how traffic would flow on El Camino Real and where there would be u-turns, queues to the garage, and how bike and pedestrian safety would be protected with all of the entrances and exits. He said there needed to be a separation of bike and car traffic.

Mr. David Roise, Menlo Park, said he hoped that bike facilities would be considered from the start of the project and that there be secure and convenient access and egress for bikes. He said the Project should provide showers and changing rooms for the commercial use to allow for bike use. He said there should be crosswalks on both sides of the intersections at Cambridge Avenue and Middle Avenue at El Camino Real and Middle Avenue noting bicycle traffic habits were currently unwise. He said the north south traffic on El Camino Real should be improved for either Class I or Class II and at least share arrows on El Camino Real.

Mr. Steven Schmidt, Menlo Park, thanked Commissioner Bressler for pointing out the discrepancy between the community's expectations for the Middle Avenue Plaza and what was being proposed, noting sheet D.3. He said the proposed plaza had three lanes of traffic bisecting it and two lanes of traffic in the back separating it from the bicycle/pedestrian undercrossing. He said there was a way to enhance this Project working with the design for bicycle and pedestrian safety. He suggested moving the vehicular access to the residential part of the Project to College Avenue where there was already a driveway and have a full intersection with pedestrian crossing at that location, which would require a new traffic signal and should not allow crossing of El Camino Real from the Project to College Avenue. He said it was the Commission's obligation to instruct the Applicant to develop a design that liberated space opposite Middle Avenue for its intended purpose, and suggested the plaza be located between Residential Building B and Office Building A.

Mr. David Alfano, Menlo Park, said that he lived on Kenwood Drive which was the first side street off of Middle Avenue, and that he commuted daily to Moffett Field by car and also by bicycle. He said he had no qualms about cutting through the Allied Arts neighborhood on his bicycle and disappointingly also cuts through Allied Arts to get home by car. He said he did not like to do that but his commute was delayed 15 minutes to get just from Cambridge Avenue to his driveway from El Camino Real. He said this boded poorly for the future and he was not in favor of the development as proposed. He said issues of public benefit and insufficient sales tax revenue for the City were concerns for the City Council. He said the main concern for the community was traffic. He said the proposed project was interesting from an architectural point of view but not from an engineering point of view. He noted his occupation as an engineering manager and said the Project overlooked a fundamental of planning which was to not build secondary development until sufficient infrastructure was provided. He said the project was bounded by a railroad line, a creek and a residential development. He said El Camino Real was running dangerously close to capacity now and there was not sufficient infrastructure to support traffic associated with this Project. He said he was strongly opposed to the Project as currently proposed. He said the City should focus on getting people off El Camino Real and suggested a dedicated Class I multi-use path running along the tracks from Stanford Park Hotel to the Menlo Park Train Station. He said that would facilitate employees of the Project's office space taking the train and feeling safe about commuting in modes other than automobiles. He said if the City approved this poorly designed Project at least from an infrastructure point of view, that other agencies might get involved in mitigation of the problem. He said Menlo Park should not block traffic for the rest of the peninsula on El Camino Real. He said if air quality or traffic should get noticeably worse that other groups might apply remedial measures to the area. He said that heavy traffic might reopen the unpopular notion of connecting Sand Hill Road to Willow Road, and suggested addressing the infrastructure first.

Ms. Marjorie Zimmerman, Menlo Park, thanked previous speakers for addressing many of her concerns. She said one that had not been addressed as much was the scale of the project and she thought it was out of character. She said she thought that the car dealership lots would be redeveloped to provide services and amenities for City residents. She noted she goes to other cities such as Palo Alto, Mountain View and Redwood City for her shopping and services. She said she would like Menlo Park to have the resources she needed and she wanted to be proud of the town. She said she lives on Kenwood Drive and was very concerned about traffic being diverted to the Allied Arts neighborhood noting the existing difficulties getting out of the neighborhood. She said she also commutes by bike and would like improved bicycle safety for schools.

Chair Ferrick called Ms. Julie Harris but she did not respond.

Chair Ferrick called Mr. Charlie Bourne noting he had time donated by Mark McBirney.

Mr. Charlie Bourne, Menlo Park, said he was a long time resident and a member of the Transportation Commission. He urged the Commission to really look at the Burgess Park linkage plaza being interrupted with three lanes of traffic for the complex which seemed to be a recipe for a hazardous situation and spoiled what could be a pleasant plaza. He said his questions which hopefully would be answered before the February 14 Transportation Commission meeting on this topic, included:

- Have plans been formally submitted – are these final or conceptual plans?
- There are five or six curb cuts described for the Project where there are now fewer. Does the Plan retain authority of curb cut?
- Under the Plan what are the trip generation for the following types of activities: office, medical/dental, residential, below market housing, and general retail? He said those trip generation rates were not readily available.
- As the Project was proposed, what would be the daily trip rate?
- Were there evening activities such as bars, theaters, or all night food service?
- How does the projected total daily weekday trip generation rate at full build-out differ from that which was accepted by permit and experienced by the prior set of dealership activities?
- At full build-out what is the traffic volume and turn rates expected at each of the proposed curb cuts and nearby intersections, and what does that do to level of service at nearby streets and intersections?
- What are the proposed mitigations for the traffic impacts and even with the mitigations what projected volume and level of service? Compare full measures for when car dealerships were fully functioning.
- When will the traffic study be available that Stanford is supposed to do?
- Are there any plans to facilitate safe bicycle traffic to and from the complex particularly for children as part of the City's safe routes to school plans.
- Will the buildings be constructed all at once or in sequence and over what time span.
- What is the traffic plan during demolition and construction? For example how many lanes of El Camino Real would need to be set aside for loading demolition rubble and unloading materials?
- Where would materials storage be located and how much space was needed?
- Where would construction workers park and how much traffic would they generate?
- Where will the food service trucks be parked?
- Will normal City regulations for construction apply or were there special situations for Plan development?
- Would things normally considered in a major project EIR be considered here such as hydrology, runoff, drainage clean streets and traffic control?

