REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 02/14/2022
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 871 4022 8110

NOVEL CORONAVIRUS, COVID-19, EMERGENCY ADVISORY NOTICE
On March 19, 2020, the Governor ordered a statewide stay-at-home order calling on all individuals living in the State of California to stay at home or at their place of residence to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Additionally, the Governor has temporarily suspended certain requirements of the Brown Act. For the duration of the shelter in place order, the following public meeting protocols will apply.

Teleconference meeting: In accordance with Government Code section 54953(e), and in light of the declared state of emergency, all members of the Planning Commission, city staff, applicants, and members of the public will be participating by teleconference.

How to participate in the meeting

- Submit a written comment online up to 1-hour before the meeting start time: PlanningDept@menlopark.org *
- Access the meeting real-time online at: zoom.us/join – Meeting ID# 871 4022 8110
- Access the meeting real-time via telephone (listen only mode) at: (669) 900-6833
  Regular Meeting ID # 871 4022 8110
  Press *9 to raise hand to speak

  *Written and recorded public comments and call-back requests are accepted up to 1 hour before the meeting start time. Written and recorded messages are provided to the Planning Commission at the appropriate time in their meeting. Recorded messages may be transcribed using a voice-to-text tool.

- Watch the meeting
  - Online: menlopark.org/streaming

Subject to Change: Given the current public health emergency and the rapidly evolving federal, state, county and local orders, the format of this meeting may be altered or the meeting may be canceled. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the City’s website www.menlopark.org. The instructions for logging on to the webinar and/or the access code is subject to change. If you have difficulty accessing the webinar, please check the latest online edition of the posted agenda for updated information (menlopark.org/agenda).
Regular Meeting

A. Call To Order

B. Roll Call

C. Reports and Announcements

D. Public Comment

Under “Public Comment,” the public may address the Commission on any subject not listed on the agenda, and items listed under Consent Calendar. Each speaker may address the Commission once under Public Comment for a limit of three minutes. Please clearly state your name and address or political jurisdiction in which you live. The Commission cannot act on items not listed on the agenda and, therefore, the Commission cannot respond to non-agenda issues brought up under Public Comment other than to provide general information.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the December 13, 2021, Planning Commission meeting. (Attachment)

E2. Architectural Control/Audrey Bauer/133 Stone Pine Lane:
Request for architectural control to make exterior modifications to the front façade of an existing three-story townhouse in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, including the addition of new gross floor area. (Staff Report #22-008-PC)

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Charlene Cheng/269 Willow Road:
Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot with access via an easement over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. The proposal also includes a request for a use permit to allow seven-foot tall fences within the front setback. (Staff Report #22-009-PC)

F2. Conditional Development Permit Major Modification/Heather Skeehan (citizenM)/300 Constitution Drive:
Request for review and approval of major modifications to an approved Conditional Development Permit (CDP) for interior and exterior changes to the previously approved hotel building and changes to the landscaping and on-site circulation. No changes are proposed to the number of rooms (240 rooms), the number of onsite parking spaces (118 parking spaces) or the shared parking agreement between the hotel use and the other site occupant, Meta (formerly Facebook). The proposed modifications would continue to comply with the floor area ratio, building coverage, and maximum height limits of the previously approved CDP. In 2016 the City Council certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as part of its approval of the Meta Campus Expansion Project, which included a potential 200-room hotel. Subsequent revisions to the Meta Campus were previously analyzed through the Facebook Campus Expansion Project First Addendum. In February 2020 the City Council approved revisions to increase the number of hotel rooms to 240 rooms and
approved a shared parking agreement, which was analyzed in a Second Addendum to the certified EIR. The currently proposed revisions have been reviewed against the analysis in the certified EIR, and First and Second Addendums, and the proposed revisions would not result in new impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified impacts. Continued to February 28, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting

G. Study Session

G1. Study Session/O’Brien Drive Portfolio LLC/1300-1320 Willow Road, 975-995 and 1001-1015 O’Brien Drive:

Study session for a request for a development agreement, architectural control, use permit, lot line adjustment, lot merger, Below Market Rate (BMR) housing agreement, and environmental review to demolish three existing, one-story commercial buildings on three parcels and construct one new five-story building for research and development (R&D), one new four-story building for R&D, and one new six-story parking structure with an attached two-story meeting space on two parcels located in the Life Science, Bonus (LS-B) zoning district. The proposed project would be constructed in two phases, with the five-story R&D building, parking structure, and meeting space to be developed in the first phase and the four-story R&D building in the second phase. The proposed total gross floor area of the project would be approximately 228,260 square feet of R&D space with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.24, and 9,600 square feet of commercial space (0.04 FAR). The proposal includes a request for an increase in height and FAR under the bonus level development allowance in exchange for community amenities. (Staff Report #22-010-PC)

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.

- Regular Meeting: February 28, 2022
- Regular Meeting: March 14, 2022

J. Adjournment

At every regular meeting of the Planning Commission, in addition to the public comment period where the public shall have the right to address the Planning Commission on any matters of public interest not listed on the agenda, members of the public have the right to directly address the Planning Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the chair, either before or during the Planning Commission’s consideration of the item.

At every special meeting of the Planning Commission, members of the public have the right to directly address the Planning Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the chair, either before or during consideration of the item. For appeal hearings, appellant and applicant shall each have 10 minutes for presentations.

If you challenge any of the items listed on this agenda in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of Menlo Park at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Any writing that is distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission by any person in connection with an agenda item is a public record (subject to any exemption under the Public Records Act) and is available by request by emailing the city clerk at jaherren@menlopark.org. Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in attending or participating in Planning Commission meetings, may call the City Clerk’s Office at 650-330-6620.

Agendas are posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956. Members of the public can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the City website at menlopark.org/agenda and can receive email notification of agenda and staff report postings by subscribing to the “Notify Me” service at menlopark.org/notifyme. Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 02/9/22)
A. Call To Order

Chair Michael Doran called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Associate Planner Matt Pruter at Chair Doran’s request explained how applicants and the public would be able to participate in the virtual meeting.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes (arrived at 8:17 p.m.), Chris DeCardy (Vice Chair), Michael Doran (Chair), Cynthia Harris, Camille Gonzalez Kennedy, Henry Riggs, Michele Tate

Staff: Ori Paz, Associate Planner; Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner; Chris Turner, Assistant Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Acting Principal Planner Corinna Sandmeier said the City Council at its December 14 meeting would consider interim regulations for the implementation of SB 9 that would become effective January 1, 2022.

D. Public Comment

Chair Doran closed public comment as there were no speakers.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the October 18, 2021, Planning Commission meeting. (Attachment)

ACTION: M/S (Doran/Henry Riggs) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of the minutes from the October 18, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as submitted; passed 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Michele Tate abstaining and Commissioner Andrew Barnes absent.

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Marjorie Andino/730 Ivy Drive:
Request for a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and construct first-floor additions to an existing nonconforming one-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period and requires use permit approval by
the Planning Commission. (Staff Report #21-062-PC)

Commissioner Michele Tate was recused from this item.

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Chris Turner said staff received a question from a commissioner regarding natural gas appliances. He said the project included a gas fireplace proposal and the use of gas appliances was covered by the Building Code. He noted development of the REACH code that said new single-family residences needed to use electricity for space heating and water heating including clothes dryers but could still use gas fireplaces and stoves. He said the kitchen however needed to be prewired for the use of electric stoves in the future.

Applicant Presentation: Marjorie Andino-Rivera, property owner, said she and her husband were hoping to upgrade their home to correct faults and provide for her mother and grandmother to live with them as well as expand living space for her immediate family.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Camille Gonzalez Kennedy expressed support for the project and its purposes.

Commissioner Henry Riggs moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Chris DeCardy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cynthia Harris said she liked that they moved the entry door to the front.

ACTION: M/S (Riggs/DeCardy) to approve the item as presented in the staff report; passed 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Tate recused and Commissioner Barnes not yet in attendance.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (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. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.

   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Los Reyes Architecture, consisting of six plan sheets, dated received October 27, 2021 and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

   c. 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.
d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

g. 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.

h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

i. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control Plan and construction detail sheet that documents all erosion control measures implemented during the course of construction including, but not limited to, straw waddles, silt fence, temporary construction entrances, inlet protection, check dams, tree protection fencing, etc.

j. Required frontage improvements include but not limited to: Construct a new concrete curb and gutter along entire project frontage conforming to the adjacent properties.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:

a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the site plan and elevation drawings to correctly show the existing nonconformity on the left side of the residence. Additionally, the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed eaves will comply with the maximum allowed eave encroachments on the left side. The applicant shall note that the existing nonconforming portions of the wall may not be removed, and if they are removed, that they cannot be rebuilt in their existing location.

F2. Use Permit and Variance/Rasoul Oskouy/671 Live Oak Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning
district. The proposal includes a request for a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review. (Staff Report #21-063-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Turner said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Daryl Fazekas, project architect, said their request was a variance to allow construction of a garage at a 10-foot setback, which did not meet the 20-foot building separation distance requirement between main buildings on adjacent lots.

Rasoul Oskouy, property owner, said the project would bring added housing density to the downtown including an ADU at the front of the house.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said the property was an R-3 zone and asked why they had not proposed a multi-unit building. Mr. Fazekas said they had done sketches to do that and found parking requirements were prohibitive and would have needed an extra-large front driveway for which there was insufficient space. He said there was also a large oak tree in the back to preserve.

ACTION: M/S (DeCardy/Kennedy) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passed 6-0-1 with Commissioner Barnes not yet in attendance.

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 California Environmental Quality Act 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. Make the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the approval of the variance:

   a. The combination of lot shape and the nonconformity of the adjacent building are unique hardships to this lot. The adjacent building is excessively nonconforming, which affects the placement of the proposed residence. The location of the adjacent building and shape of the subject property are circumstances not created by the owner of the property and create a hardship for creating a livable residence.

   b. The outcomes that would be gained by the variances are property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity as other conforming properties in the R-3 district would have the right to build to a standard 10-foot side setback. The setback regulations of the adjacent property and existing building effectively create a 15-foot side setback on the subject property, which is 50 percent greater than requirements on other R-3 lots.
c. The encroachments into the 20-foot separation requirement between main buildings on adjacent lots would comply with the standard 10-foot side setback in the R-3 district. A 15-foot separation distance would remain between the two structures and would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property.

d. Similar to the discussion on findings a and b, staff believes there are unique aspects of the parcel’s shape and orientation that create a unique situation that would not be generally applicable to other single-family homes in the same zoning district. A variance would allow the residence to fit within the development pattern of adjacent residences and other properties in the R-3 zoning district.

e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area. Hence, a finding regarding an unusual factor does not apply.

4. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following standard conditions:

a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Daryl Fazekas, consisting of 10 plan sheets, dated received November 15, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, 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, the arborist report prepared by Colony Landscape and Maintenance, dated July 15, 2021, and the addendum to the arborist report prepared by Colony Landscape and Management, dated July 16, 2021.

F3. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Matthew Pearson/66 Willow Place:
Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) district. The applicant requests that the office module be placed on the property for a period of three years to accommodate additional temporary staff associated with the completion of the Stanford Hospital expansion. The office module would occupy nine parking spaces, decreasing the number of parking spaces from 91 to 82 spaces where 77 spaces is required. (Staff Report #21-064-PC)

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Ori Paz said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Riggs asked if the modular would be visible from the Palo Alto side of the Creek. Planner Paz said the applicants would be better able to answer that.

Commissioner Riggs asked if residents within 300 feet of the parcel in Santa Clara County were also notified. Planner Sandmeier confirmed that noticing was done within 300-foot radius of the subject property and that included properties outside of Menlo Park in this instance. Commissioner Riggs referred to air conditioning units that were attached to modular units and if those met the City’s noise ordinance.

Applicant Presentation: Molly Swenson, Senior Program Manager in Stanford Medicine’s Planning, Design and Construction Department, said their primary office had been located at 66 Willow Place for approximately 10 years. She said their proposal was to locate a temporary modular office in the rear parking lot and behind their existing office building for a period of three years. She said the proposal would take nine parking spaces, but the total number of parking spaces would still exceed the required minimum parking. She said the site was bordered on two sides by the San Francisquito Creek and on the other two sides by office buildings. She said residential properties were on the other side of the Creek, but their site was heavily wooded, and the proposed trailer would not be visible. She said tree protection was a key consideration in developing the plans and their proposal was expected to have very limited impact on existing site trees. She said operating hours for the temporary office would be the same as their existing facility, which was roughly 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. She said they reached out to neighbors within the 300-foot radius including the Palo Alto neighbors and included a contact email. She said no comments or concerns were received.

Tran Le, Project Manager, said she reached out to the supplier of the modular building regarding the HVAC specifications, and was sent a list that was not specific to a particular model. She said she took the highest value of noise measured at 10 feet from the module, which would be 67.1 decibels. She said the nearest residential property was approximately 170 feet away from the module. She said the noise level at 160 feet would be attenuated to about 51 decibels well below the 60-decibel daytime allowance. She said the night time decibel limit was not applicable as the building would not be operated at night.

Commissioner Riggs said the City’s noise ordinance was applicable at the property line and suggested the applicants inform the modular building provider that the AC units would need to meet the City’s noise ordinance.
Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said in his experience that temporary modulars often did not leave and he wanted to see this one removed in three years.

ACTION: M/S (Riggs/Kennedy) moved to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passed 6-0-1 with Commissioner Barnes not yet in attendance.

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 California Environmental Quality Act (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. 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.
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   c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
   d. The development would not modify the previously approved adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

4. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following standard conditions:
   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.
   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by PHd Architects, Inc. consisting of 14 plan sheets, received December 3, 2021 and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
   c. 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.
d. 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.

e. 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.

f. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

g. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant’s design professional shall evaluate the Project’s impact to the City’s storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City’s Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

i. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report updated by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting dated December 8, 2021.

j. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

k. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

1. Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:

a. The use permit shall expire and the applicant shall remove the modular office and all temporary site improvements three years after the date of the final inspection or issuance of temporary occupancy for the modular office, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Building Divisions.

b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an updated arborist report correcting missing values in the appraised value column subject to review and approval by the Planning Division and City Arborist.
F4. Architectural Control and Use Permit/Paul Turek/2400 Sand Hill Road:
Request for architectural control review and a use permit to construct a new entrance along with
other modifications to an existing commercial building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional,
and Research, Restrictive) zoning district, at 2400 Sand Hill Road. The project also includes
landscape modifications. (Staff Report #21-065-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Pruter said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Kelly Simcox, principal architect for Studio G Architects, said she had
worked closely with their client, the design team and planning staff on the project. She provided a
general visual summary of the project.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Chair Doran said the project was attractive and the ADA improvements were
welcome. He moved to approve. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion and commented on
excellent integrative architectural work that Studio G had done in Menlo Park.

ACTION: M/S (Doran/Riggs) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passed 6-0-1
with Commissioner Barnes not yet in attendance.

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 California Environmental Quality
Act (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. 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.

   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding
      consistency is required to be made.

4. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following standard conditions:
a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.

b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Studio G Architects, consisting of 92 plan sheets, dated received December 8, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a hydrology report for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The hydrology report shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits.

g. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

h. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Tree Management Experts, dated received September 20, 2021.

i. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

5. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following project-specific condition:

   a. Prior to final inspection, the applicant shall record both the emergency vehicle access easement and stormwater operations and maintenance agreement, subject review and approval by the Engineering Division.

G. Study Session

G1. Study Session/Cyrus Sanandaji/1300 El Camino Real:
Study session on a request for a zoning text amendment to modify Municipal Code Chapter 16.92 (Signs-Outdoor Advertising) with regard to a previously approved architectural control, below market
rate housing agreement, environmental review, and use permit for a new mixed-use office, residential, and retail development on a 6.4-acre site in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposed zoning text amendment includes eliminating the square footage cap on the total sign area for larger projects within the SP-ECR/D zoning district and establishing new regulations to calculate permitted signage for certain projects in the SP-ECR/D zoning district. (Staff Report #21-066-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said she had no updates to the written report.

Chair Doran confirmed with Ms. Sandmeier that the question of recusal applied previously had been resolved.

Applicant Presentation: Cyrus Sanandaji, project representative, said at the prior study session in November 2021, he had outlined the need to amend the signage ordinance as it did not consider buildings developed under the Downtown Specific Plan. He said when the Specific Plan was approved the City Council had directed Planning to do a signage study. He said it had not been completed and with their 1300 El Camino Real and Stanford’s Middle Plaza projects nearing completion, his group was requested to spearhead the effort to determine what was needed to amend the signage ordinance appropriately. He said at the prior study session on this with the Planning Commission they outlined the challenges the current ordinance posed to development under the Specific Plan and the specific modifications being sought. He said feedback from that session leading to this study session was to summarize the existing sign regulations that would not change. He said they were asking for a very specific modification to allow larger frontage projects to have an equitable share of signage from an overall square footage standpoint. He said to support that and justify the request they were asked to study the precedent signage standards and provide examples within Menlo Park and in adjacent jurisdictions of Palo Alto and Redwood City; also, to refine the proposed signage standards to address various comments by Planning Commission members around the potential of creating a Times Square / Las Vegas style environment. He said they were urged to formally conduct community outreach.

Mr. Sanandaji said the current signage ordinance had a 100 square foot cap for the primary frontage regardless of the size and 50 square foot cap on secondary frontage. He said this cap hurt projects like Springline or Middle Plaza disproportionately as those had significant frontages. He said with that Springline could have only 200 square feet of signage for the entire project. He said that would not even cover the Springline project identity on the arch between the two buildings on El Camino Real. He said the amendment they were proposing to the signage ordinance would apply specifically to the Downtown Specific Plan area only. He said tonight’s study session purpose was to get Planning Commission feedback on their proposal for amendment to allow for the community serving and retail uses and other commercial users to receive proportionate signage rights relative to the rest of Menlo Park. He said that would then allow them to move forward with their marketing efforts and hopefully successful leasing and activation of the project. He said if the ordinance was amended projects would still need to bring a master sign plan for multi-tenant projects to the Planning Commission for approval.

Mr. Sanandaji said they looked at signage regulations for the City of Palo Alto. He said similarly they required a master sign plan but like their proposed amendment they had no limitations resembling what Menlo Park currently had. He said the allowances in terms of freestanding signs and wall signs, and their combination, in the City of Palo Alto exceeded what they were proposing in their formulation. He said the City of Redwood City similarly had a sign area formula that calculated one and a half square feet of sign area to one linear foot of frontage and that was significantly greater
than the proposed formula that they would like for the downtown area. He said the City of Redwood City allowed that each ground floor establishment might display one sign and each legally recognized tenant be allowed at least 50 square feet of sign area. He said they use a master sign program and discretionary review to ensure conformance with the overall signage ordinances.

Mr. Sanandaji presented their proposed signage standard modifications that included revisions made in response to various Planning Commissioners’ feedback during the first study session. He said they were seeking to eliminate the 100 and 50 square foot caps on signage for projects that had much longer street facades. He said Chair Doran he believed had raised a concern that if the current caps were removed there was a potential of the allowable 1,000 square feet being turned into one massive billboard for a single tenant. He said to address that they were proposing a single sign cap of 50 square feet, regardless of what the total allocation was.

Mr. Sanandaji commented on the public outreach they had done with both residential and business neighbors, a variety of business groups and the Chamber of Commerce leading up to the first study session. He said most recently that they had a stand at several Farmer’s Markets to try to engage with the community and solicit feedback. He said they received very positive support for the proposed ordinance amendment.

Chair Doran opened public comment.

Public Comment:

- Michael Burch, Scott AG, said they were the signage designer and consultant for the Middle Plaza project. He said they had been working with City staff for the past two and a half years toward a good solution to the signage issue of not being able to accomplish an appropriate level of signage for the mixed use project that was Middle Plaza with the residential project, retail at the Plaza space, and three office buildings. He said he provided a letter of support for the Springline text amendment and included a basic massing study for the Middle Plaza project elevations of the El Camino Real frontage. He said their project had about three times the frontage along El Camino Real that the Springline project had. He said they could accomplish good signage under the proposed 1,000 square feet even on 1,600 feet of linear frontage.

Chair Doran closed public comment. He noted for the record that Commissioner Barnes had arrived. He told Commissioner Barnes that the Commission was on the study session item and had just heard from the applicant and received public comment.

Commission Comment: Commissioner DeCardy referred to Attachment A and said the parcel closest to Santa Cruz Avenue going up El Camino Real from the Middle Plaza project was the shopping area with Big 5 and other stores. He said that was one parcel and multiple tenants. He asked why the proposed project and the Middle Plaza project were different from that one.

Planner Sandmeier said she could research the parcel during the meeting as she was not familiar with its specifics regarding signage for that parcel.

Commissioner Riggs said he had made a specific comment at the October study session, noting it was not listed in this staff report about limiting top of building signage differently than overall building signage as it was undesirable to clutter and overemphasize what would be visible from a distance, which also was when the building was seen for the longest period of time. He said although Mr. Sanandaji had expressed similar concern the amendment would codify signage for other persons
who might not share that concern. He said what was presented tonight as a perspective for Springline was attractive particularly in part because the colors were all pulled from the existing building palette. He said that was not something they could regulate necessarily. He used corporate signage and colors as an example. He suggested codifying color palette in some way. He asked if there were existing regulations about flashing lights or moving images on signage, noting Mountain Mike’s signage. Planner Sandmeier said that flashing and moving lights on signage were not permitted. She said she was alerted to the particular building on El Camino Real Commissioner Riggs mentioned and would follow up with code enforcement.

Commissioner Riggs said related to fine tuning the proposed modifications that a suggestion was to budget every 100 feet of frontage but that it would be rounded up 150 feet. He said it seemed that a building with 150-foot frontage or a portion of a building would be allowed to have double the signage that was anticipated on a 100-foot frontage. He said he was not sure that was how to do that. He said perhaps saying at a 150-foot of frontage you could have 50% more but he would be more comfortable if the allowance did not jump to double. He said he was particularly open to staff’s response to that. He said he thought he understood what was intended for the parking and way finding signage and what was written in the narrative of Attachment B that was offered by the applicant. He said that would benefit from being codified. He said for example that the parking signage would not state “Data House Parking Here” with the Data House logo and colors. He said in the applicant’s submittal, sheet 5 in Attachment C (not titled that but located between Attachments B and D) frontage was indicated with a green line but the courtyard frontages were not part of the formula. He said he was fairly sure those were intended not to be included but he wanted that clarified. He referred to page 7 of the staff report and prompts for the Planning Commission to consider and noted the three bullet points.

- Are the proposed formulas for calculating signage generally supported?
- Should a Master Sign Plan be required for projects that fall under the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment?
- Should office tenant signage limitations be based on Springline’s proposal to allow one sign per 100 feet of the applicable frontage and one ground-mounted monument sign per office building (with the provision that frontage over 150 feet would be rounded up to allow two signs)?

Commissioner Riggs asked whether full time, qualified staff assigned to this project might provide their considered and informed opinion on the issues listed.

Chair Doran said he would recognize Steve Atkinson to speak first.

Steve Atkinson, Arent Fox, Springline project, said he would like to address some of Commissioner Riggs’ comments and questions. He said 100 foot and 150 feet referred to the proposal piece regarding limitations on office signage. He said the letter from the Middle Plaza project proposed a slightly different calculation for that limitation. He said it basically took the frontage, multiplied it by 1%, and then multiplied that by 50. He said doing that for the Springline project the result was a very similar number to the one doing Springline’s proposed formula. He said for the Middle Plaza project that method worked a bit better due to the project’s unique configuration. He said Springline was prepared to go with that alternative funding and for that project would result in approximately four 50 square foot signs on the El Camino Real frontage.

Requested by the Chair, Planner Sandmeier said in response to Commissioner Riggs that generally staff was supportive of the applicant’s proposal based on the massing studies provided by the
applicants for Springline and Middle Plaza projects as well as with comparing neighboring or nearby jurisdictions having similar downtowns on the El Camino Real corridor.

Chair Doran referred to the points for Commission consideration and mentioned that hearing from each Commissioner on those helped staff’s work. He said he supported the proposed formulas for calculating signage and was in favor of a Master Sign Plan as stated. He said regarding the third bullet point it seemed the Middle Plaza consultant solution addressed Commissioner Riggs’ concern and was supported by the Springline project applicant. He said he would favor that rather than the Springline proposal that seeded to jump to 150 feet. He said he supported the proposed ordinance amendment.

Commissioner Kennedy said she was generally supportive of the proposed ordinance amendment. She noted challenges around signage and brand alignment. She said she thought it was important to have cohesive signage elements within the bigger scope and then where a company’s brand and logo were intertwined to have that at a smaller level. She said that larger corporate entities as tenants might push back if not allowed their branding signage so they could allow that just not at a gigantic scale.

Commissioner DeCardy noted the public outreach at the Farmers’ Market and asked how many people the applicants spoke with and if tracked how many provided feedback, and if they could characterize the feedback.

Mr. Sanandaji said they had about 10 conversations at each Farmers’ Mark that for the most part was at a casual level. He said a few people engaged with his colleagues representing the project and those people appreciated the need for retailers to be noticed. He said they had great interest in what retailers would be there toward the goal of enlivening the downtown and making it fun.

Commissioner DeCardy said he appreciated their presentation summary about the history of signage and guidance already in place. He said one of those said in general that signage should be eight to 18 inches in height and to 24 inches only were there were large setbacks. He asked for their thoughts on that. He said in the unlabeled attachment (assumed Attachment C) that at the upper floors for an example it appeared signs were 30 inches in height and 20 feet wide. He asked how that aligned with the historical one regarding height. He said the last slide they showed, sort of a street view looking at the project, looked fantastic, but it was not a view anyone would have so that was misleading. He said that large signs at a distance would work but here there was no distance.

Mr. Sanandaji asked that the slide referred to be shown. He said the green indicated where signage would be placed and not the size of it. He said one of their proposals was to limit any one individual sign to 50 square feet so signs 30 inches by 20 feet long were not possible. He showed slides that better demonstrated the pedestrian’s view of the frontage.

Commissioner DeCardy said he expected the City’s downtown would become denser noting multiple reasons for that. He said opposing that would be people’s concern about missing the look and feel of a smaller community. He said that signage played a big part in that, and he thought the signage in the community currently was a mess and a hodgepodge of distraction. He wanted his bias on that to be clear. He said in general they were headed in the right direction but signage that would be allowed up high was too big. He said he supported individual storefronts having their own signs. He said in general it was headed in the right direction, there should be a Sign Master Plan, and while they had reduced the proposed amount of signage from where they were before, he still thought it was too much. He referred to Commissioner Riggs’ points about staff perspective and expertise and
suggested that it would be great to hear from them in detail about the history of the Big Five property. He said he appreciated the information from nearby jurisdictions, but the comparisons were not straightforward for the Commissioners, or at least to him. He said it would be helpful if staff as this moved forward to the City Council for consideration presented those comparisons “apples to apples.”

Commissioner Barnes apologized that he was late due to a work meeting and asked about the Master Sign Plan and whether its review was discretionary or not. Planner Sandmeier said it was anticipated as discretionary. She said input from the Commission on what particular specifics were desired for that would be helpful for staff to know. She said the Big Five property on El Camino Real had a Conditional Development Permit, but that did not seem to have any special signage allowances. She said signage along El Camino Real frontage was the only signage that would be limited to the 100 square feet commercial signage. She said any signage adjacent to the driveway facing private property would not be limited. She said they would need to do an inventory to ensure all the signs had been permitted.

Commissioner Barnes said regarding a Master Sign Plan that he would prefer to see some consistency and transparency in the process. He said his concern was about the level of discretion or the lack of consistency and transparency. He said he wanted it to be clear what was acceptable in Menlo Park for signage, and what was not. He asked what level of discretion was being contemplated.

Planner Sandmeier said as mentioned in the applicant’s presentation the current design guidelines were fairly strict. She said the draft ordinance as written now said that any signage that went beyond the 100-foot cap currently allowed would require a Master Sign Program and that needed Planning Commission discretionary review. She said none of the signs under the new proposed language would be approved at staff level. She said if the Commission liked it could advise adding specific parameters to future review of Master Plan Programs, for example, more restrictive colors or such things than what’s in the current design guidelines as that would be helpful for staff to know. She said how it was now contemplated a Master Sign Program might allow something that the current design guidelines said was not recommended. She said the Planning Commission could provide advice that a Master Plan Program should be limited to the design guidelines and then reviewed in conformance to make sure everything had a cohesive look.

Commissioner Barnes said his preference was that the Commission would be queried when the proposal did not conform to the Master Sign Program and was seeking allowance similar to use permit process.

Commissioner Tate said she agreed with Commissioner Barnes’ comments on a Master Plan Program and discretionary review. She said regarding company logos and branding she agreed with Commissioner Kennedy those should be scaled back and suggested similar to what was seen in planned communities.

Commissioner Riggs said he agreed with Commissioner Barnes’ call to make the regulations as specific as possible and limiting how much discretion the Planning Commission would have. He said there were risks as it was difficult to anticipate a mistake that might slip through the intent of the regulation. He said maybe the main variable to be concerned with was color. He said previously they had been concerned about bright red and bright yellow. He said perhaps it could be written that it was nondiscretionary if the colors come from the base colors of the building and not some small
amount of trim color. He said if more color or a particular lighting of the signage was desired that would come for discretionary review. He said that was a sample idea.

Commissioner Harris said she would like the rules to be consistent, clear and simple enough, so it was easier for developers to execute them and for staff to check without the need of much oversight by the Planning Commission. She said she would also like it to be reasonable and supportive of success for Menlo Park businesses. She said they were looking at adding retail in an area where retail was already difficult so she would not want the rules to be so onerous it created issues for new retail. She said she would not want brands to be restricted or requiring changing the colors of logos.

Chair Doran said he thought the Master Sign Plan was a good idea and did not see it as a way out of restrictions proposed in the ordinance. He said he did not think the Master Sign Plan should allow larger signs and more signs. He said his concept of what a Master Sign Plan would do was to ensure a cohesive look for development so you would not have a riot of different types of signs and flashing colors close together. He said the rules themselves should be prescriptive to make it easier for applicants to plan and make things more consistent and fairer. He said regarding colors that he was concerned about the size of signs much more than about the colors. He said if retailers had a color scheme that was part of their branding, he would not want to require them to use a different color.

Commissioner Kennedy said a company’s brand was not their sign and their brand was typically their logo, so the logo and sign were two different things. She said as this was a sign ordinance then they were talking about the name of the company and not its designed logo. She said if they were placing rules around size then they might also have to consider the variety of colors that signs typically come in as signs do double duty as a logo for a company. She said for example Lululemon’s sign stated Lululemon, but their brand was the weird little thing that was their logo. She said Bank of America signs often had their logo embedded in it. She said it would be challenging to have an enormous sign with part of a logo embedded in it. She said what the applicant had talked about tonight was just words and no logos. She said what signage was presented on screen tonight had no logos.

Recognized by Chair Doran, Mr. Sanandaji clarified that they did not have a specific tenant or set of tenants and what they presented was not a Master Sign Plan proposal for their project but was generic. He said Phil’s Coffee right around the corner by the train station was the perfect example of a retail sign with their logo and name. He said that was what they were proposing for these signs.

Commissioner Kennedy said that was different from signs high above El Camino Real. She used an example of Allstate and their logo, gigantic size, and said that would be gaudy.

Mr. Sanandaji said he agreed with that. He said the clarification he was trying to make was those projects like Springline and Middle Plaza would be self-governing and judicious about the use of their sign allocation as they had to maintain flexibility. He said for instance what if one of their large restaurant tenant’s business failed to work out for some reason and they had to demise that space into three uses. He said they could not suddenly strip signage off other tenants or shrink their signage down. He said what they would propose later as their final plan would demonstrate that there was ample flexibility for future demising of the retail suites. He said they would at the most have two signs at the upper levels and those were capped at 50 square feet and the majority of signage would be on the ground floor to identify retailers.
Commissioner Tate said she believed the applicant had answered her question by his comments about Phil’s Coffee sign with their name and logo. She said companies would want signs that provided brand recognition and would want to advertise or have on the building whatever it was they used as their marketing tool.