Mr. Bourne said his questions could be answered in an hour or two with joint discussion with the developer and City staff. He said he was looking forward to hearing the first installment this evening and hopefully the remainder before the February 14 Transportation Commission's consideration of the Project.

Ms. Anna Alioto, Menlo Park, said that most of her concerns had been expressed, but she wanted to share her story. She said she was not a morning person but needs to be at work by 8 a.m. She said each morning she drives from her home on Partridge Avenue and it's an obstacle course with children walking on Partridge Avenue. She said she then turns on University Avenue and then right onto Middle Avenue. She said she used to go all the way down University Avenue to Oak Grove Avenue and then to El Camino Real and Menlo Avenue but hit traffic. She then decided Encinal Avenue might be faster but there was a school there and children everywhere. She said she now decided to take Middle Avenue to Ravenswood but as she commutes at 8 a.m., children were also going to school at 8 a.m., and others going to work at 8 a.m. She said with medical buildings and people with appointments at 8 a.m. it was too much. She said she supported improving Menlo Park but they needed to provide infrastructure for all those who needed to be somewhere at 8 a.m.

Mr. Brian Schmitz, Menlo Park, said his concern was with cut through traffic in the Allied Arts area noting these were the streets his wife and he walk their baby. He said these were the streets that they would teach their baby to walk and ride a bike on and then ride the bike to school. He said he was convinced these streets would be overrun by cut through traffic because of this project. He asked for his baby and the other children's sake to research and mitigate the cut through traffic in Allied Arts.

Ms. Margaret Osborn, Menlo Park, said the proposed project was dense and out of scale. She said her first question was why would Menlo Park want this project and what was the benefit for residents. She said it took all her money to buy a home in Menlo Park noting she teaches at Menlo Atherton. She said the school put in a great parking lot for the theater with trees and greenery, which she gets to admire every afternoon as she tries to leave the school grounds. She said her trip from Menlo Atherton to her house on College Avenue in the afternoon took anywhere from 18 to 20 minutes. She said if she goes to Stanford Shopping Center after work and then returns to her home that took easily 12 minutes from the Center to the turnoff for her home in Allied Arts. She said it was faster to walk but she could not walk to all of the different places all of the time. She said the Project would create tons of traffic and there was not much revenue for the City. She said the project would look like a "glass canyon," which did not fit with the architecture in that area now. She asked how the users of the facility would get to Hwy. 280 and Hwy. 101. She said traffic would back up and overflow into the residential streets. She said she was pro-growth but this Project was not in the interest of Menlo Park residents.

Mr. Herbert Stone, Menlo Park, noted he has lived in Menlo Park for 51 years and that over the last 10 to 15 years he has seen nothing but traffic in Menlo Park. He said Stanford previously promised when the extension to Sand Hill Road was done to mitigate the additional traffic on Santa Cruz Avenue. He said he defied that point of view noting how hard it is for children trying to cross Santa Cruz Avenue from San Mateo Drive. He said El Camino Real was even worse. He said the proposal was oversized and would do nothing but impact the infrastructure of Menlo Park. He said he expected in three years that Stanford would apply to San Mateo County for tax relief and Menlo Park would ask citizens to pay extra to cover the costs of the water and streets, etc.

Ms. Marjorie Stone, Menlo Park, said she and her husband live on San Mateo Drive between Middle Avenue and Santa Cruz Avenue. She said they have seen much worse traffic since the Sand Hill Road extension was built. She said traffic backs up from San Mateo Drive to El Camino Real at least three times a day and the situation was the same on Middle Avenue. She

said it was inconceivable that the City would even consider the proposed Project without addressing traffic. She said regarding medical offices that she has noticed Stanford has closed all of its Walsh Road medical offices and was now probably moving them through this proposal to Menlo Park. She said she did not know how that would benefit Menlo Park. She said they already have the Menlo Park and the Palo Alto Clinics in the City. She said regarding property taxes that perhaps now they were not proposing an educational use but she suspected they would bring research in and then request reduced taxes.

Ms. Cynthia Dusel-Bacon, Menlo Park, said she and her husband have lived on Princeton Road since 1978. She said she agreed with most of the comments about the Project. She said it was too big, and partly it was the visual effect as the entry way to Menlo Park. She said she could appreciate that the architect had tried to soften but it was an office complex and inappropriate next to the beautiful Stanford Park Hotel and the scale of the adjoining Allied Arts neighborhood. She said most importantly the traffic impact of the project was untenable and would have a horrific effect on El Camino Real, the main transportation route within and through Menlo Park. She said it was already at gridlock and could not absorb a project as big as currently proposed. She said several days last week as she drove home from her job as a geologist off of Linfield Drive and Middlefield Road, she used Laurel Avenue and waited through multiple traffic lights to get onto Ravenswood and then slowly made her way down to El Camino Real to make a left and drive the rest of the way home. She said traffic on El Camino Real was a parking lot. She said once she was on El Camino Real it took three cycles of green lights to turn onto El Camino Real and go south. She said cars going north on El Camino Real were so frustrated that they drove into the intersection and blocked the El Camino Real intersection. She said road rage was what driving through Menlo Park created. She said the Project as proposed would be the final nail in the coffin of Menlo Park's reputation as the peninsula's traffic bottleneck. She said drivers' frustration would cause them to routinely cut through the Allied Arts neighborhood. She said she experiences this when she tries to get off of El Camino Real and has considerable difficulty crossing University Drive as it was bumper to bumper with people who had given up on El Camino Real. She implored them to consider the traffic impacts and a considerable downsizing of the Project.