Commissioner Harris commented that for some their mark would be their name such as FedEx and for others a symbol. She said she did not think they could say whether a company could have a logo or not. She said for her it was having the appropriate size for signs.

Commissioner Barnes said the sizing and placement of signage did not seem out of context for the building or the El Camino Real corridor. He said it was appropriate for businesses located in Menlo Park to have the equity needed in terms of signage to thrive.

Replying to Chair Doran, Planner Sandmeier said most of staff's questions had been answered. She said Commissioner DeCardy asked earlier about more specific comparisons. She said she did some very rough estimates for the Springline project along the El Camino Real frontage. She said just looking at the City of Palo Alto's requirements for wall signage limits and freestanding signs that with that Springline could have along that frontage 500 or 550 square feet if it was in Palo Alto and along El Camino Real. She said that was similar to the proposed ordinance that would allow 540 square feet. She said in the City of Redwood City if Springline had the same frontage along El Camino Real but was outside their Downtown Precise Plan it would be allowed about 685 square feet of signage very roughly. She said that was more than the 540 square feet permitted through the proposed amendment and if within the Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan quite a bit more signage would be permitted with different types of signage as outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner DeCardy said he thought that information would be helpful as the proposed ordinance moved to City Council.

Commissioner Harris said that they all seemed to want the rules to be consistent and easy to follow so they did not have to make a lot of judgments later. She said one comment by Commissioner Riggs she did not think they discussed was whether the building signage should be different at the top of the building versus the side of the building.

Commissioner Tate said in her opinion the signage on the sides of the building should be smaller.

Commissioner Riggs asked if Commissioner Tate’s comment was in response to his suggestion that signage at the top of the building typically used by a major tenant to identify that building as them would not have as many square feet as the dozen tenants on the ground floor that got their own individual signs.

Commissioner Tate said it was. She said if they were looking at putting together guidelines to go forward that the side of the building might very well face a residential street and there, she did not think signage needed to be huge for the major tenant.

Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Planner Sandmeier said the way the draft ordinance was written El Camino Real was the front. She said she thought the idea of allowing less or smaller signage on upper floors sounded reasonable. She said some cities had those types of regulations especially since retail tenants were usually on the first floor. She said that way the building could become a little more pedestrian in scale. She said it was helpful to hear that was important to some Commissioners to be included in the ordinance.
Commissioner Barnes said upper floors and sides of buildings seemed to be used interchangeably.

Planner Sandmeier asked for clarification whether the concern about signage and size was more that it was along a secondary frontage or even a third frontage as with Springline or if along the El Camino Real frontage the preference was not to have large signs or to have smaller signs for upper floors.

Chair Doran said in this zoning district, a commercial district, he was less concerned about the sides of the building and signage. He said all sides of this project would be commercial and he thought that was generally true of the Downtown Specific Plan area. He said the proposed size limitations on the upper floors made sense to him. He said having the primary tenant or anchor tenant’s sign on the upper floors did not offend his view either walking or driving in its vicinity.

Commissioner DeCardy said he questioned the need for signage at all on upper floors. He said he questioned the total amount of space for signage. He said he was fine with colors, but he would not want flashing lights. He said businesses could do great with attractive and well-placed signage.

H. Regular Business

H1. Review of Draft 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Dates. (Staff Report #21-067-PC)

Planner Sandmeier said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Chair Doran opened the public comment period and closed it as there were no speakers.

Both Commissioners Harris and Tate indicated they would not be available May 23.

Chair Doran commented that with five Commission members available that was a quorum and if closer to that date a quorum was not possible another meeting date could be identified.

ACTION: M/S (Barnes/DeCardy) moved to approve the calendar as submitted; passed 7-0.

I. Informational Items

I1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

- Regular Meeting: December 20, 2021 – Cancelled

J. Adjournment

Chair Doran adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve a request for architectural control to make exterior modifications to the front façade of an existing three-story townhouse in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, including the addition of new gross floor area. The recommended actions are contained within Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each architectural control request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required architectural control findings can be made for the proposal.

Background

Site location
The subject property is located at 133 Stone Pine Lane, in the Park Forest neighborhood near the City’s northern border. The adjacent parcels along Stone Pine Lane are also located within the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, and contain townhouses and associated common space. The subject parcel and the townhouses surrounding the parcel were originally developed under the jurisdiction of San Mateo County as a Planned Unit Development and are known collectively as the Park Forest development. The area represents a variety of architectural styles, with most townhouses at a three-story scale. Many residents have modified their units since being annexed into the City of Menlo Park. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Analysis

Project description
The existing townhouse contains approximately 2,624.5 square feet of gross floor area. The existing townhouse also includes a two-car garage, which is not included in the calculation of gross floor area. The townhouse consists of three levels with two bedrooms and two and a half bathrooms. The applicant is proposing to add a new bay window, which would add 11.5 square feet, and to modify the interior layout, which would create a third bedroom on the third floor but would not add square footage. The applicant is proposing exterior modifications, which are described in detail in the following section of this staff report. The project plans are included as Attachment C, and the project description letter is included as Attachment D.
**Design and Materials**

Only the front elevation of the townhouse is proposed to be modified. The applicant is proposing to replace the vertical board and batten siding with thermory (wood) siding and stucco in a light color.

A total of 10 windows would be removed, five from the second floor and five from the third floor. A new bay window would be added on the second floor on the right side, where the relocated kitchen is proposed. Of the two window panels for the bay window, the smaller panel on the right would be operable. Four new window panels are proposed for the proposed bedrooms on the third floor, of which only the two smaller panels would be operable. The proposed windows would be metal-clad casement windows with a four-and-a-half-inch thick black trim, in order to provide accent features. The proposed new window locations were designed to accommodate the proposed internal changes, including a change to the layout to create a third bedroom at the third floor.

The applicant is also proposing to replace the existing front door with a new white oak front door with a sidelite. The proposed front elevation, including colors and materials, can be seen on Plan Sheets A2.01 and A3.01.

Staff believes the project would be consistent with the existing contemporary architectural style of the individual unit. The project would also be compatible with the existing architectural style of the overall Park Forest development, which features a number of townhouses with a variety of materials and architectural styles.

**Correspondence**

Staff has not received any correspondence on this proposal as of the writing of this staff report.

**Conclusion**

Staff believes the project would result in a consistent architectural style for the individual unit. Additionally, the project would be compatible with the existing architectural style of the overall development, which features a number of townhouses with a variety of materials and architectural styles. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

**Impact on City Resources**

The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

**Environmental Review**

The project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

**Public Notice**

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72
hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

**Appeal Period**
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

**Attachments**
A. Recommended Actions  
B. Location Map  
C. Project Plans  
D. Project Description Letter

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

**Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting**
None.

Report prepared by:  
Fahteen Khan, Assistant Planner

Report reviewed by:  
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
ACTION:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (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.
   
   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

3. Approve the architectural control subject to the following **standard** conditions:

   a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Studio Maven, consisting of 13 plan sheets, dated received December 7, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 14, 2022, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
   
   b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant 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 applicant 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
LOCATION: 133 Stone Pine Lane
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2021-00039
APPLICANT: Audrey Bauer
OWNER: Ching Annie Wong

PROPOSAL: Architectural Control/Audrey Bauer/133 Stone Pine Lane: Request for architectural control to make exterior modifications to the front façade of an existing three-story townhouse in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, including the addition of new gross floor area.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission
DATE: February 14, 2022
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

f. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

h. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

4. Approve the architectural control subject to the following project-specific condition:

a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a compete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the cover sheet to indicate the gross floor area increase, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
EXISTING ELEVATION EAST

EXISTING ELEVATION WEST

PROPOSED ELEVATION EAST

PROPOSED ELEVATION WEST
December 07, 2021

Project Description Letter for: 133 Stone Pine Ln.

APN: 069-343-090

To Whom it May Concern,

We are submitting documents for the proposed project at 133 Stone Pine Lane for an Architectural Control review and approval. Proposed are alterations to the front facade openings and materials, as well as minor interior alterations. This is a single family townhouse built in 1964 with painted vertical board siding and trim.

The goals of the project are:

1. Update the façade of the townhouse, replacing the existing trim and finishes with a style that's more consistent with the neighborhood
2. Convert the existing oversized bedroom into 2 usable bedrooms, likely consistent with the original layout of the home.
3. Update the current kitchen in-kind.

The detailed scope of work is as follows:

1. Replace the traditional styled french-door entry door with a modern single door and sidelite.
2. Replace the 5 windows at the main level (Level 1) with 2 windows, adding a bay window bump out to host the windows (11.5 square feet added).
3. Update the kitchen, adding a closet to move the washer & dryer to the main level (Level 1)
4. Replace the vertical wood siding with a combination of light stucco and stained wood siding at the front of house.
5. Convert the oversized bedroom at the 3rd floor into 2 smaller bedrooms.
6. Replace the 5 windows at the upper level (Level 2) with 4 windows.

There are no changes to the existing setbacks on the property, nor any changes to the existing site layout, parking, fences, garage, driveway or roof. No work shall occur at the lower level (Ground Level). No work shall occur in the rear of the townhome.

The property is adjacent to a large apartment building on the left and a single family townhouse immediately adjacent to the right. The property owners of the townhouse at 135 Stone Pine
Lane are aware of the project and are supportive of the proposed alterations.

The homeowners reported that they "had one [conversation] verbally with our nextdoor neighbor 135 Stone Pine Lane, and with the owners couple (Jun Choi and Diane Moon), and I believe we spoke on March 19th, 2021 Friday evening, shortly after Jun and Diane moved in...we mentioned our project scope (primarily kitchen remodelling and the bedroom change with modifying windows) and asked whether they are OK with upcoming construction noises - which they said no problem at all."

Please feel free to contact us with any questions you may have about the drawings.

Please let us know if there are further questions.

Thank you,

Audrey Bauer

Studio Maven
135 Webster St
San Francisco, Ca 94117
415-494-8255
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot with access via an easement over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. The proposal also includes a request for a use permit to allow seven-foot tall fences within the front setback. Recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each use permit request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit findings can be made for the proposal.

Background
Site location
The subject property is located at 269 Willow Road in the Seminary Oaks neighborhood. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot oriented parallel to Willow Road. Two adjacent parcels separate the subject site from Willow Road. An access easement over the right ten feet of the 267 Willow Road property and the left ten feet of the 275 Willow Road property combine to form the “handle” for the panhandle lot and provide access to the subject parcel. The subject parcel is proposed to have the address of 269 Willow Road. Using Willow Road in a north-south orientation, the project site is located near the western side of Willow Road between Nash Avenue to the north and Blackburn Avenue to the south. The adjacent parcels along the street are also located within the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district and feature primarily single-family residences. The area represents a variety of architectural styles, including Mediterranean, traditional, and ranch style homes. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Previous Planning Commission review
The project was heard by the Planning Commission on January 24, 2022. Public comment from neighboring residents was received in advance of the meeting identifying a desire for a taller fence in the front 20 feet of the lot, which would require a use permit. Another neighbor provided input requesting additional screening trees at the rear of the lot. The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they would be amenable to continue the project to a future meeting and add the request for fences exceeding four feet in height within the front setback to their proposed project. The applicant agreed. The applicant has revised the proposed plans to reflect the request for the taller fence height and additional screening trees at the rear of the property. The staff report from the January 24, 2022 meeting is included as Attachment C.
Analysis

Project description
The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story, single-family residence on the vacant panhandle lot. The project also includes a request for fences taller than four feet in height within the front 20 feet of the lot. A data table summarizing parcel and project characteristics is included as Attachment D. The project plans and project description letter are included as Attachments E and F, respectively.

The proposed residence would be a three-bedroom home with the master bedroom and two additional bedrooms on the second floor. The first floor would be dedicated to shared living space, including the kitchen, dining, and living rooms and an office. The required parking for the home would be provided by an attached, front-loading, one-car garage and an uncovered parking space to the left of the garage. Guest parking would be provided near the uncovered parking space at the end of the driveway. The proposed residence would meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements for setbacks, lot coverage, floor area limit (FAL), daylight plane, parking, and height. Of particular note, the project would have the following characteristics with regard to the Zoning Ordinance:

- The proposed floor area would be near the maximum FAL with 2,917.1 square feet proposed where 2,967 square feet is the maximum.
- The proposed project would be constructed below the maximum lot coverage at 23.7 percent where 35 percent is the maximum.
- The proposed residence would be constructed near the maximum height, at 27.9 feet proposed where 28 feet is the maximum.

The proposed residence would have a front setback of 24.6 feet, and a rear setback of 20, where 20 feet is required in either case. The required interior side setback in the R-1-U district is 10 percent of the minimum lot width, with a minimum of five feet and a maximum of ten feet. The flag lot orientation is such that the lot line met by the access, or “panhandle” is considered the front lot line. The panhandle reaches the lot at the center. The width, as measured as the distance between the two sides, is 109.8 feet. Therefore the side setbacks are ten feet on either side. The residence is proposed to be located at the minimum right-side setback and 20.9 feet from the left side. The proposed second story would be directly above the first story at the front and rear, and stepped in from the first floor on both sides of the residence.

Fencing
The proposed project would include construction of a new seven-foot tall wood fence within the front setback at the right side of the property and legalization of an existing seven-foot tall wood fence within the front setback at the left side of the property. The proposal also includes fences along the front property line that would feature four-foot tall stone-clad columns, which would increase to seven feet in height on each side of the driveway, approximately four feet from the columns.

Because the front setback of the subject property is also the rear setback of two adjacent lots, shared fences along this property line or on the adjacent parcels may be up to seven feet tall, as is allowed for fences along rear property lines. However, the sides of the subject parcel are adjacent to the sides of adjacent parcels, so along these property lines, a use permit is needed to exceed the four-foot height limitation within the front 20 feet of the subject property.

Staff believes that the taller fences within the front setback would be appropriate and provide additional privacy to the occupants of the subject property as well as neighbors, without imposing on the pedestrian and vehicular experience at the street given the subject parcel is not adjacent to the public right-of-way.
**Design and materials**
The applicant states that the proposed residence would be constructed in a colonial revival design. The exterior materials would be hardi board horizontal siding. The roof would feature presidential shingle roofing material. The windows would be simulated true divided lite style fiberglass windows with vinyl shutters at the first and second floor at the front, and second floor at the rear. A large fixed window would be set between two fiberglass casement windows without grids at the center of the rear elevation. The rear elevation would also feature sliding glass doors at the first floor.

There are six second-story windows proposed at the rear and five at the front, along with three dormers with windows. All second-story windows would have a minimum sill height of three feet. No second-story windows are proposed at the sides. Staff believes the proposal not to have side-facing, second-story windows would help alleviate potential privacy concerns.

Staff believes that the design and materials of the proposed residence are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The colonial revival style would be generally attractive and add to the mix of architectural styles in the area.

**Trees and landscaping**
There are a total of 32 trees at and near the project site. Two heritage trees, tree #2, an apple tree in the southeast corner of the lot, and tree #6, a plum tree in the southwest quarter of the lot nearer to the center, and nine non-heritage trees, primarily at the center and rear of the lot, are proposed for removal due to conflict with the proposed residence and driveway. The remaining heritage trees would be protected according to the heritage tree ordinance and the applicant’s arborist report (Attachment G).

One coast live oak tree and one hybrid laurel tree are proposed as heritage tree replacements. Four additional hybrid laurel trees are proposed as screening trees. The coast live oak tree is proposed in the rear yard. The hybrid laurel replacement tree would be located at the east side of the lot. Two hybrid laurel trees would be planted in the southeast corner near where the apple tree would be removed, one would be planted near the center of the southern side of the lot, and one would be planted toward the northeast corner of the lot.

The applicant has indicated three additional hybrid laurel screening trees would be planted in the rear yard as a result of feedback from neighbors. Project-specific conditions of approval 4b and 4c would ensure that the applicant provide an updated arborist report assessing the additional plantings and irrigation plans to confirm there would be no impacts to the existing heritage trees and the new trees would be successful.

The trees are shown on the site plan and landscape plan within the proposed plan set (Attachment D). The proposed tree removals and tree protections were evaluated by the City Arborist. The City Arborist waived the notice and appeal period for the heritage tree removals based on the condition of the trees as part of the review of the heritage tree removal permits as the poor health of the trees is sufficient to warrant their removal. Protection of the trees in accordance with the arborist report and the Heritage Tree Ordinance would be ensured through standard condition of approval 3(k).

**Correspondence**
The applicant indicates they reached out to surrounding properties. Correspondence with the neighbors at 247 Willow Road, 245 Willow Road, and 254 Santa Margarita Avenue has been included as Attachment H.

The neighbor at 247 Willow Road expressed concerns including potential privacy impacts from second-story
windows and the removal of the apple tree in the southeast corner of the lot, as well as general concerns about rodents on the vacant site and sewer line issues. The neighbors at 245 Willow Road expressed concerns about privacy with the lower fence along the front. The rear-adjacent neighbor on Santa Margarita Avenue also expressed concerns about privacy impacts from the second story and requested additional landscape screening and that the proposed location of the home be revised.

The applicant has added screening trees to the existing trees along the rear. The home would meet the rear setback and the three-foot sill heights for the windows at the rear would help to mitigate potential privacy concerns. The applicant has also revised the proposal to include a taller fence in the front setback to address privacy concerns. In addition, the applicant indicates they will address the rodent concern during demolition and new sewer connections are proposed.

Conclusion
Staff believes the proposed home would be aesthetically compatible with others in the neighborhood and the design decision not to install windows on the side-facing elevations at the second floor would help to reduce potential privacy concerns. The use permit request for fences over 7 feet in height within the front setback would be appropriate for the panhandle lot and would provide additional privacy to the subject property as well as neighbors. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

Impact on City Resources
The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project. In addition, the proposed development would be subject to payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) as outlined in project-specific condition of approval 4.a.

Environmental Review
The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

Appeal Period
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

Attachments
A. Recommended Actions
B. Location Map
C. January 24, 2022 Planning Commission Staff Report
D. Data Table
Disclaimer
Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Ori Paz, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
LOCATION: 269 Willow Road
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2021-00024
APPLICANT: Charlene Cheng
OWNER: MP Willow Capital LLC

PROPOSAL: Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot with access via an easement over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. The proposal also includes a request for a use permit to allow seven-foot tall fences within the front setback.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission
DATE: February 14, 2022
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Kennedy, Riggs, Harris, Tate)

ACTION:

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 California Environmental Quality Act (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. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by February 14, 2023) for the use permit to remain in effect.
   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by ZSD Architects, Inc. consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received February 7, 2022, and approved by the Planning Commission on February 14, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
   c. 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.
   d. 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.
   e. 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.
   f. 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.
   g. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.
PROPOSAL: Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot with access via an easement over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. The proposal also includes a request for a use permit to allow seven-foot tall fences within the front setback.

**ACTION:**

h. 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.

i. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant’s design professional shall evaluate the Project’s impact to the City’s storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

j. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City’s Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

k. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control Plan and construction detail sheet that documents all erosion control measure implemented during the course of construction including, but not limited to, straw waddles, silt fence, temporary construction entrances, inlet protection, check dams, tree protection fencing, etc.

l. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting, dated January 6, 2022.

m. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

n. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project-specific** conditions:

   a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF), subject to the review and approval by the Planning and Transportation Divisions. The estimated TIF is $16,516.73. The TIF escalates annually on July 1.

   b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide an updated arborist report evaluating the proposed tree locations, possible impacts to the existing trees and proposed tree protections, subject to review and approval by the City Arborist and the Planning Division.
**LOCATION:** 269 Willow Road  
**PROJECT NUMBER:** PLN2021-00024  
**APPLICANT:** Charlene Cheng  
**OWNER:** MP Willow Capital LLC

**PROPOSAL:** Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot with access via an easement over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. The proposal also includes a request for a use permit to allow seven-foot tall fences within the front setback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission</th>
<th>DATE: February 14, 2022</th>
<th>ACTION: TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**VOTE:** TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Kennedy, Riggs, Harris, Tate)

**ACTION:**

c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application the applicant shall provide irrigation plans indicating no new irrigation would be installed near existing oak trees, to prevent summer irrigation that results in disease and root rot development, and no trenching for irrigation would occur within any heritage tree’s tree protection zone subject to review and approval by the City Arborist and the Planning Division.
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot, with access via an easement located over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel. Recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each use permit request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit findings can be made for the proposal.

Background
Site location
The subject property is located at 269 Willow Road in the Seminary Oaks neighborhood. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot oriented parallel to Willow Road. Two adjacent parcels separate the subject site from Willow Road. An access easement over the right ten feet of the 267 Willow Road property and the left ten feet of the 275 Willow Road property combine to form the “handle” for the panhandle lot and provide access to the subject parcel. The subject parcel is proposed to have the address of 269 Willow Road. Using Willow Road in a north-south orientation, the project site is located near the western side of Willow Road between Nash Avenue to the north and Blackburn Avenue to the south. The adjacent parcels along the street are also located within the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district and feature primarily single-family residences. The area represents a variety of architectural styles, including Mediterranean, traditional, and ranch style homes. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Analysis
Project description
The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story, single-family residence on the vacant panhandle lot. A data table summarizing parcel and project characteristics is included as Attachment C. The project plans and project description letter are included as Attachments D and E, respectively.

The proposed residence would be a three-bedroom home with the master bedroom and two additional bedrooms on the second floor. The first floor would be dedicated to shared living space, including the kitchen, dining, and living rooms and an office. The required parking for the home would be provided by an attached, front-loading, one-car garage and an uncovered parking space to the left of the garage. Guest
parking would be provided near the uncovered parking space at the end of the driveway. The proposed residence would meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements for setbacks, lot coverage, floor area limit (FAL), daylight plane, parking, and height. Of particular note, the project would have the following characteristics with regard to the Zoning Ordinance:

- The proposed floor area would be near the maximum FAL with 2,917.1 square feet proposed where 2,967 square feet is the maximum.
- The proposed project would be constructed below the maximum lot coverage at 23.7 percent where 35 percent is the maximum.
- The proposed residence would be constructed near the maximum height, at 27.9 feet proposed where 28 feet is the maximum.

The proposed residence would have a front setback of 24.6 feet, and a rear setback of 20, where 20 feet is required in either case. The required interior side setback in the R-1-U district is 10 percent of the minimum lot width, with a minimum of five feet and a maximum of ten feet. The flag lot orientation is such that the lot line met by the access, or “panhandle” is considered the front lot line. The panhandle reaches the lot at the center. The width, as measured as the distance between the two sides, is 109.8 feet. Therefore the side setbacks are ten feet on either side. The residence is proposed to be located at the minimum right side setbacks and 20.9 feet from the left side. The proposed second story would be directly above the first story at the front and rear, and stepped in from the first floor on both sides of the residence.

**Design and materials**

The applicant states that the proposed residence would be constructed in a colonial revival design. The exterior materials would be hardi board horizontal siding. The roof would feature presidential shingle roofing material. The windows would be simulated true divided lite style fiberglass windows with vinyl shutters at the first and second floor at the front, and second floor at the rear. A large fixed window would be set between two fiberglass casement windows without grids at the center of the rear elevation. The rear elevation would also feature sliding glass doors at the first floor.

There are six second-story windows proposed at the rear and five at the front, along with three dormers with windows. All second-story windows would have a minimum sill height of three feet. No second-story windows are proposed at the sides. Staff believes the proposal not to have side-facing, second-story windows would help alleviate potential privacy concerns.

Staff believes that the design and materials of the proposed residence are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The colonial revival style would be generally attractive and add to the mix of architectural styles in the area.

**Trees and landscaping**

There are a total of 32 trees at and near the project site. Two heritage trees, tree #2, an apple tree in the southeast corner of the lot, and tree #6, a plum tree in the southwest quarter of the lot nearer to the center, and nine non-heritage trees, primarily at the center and rear of the lot, are proposed for removal due to conflict with the proposed residence and driveway. The remaining heritage trees would be protected according to the heritage tree ordinance and the applicant’s arborist report (Attachment F). One coast live oak tree and one hybrid laurel tree are proposed as heritage tree replacements. Four additional hybrid laurel trees are proposed as screening trees. The coast live oak tree is proposed in the rear yard. The hybrid laurel replacement tree would be located at the east side of the lot. Two hybrid laurel trees would be planted in the southeast corner near where the apple tree would be removed, one would be planted near the center of the southern side of the lot and one would be planted toward the northeast corner of the lot.
The trees are shown on the site plan and landscape plan within the proposed plan set (Attachment D). The proposed tree removals and tree protections were evaluated by the City Arborist, as well as the proposed replacement trees and their locations to confirm compliance with relevant standards. The City Arborist waived the notice and appeal period for the heritage tree removals based on the condition of the trees as part of the review of the heritage tree removal permits as the poor health of the trees is sufficient to warrant their removal. Protection of the trees in accordance with the arborist report and the Heritage Tree Ordinance would be ensured through standard condition of approval 3(k).

**Correspondence**

The applicant indicates they reached out to surrounding properties and included correspondence with a neighbor at 247 Willow Road in their project description letter, Attachment E. The neighbor at 247 Willow Road expressed concerns including potential privacy impacts from second-story windows and the removal of the apple tree in the southeast corner of the lot, as well as general concerns about rodents on the vacant site and sewer line issues. The applicant indicates they will address the rodent concern during demolition and new sewer connections are proposed. Additional screening trees are now proposed in the southeast corner of the lot and the proposed second-floor sill heights for the windows were raised to three feet to address privacy concerns.

**Conclusion**

Staff believes the proposed home would be aesthetically compatible with others in the neighborhood and the design decision not to install windows on the side-facing elevations at the second floor would help to reduce potential privacy concerns. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

**Impact on City Resources**

The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project. In addition, the proposed development would be subject to payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) as outlined in project-specific condition of approval 4.a.

**Environmental Review**

The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

**Public Notice**

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

**Appeal Period**

The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.
Attachments
A. Recommended Actions
B. Location Map
C. Data Table
D. Project Plans
E. Project Description Letter
F. Arborist Report

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

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Ori Paz, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
REQUEST: Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot, with access via an easement located over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission
DATE: January 24, 2022
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

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 California Environmental Quality Act (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. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by January 24, 2023) for the use permit to remain in effect.
   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by ZSD Architects, Inc. consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received December 15, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on January 24, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
   c. 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.
   d. 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.
   e. 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.
   f. 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.
   g. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.
   h. 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.
**LOCATION:** 269 Willow Road  
**PROJECT NUMBER:** PLN2021-00024  
**APPLICANT:** Charlene Cheng  
**OWNER:** MP Willow Capital LLC

**REQUEST:** Request for a use permit to construct a new two-story residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot depth in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) district. The parcel is a vacant panhandle lot, with access via an easement located over 267 and 275 Willow Road, and 269 Willow Road is proposed as the new address for the subject parcel.

**DECISION ENTITY:** Planning Commission  
**DATE:** January 24, 2022  
**ACTION:** TBD

**VOTE:** TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

**ACTION:**

Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.

i. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

j. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

k. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting, dated January 6, 2022.

l. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

m. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

4. **Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:**

   a. Prior to building permit issuance the applicant shall pay the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF), subject to the review and approval by the Planning and Transportation Divisions. The estimated TIF is $16,516.73. The TIF escalates annually on July 1.
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## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING DEVELOPMENT*</th>
<th>ZONING ORDINANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td>7,668.0 sf</td>
<td>7,668.0 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>109.8 ft.</td>
<td>109.8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>69.9 ft.</td>
<td>69.9 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>24.6 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>20.0 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (left)</td>
<td>20.9 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (right)</td>
<td>10.0 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>1,819.2 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7 %</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAL (Floor Area Limit)</td>
<td>2,917.1 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage by floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,555.0 sf/1st floor</td>
<td>- sf/1st floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,134.6 sf/2nd floor</td>
<td>- sf/2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227.5 sf/garage</td>
<td>- sf/garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0 sf/porches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7 sf/fireplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage of buildings</td>
<td>2,953.8 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>27.9 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1 covered/ 1 uncovered</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.

### Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage trees**:</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Non-Heritage trees**:</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>New Trees:</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage trees proposed for removal:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total Number of Trees**:</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The subject site is a vacant lot
**Includes trees on an adjacent lots
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PROJECT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT D
TREE PROTECTION NOTES

Design Phase
1. Define proposed tree protection measures, including the following:
   a. A tree protection plan, including the purpose, scope, and goals of the plan.
   b. A site plan showing the location of the protection area.
   c. A soil test showing the existing soil conditions in the protection area.
   d. A hydrology test showing the existing drainage conditions in the protection area.
   e. A geotechnical test showing the existing geotechnical conditions in the protection area.
   f. A topographic survey showing the existing topographic conditions in the protection area.

Reconstruction Phase
1. Construct a tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and install a tree protection plan, including the following:
   a. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   b. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   c. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   d. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:

Construction Phase
1. Install a tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   a. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   b. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   c. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   d. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:

Post Construction Phase
1. Maintain the tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and the tree protection plan, including the following:
   a. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   b. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   c. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   d. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:

TREES PROTECTION SPECIFICATIONS

a. All trees and shrubs shall be protected from harm to the extent possible during the course of the proposed work. The tree protection shall be in accordance with the best practices of the trade.

b. The tree protection shall be in accordance with the best practices of the trade, including the following:
   a. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   b. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   c. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
   d. A tree protection fence, approximately 10 feet wide, and a tree protection plan, including the following:
FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
1/4"=1'-0"
FLOOR AREA CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: (CAR GARAGE)</td>
<td>21'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>227.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>68.8 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>200.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18'-0&quot; X 15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>278.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ST FLOOR TOTAL AREA = A+B+C+D = 1,782.5 S.F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>24'-0&quot; X 15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>499.8 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14'-0&quot; X 14'-0&quot;</td>
<td>222.7 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23'-0&quot; X 11'-0&quot;</td>
<td>384.7 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (DOUBLED HEIGHT SPACE ABOVE FLOWERING) 12'-0&quot;</td>
<td>86.6 S.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2ND FLOOR LIVING AREA = F+G+H+J = 1,192.2 S.F.

TOTAL FLOOR AREA LIMIT (FAL) = A+B+C+D+F+G+H+J = 2,974.7 S.F.

BUILDING COVERED AREA CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: (CAR GARAGE)</td>
<td>21'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>227.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>68.8 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>200.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18'-0&quot; X 15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>278.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (FORCES)</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; X 5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>22.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (DOORWAYS)</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; X 7'-0&quot;</td>
<td>42.7 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (ENTRY FORCES)</td>
<td>10'-0&quot; X 6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>60.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING COVERED AREA = A+B+C+D+E+F+G+H+J = 1,013.3 S.F.

LOT AREA = 7,668 S.F.

BUILDING COVERAGE = 1,013.3 S.F. / 7,668 S.F. = 13.3%
Parcel General Information
The 7668 +/- sqft parcel is a vacant lot that approximately 110’ x 70’. The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached 1-car garage. A shared new paver driveway will be replaced with the current cracked concrete driveway.

There are two heritage trees are recommended for removal, the permit HTR2021-00095 has been approved. After discussing with 247 Willow Road neighbor, the key replacement trees are including one 15 gallons California live oak and six of 36” box of Hybrid Laurel which serve as screening trees. Please refer details on L1 of the landscape plan set.

Proposed Single Family Residence
The architectural style selected for the proposed home is the Colonial Revival which we believe that best blends in the neighborhood. As we know the Colonial Revival style encompasses a number of architectural traditions, such as English, Dutch, and Spanish colonial influences that were combined during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-centuries to create buildings that celebrated Colonial America. The ground level of the new home will have a living room, family room, Kitchen, formal dining and a private office with a bathroom. The second floor will have three bedrooms with two bathrooms and a laundry room. The open floor plan designed to appeal to families. There is attention paid to indoor-outdoor living, which contributes to healthy living and home value.
Neighborhood Outreach

We have contacted the owners of 277, 277A, 277B, 243, 245, 247 Willow Rd and 254, 260 Santa Margarita Ave. We have communicated and hand delivered a copy of the draft of the architectural design to all the adjacent neighbors. They were all pleased that finally a new development is happening on the vacant lot. Some of the neighbors were more excited that finally new fences would be installed around the property as well. Daniel Hom the owner of 247 Willow had some concerns regarding this new development and we have addressed his concerns via emails and in person. Attached email communication history for your reference. The last visit to the neighbors was on Oct 16th, 2021. We have sent the most updated plan set to the neighbor.