Chair Ferrick called the next speakers Ms. Kate Ague and Mr. Chris Diehl, but neither spoke.

Mr. Chris Ball said he lived on Morey Drive which was the second cut-in off of Middle Avenue. He said this was a dilemma for all. He said he was an early morning person and travels to Palo Alto at 5 a.m. to work out at which time El Camino Real was empty. He said he thinks how ugly the abandoned buildings at the subject property are when he drives past. He said friends question why he would spend so much for a home when the streetscape of nearby El Camino Real was so ugly. He said his dilemma was when he returns home at 5:30 p.m. and is stuck in traffic he then thinks that he would do anything to get rid of the traffic. He said there were business owners along El Camino Real who wanted to make money and it needed to be economically viable for them but at the same time be at the size and scale that would fit within the neighborhood. He said that was a dilemma. He said there was a lot of traffic but people had chosen to live on the Peninsula and to expect anything else was madness. He said what he was hearing was not about this Project but that Menlo Park has a major traffic issue both upstream and downstream from the subject property. He said the traffic situation begins beyond the Stanford Shopping Center in Palo Alto and ends on the other end of Menlo Park when El Camino Real goes from three to two lanes creating a bottleneck. He said there might be issues with the scale and uses of the Project, but in fact this was a watershed moment for

Menlo Park as this was the entrance and gateway to the City and it was a decision that would have a lot of ramifications. He said he wanted them to build a beautiful property but asked them to pause and examine ramifications. He said when Safeway was rebuilt that he had gone through the same dilemma regarding the ugly Safeway store and that he could not wait for the new Safeway to come. He said he was glad the new Safeway was there and it looked so much better but every day when he drives past the exit he reflects that if they had just thought a bit more about the project it could have been a beautiful property but they had not thought out far enough about the Middle Avenue exit onto El Camino Real. He said a bit more time and analysis would find a better solution for this proposal.

Ms. Cherie Zaslowsky, Menlo Park, said she agreed with what had been said but wanted to describe what cut through traffic was. She said this was coming down Middle Avenue to El Camino Real and seeing people trying to avoid the intersection take a really hard turn on Blake which has no sidewalks and then onto College Avenue really fast with no stopping at the stop sign. She said the drivers then can see El Camino Real and gun it and when residents hear vehicles accelerate they sometimes step out to motion the drivers to slow down. Drivers accelerate more and make obscene gestures. She said sometimes residents stand right in front of these drivers and get into altercations after which the police come and scold them. She said the police cannot come and mitigate the angry traffic. She said coming through the cracks of everybody not taking responsibility for cut through traffic was the person who jumps the barrier because they don't want to wait for the u-turn to get to the Yogurt Shop. She said no one gets a ticket for this. She said cut through traffic was angry, road rage, irrational and fast and was going to kill one of the children. It was not about property values but about the safety of the neighborhood. She said if they allowed a Project that would add up to ten thousand trips a day to clog an obviously disastrous traffic situation the drive through angry road rage traffic would kill one of the children.

Ms. Barrett Moore, Menlo Park, said she has lived many decades in the downtown of Menlo Park right off of University Drive. She said traffic impacted her but mainly it impacted her City which she cared about deeply. She said the residents were vehemently opposed to this proposed Project, and they needed the Commission to stand behind them and represent them, and at the very least insist an entirely new EIR was done. She asked them to not rubber stamp what Stanford and Arrillaga wanted to do with these properties but be responsible to the residents. She the Palo Alto Medical Foundation on El Camino Real was set way back and with a u-shaped driveway. She said there were only two lanes of cars with buildings set back and underground parking. She said if the City was saddled with medical office that this should be the model. She noted the San Antonio Shopping Center has virtually no setbacks and was oppressive and ugly. She said she agreed with others that this Project was out of scale. She said the City could not describe itself as having village character and allow such large buildings.

Ms. Susan Connelly said she has lived in Menlo Park for 50-plus years and asked that Menlo Park not be killed. She said the City was at a tipping point. She said the architects tried to make the project look decent but it was horrifically huge, poorly designed and did not belong in Menlo Park. She asked where the applicants lived and if their children were safe playing in front of their homes, and had a huge commute just going down the block. She asked them to consider as fellow human beings what they were doing to a community and would be irrevocable. She said the residents have benefitted from Stanford's presence but it was unconscionable to put such huge high density, high use projects in a very narrow area. She said the grade separation between the train tracks and the Palo Alto Medical Foundation was

much greater than what was here. She said this was a massive mountain of cement. She said it was not attractive at all and there was no open space. She said Stanford should use other property noting there was a Housing Element issue with Facebook. She asked why they would allow the building of more office space in Menlo Park here and the Facebook Campus as that was creating an even greater burden on City to provide housing for very low income residents. She said they were killing Menlo Park. She said she lived in Burgess Classics and that a tunnel would be a safety issue noting issues with homeless and two homicides over the weekend. She said tunnels were notoriously bad and not safe for children to use to ride bicycles. She said it would eventually become a road and she thought people from this project would the park in Burgess Park. She said there was no EIR study for the sound of this Project and the noisy train project. She said this Project would project the train noise more. She said to stop the Project, and to improve the existing buildings but not increase impacts.