Best,
Charlene Cheng
PM@MP Willow Capital LLC
Charlene2005@gmail.com
408-772-9476
July 14, 2021

Re: 269 Willow Road new two-story residence

Hello Charlene,

We meet and spoke briefly outside my home at 247 Willow Road. At the time, you mentioned the upcoming submittal and plans for the new house at 269 Willow. I want to take this opportunity to have a follow up now that I received the public notice.

1. As we discussed, I am in support of building on the empty property. Open space is nice however; I understand the desire for housing. I am in favor if the design is well planned and takes into consideration neighbors’ concerns.
2. We discussed my concerns regarding privacy and line of site. With the planned two-story home, second-floor windows has the potential for direct line of site to the rear yard of my house at 247 Willow. I ask that your building design consider this. Please look into your building layout; window type, size and arrangement; architectural screening; exterior landscape screening; etc... for mitigation.
3. The City notice states two-heritage trees proposed for removal. I am curious about which trees? The property has an apple tree at the corner of the lot that provides some screening. It would be a shame to have this tree removed and the loss of privacy and fruits it provides.
4. 265 Willow has a tree that also provides minimal screening. I hope your new landscaping design has plans for relatively high screening for the line of sight from the second floor to my rear yard. Perhaps consider addition trees along the property line of to benefit all parties.
5. The previous owners of 265 Willow was unwilling to share the cost of a new fence. The fence is in decrepit condition. It is only standing because we attached supports from our roof to keep it up. Our properties needs a new privacy fence to match similar design.
6. The empty lot likely has rodents. I see field rats along the fence at night. I am sure these rodents will scatter once construction begins. However, where will they go and live is the concern.
7. Sanitary sewer laterals on your property should be inspected. Over the years, there’s signs of raw sanitary waste in the front landscaping. You may want to have this looked into and repaired before Willow Road is repaved this summer. WBSD sent notices to all residents regarding the current repairs underway now.
8. I am not concern about construction noise as long it falls within City ordinance.
9. Throughout the years, the residents on our common driveway have enjoyed spending time outside. We hope construction and the plans do not negatively affect the quality of life.

In conclusion, our family is excited to have a change in ownership and looking forward to working with you on this project.

Please let me know when is a good time for you to meet again and share any future updates.

Regards,

Daniel Hom - owners of 247 Willow Road (and part owner of 243 Willow Road)
Cc: Leo Tapia – MP Planning Technician
Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  
Cc: "Tapia, Leonel" <ltapia@menlopark.org>, dnahom@aol.com, danielkhom@aol.com  

Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 6:48 PM

Thank you for your email.
I really appreciate you sharing your concerns as well as some good suggestions, my team will look into them and get back to you in a day or two.

BR,  
Charlene

[Quoted text hidden]

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  
Cc: dnahom@aol.com, Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  

Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 11:43 PM

Hi Daniel,

Would you like to meet up this Friday either 10-11am or after 4pm?

Please let me know,  
Thanks  
Charlene

[Quoted text hidden]

Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  
To: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
Cc: dnahom@aol.com  

Fri, Jul 16, 2021 at 1:11 AM

Hi Charlene,  
I'm out of town now. Weekend or next week Mon or Thu after 4 may work. I'm not available weekdays.

On Jul 14, 2021, at 11:44 PM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  
Cc: dnahom@aol.com, "Tapia, Leonel" <ltapia@menlopark.org>, mpwillow2021@gmail.com  

Mon, Jul 19, 2021 at 11:37 AM

Good morning Daniel,  
Hope you had a great weekend!

Since we couldn't meet up sooner I'm going to address your concerns in the email below, see check my comments in RED.
Please let me know if you have any questions and we can meet up Thursday after 4 if necessary.

Thanks  
Charlene

On Fri, Jul 16, 2021 at 1:11 AM Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com> wrote:
Hi Charlene,
I’m out of town now. Weekend or next week Mon or Thu after 4 may work. I’m not available weekdays.

On Jul 14, 2021, at 11:44 PM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Daniel,
Would you like to meet up this Friday either 10-11am or after 4pm?
Please let me know,
Thanks
Charlene

On Jul 14, 2021 at 11:44 PM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

On Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 6:48 PM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for your email.
I really appreciate you sharing your concerns as well as some good suggestions, my team will look into them and get back to you in a day or two.

BR,
Charlene

On Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 6:11 PM Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com> wrote:

July 14, 2021
Re: 269 Willow Road new two-story residence

Hello Charlene,

We meet and spoke briefly outside my home at 247 Willow Road. At the time, you mentioned the upcoming submittal and plans for the new house at 269 Willow. I want to take this opportunity to have a follow up now that I received the public notice.

1. As we discussed, I am in support of building on the empty property. Open space is nice however; I understand the desire for housing. I am in favor if the design is well planned and takes into consideration neighbors’ concerns.

   Thank you for your support! Yes, our experienced Architect has been diligently making the design not only follow the city guidelines as well as considering neighbors’ concerns.

2. We discussed my concerns regarding privacy and line of site. With the planned two-story home, second-floor windows has the potential for direct line of site to the rear yard of my house at 247 Willow. I ask that your building design consider this. Please look into your building layout; window type, size and arrangement; architectural screening; exterior landscape screening; etc... for mitigation.

   Yes we take neighbors’ privacy very seriously. There is only one bedroom whose window may be in the direction of your rear yard. The distance from that window to your rear yard is more than 60 feet, please refer to the diagram attached. In addition, there is a big tree in the corner which will protect your privacy as well.

3. The City notice states two-heritage trees proposed for removal. I am curious about which trees? The property has an apple tree at the corner of the lot that provides some screening. It would be a shame to have this tree removed and the loss of privacy and fruits it provides.

   Attached is the Arborist report FYI. Yes, the apple tree stays;)

4. 265 Willow has a tree that also provides minimal screening. I hope your new landscaping design has plans for relatively high screening for the line of sight from the second floor to my rear yard. Perhaps consider addition trees along the property line of to benefit all parties.

   Sure, we will review our landscaping design again to give you the maximum privacy possible.
5. The previous owners of 265 Willow was unwilling to share the cost of a new fence. The fence is in decrepit condition. It is only standing because we attached supports from our roof to keep it up. Our properties needs a new privacy fence to match similar design.

Yes, we should collaborate to build the new fences.

6. The empty lot likely has rodents. I see field rats along the fence at night. I am sure these rodents will scatter once construction begins. However, where will they go and live is the concern.

We will looking into this concern

7. Sanitary sewer laterals on your property should be inspected. Over the years, there's signs of raw sanitary waste in the front landscaping. You may want to have this looked into and repaired before Willow Road is repaved this summer. WBSD sent notices to all residents regarding the current repairs underway now.

The new construction will have brand new sewer pipe

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  
Cc: dnahom@aol.com, "Tapia, Leonel" <ltapia@menlopark.org>, mpwillow2021@gmail.com  
oops forgot the attachment

danielkhom@aol.com <danielkhom@aol.com>  
Reply-To: danielkhom@aol.com  
To: "charlene2005@gmail.com" <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
Cc: "dnahom@aol.com" <dnahom@aol.com>, "ltapia@menlopark.org" <ltapia@menlopark.org>, "mpwillow2021@gmail.com" <mpwillow2021@gmail.com>  

Hi Charlene,

Thanks for the email. I appreciate the prompt response. Can you clarify item 3? You mentioned the apple tree stays. But the arborist report states #1 heritage apple tree removed. Is the layout old?

Regarding the second story, what are the proposed elevations of the window and top of the structure?

Regards,
Daniel

(apologizes if you receive this email twice. Having problems with my phone)

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>  
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>  

My apologies, that apple tree will have to be removed since it's not healthy to stay, we will discuss with you when we are doing the landscaping. Please refer to the attached schematics and hopefully address your concerns for the elevations of the window and top of the structure.

BR,
Charlene

2 attachments

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 21, 2021 at 10:04 AM
Charlene,

it's unfortunate the apple tree is to be removed. This tree is fairly tall and provides adequate screening from the second floor center of windows at 16'. You may want to consider mature trees when engaging the landscape architect. 7' privacy fence along the property line is adequate for ground levels but not second floors. Normally I wouldn't be concerned with a public easement, front entrance, or driveways such as some of the other neighbors. But I am worried as it relates to my private rear yard where my family relaxes and two bedrooms faces.

Regarding the two-story house. What is the planned footage? I understand a few other homes on Willow Road have two-story houses. I believe those lots are larger. This lot appears smaller and uncharacteristic for a structure this size. As previously stated, I'm supportive of developing the empty lot at 269. But I am worried about the privacy and size of the structure relative to all other adjacent single-story homes.

I'm confident we can continue to work together towards a resolution.

Regards,
Daniel

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 21, 2021 at 10:04 AM
Charlene,
Morning Daniel,

I totally understand your concerns. We have followed all of the city guidelines and the building codes to design this project, we can work together in fine details later to protect you with the maximum privacy as possible.

Thank you for your understanding.
Charlene

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 21, 2021 at 10:09 AM
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>

Attached is the site plan we submitted for your review, everything designed was under the guidelines of the planning department. We had preliminary review with the city before the submission.
If you have more questions, I can arrange a zoom call with our Architech if needed,

Thanks again,
Charlene

Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com> Wed, Jul 21, 2021 at 6:38 PM
To: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>

Thank you Charlene

On Jul 21, 2021, at 10:10 AM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> Thu, Jul 22, 2021 at 1:30 PM
To: Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>

We are in the process of reviewing all the details with planning division, we will keep you updated. Thanks!

[Quoted text hidden]

Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com> Thu, Jul 22, 2021 at 11:32 PM
To: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>

Great! And good luck working with Planning.  
Menlo Park isn’t the easiest city to work with. Lot sizes aren’t standard and require more effort.
On Jul 22, 2021, at 1:31 PM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]
Hi Greg and Charlene,

I reviewed your attachment and have the following additional note/comments. (embedded image with Red line note)

Also included is an aerial with the 269 site plan. Note the line of site concern. This view is to my 247 rear yard and bedrooms. And therefore my request for taller screening from 269 second floor elevation.

I hope this helps.

Respectfully,

Daniel and Alice Hom

247 Willow Owners
Taller trees for screening in lieu of LN scrubs
Hi Charlene,

Thanks.

Greg,
It’s inefficient to keep doing a little bit of work on this and then having to wait for information from different people.

I think the civil will be pretty responsive and send me something.

From you I need to know if you want to keep all the trees I have at this point and down size them to 15 gal except for the screen trees or if you want me to remove the trees we don’t need for replacement trees.

Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> Sun, Oct 31, 2021 at 5:09 PM
To: Daniel Hom <Daniel.Hom@bloomenergy.com>

Hi Daniel and Alice,

FYI, Please find attached is the latest landscape plan for 269 Willow.

BR,
Charlene

269 landscaping planting plan 103121.pdf
911K
1/6/2022

Charlene Cheng
MP Willow Capital LLC
353 Costello Dr.
Los Altos, California 94024
(408) 772-9476
charlene2005@gmail.com

Re: Tree protection for proposed new residence at 267-275 Willow Rd, Menlo Park, California 94025

Dear Charlene,

At your request, we have visited the property referenced above to evaluate the trees present with respect to the proposed project. The report below contains our analysis.

**Summary**

There are six heritage trees on this property, one heritage tree overhanging from an adjacent property, and two street trees overhanging the property. Two, both heritage trees on this property, are recommended for removal, as they conflict with project features.

There are an additional 21 trees present on and adjacent to the property which do not belong to any class of protected trees. Of these, six are recommended for removal, as they conflict with project features. Three more are recommended for removal because they are dead.

All other trees are in good condition and should be retained and protected as detailed in the Recommendations, below. With proper protection, all are expected to survive and thrive during and after construction.
Assignment and Limits of Report

We have been asked to write a report detailing impacts to trees from construction of the proposed new single-family house on this property. This report may be used by our client and other project members as needed to inform all stages of the project.

All observations were made from the ground with basic equipment. No root collar excavations or aerial inspections were performed. No project features had been staked at the time of our site visit.

Tree Regulations

The Report is intended to satisfy tree reporting requirements for the City of Menlo Park, as detailed in relevant portions of the document titled “Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines,” available at: https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/25577/Heritage-tree-ordinance-administrative-guidelines---draft

Tree protection measures are intended to be consistent with the document titled “Tree Protection Specifications,” available at: https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/90/Tree-Protection-Specifications

Observations

Current Site Conditions

The property is currently vacant, though old landscape plants indicate that it may once have been used as a back yard. Access is through a wide shared driveway for the houses between this property and Willow Road.

Trees

There are six heritage trees on this property, three overhanging the property from adjacent properties, and two street trees (Images 8). Two are coast live oaks (Quercus agrifolia), six are other large-stature ornamental trees, and three are fruit trees.

There are an additional 21 trees present on and adjacent to the property which do not belong to any class of protected trees. Three of these are dead.
Project Features

A single-family home is proposed on the rear parcel of the property, which is currently occupied by landscaped area.

A paver driveway is proposed at the front of the property. A new paver path is proposed on the south side of the house. A new patio is proposed at the rear of the house, near the southwest corner just north of the garage.

A storm drain is proposed around the perimeter of the house, feeding into a proposed gravel basin in the northeast corner of the property.

A vehicle gate is proposed at the entrance to the property, to be installed on two large posts.

Potential Conflicts

Trees #1, 4-6 - the house footprint conflicts directly with these trees.

Trees #2, 10 - the proposed driveway conflicts directly with these trees' trunks.

Trees #3, 7, 8 - a portion of the proposed driveway lies within these trees' TPZs.

Trees #9, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 - no project features lie within these trees' TPZs.

Trees #11-13, 17, 18 - the proposed walkway around the house conflicts directly with these trees' trunks.

Tree #20 - portions of the proposed storm drain, walkway, and house lie within this tree's TPZ.

Tree #23 - portions of the proposed storm drain, gravel basin, and northern fence post lie within this tree's TPZ.

Testing and Analysis

Tree DBHs were taken using a diameter tape measure if trunks were accessible. The DBHs of trees with non-accessible trunks were estimated visually. All trees were inventoried. Full tree protection analysis was performed for all trees with protected status.

Vigor ratings are based on tree appearance and experiential knowledge of each species.
Tree location data was collected using a GPS smartphone application and processed in GIS software to create the maps included in this report. Due to the error inherent in GPS data collection, and due also to slight differences between GPS data and CAD drawings, tree locations shown on the map below are approximate.

We visited the site once, on 4/7/2021. All observations and photographs in this report were taken at that site visit.

This report is based on the 11-page plan set titled “269 Willow Road Residence,” last revised 12/15/2021, provided to me electronically by the client.

Discussion

Tree Protection Zones (TPZ’s)

Tree roots grow where conditions are favorable, and their spatial arrangement is therefore unpredictable. Favorable conditions vary among species, but generally include the presence of moisture, and soft soil texture with low compaction.

Contrary to popular belief, roots of all tree species grow primarily in the top two feet of soil, with a small number of roots sometimes occurring at greater depths. Some species have taproots when young, but these almost universally disappear with age. At maturity, a tree’s root system may extend out from the trunk farther than the tree is tall.

The optimal size of the area around a tree which should be protected from disturbance depends on the tree’s size, species, and vigor, as shown in the following table (adapted from Trees & Construction, Matheny and Clark, 1998):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species tolerance</th>
<th>Tree vitality$^1$</th>
<th>Distance from trunk (feet per inch trunk diameter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good High</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Low</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate High</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Low</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Moderate</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Low</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that some roots will almost certainly be present outside the TPZ; however, root loss outside the TPZ is unlikely to cause tree decline.

Some of the tree species present here are not evaluated in Trees & Construction. Our own evaluation of them based on our experience with the species is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Estimated tolerance</th>
<th>Reason for tolerance rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insufficient experience with this species leads us to assign it the most conservative rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Matheny & Clark uses tree age, but we feel a tree's vitality more accurately reflects its ability to handle stress.