Ms. Lynn Mickleburgh, Menlo Park, asked if any of the Commissioners lived in Allied Arts and noted there was some representation. She said she had two children, seven and nine, and they had lived in Allied Arts for about nine years. She said her children liked to bike and roller blade to school, and downtown they ride the bus every day from school and get dropped off at Middle and University Avenues around 3 p.m. She said at that time El Camino Real was already congested as was Middle Avenue. She said this Project would increase congestion which caused great concern about the safety of the children being dropped off at the bus stop. She wanted to protect the neighborhood so in the future children would still be able to walk to their houses. She concurred that this proposal was just too big, too ugly, and created too much traffic. She said the idea of having four or five story buildings just across El Camino Real from their quaint neighborhood did not fit. She said the Commission had the authority to make sure the Project fit with the character of Menlo Park and that the right infrastructure was in place to support it. She said residents were putting their trust in the Commission to make sure kids remained safe and unsure that there was the same sense of community, that we are proud to live here, and that the decision makers demonstrate they were proud to live here too.

Chair Ferrick noted no decisions were being made this evening and that this was a study session.

Mr. Drew Guevara, Cambridge Avenue, thanked the community members who had appeared and expressed their concerns. He said he wanted to add his concern that there would be a catastrophic impact on traffic from the proposed project on El Camino Real between Sand Hill Road and Ravenswood during peak times. He said he also was gravely concerned with the cut through traffic in the Allied Arts area and noted he has small children. He said the testimonials about aggressive driving were true and it was hard not to run the probability and determine that eventually someone would get run over and most likely it would be a child. He said the Project was too much burden on overburdened infrastructure. He said he was excited about the potential for more revenue for the City for local merchants and removal of the blight that was currently 300 to 550 El Camino Real but he thought that tradeoffs and balance were paramount, and he urged decision makers to resolve this thoughtfully for the Allied Arts residents.

Ms. Gail Sredanovic, Menlo Park, said she did not live in Allied Arts but sympathized with them. She said she had many concerns with the Project. She noted one speaker who supported the project said it was a model for the future and she thought that was a scary concept. She said that she talked to people at the Farmer's Market about the Plan. She said none of them understood why residential would be built in the downtown but through El Camino Real was a



perfect place for residential with all of the empty lots and also close to transit. She said Menlo Park was supposed to be part of "Cool Cities" and they needed to consider how this project would exacerbate or help resolve carbon emissions. She said Menlo Park has a problem with housing imbalance and said they should seriously count up the number of jobs from this Project if built and the number of residential units needed, and ask if it would help or worsen the job-housing imbalance. She said she thought the answer was fairly obvious. She said no one had talked about water and that needed serious discussion as water was a growing concern for California. She said Menlo Park has the ambition to be a walkable city but it was proven that walkability was not supported by big buildings and wide windy plazas. She said foot traffic was attracted by small intimate interesting spaces, which they currently have more or less in the downtown. She said she wanted to draw attention to the fact that the proposed trees on the Project plan would not be that tall for a long time and maybe never. She said she had been around long enough to remember when there was a serious concern about the project to ram through a Willow Expressway and in her opinion this Project was drawing an arrow aimed at the heart of the Willows. She said they also needed to ask what this proposal would do to property values in Menlo Park - she thought the answer was pretty obvious. She said finally a rhetorical question was why these types of projects were not being proposed for Atherton or Hillsborough and she said again, she thought the answer was obvious. She thanked the Commission for their hard work. She said the Project needed a lot of thought. She said there needed to be some major rethinking of past decisions that were made in good faith as something was really wrong, and that they protect Menlo Park for future generations.

Chair Ferrick called speaker Ms. Susan Hart, but person did not speak.

Mr. Ron Zolezzi said he had been a resident on College Avenue for 43 years. He thanked his neighbors for their well articulated concerns and complaints. He said he did not see how a project of this magnitude benefited the community. He saw the need for high quality, low density housing but this was massive office, medical and dental, and retail space, and this hurt the community given the state of traffic. He said there were thousands of square feet of vacant office space better located in office parks off of Hwy. 101. He said that he did not think anyone in the room did not have a place to get their teeth fixed or to see a doctor. He said they already had more medical services in town than anywhere in the world. He said regarding the retail component shops and restaurants that perhaps he was not paying attention but he did not recall waiting lines for shops and restaurants on Santa Cruz Avenue. He asked if the Project would help downtown business owners. He said office workers from this Project would just clog up the streets and not bring revenue to the city.

Mr. Don Brawner, Menlo Park, said he appreciated the comments being made. He thanked Commissioner Kadvany for his article in the Almanac and Commissioner Bressler for informing the community informally as to what was going on. He said the rest of the Commissioners should get with the program and understand that Stanford did not need any buildings, medical or office, in Menlo Park. He said Stanford has a problem with Santa Clara County for producing too much traffic so of course they would want to shift their office buildings to Menlo Park. He said Stanford has 7,000 acres and suggested they build along Junipero Serra but apparently have already met their limits there. He said the Plan was a constantly changing animal over the past two years and it hard to keep up with it. He asked who the original consultant was for the Specific Plan. Staff said it was Design Community and Environment (or DC&E). Mr. Brawner said that firm was replaced by Perkins & Will which had been working with Stanford University

for the past three years. He said that a conflict of interest to have them tell Menlo Park what to do. He wanted to know why the first consultant was dismissed.

Ms. Mike Lanza, Menlo Park, said his wife was Perla Ni, they have three boys, and live in the Allied Arts area. He said it was nearly impossible to find a resident who supported the Project. He said he was an author and blogger about providing an environment of neighborhood play for children noting he and his neighbors had created this in the neighborhood of Allied Arts. He said the Project presented a great threat to the community especially with increased car traffic. He said it was wrong that the City had not studied the traffic impact of this project noting that medical offices were the most intensive traffic producers. He said there should be a detailed traffic study and he demanded that the Project add zero cars to the Allied Arts neighborhood. He said if this Project went forward in and children no longer felt safe to ride bikes to Nealon Park or downtown to Santa Cruz Avenue then the City had failed. He said the Project brought a great opportunity to the City as West Menlo Park was cut off from Burgess Park and the Arrilleaga Gym. He said the project showed a railroad crossing but that was not attractive to bicyclists and pedestrians. He said there should be a crossing at Middle Avenue as a retail promenade from Safeway to the other side and then to Burgess Park and the gym and recreation center. He said the City was a failure until its two sides could be connected.