Roots and Foundations

Tree roots do not generally grow under houses, as foundation installation requires these areas to be heavily compacted and dry. As discussed above, these conditions do not meet trees' needs for root colonization. Roots may grow under houses if foundations are poorly installed, or if trees are growing in contact with the foundation.
Conclusions

Trees #1, 2, 4-6, 10-13, 17, 18 - these trees are incompatible with the project as proposed.

Trees #3, 7, 8 - impacts to trees #3 and 7 from the proposed driveway will likely be minor. Impacts to tree #8 will likely be major.

Trees #9, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 - significant impacts to these trees are unlikely from the project as proposed.

Tree #20 - combined impacts to this tree from the proposed storm drain, walkway, and house will likely be moderate to major.

Tree #23 - combined impacts to this tree from the proposed storm drain, gravel basin, and northern fence post will likely be moderate to major.

Recommendations

Design Phase

1. When placing sewer and other underground utilities, either:
   a. Place them as far away from tree trunks as practical (preferably outside TPZs), or
   b. Specify installation via directional boring at a depth of at least 3 feet.
2. Explore design options to minimize impacts to heritage trees #3, 7, 20, and 23.

Preconstruction Phase

1. Remove trees #1, 2, 4-6, 10-13, 17, 18 (only #2 and 6 are heritage trees).
2. Install tree protection fencing, approximately as shown in the Tree Map, below.
   a. Distances from trunk centers are given on the Tree Map.
   b. Fencing for some trees may need to be slightly closer to the trunk to allow for access to the proposed house.
      i. If fencing will need to be moved more than 2 feet closer to the tree than specified, contact the project arborist for guidance.
   c. Please be aware that tree protection zones may differ from canopy sizes.
   d. Tree protection fencing shall comprise 6’ chain link fabric mounted on 1.5” diameter metal posts driven into the ground. (continued on next page)
e. Place a 6” layer of wood chips inside tree protection fencing.

f. Tree protection fencing shall adhere to the requirements in the document titled “Tree Protection Specifications,” available at https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/90/Tree-Protection-Specifications

Construction Phase

1. Maintain tree protection measures as specified above.

2. Excavation for portions of proposed house and pavement within TPZs shall be performed as follows:
   a. Hand-excavate nearest edge within tree protection zone to the full depth of the feature being installed or to a depth of three feet, whichever is shallower.
   b. If roots over 1” must be severed, do so with a sharp saw or bypass pruners as close to the edge of excavation as possible.
   c. Notify project arborist when excavation is complete. Project arborist shall inspect work to make sure all roots have been cut cleanly.
   d. If excavation will be left open for more than 3 days:
      i. Cover excavation wall nearest tree with several layers of burlap or other absorbent fabric
      ii. Install a timer and soaker hoses to irrigate with potable water twice per day, enough to wet fabric thoroughly.

Post-Construction Phase

1. Install two new 15-gallon trees as replacements for heritage trees #2 and 6.
   a. The DBHs of these trees are 15.4 and 18.1, respectively. According to the Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines, a heritage tree 15-20” in DBH must be replaced with a 15-gallon container.

2. Provide supplemental irrigation for trees #4 and 5 for at least 3 years to aid in root regrowth. Note that tree #5 should only be irrigated during the normal wet season (October-May), and only if rainfall is below average.
Tree Map

Trees to be removed
Tree trunks, to scale.
Locations approximate where not matched to survey.
Tree protection zones (ideal; may differ significantly from tree protection measures)
Careful hand excavation required. Preserve as many roots as possible.
Tree protection fencing
Supporting Photographs

*Image 1: apple #1 (note trunk damage in right-hand photograph)*
Image 2: plum #3
Image 4: coast live oak #5
Image 6: red horsechestnut #7
Image 7: London plane #8
Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Naegele
Consulting Arborist
Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting, LLC
Master of Forestry, UC Berkeley
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-9658A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
American Society of Consulting Arborists, Member
Cell: 650 209-0631
Terms of Assignment

The following terms and conditions apply to all oral and written reports and correspondence pertaining to the consultations, inspections, and activities of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting:

1. All property lines and ownership of property, trees, and landscape plants and fixtures are assumed to be accurate and reliable as presented and described to the consultant, either orally or in writing. The consultant assumes no responsibility for verification of ownership or locations of property lines, or for results of any actions or recommendations based on inaccurate information.

2. It is assumed that any property referred to in any report or in conjunction with any services performed by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting is in accordance with any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations, and that any titles and ownership to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. The existence of liens or encumbrances has not been determined, and any and all property is appraised and/or assessed as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

3. All reports and other correspondence are confidential and are the property of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting and its named clients and their assigns or agents. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply any right of publication or use for any purpose, without the express permission of the consultant and the client to whom the report was issued. Loss, removal, or alteration of any part of a report invalidates the entire appraisal/evaluation.

4. The scope of any report or other correspondence is limited to the trees and conditions specifically mentioned in those reports and correspondence. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting assumes no liability for the failure of trees or parts of trees, inspected or otherwise. The consultant assumes no responsibility to report on the condition of any tree or landscape feature not specifically requested by the named client.

5. All inspections are limited to visual examination of accessible parts, without dissection, excavation, probing, boring or other invasive procedures, unless otherwise noted in the report, and reflect the condition of those items and features at the time of inspection. No warranty or guarantee is made, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or the property will not occur in the future, from any cause. The consultant shall not be responsible for damages caused by any tree defects, and assumes no responsibility for the correction of defects or tree related problems.

6. The consultant shall not be required to provide further documentation, give testimony, be deposed, or to attend court by reason of this appraisal/report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for such services as set forth by the consultant or in the fee schedule or contract.

7. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting makes no warranty, either expressed or implied, as to the suitability of the information contained in any reports or correspondence, either oral or written, for any purpose. It remains the responsibility of the client to determine applicability to his/her particular case.

8. Any report and the values, observations, and recommendations expressed therein represent the professional opinion of the consultant, and the fee for services is in no manner contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any particular finding.

9. Any photographs, diagrams, charts, sketches, or other graphic material included in any report are intended solely as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale, and should not be construed as engineering reports or surveys unless otherwise noted in the report. Any reproduction of graphic material or the work product of any other persons is intended solely for clarification and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information does not constitute a representation by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting as to the sufficiency or accuracy of that information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (inches)</th>
<th>Vitality</th>
<th>Heritage Tree?</th>
<th>Street Tree?</th>
<th>Off-Site Tree?</th>
<th>Remove?</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</th>
<th>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</th>
<th>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Citrus reticulata</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Malus domestica</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed driveway</td>
<td>Trunk is damaged from a prior leader failure. Ganoderma conk is present in damaged area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Minor from driveway</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peach</td>
<td>Prunus persica</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Citrus sp.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$770.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td>Very poor structure from past pruning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>European pear</td>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Minor from driveway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Major from proposed storm drain, major from proposed walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,790.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed driveway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal, feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Citrus reticulata</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>European pear</td>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pittosporum</td>
<td>Pittosporum sp.</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,690.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Common Fig</td>
<td>Ficus carica</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,890.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Moderate to major overall - moderate from new storm drain; moderate from proposed walkway; minor from proposed house</td>
<td>Tree protection fencing may need to be moved slightly closer for access to house corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Red horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus x carnea</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,200.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Moderate to major overall - moderate from storm drain; minor from gravel basin; minor from proposed fence pillar</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,800.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>TPZ appears to end just beyond property line fence. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,990.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,820.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,870.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$590.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Red horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus x carnea</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,600.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,600.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Liquidambar</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED PROJECT</td>
<td>EXISTING DEVELOPMENT*</td>
<td>ZONING ORDINANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td>7,668.0 sf</td>
<td>7,668.0 sf</td>
<td>7,000 sf min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>109.8 ft.</td>
<td>109.8 ft.</td>
<td>65 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>69.9 ft.</td>
<td>69.9 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>24.6 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
<td>20 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>20.0 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
<td>20 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (left)</td>
<td>20.9 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
<td>10 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (right)</td>
<td>10.0 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
<td>10 ft. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>1,819.2 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
<td>2,683.8 sf max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7 %</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35 % max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAL (Floor Area Limit)</td>
<td>2,917.1 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
<td>2,967.0 sf max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage by floor</td>
<td>1,555.0 sf/1st floor</td>
<td>- sf/1st floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,134.6 sf/2nd floor</td>
<td>- sf/2nd floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227.5 sf/garage</td>
<td>- sf/garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0 sf/porches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7 sf/fireplace</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage of buildings</td>
<td>2,953.8 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>27.9 ft.</td>
<td>- ft.</td>
<td>28 ft. max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1 covered/ 1 uncovered</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 covered/1 uncovered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.

Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage trees**: 11</th>
<th>Non-Heritage trees**: 21</th>
<th>New Trees***: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage trees proposed for removal: 2</td>
<td>Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal: 9</td>
<td>Total Number of Trees**: 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The subject site is a vacant lot
**Includes trees on an adjacent lots
***Final number of new trees may vary pending review of spacing impacts by project arborist and City Arborist evaluation of revised arborist report.
### FLOOR AREA CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (1 CAR GARAGE)</td>
<td>21'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>227.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>85.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>16'-0&quot; X 48'-0&quot;</td>
<td>1,200.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>270.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST FLOOR TOTAL AREA</td>
<td>A+B+C+D</td>
<td>1,782.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21'-0&quot; X 10'-10&quot;</td>
<td>409.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>222.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23'-0&quot; X 13'-0&quot;</td>
<td>341.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (DOUBLED HEIGHT SPACE ABOVE FIFTH+ 12'-0&quot;)</td>
<td>10'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>86.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND FLOOR LIVING AREA</td>
<td>F+G+H+J</td>
<td>2,124.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FLOOR AREA (FAL)</td>
<td>A+B+C+D+F+G+H+J</td>
<td>2,316.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDING COVERED AREA CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (1 CAR GARAGE)</td>
<td>21'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>227.5 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13'-0&quot; X 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>85.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>16'-0&quot; X 48'-0&quot;</td>
<td>1,200.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18'-0&quot; X 10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>270.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (FORCING)</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; X 5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>26.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (STAIRS)</td>
<td>4'-0&quot; X 7'-0&quot;</td>
<td>22.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (ENTRY FORC)</td>
<td>10'-0&quot; X 5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>50.0 S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING COVERED AREA 1,813.5 S.F.

LOT AREA 7,668 S.F.

BUILDING COVERAGE 1,813.5 S.F. / 7,668 S.F. = 23.7%
Parcel General Information

The 7668 +/- sqft parcel is a vacant lot that approximately 110’ x 70’. The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached 1-car garage. A shared new paver driveway will be replaced with the current cracked concrete driveway.

There are two heritage trees are recommended for removal, the permit HTR2021-00095 has been approved. After discussing with 247 Willow Road neighbor, the key replacement trees are including one 15 gallons California live oak and six of 36” box of Hybrid Laurel which serve as screening trees. Per neighbors’ request, we have added 3 additional screening trees along the rear property line and change some of the 4’ fence heights in the side and front yard setbacks to taller fences. Please refer details on L1 of the landscape plan set.

Proposed Single Family Residence

The architectural style selected for the proposed home is the Colonial Revival which we believe that best blends in the neighborhood. As we know the Colonial Revival style encompasses a number of architectural traditions, such as English, Dutch, and Spanish colonial influences that were combined during the late nineteenth and early-twentieth-centuries to create buildings that celebrated Colonial America. The ground level of the new home will have a living room, family room, Kitchen, formal dining and a private office with a bathroom. The
second floor will have three bedrooms with two bathrooms and a laundry room. The open floor plan designed to appeal to families. There is attention paid to indoor-outdoor living, which contributes to healthy living and home value.

Neighborhood Outreach

We have contacted the owners of 277, 277A, 277B, 243, 245, 247 Willow Rd and 254, 260 Santa Margarita Ave. We have communicated and hand delivered a copy of the draft of the architectural design to all the adjacent neighbors. They were all pleased that finally a new development is happening on the vacant lot. Some of the neighbors were more excited that finally new fences would be installed around the property as well. Daniel Hom the owner of 247 Willow had some concerns regarding this new development and we have addressed his concerns via emails and in person. The last visit to the neighbors was on Jan 16th, 2022. We have sent the most updated plan to the neighbors on Feb 8th, 2022.

Best, Charlene Cheng
PM@MP Willow Capital LLC
Charlene2005@gmail.com
408-772-9476
1/24/2022

Charlene Cheng
MP Willow Capital LLC
353 Costello Dr.
Los Altos, California 94024
(408) 772-9476
charlene2005@gmail.com

Re: Tree protection for proposed new residence at 267-275 Willow Rd, Menlo Park, California 94025

Dear Charlene,

At your request, we have visited the property referenced above to evaluate the trees present with respect to the proposed project. The report below contains our analysis.

Summary

There are six heritage trees on this property, one heritage tree overhanging from an adjacent property, and two street trees overhanging the property. Two, both heritage trees on this property, are recommended for removal, as they conflict with project features.

There are an additional 21 trees present on and adjacent to the property which do not belong to any class of protected trees. Of these, six are recommended for removal, as they conflict with project features. Three more are recommended for removal because they are dead.

All other trees are in good condition and should be retained and protected as detailed in the Recommendations, below. With proper protection, all are expected to survive and thrive during and after construction.
Assignment and Limits of Report

We have been asked to write a report detailing impacts to trees from construction of the proposed new single-family house on this property. This report may be used by our client and other project members as needed to inform all stages of the project.

All observations were made from the ground with basic equipment. No root collar excavations or aerial inspections were performed. No project features had been staked at the time of our site visit.

Tree Regulations

The Report is intended to satisfy tree reporting requirements for the City of Menlo Park, as detailed in relevant portions of the document titled “Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines,” available at: https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/25577/Heritage-tree-ordinance-administrative-guidelines---draft

Tree protection measures are intended to be consistent with the document titled “Tree Protection Specifications,” available at: https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/90/Tree-Protection-Specifications

Observations

Current Site Conditions

The property is currently vacant, though old landscape plants indicate that it may once have been used as a back yard. Access is through a wide shared driveway for the houses between this property and Willow Road.

Trees

There are six heritage trees on this property, three overhanging the property from adjacent properties, and two street trees (Images 1-8). Two are coast live oaks (Quercus agrifolia), six are other large-stature ornamental trees, and three are fruit trees.

There are an additional 21 trees present on and adjacent to the property which do not belong to any class of protected trees. Three of these are dead.
Project Features

A single-family home is proposed on the rear parcel of the property, which is currently occupied by landscaped area.

A paver driveway is proposed at the front of the property. A new paver path is proposed on the south side of the house. A new patio is proposed at the rear of the house, near the southwest corner just north of the garage.

A storm drain is proposed around the perimeter of the house, feeding into a proposed gravel basin in the northeast corner of the property.

A vehicle gate is proposed at the entrance to the property, to be installed on two large posts.

Potential Conflicts

Trees #1, 4-6 - the house footprint conflicts directly with these trees.

Trees #2, 10 - the proposed driveway conflicts directly with these trees’ trunks.

Trees #3, 7, 8 - a portion of the proposed driveway lies within these trees’ TPZs.

Trees #9, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 - no project features lie within these trees’ TPZs.

Trees #11-13, 17, 18 - the proposed walkway around the house conflicts directly with these trees’ trunks.

Tree #20 - portions of the proposed storm drain, walkway, and house lie within this tree’s TPZ.

Tree #23 - portions of the proposed storm drain, gravel basin, and northern fence post lie within this tree’s TPZ.

Testing and Analysis

Tree DBHs were taken using a diameter tape measure if trunks were accessible. The DBHs of trees with non-accessible trunks were estimated visually. All trees were inventoried. Full tree protection analysis was performed for all trees with protected status.

Vigor ratings are based on tree appearance and experiential knowledge of each species.
Tree location data was collected using a GPS smartphone application and processed in GIS software to create the maps included in this report. Due to the error inherent in GPS data collection, and due also to slight differences between GPS data and CAD drawings, tree locations shown on the map below are approximate.

We visited the site once, on 4/7/2021. All observations and photographs in this report were taken at that site visit.

This report is based on the 11-page plan set titled “269 Willow Road Residence,” last revised 12/15/2021, provided to me electronically by the client.