Chair Ferrick noticed some inconsistencies in speakers names who were grouped for Ms. Ni and that needed to be reviewed as it was unfair to other speakers.

Mr. Heyward Robinson, Menlo Park, said had been on the City Council in 2007 when the Downtown El Camino Real visioning kicked off to address spot development and one-offs and determine what the City wanted, to lay it out in a good way and have developers. He said this was the first project under the Plan and would set a precedent. He was concerned with the amount of office space this would use of what was allowed under the Plan. He said he did not recall hearing ever during the discussions leading to the Plan to have a five-story office building with medical use at this location. He said there were ideas but not this use. He said the biggest concerns were the cumulative effect of this and other Stanford projects under construction or in the pipeline such as the Medical Center and projects in Palo Alto by Arrillaga. He said it was difficult to mitigate traffic impacts with a Traffic Demand Management Program.

Mr. Roger Levin, Menlo Park, said the building was very unattractive and not in keeping with architecture in Menlo Park besides the traffic considerations noting Cambridge Avenue and delays no matter what time of day.

Mr. Jeffrey Tong, Menlo Park, said he had heard about the Project only recently. He said the presentation by Stanford described the Project in the best light but did not answer any of the concerns being raised such as traffic. He said they needed to address alleviating traffic and the proposal to widen the turn lane from El Camino Real onto Middle Avenue seemed inadequate. He said he would love to see the eyesore gone and a nice development but one that protected he safety and community on the east side of the project.

Ms. Gita Dev, Sierra Club, said the community had worked hard to create a framework for development for Menlo Park. She said the Menlo Park community was pro-growth in many ways but how it grows was the question. She said the Stanford Project would exacerbate the housing and job imbalance. She said they had hoped for more housing in the Project. She said the existing medical offices next door was putting pressure on Menlo Park for housing. She

said Stanford should be a good neighbor and offer housing for Menlo Park. She said the Plan vision was very much for a pedestrian oriented experience. She said the Project had many shortfalls as it was missing a pedestrian plaza and an undercrossing should be built as part of the project. She said the proposed office buildings had a typical suburban office park look and should be a unique design to be part of the Grand Boulevard and a gift to the street. She said the plaza should fit the street and not the parking lot, and that setbacks should be from the street and not space in the back. She said the office buildings should face south and have seating on south but the Project showed office seating in north. She said there was a traffic study planned for El Camino Real for the next fiscal year but it should be moved up and done in this year. She said the Sierra Club advocated protection of neighborhoods in many cities where there has been up-zoning around transit. She said they have many strategies to share to protect the neighborhood.

Ms. Adina Levin, Menlo Park, member of the Environmental Quality Commission, but speaking for herself and as a member of the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter, said the Sierra Club was in general supportive of in-fill development near transit and that was what development did in theory, but whether this was environmentally sustainable needed to be examined. She said in some ways it was fortunate that Stanford was presenting a Project now as Stanford was an organization able to keep its car trips down. She said under a settlement with Santa Clara County they had to implement a program to reduce traffic. She said in 2002, 72% of their employees got to work by car and by 2010 that was down to 48%. She said they have the knowhow to do development that supports a lot less cars. She said hopefully that could be implemented at this site and they could teach how to do that. She said there was a large component of medical use and generally users of that service use cars. She said that medical offices were a real waste of a transit oriented walkable space. She said the Plan has a good Transportation Demand Management plan in theory and it would be good to put that into practice. She said it uses the C/CAG transportation demand policy, which only requires three years of reporting but also encourages developers and the City go above and beyond features to encourage use of metering drive alone and road share over time, She said another key difference about sustainability was the issue of the job-housing balance and adjusting the Housing Element. She said the City's job-housing ratio was 1.9 and balance would be 1.5. She said this development at a conservative estimate has a six to one job to housing imbalance and would impact a future Housing Element cycle. She urged that the uses be moved from office more to housing with less medical to reduce trip generations and improve crossings.

Chair Ferrick closed the public comment period. She noted it was 10:40 p.m. and recessed the meeting for a short break.

Chair Ferrick reopened the meeting to continue the study session on 300 to 550 El Camino Real. She noted that the Commission would try to conclude the meeting by 11:30 p.m.

Commission Comment: Commissioner O'Malley said that a large group of residents were vehemently opposed to the Project proposal. He said Stanford should listen to the participants closely. He said he heard that there should be more housing and no medical offices. He said he did not know enough about traffic impacts but doing a traffic study on something not yet well defined was not acceptable. He said it seemed clear there would be overflow traffic to the Allied Arts neighborhood and there were safety concerns. He said clearly having more jobs would change the job-housing ratio and create a need to increase the amount of housing, which was a legitimate concern. He said related to the design generally that the plaza area needed to be

redesigned. He said the ingress and egress to the Project needed consideration and how to keep traffic from other parts of town. He said the question was how this Project would fit with the City, and he did not have a good answer to that.

Chair Ferrick said it was 10:55 p.m. and asked if they wanted to stay until 11:30 p.m. There was general consensus to continue until 11:30 p.m. and if more discussion time was needed to continue the item to a future meeting.

Commissioner Bressler said most salient point made was the power the Commission has, and that a project had to meet the standards of the neighborhood, not be harmful and meet the Specific Plan. Planner Rogers said that was one of the findings for architectural control. He said it was important what the Plan states and includes standards for development for floor area ratio, density and maximums. He said that one item could not be singled out at the exclusion of others. He said it was a holistic evaluation and included rights as well as expectations.

Commissioner Bressler asked if it could be said that the Plan was not properly vetted and did not represent community support. Planner Rogers said that might be a topic better addressed by the City Attorney. He said any project was looked at through the CEQA lens and that was the detailed evaluation of what this Project is relative to what the Plan Program EIR recommended. He said if there was a difference that opened a different path than if there was substantive agreement on the broad principles. Commissioner Bressler said that the cut through traffic into Allied Arts had not been studied, and if it was to what extent for the record. Planner Rogers said that was something the City's transportation staff could best respond to, but the dialogue the Commission should prepare for was: what is the difference between what the Plan studied for any piece of property versus what was being proposed. He said there had been discussion of a large mixed use development on these exact parcels. There were some differences with what types of uses might occupy the site but those were translated into trips which could be more or less.

Commissioner Bressler asked about mitigations that were not covered in the Plan such as people mover systems, opening up behind the buildings for much improved pedestrian/bicycle and/or vehicle access. He asked if there was any mechanism in the Plan to get some money from people who would benefit from the development to fund something like that. Planner Rogers said in broad terms that the analysis of the Project's environmental conformance with CEQA relative to the Plan could include discussion or analysis of whether there were additional impacts not analyzed by the EIR and also look at the potential for mitigation measures not analyzed by EIR. However, these had to be held to the same standards as the Program EIR that they were feasible and not previously considered. He said the one idea of a trail behind the property had been discussed extensively during the public process and had not been included in the Plan. Commissioner Bressler said at the time it was not incorporated into the Plan because Stanford had indicated they did not want to deal with that and they could not build on the land without it. Planner Rogers said it was more complex and had to do with connectivity of not having the ability to continue it over the developed property of the Stanford Park Hotel and another piece of property owned by another property owner; he said it also related to a bike lane that was proposed for El Camino Real and the potential disadvantages of splitting bike access vs. unifying it. Commissioner Bressler said that had fallen under the area of not being feasible.

Commissioner Eiref said he specifically had brought forth the idea of a dedicated trail along the railroad tracks and that they had gotten exhausted with so many details that were needed to be

covered in considering the Plan that they never really gave the idea the time it deserved. He said it seemed there were three different control points: one was the notion of architectural control. He said it was the first time he had seen the five points of criteria, a couple of which he thought were fairly subjective but interesting such as the appearance of the structure and not being detrimental to the community. He said he would like to understand that in more detail. He said the second was about traffic and whether they had done a sufficient job through the EIR for the Plan. He said his impression was they had not in respect to the cut through traffic. He said the third was something brought up by Commissioner Kadvany that for this Plan to be implemented parcels had to be merged. He asked if that would require Planning Commission review. He asked if there were three distinct ways in which the Commission could meter what was being proposed.

Planner Rogers said taking the last question first that the lot merger process was an administrative process and not a Planning Commission role. He said when there was a subdivision of parcels there was a statutory Planning Commission role. He said regarding the findings for the architectural control that those were included in conditions for other projects, including one earlier that same evening. He said the Commission's record has been that those findings were not used in a way to extend beyond the look and feel of a project and not to arbitrarily deny a use or size of a building if it conformed with a set of ordinances or design guidelines. He said the most applicable finding to the Plan was the fifth finding that a project was applicable within the Specific Plan. He said the sentence did not give an adequate relationship of how meaningful that is, as the Plan is 360 pages of very detailed standards and regulations that had superseded an ordinance that had been barely over a page of regulations and applied to the C-4 El Camino Real zoning district. He said that was where the Commission could provide valuable input but the criteria against which the project was evaluated was the Plan, and individual components could not be picked out and isolated or ignored when others were focused on. He said it was a holistic analysis of whether the project met the numerical standards and in sum total addressed the guidelines. He said regarding the EIR and traffic that they were all anticipating continuing discussion on that. He said if the analysis was that the project was largely consistent or even less that what the Program EIR analyzed that was a different situation than if it showed significant impacts that were not adequately analyzed. He said they had heard the key areas of interest that he would share with the City's Transportation Manager but they could not go into more detail about that tonight.

Commissioner Eiref said if it was determined that a Project was not harmonious with the neighborhood was that a legitimate finding as to whether the project could be built or not. Planner Rogers said if there was a question raised of a decision made by the Commission, the evaluating authority would ask: what are the standards by which "harmonious" was determined. He said the Plan, which had been adopted after five years of work and before this Project application came, would be weighted significantly more than something less defined or which had less precedent. He said that there must be evidence and facts behind the findings.

Commissioner Kadvany thanked Gita Dev and Adina Levin for their final presentation. He said the retail parking was kind of a long circle around and there was not a two-way entrance for Building B. He said he was pro retail but did not want parking configuration to discourage users. He said the seating at the café restaurant was much too close to El Camino Real and noted Café Borrone's setback from the street. He said it looked like one unit housing on the floor level faced El Camino Real in front, which he did not think was appropriate. He said he understood about the building breaks in the Plan but with this Project he thought they were posing a