Discussion

Tree Protection Zones (TPZ’s)

Tree roots grow where conditions are favorable, and their spatial arrangement is therefore unpredictable. Favorable conditions vary among species, but generally include the presence of moisture, and soft soil texture with low compaction.

Contrary to popular belief, roots of all tree species grow primarily in the top two feet of soil, with a small number of roots sometimes occurring at greater depths. Some species have taproots when young, but these almost universally disappear with age. At maturity, a tree’s root system may extend out from the trunk farther than the tree is tall.

The optimal size of the area around a tree which should be protected from disturbance depends on the tree’s size, species, and vigor, as shown in the following table (adapted from Trees & Construction, Matheny and Clark, 1998):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species tolerance</th>
<th>Tree vitality(^1)</th>
<th>Distance from trunk (feet per inch trunk diameter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that some roots will almost certainly be present outside the TPZ; however, root loss outside the TPZ is unlikely to cause tree decline.

Some of the tree species present here are not evaluated in Trees & Construction. Our own evaluation of them based on our experience with the species is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Estimated tolerance</th>
<th>Reason for tolerance rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insufficient experience with this species leads us to assign it the most conservative rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roots and Foundations

Tree roots do not generally grow under houses, as foundation installation requires these areas to be heavily compacted and dry. As discussed above, these conditions do not meet trees' needs for root colonization. Roots may grow under houses if foundations are poorly installed, or if trees are growing in contact with the foundation.

\(^1\) Matheny & Clark uses tree age, but we feel a tree's vitality more accurately reflects its ability to handle stress.
Conclusions

Trees #1, 2, 4-6, 10-13, 17, 18 - these trees are incompatible with the project as proposed.

Trees #3, 7, 8 - impacts to trees #3 and 7 from the proposed driveway will likely be minor. Impacts to tree #8 will likely be major.

Trees #9, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 - significant impacts to these trees are unlikely from the project as proposed.

Tree #20 - combined impacts to this tree from the proposed storm drain, walkway, and house will likely be moderate to major.

Tree #23 - combined impacts to this tree from the proposed storm drain, gravel basin, and northern fence post will likely be moderate to major.

Recommendations

Design Phase

1. When placing sewer and other underground utilities, either:
   a. Place them as far away from tree trunks as practical (preferably outside TPZs), or
   b. Specify installation via directional boring at a depth of at least 3 feet.

2. Explore design options to minimize impacts to heritage trees #3, 7, 20, and 23.

Preconstruction Phase

1. Remove trees #1, 2, 4-6, 10-13, 17, 18 (only #2 and 6 are heritage trees).
2. Install tree protection fencing, approximately as shown in the Tree Map, below.
   a. Distances from trunk centers are given on the Tree Map.
   b. Fencing for some trees may need to be slightly closer to the trunk to allow for access to the proposed house.
      i. If fencing will need to be moved more than 2 feet closer to the tree than specified, contact the project arborist for guidance.
   c. Please be aware that tree protection zones may differ from canopy sizes.
   d. Tree protection fencing shall comprise 6’ chain link fabric mounted on 1.5” diameter metal posts driven into the ground. (continued on next page)
e. Place a 6” layer of wood chips inside tree protection fencing.
f. Tree protection fencing shall adhere to the requirements in the document titled “Tree Protection Specifications,” available at https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/90/Tree-Protection-Specifications

Construction Phase

1. Maintain tree protection measures as specified above.
2. Excavation for portions of proposed house and pavement within TPZs shall be performed as follows:
   a. Hand-excavate nearest edge within tree protection zone to the full depth of the feature being installed or to a depth of three feet, whichever is shallower.
   b. If roots over 1” must be severed, do so with a sharp saw or bypass pruners as close to the edge of excavation as possible.
   c. Notify project arborist when excavation is complete. Project arborist shall inspect work to make sure all roots have been cut cleanly.
   d. If excavation will be left open for more than 3 days:
      i. Cover excavation wall nearest tree with several layers of burlap or other absorbent fabric
      ii. Install a timer and soaker hoses to irrigate with potable water twice per day, enough to wet fabric thoroughly.

Post-Construction Phase

1. Install two new 15-gallon trees as replacements for heritage trees #2 and 6.
   a. The DBHs of these trees are 15.4 and 18.1, respectively. According to the Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines, a heritage tree 15-20” in DBH must be replaced with a 15-gallon container.
2. Provide supplemental irrigation for trees #4 and 5 for at least 3 years to aid in root regrowth. Note that tree #5 should only be irrigated during the normal wet season (October-May), and only if rainfall is below average.
Tree Map

- Trees to be removed
- Tree trunks, to scale.
- Locations approximate where not matched to survey.
- Tree protection zones (ideal; may differ significantly from tree protection measures)
- Careful hand excavation required. Preserve as many roots as possible.
- Tree protection fencing
Supporting Photographs

*Image 1: apple #2 (note trunk damage in right-hand photograph)*
Image 3: coast live oak #20
Image 5: bay laurel #23
Image 6: red horsechestnut #30
Image 7: London plane #31
Image 8: liquidambar #32
Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Naegele
Consulting Arborist
Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting, LLC
Master of Forestry, UC Berkeley
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-9658A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
American Society of Consulting Arborists, Member
Cell: 650 209-0631
Terms of Assignment

The following terms and conditions apply to all oral and written reports and correspondence pertaining to the consultations, inspections, and activities of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting:

1. All property lines and ownership of property, trees, and landscape plants and fixtures are assumed to be accurate and reliable as presented and described to the consultant, either orally or in writing. The consultant assumes no responsibility for verification of ownership or locations of property lines, or for results of any actions or recommendations based on inaccurate information.

2. It is assumed that any property referred to in any report or in conjunction with any services performed by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting is in accordance with any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations, and that any titles and ownership to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. The existence of liens or encumbrances has not been determined, and any and all property is appraised and/or assessed as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

3. All reports and other correspondence are confidential and are the property of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting and its named clients and their assigns or agents. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply any right of publication or use for any purpose, without the express permission of the consultant and the client to whom the report was issued. Loss, removal, or alteration of any part of a report invalidates the entire appraisal/evaluation.

4. The scope of any report or other correspondence is limited to the trees and conditions specifically mentioned in those reports and correspondence. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting assumes no liability for the failure of trees or parts of trees, inspected or otherwise. The consultant assumes no responsibility to report on the condition of any tree or landscape feature not specifically requested by the named client.

5. All inspections are limited to visual examination of accessible parts, without dissection, excavation, probing, boring or other invasive procedures, unless otherwise noted in the report, and reflect the condition of those items and features at the time of inspection. No warranty or guarantee is made, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or the property will not occur in the future, from any cause. The consultant shall not be responsible for damages caused by any tree defects, and assumes no responsibility for the correction of defects or tree related problems.

6. The consultant shall not be required to provide further documentation, give testimony, be deposed, or to attend court by reason of this appraisal/report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for such services as set forth by the consultant or in the fee schedule or contract.

7. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting makes no warranty, either expressed or implied, as to the suitability of the information contained in any reports or correspondence, either oral or written, for any purpose. It remains the responsibility of the client to determine applicability to his/her particular case.

8. Any report and the values, observations, and recommendations expressed therein represent the professional opinion of the consultant, and the fee for services is in no manner contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any particular finding.

9. Any photographs, diagrams, charts, sketches, or other graphic material included in any report are intended solely as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale, and should not be construed as engineering reports or surveys unless otherwise noted in the report. Any reproduction of graphic material or the work product of any other persons is intended solely for clarification and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information does not constitute a representation by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting as to the sufficiency or accuracy of that information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (inches)</th>
<th>Vitality</th>
<th>Heritage Tree?</th>
<th>Street Tree?</th>
<th>Off-Site Tree?</th>
<th>Remove?</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</th>
<th>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</th>
<th>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Citrus reticulata</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Malus domestica</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed driveway</td>
<td>Trunk is damaged from a prior leader failure. Ganoderma conk is present in damaged area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Minor from driveway</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peach</td>
<td>Prunus persica</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Citrus sp.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$770.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed house</td>
<td>Very poor structure from past pruning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>European pear</td>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Minor from driveway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Major from proposed storm drain, major from proposed walkway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,790.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed driveway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Citrus reticulata</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>European pear</td>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pittosporum</td>
<td>Pittosporum sp.</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,690.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Common Fig</td>
<td>Ficus carica</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Conflicts with proposed walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,890.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Moderate to major overall - moderate from new storm drain; moderate from proposed walkway; minor from proposed house</td>
<td>Tree protection fencing may need to be moved slightly closer for access to house corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Red horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus x carnea</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,200.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Moderate to major overall - moderate from storm drain; minor from gravel basin; minor from proposed fence pillar</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,800.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>TPZ appears to end just beyond property line fence. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,990.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,820.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,870.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>Eryobotria japonica</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$590.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal, feet from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts (for Heritage/Street/Off-Site trees only)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Red horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus x carnea</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,600.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,600.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Liquidambar</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Activity within the TPZ is very unlikely. Neighbor tree. DBH estimated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Charlene,

Yes I received your email and update. Glad that you’re able to have the taller fence. I could not envision the previous design with the other neighbors.

Regards,

Daniel

---

Hi Daniel

Attached is the revised Landscape Plan for 269 Willow, Menlo Park

We have added 3 screen trees along the rear property line and changed some of the 4’ fence heights in the side and front yard setbacks to taller fences.

Please let me know if you have any questions and please confirm upon receipt.

BR,

Charlene

On Tue, Jan 25, 2022 at 1:55 PM Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org> wrote:

Hi Daniel,
A request for a seven foot fence at the front of 269 Willow Road could be added. However, if both neighbors are in agreement of a seven foot height fence and the fence is located at the rear of the adjacent property, instead of entirely on the 269 Willow property, no use permit would be required for a taller fence at the property line.

I have a call with Charlene later today to confirm what their team intends to do.

Sincerely,

Ori

---

From: Daniel Hom [mailto:Daniel.Hom@bloomenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 10:17 PM
To: Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org>; Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>
Cc: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Urgent please review this Final 269 Willow Plan Set and reply

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, **DO NOT** click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Ori and Charlene,

Regarding the 4’ high section of fence common with 245, would the use permit for 7’ also apply for the opposite side common with 277 Willow? Furthermore, wouldn’t the front fence of 269 be the rear fence for the other two lots? Will the front fence change to 7’ also?

Regards,

Daniel Hom
Hi Daniel,

Thank you for letting me know. I will notify the administrative staff.

Sincerely,

Ori

---

From: Daniel Hom [mailto:Daniel.Hom@bloomenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 2:01 PM
To: Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org>; Daniel Hom <danielkhom@aol.com>
Cc: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Urgent please review this Final 269 Willow Plan Set and reply

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

I don’t have anymore comments.

A neighbor, Shaffer (opposite side along 277) stopped by Sunday and asked me about the project. Apparently they too didn’t get the mailer.

Regards,

Daniel Hom
Hi Daniel,

I wanted to confirm whether you had additional concerns or words of support for the project that you wanted included in the public record and sent to the Planning Commission before tonight’s meeting. You are also welcome to attend the meeting to share your input on the item. The link is available here: https://beta.menlopark.org/files/sharedassets/public/agendas-and-minutes/planning-commission/2022-meetings/20220124-planning-commission-agenda-packet.pdf#%5B%7B%22num%22%3A308%2C%22gen%22%3A%7D%2C%7B%22name%22%3A%22FitR%22%7D%2C-194%2C132%2C806%2C729%5D

I am sorry to hear you did not receive the mailing. I was able to review the mailing list to confirm your name was on the mailing list.

Sincerely,

Ori
Hi Charlene,

I reviewed the plans and have no further questions or comments as 247 Willow property owner.

I have a question that affect the 245 Willow owner. I see sheet A1.1 notes existing fence to be replace with new 4’ and 7’. I don’t know if this is still the plan and if 245 owners Josh and Samira is aware.

BTW I never received the public notice mailing. Thank you for emailing me. I learned about the mailing from other neighbors recently.

Regards,

Daniel
On Jan 19, 2022, at 10:26 AM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Good Morning Daniel

Please note Ori the planner from the City of Menlo Park is CC in this email.

As my other email to you, June and I came to your house on Sunday afternoon and unfortunately no one was home. I was hoping
you can get back to me regarding the latest version of our plan set. I also mentioned earlier that the planning meeting is on 1/24 and the staff report needs your final feedback if any.

We are looking forward to your response.

Charlene

On Wed, Jan 12, 2022 at 4:06 PM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Happy New Year Daniel and your family!

I just want to make sure you are receiving the latest and final version of the plan set for 269 Willow road, please find attached. Please note the height of the window sills have been raised for privacy concerns.

Our team would be much appreciated if you would kindly reply to this email after you review the plan.

Thanks

Charlene

On Mon, Nov 29, 2021 at 9:03 AM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Daniel,

Hope you and your family enjoyed the Thanksgiving holiday long weekend!

I just want to inform you that we are making the final plan set submission after three rounds of reviews with the city. Please see attached for your review. Please let us know if you have any questions. In addition, I believe that we have communicated with you in person that the
fence height of front yards is no more than 4' per city's requirement and this has been reflected on the plan set FYI.

Thank you for your attention and Happy Holidays!

Charlene

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Henry Hong Zeng <HZeng@steinberghart.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 28, 2021 at 4:56 PM
Subject: 269 Willow Plan Set - 20211128
To: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>
Cc: Jun (junzhangzeng@gmail.com) <junzhangzeng@gmail.com>, Yue Zhao <yzhao1225@gmail.com>

Hi Charlene,

Attached, please find updated plan set. Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

HZ

This email, including any attachments, may contain information that is confidential or proprietary. It is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it is addressed. If you received this email and are not an intended recipient, any disclosure, distribution, copying or other use or retention of this email or information contained within it are prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender via email and also permanently delete all copies of the original message together with any of its attachments from your computer or device.
contained within it are prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender via email and also permanently delete all copies of the original message together with any of its attachments from your computer or device.
Hi Charlene,
Thank you for the updated drawing reflecting the 7 foot fence and more screening. Please let us known if you need any more confirmation for the process.
Thank you for accommodating.
Josh and Samira
245 willow Rd.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 26, 2022, at 7:41 PM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Josh and Samira,

Attached is the revised Landscape Plan for 269 Willow, Menlo Park

We have added 3 screen trees along the rear property line and changed some of the 4’ fence heights in the side and front yard setbacks to taller fences.

Please confirm upon receipt,

Thanks

Charlene

On Tue, Jan 25, 2022 at 9:44 PM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Samira,

After today's meeting with Ori, we will update our plan to retain the 7ft fence. We will make the resubmission on Thursday and I will forward you a copy.

Thanks
Charlene

On Tue, Jan 25, 2022 at 9:33 PM Samira Bozorgi <sbozorgi@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Ori and Charlene,

Thank you so much and please let us know if you need additional information from us to support the use permit request.

With kind regards,
Samira

On Jan 25, 2022, at 1:56 PM, Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org> wrote:

Hi Samira,

I have a call with Charlene later today to outline the next steps for their team to include the fence request with their use permit. We are hopeful they will be able to incorporate this request in their materials in time for the 2/14 Planning Commission meeting notice deadline later this week.

Sincerely,
Ori

Ori Paz
Associate Planner
City Hall - 1st Floor
701 Laurel St.
tel 650-330-6711
menlopark.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Samira Bozorgi [mailto:sbozorgi@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 9:45 PM
To: Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org>
Cc: Josh Spira <joshspira@gmail.com>; charlene2005@gmail.com; Sandmeier, Corinna D <cdfsandmeier@menlopark.org>
Subject: Re: Fence between 269 willow and 245 willow

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Ori,

Thank you so much for your swift response. I want to follow up to apologize for not making the deadline to submit our comments for tonight’s meeting: Josh is a public school teacher and I am a librarian, we have a young kid in a Menlo Park preschool, and the realities of this ongoing pandemic have taken away our ability to direct appropriate attention to this. We want to retain our 7ft fence...
because it provides privacy to our property and it’s a perfectly good fence.

We have owned our property since 2011 and we absolutely love our home and our neighborhood, even with all its eccentric qualities. We are grateful for all the commission’s work and look forward to hearing back from you.