considerable amount of constraint on a very narrow plot of land for building. He said the purpose of building breaks was not to have massive walls but that goal could still be attained perhaps at the same places by having one or two stories. He said he did not agree with the idea that because the Plan had been studied for five years that it was faultless. He said it could have errors and it was being tested for the first time with this Project. He said he totally agreed that the image of a plaza from the Plan was what he had in mind as the substantial benefit for the trade off for larger scale, but what was being proposed was not like that plaza. He said if Stanford had the panhandle parcel behind they could reproduce the rendition of the plaza included in the Plan with roadway access in front. He said without the segment there were constraints. He said he was very curious about the ownership of that property. He said it was irrational to build this project without that parcel of land. He said having that parcel they would connect to Burgess Park and the Arrillaga Gym and Recreation Center through the future tunnel for bikes and pedestrians and that would activate the area making it more likely that retail would be successful here. He said that was why the plaza was very important to him. He said he could not understand why Stanford would not want to actively create the east-west connectivity at this site. He said not that they should necessarily pay for all of it but working in partnership with the City on grants and funding. He said if they were asked to accept the plaza as being presented then they needed to reconsider what the benefits of the Project were to Menlo Park. He said the architecture of the office buildings was plain and faceless and from another era. He said it was not world class and it should combine the best of architecture at Stanford and Palo Alto and perhaps different styles, more traditional materials and with more modulation. He said the Commission had plenty of discretion about harmonious development and if this proposal made them feel the Plan was not working then they faced future unharmonious development. He said Stanford should step up to this project as an urban planning, architectural, public space and transit development for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, in ways suitable for a world class university and not what was on the last line of a spreadsheet. He said Google and Facebook were competing on the types of buildings they would create and asked why Stanford was not doing that.

Commissioner Riggs said the public comment had been very instructive and issues raised were ones that the Commission has wrestled with years, and establishing priorities of those issues. He said the applicant owns six parcels and was bringing those all forward at the same time, and these were six of the largest parcels in the City's Plan area. He said the priorities he had heard were: we had hoped for senior housing but decided in the Plan we were not going to force it and legally could not. He said there had been more than one comment about the plaza not being what they had hoped. He suggested when they had more time to ask the applicant to better describe it as it seemed to be located in the rear middle of the rendering. He said the plaza there looked nice but was much smaller and was that what was hoped for. He said separate bicycle ingress/egress had been requested but not there. He said this was not the architecture he expected with the guideline to be harmonious with the neighborhood but neither could the neighborhood of Allied Arts define office buildings on El Camino Real but there had to be some relationship and context between the two. He said the priority he heard repeatedly was about scale. He said two or three people had referred to this project as five to six stories, and unfortunately he architectural style seemed to create the image it was five to six stories while he had hoped with setbacks it would look like three stories with something behind and below it. He said the massing of the buildings was treated with sophistication but on the renderings the project looked big. He said the main priority heard was traffic. He said through the Plan the community had considered a lot of things that did not necessarily fit well with one another and even seemed to conflict but they had ended up with 12 guiding principles. He said that the concern about El Camino Real congestion was expressed from the beginning. He said

Caltrans has not fixed a broken link for the signalization increasing the problem. He said it's a serious problem that a lot of people want solved. He said the City adopted a Plan that allowed for significant growth as more people were wanted downtown and the vacant lots developed. He said that the City was going to need to step up and solve El Camino Real traffic. He said that might disappoint people as they might not be able to dedicate a lane to bikes or allow parking in front of Clock Works; they might not get a dedicated bus lane at the expense of three open lanes, and three open lanes of traffic throughout Menlo Park with synchronized lights. He said town was full of people who have to use their cars.

Chair Ferrick said Mr. Bourne asked about curb cut control. Planner Rogers said in general terms that could be something considered as part of the traffic part of the CEQA conformance analysis as to how the different curb cuts impact what was analyzed for pedestrian and bike safety, and also auto patterns. Chair Ferrick asked if that would be the same answer for the question about the daily trip generation rates for this particular project. Planner Rogers said that was correct. Chair Ferrick said Mr. Bourne asked about after-hour activities. Planner Rogers said the Plan included uses that were permitted or not. He said restaurant uses with entertainment were an administrative permit that could be appealed to Council and bars and lounges were conditional permits. Chair Ferrick asked when Stanford traffic study would be ready.

Mr. Elliott said they had a number of reports and studies to do before they would have a complete application and that the traffic study would probably be part of that. He said it needed to be discussed as to whether the City would do traffic study or Stanford would with peer review. Chair Ferrick asked about construction traffic. Mr. Elliott said they would have to have a construction plan. Chair Ferrick asked how the building might be phased. Mr. Elliott said they envisioned this Project as one comprehensive coordinated project. He said the intention was to get it all done within a similar timeframe.

Chair Ferrick asked about water resources. Planner Rogers said that was considered as part of the EIR.

Chair Ferrick said Mr. Brawner asked a question about potential conflict of interest for Perkins & Will. She said she recalled there had been a review process by a committee, and that the consultant used for the first phase had not risen to the top for the second phase. Planner Rogers said there were two Commissioners, two City Council members, and a few staff members who served on the consultant selection committee for both rounds. He said the first round consultant did make a proposal for the second round and was close for selection but the committee felt Perkins & Will provided the best services. Planner Rogers said that consultant met all of the qualifications and was hired by a transparent process. He said anything suggested by them was the City's option to accept or reject and had rejected things in certain instances.

Chair Ferrick asked if this was venue to prioritize intersections as part of the traffic study. Planner Rogers said the Program EIR was meant to cover the majority of projects and when a project came forward the question was what basis was there for reviewing or not revising an intersection or segment. He said based on the differences of that program and this application one would need to consider why specifically to recommend more analysis. He said the EIR was meant to account for the majority of impacts and generated the trip intersections so addition of

intersections or segments was something that could have been considered during that stage. What was the specific intersection and why was it analyzed or not analyzed?

Chair Ferrick said the plaza on the east side of Middle Avenue would have traffic going in and out and whether that might have impacts on Middle Avenue. She said she was not sure if studies were that specific as to traffic related to uses. Planner Rogers said that was a key question and did the mix of uses as proposed have significant trip rates or distribution patterns different from what was looked at before. He said the EIR did assume this property would be used by the applicant and for such a long run of property the signalized intersections of Cambridge and Middle Avenues seemed integral to sensible access and the ability to go in different directions on El Camino Real. He said that was presumed. Chair Ferrick noted there should be a really careful look at traffic differences as this could make or break the success of the Project. She asked when the next meeting would be on this item. Planner Rogers said he would need to sit down with the Planning Commission calendar and the applicants. He said perhaps traffic analysis might need to be next step, and that would probably not come back for several months.

Chair Ferrick said things she liked about the Project were the small unit sizes in the apartment building. She said she would like to see more residential units because of the job/housing ratio and Housing Element challenges. She said she liked the part of the plaza that was plaza and would like ingress/egress looked at so there was a full plaza. She said perhaps the residential buildings could be shifted to allow for a full 120 foot plaza next to the ingress and egress. She said she liked the outdoor dining and the public fountain. She said she would like an interactive fountain, and provided a photo of such a fountain. She said she liked that the parking was underground. She said she liked the architecture of the residential buildings better than the commercial buildings. She said probably because it was smaller scale with more interesting details and stepped back facades. She said the commercial buildings seemed to be glass and not in keeping with the area. She said she would like something in keeping with the convergence of Palo Alto, Stanford and Menlo Park this area represented. She said a critical piece to support the Project would be infrastructure such as an undercrossing for pedestrians and bicyclists providing the connectivity that would mitigate massive amounts of traffic, really connect the Project and make it the vibrant place everyone wanted. She said it would not happen if there was continued gridlock on El Camino Real and the surrounding streets.

Commissioner Eiref said there was a great deal of new information and ideas since the adoption of the Plan such as the Arrillaga proposal in Palo Alto and in the last few months the failures of the traffic signals and realizing the fragility of the system. He said that was why they needed to work through the details of that process. He said he liked the residential design and would like to see wider sidewalks down El Camino Real. He said he was confused by the office buildings as they were sterile. He said also he had anticipated more conference or meeting space. He asked if an EIR had been done for the development project for what had been the Anderson car dealership. Planner Rogers said that there had been as that project was proposed before the adoption of the Plan. He said a Program level analysis was meant in general terms to allow a community to consider the overall pros and cons and then to allow individual projects to move forward typically without environmental review but not exclusively. He said that was one of the objectives of the CEQA section. Commissioner Eiref said he understood but with all of the concerns raised he thought it would be good to have closer analysis.



Commissioner Bressler said he supported what Commissioner Kadvary had said related to this being the first project under the Plan. He said there seemed to be forces at work to push this project through and even if that was something of great expense and difficulty to the City they should not allow this to happen unless it was a project the City wanted. He said why follow a plan if it made people unhappy with the projects that came forth under it.

Commissioner Riggs asked how to finish giving the applicant feedback as they might want something more specific. He said the Project had good planning, good circulation, and good general massing and forms. He said he did not think the plans had to be substantially changed and that facades could be altered to minimize scale. He appreciated the attention to rhythm as they buildings followed a pattern but which did not create a wall.

Chair Ferrick said she would like to see a continued study session but it appeared the calendar was full and that could not occur until March.

Commissioner Kadvary said that much had been said and there were a lot of tradeoffs and values at stake.

Mr. Elliott said they had heard a lot from the community and there were big issues to consider. He said he would like more to go on as far as the architectural details. He asked if there were feedback questions from them. He said he would like a continuation but if they felt they had said everything then they could move forward.

Chair Ferrick said the residential buildings had been better received with lesser scale, modulation, details and use of materials. The office buildings were very large but Commissioner Riggs liked the rhythm and modulation of those buildings. She said that maybe they could get the commercial buildings to appear more residential or smaller in scale with perhaps a classic Stanford look and feel.

Commissioner Eiref said he had a lot of questions about functional tradeoffs for retail and thought it was going to be very expensive to tell Stanford to go away and come back hopefully incorporating everything that solved all.

Chair Ferrick asked if they would like another study session. Mr. Elliott said they would continue to reach out to the community and would probably have enough to digest but they would appreciate continued comments and coming back sooner than later. Chair Ferrick said she thought that this was an important enough project to have a more detailed architectural discussion. Mr. Elliott said he would work with staff and determine a resubmittal. Commissioner Riggs said some cities create subcommittees so an applicant can meet with one to three commissioners at a time. Planner Rogers said if there was a subgroup, the composition would have to remain stable. Chair Ferrick said that would also be outside the realm of the public. Commissioner Riggs said that it was the applicant's right to meet with each and every Commissioner. Chair Ferrick said she liked the idea of a formal subcommittee as that would be open to the public. Planner Rogers said that was good practice for a subcommittee but not a requirement.

Commissioner Kadvany said they could receive information from applicants but had to hold value judgments. He asked how they could do that without indicating preference.

Commissioner Eiref said there had been an interesting dynamic for the 389 El Camino Real project with dialogue between the community and applicants. He said there great community presence this evening and that another element was for Stanford to have a dialogue with the community. Chair Ferrick suggested that Stanford collaborate with a group of the neighbors and avoid perception of anything untoward, and then meet with Commissioners to have a study session in March. Commissioner Riggs said that they could not suggest to Stanford that homeowners in one area should determine what was built under Plan.

Mr. Elliott indicated they had met with neighbors, and were interested in continuing to meet with them and others.

#### **F. REGULAR BUSINESS**

There was none.

#### **G. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

There was none.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 a.m. (Tuesday, January 29, 2013)

Staff Liaison: Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by Planning Commission on February 25, 2013