Thank you,
Samira

On Jan 24, 2022, at 7:10 PM, Paz, Ori
<OriPaz@menlopark.org> wrote:

Hi Josh,

Thank you for the email. I have forwarded this to the Planning Commission for their review. Please note, a higher fence within the front setback would require a use permit. That request was not included with the notice for the item this evening. Inclusion of the request would require the item to be renoticed.

You are welcome to join the meeting to discuss your concern during the public comment portion for this item. The meeting is currently underway.
https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fbeta.menlopark.org%2fffiles%2fsharedassets%2fpublic%2fagendas-and-minutes%2fplanning-commission%2f2022-meetings%2f20220124-planning-commission-agenda-packet.pdf%23%5b%7b%22num%22%3a308%2c%22gen%22%3a0%7d%2c%22data%22%3a%7b%22name%22%3a%22Meetings%22%7d%2c-194%2c132%2c806%2c729%5d&c=E,1,p52ElYU1Qa0t57t-UtrzLcT_AK8_9sFAZiEF8xtAfXf4l0SnY0oyU6E5GYofiC8CvNX0-GQZqiKTGt2TXXftnPCAREDaJCZ5aD2pTQRcMrGQgU9CBoUSw,,&typo=1

Sincerely,

Ori

Ori Paz
Associate Planner
City Hall - 1st Floor
Hello,

We are the property owners at 245 and Are looking at the fence design between the sides of the lots. It currently has a 7 foot fence and looks like it’s proposed to be replaced with a 4 ft fence. This is from the plans A1.1. This would severely impact our privacy. Can you please allow a variance to leave the fence as is? We look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Josh Spira and Samira Bozorgi

Owners of 245 willow
Rick

Thank you for your time and understanding, we really appreciated it.

BR
Charlene

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 27, 2022, at 2:24 PM, Rick G Schwartz <rgschwartz2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

Ok, thanks. We won’t fuss about it any more.

On Thursday, January 27, 2022, 12:47 PM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Please see our landscape designer's response below. You are welcome to contact him directly if you have any questions.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Greg <lewislandscape@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Thu, Jan 27, 2022 at 12:33 PM
Subject: RE: updated 269 Willow landscaping plan
To: Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com>
Cc: Paz, Ori <OriPaz@menlopark.org>

Charlene and Ori

We already have proposed an Oak tree that will grow large along the fence between the Schwarz property and our project so there are 2 new trees..

We also have the T7 Heritage tree that the city doesn’t want us to put additional trees under

These neighbors already have the T14 Pittosporum in addition to some other Pittosporums and Bamboo growing along the fence line that we don’t show on the plans
I’m disappointed that you only added one tree on the half that backs on our property (vs two trees on the half that backs on our neighbor), when it seems there is plenty of space in our corner of your property for another tree or two (i.e., between your garage and our property line). Is there a reason you can’t provide more screening between your garage and our property?

Rick

On Wednesday, January 26, 2022, 7:58 PM, Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Rick and Lauren

Our landscape Architect Greg and design Architect Henry met today at the property to review the plan and attached is the revised landscape plan FYI. We have added 3 screen trees along the rear property line and changed some of the 4' fence heights to taller fences. Please let me know if you have any questions and confirm upon receipt.

Thanks
Charlene

On Mon, Jan 24, 2022 at 10:46 AM Rick G Schwartz <rgschwartz2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

Got it, thanks Katherine.

Rick
Hi Rick,

My apologies for the inconsistency here. The tree numbers in the photos are from a very early version of the report that included only heritage trees - the city informed us that all trees needed to be included, so the numbering changed but was accidentally not updated in the report photos. I just double checked the rest of the report, and proper tree numbers are used in all other sections.

The correct tree numbers for the images are as follows:

- Image 1 - apple #2
- Image 2 - plum #6
- Image 3 - coast live oak #20
- Image 4 - coast live oak #24
- Image 5 - bay laurel #23
- Image 6 - red horsechestnut #30
- Image 7 - London plane #31
- Image 8 - liquidambar #32

Best,

Katherine Naegele

She/Her
On Fri, Jan 21, 2022 at 9:13 AM Charlene Cheng <charlene2005@gmail.com> wrote:

Good morning Rick,

Thank you for your email. I am copying Katherine who provided the Arborist report for this project and she can help to explain.

My understanding is that heritage trees are the main concern from the City and the apple and plum tree are the two heritage trees on the lot we have to remove.

Thanks
On Thu, Jan 20, 2022 at 8:55 PM Rick G Schwartz <rgschwartz2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Charlene,

We live at 254 Santa Margarita, adjacent to the rear of your parcel on which the project is proposed. In reviewing the Arborist report, I am having trouble understanding which trees are to be removed. The Tree # discussed in the report and shown on the Tree Map do not appear to match the tree # indicated in the Supporting Photographs and the Tree Table. For example:

- Image 1 is for “Apple #1” but in the Table, Tree #1 is Mandarin, and Apple is Tree #2
- Image 2 is for “Plum #3” but in the Table, Plum is #6 or #10.
- Image 3 is for “Coast Live Oak #4” but in the Table, Tree #4 is Peach, and Coast Live Oaks are #9, #15, #16, and #24.

And so forth.

As such, I am unsure exactly which trees are to be removed and what their species and other characteristics are.

Can you ascertain whether there is a mismatch between the tree # indicated in the images and those shown in the Tree Table? I want to be sure that I understand exactly which trees are to be removed and which trees will remain in the 20 ft. setback between the rear of the proposed structure and our lot line.

Thanks,

Rick Schwartz (& Lauren)

254 Santa Margarita Ave.
rgschwartz@sbglobalnet (or, equivalently, rgschwartz2000@yahoo.com)

650-326-8331
Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review and provide feedback on a proposal to construct two new research and development (R&D) buildings totaling approximately 228,000 square feet, and a six-story parking structure with an attached meeting space building of approximately 9,600 square feet, located in the LS-B (Life Science, Bonus) zoning district. The project site currently contains three existing R&D and warehouse buildings with six tenant spaces, which would be demolished as part of the project. The new buildings would have a total proposed R&D floor area ratio (FAR) of 124 percent and an additional four percent FAR for commercial space. The proposal includes a request for an increase in height and FAR under the bonus level development allowance in exchange for community amenities. The project will require the following actions:

1. Environmental Review to analyze potential environmental impacts of the project through an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
2. Development Agreement to allow a phased development of the project site over approximately 10 years;
3. Use Permit for bonus-level development and the provision of community amenities, modifications to design standards, and the use and storage of hazardous materials for an emergency diesel generator;
4. Architectural Control to review the design of the new building and associated site improvements;
5. Lot Merger and Lot Line Adjustment to merge two of the properties and adjust property lines to allow for more orderly development of the site;
6. Heritage Tree Removal Permits to remove development-related heritage trees and street trees, and replace them according to the City’s heritage tree replacement guidelines; and
7. Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement to pay in-lieu fees in accordance with the City’s BMR Ordinance.
8. Community Amenities Operating Covenant or Payment of a Community Amenities In-Lieu Payment.

Safety-rated chemical storage units are also proposed at the site. The use and storage of hazardous materials in the storage units and elsewhere on the site would require project-specific administrative permits once R&D tenants for the building have been identified. Additional actions and entitlements may be required as the project plans are refined. No formal actions will be taken at this time.

Policy Issues

Study sessions provide an opportunity for Planning Commissioners and the public to provide preliminary feedback on a project, with comments used to inform future review and consideration of the proposal.
Background

Site location
The project site consists of three parcels with a total lot area of 4.2 acres. The two parcels along O’Brien Drive would be merged as part of an administrative lot merger application. Lot lines between the 1320 Willow parcel and the newly-created parcel would be adjusted to allow for the retention of a portion of the 1320 Willow Road building and construction of the parking structure. Additionally, the property line between the new 1005 O’Brien Drive and the neighboring property to the right (1025 O’Brien Drive), which is also owned by the applicant, would be adjusted to create a property line that is perpendicular to O’Brien Drive. The site contains three one-story R&D and warehouse buildings with six tenant spaces addressed 985-1015 O’Brien Drive and 1320 Willow Road. For purposes of this staff report, O’Brien Drive is considered to have an east-west orientation, Willow Road is considered to have a north-south orientation, and all compass directions referenced will use this orientation. The site is located on the northern side of O’Brien Drive between Willow Road and Kelly Court, and on the eastern side of Willow Road between O’Brien Drive and Ivy Drive.

Surrounding properties to the north, east, and west are also in the LS-B zoning district. Properties across O’Brien Drive to the south are in the LS zoning district. Immediately north of the project site is the Hetch Hetchy right-of-way owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), a portion of which is leased to Mid-Peninsula High School for their parking lot and athletics fields. The properties to the east and south are developed with existing R&D and warehouse buildings. The property to the west is developed with an existing church. The Menlo Technology and Science Park is located to the north of the Mid-Peninsula High School campus and is a multi-building office park owned and partially occupied by Facebook. The business park, which is zoned R-MU-B (Residential Mixed Use-Bonus) and O-B (Office-Bonus), also contains other general office, R&D, manufacturing, and warehousing uses. However, an application was submitted for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site into a mixed-use residential, commercial, and office campus, which is currently under review. The closest residential properties are located to the south along Alberni Street in East Palo Alto (see Attachment A).

Analysis

Project description and phasing
The applicant is proposing to demolish three existing buildings and construct two new R&D buildings and a parking structure. The project would be completed in two phases with the first phase beginning immediately after entitlement, and the second phase beginning approximately 10 years after completion of phase one. Use permits typically expire one year after approval, but may be extended administratively by one year. Due to the length of time anticipated between the two phases, the applicant is proposing to enter into a development agreement in order to ensure the entitlements do not expire.

The first phase of the project would consist of demolition of the two buildings along O’Brien Drive and a portion of the 1320 Willow Road building, and construction of the new 154,565-square-foot building (Building 1) located at 1005 O’Brien Drive, partial construction of the parking structure, and the attached meeting space building. The second phase would consist of demolition of the remainder of the 1320 Willow Road building, construction of the new 73,817-square-foot building (Building 2) located at 1320 Willow Road, and construction of two additional stories on the parking structure. The applicant’s project description is included as Attachment B, and the project plans are included as Attachment C. The applicant is proposing to develop the building utilizing the bonus level provisions permitted by MPMC Chapter 16.44
(which permits developments to obtain an increase in FAR and/or height in the LS-B zoning district subject to obtaining a use permit or conditional development permit and providing one or more community amenities.)

Site layout
The proposed R&D buildings and parking structure would all be constructed in an east-west orientation. The broader side of Building 1 would face O’Brien Drive and would be connected to the street by a landscaped entry plaza. The Willow Road frontage is the narrower of the two street frontages. Due to the east-west orientation of Building 2, this building would have a narrower profile at the Willow Road frontage. The main entrance for this building would be located along Willow Road and would have a similar entrance plaza to Building 1. The parking structure would be located behind the buildings, to the north of Building 1 and to the east of Building 2. The meeting space building would be constructed on the north side of the parking structure, facing the Hetch Hetchy right-of-way and would be accessed by a publicly accessible path connecting to Willow Road.

During phase one, an enclosure would be constructed to house trash receptacles, the generator enclosure, and chemical storage enclosures. The enclosure would be located along O’Brien drive to the west of Building 1, adjacent to the existing church at 965 O’Brien Drive. The enclosure would be separated from the street by a landscaped strip approximately 29 feet in depth. During phase two, the applicant would expand the enclosure to accommodate the trash receptacles and chemical storage for Building 2. A separate generator enclosure for Building 2 would be constructed on the south wall of the building. The chemical storage units have been proposed as part of the project even though a specific tenant has not been identified and hazardous materials needs on the site are currently unknown. The Planning Commission should consider whether the proposed chemical storage units should be included as part of the use permit application, or whether the applicant should wait until a future tenant with specific hazardous materials uses has been identified to pursue a separate administrative hazardous materials permit.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Gross Floor Area (GFA)
125 percent FAR is the maximum FAR permitted for bonus level development, and 55 percent FAR is the maximum FAR for base level developments in the LS-B zoning district. The project would be developed at a floor area ratio (FAR) of approximately 124 percent of R&D space.

Pursuant to MPMC section 16.55.050, projects in the LS-B district are permitted an additional 10 percent FAR for commercial uses other than office, R&D, and warehousing. These commercial uses are typically retail, personal service, or other neighborhood-serving uses intended to provide workers in the area services near the workplace. The applicant is proposing an additional four percent FAR (approximately 9,600 square feet GFA) for a meeting space building in the rear of the parking structure. The applicant states that the building would be available to tenants of Tarlton properties and has indicated that there is interest from several community groups that would benefit from use of the space. Staff has evaluated the proposed use and has determined that the meeting space does not meet the intent of the commercial uses other than office, R&D, or light industrial. Rather, the building serves as an extension of the R&D providing meeting space for tenants of the development. Therefore, the meeting space would count towards the maximum 1.25 FAR which is already proposed near the maximum, and the applicant would either need to propose a different use of the building or remove the building from the project scope.

Height
The two proposed buildings and the parking structure would vary in height. In the LS-B district there is a maximum height of 120 feet for any one building on a site, and a maximum average height of 77.5 feet when calculated across multiple buildings. Building 1 has a proposed height of 101 feet, Building 2 and the
parking structure have a proposed height of 74 feet, and the meeting space building has a proposed height of 45 feet. Overall, the proposed project would have an average height of 71.3 feet.

**Parking and circulation**

**Vehicular**

A proposed seven-story parking structure would be located in the rear of the proposed development, and would also be constructed in two phases. Five stories of the structure would be constructed during phase one and would contain 301 parking stalls. The final two stories would be constructed during phase two and would provide an additional 190 parking spaces. There would be an additional 34 surface parking spaces across the two parcels, but the parking would primarily be located along the eastern side of Building 1 and would be included during phase one. The existing surface parking associated with the existing 1320 Willow Road building would remain during phase one, but would be removed as part of phase two. With a final total of 545 parking spaces, the parking ratio for the site would be 2.29 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

For R&D and light industrial land uses, the LS zoning district requires a minimum parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area and a maximum parking ratio of 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with the parking requirements of the LS zoning district.

There would be three vehicular access points into the project site which would be located in the same general locations as existing driveways. Two of the access points would be along O’Brien drive. Each entrance would be a two-way driveway that would lead to the parking structure in the rear of the building. The third entrance would be along Willow Road in the same location as the existing driveway. The driveway would be a right-in-right-out which would enter from and exit onto northbound Willow Road. Garbage trucks would access the site from the Willow Road entrance and exit onto O’Brien Drive from the western driveway. Loading docks would be located on the western side of Building 1 and southern side of Building 2. For deliveries to Building 1, delivery trucks would enter the site from the western O’Brien Drive entrance, back into the loading dock, and exit onto Willow Road. For deliveries to Building 2, trucks would enter from Willow Road, back into the loading dock, and exit onto O’Brien Drive via the western driveway.

**Bicycle and pedestrian**

Staff is currently reviewing the proposed project to determine the appropriate frontage improvements, however, it is anticipated that new improvements in the public right-of-way, such as new sidewalks, would be required. There would be a total of 48 long-term bicycle parking spaces at the site. The majority of the long-term bicycle spaces would be located on the first level of the parking garage. There would be a limited number of additional long-term bicycle parking spaces located on the first floor of each of the proposed buildings. Short-term bicycle parking racks would be located near the main entrances of each of the buildings, as well as near the entrance of the meeting space building.

Pedestrians would be able to access the site from the Willow Road and O’Brien Drive frontages, which would connect directly to the main entry plazas of both proposed buildings. The meeting space building would be accessed from O’Brien Drive by a sidewalk that runs along the eastern side of Building 1 and the parking structure, and from Willow Road by a walking path which is considered to be publicly-accessible open space.

**Open space**

The proposed project would be required to provide open space equivalent to 20 percent of the project site
area and would be further required to provide 50 percent of the required open space (or 10 percent of the site area) as publicly accessible open space. According to the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 16.44.120(4)(A)), publicly accessible open space is defined as:

Publicly accessible open space consists of areas unobstructed by fully enclosed structures with a mixture of landscaping and hardscape that provides seating and places to rest, places for gathering, passive and/or active recreation, pedestrian circulation, or other similar use as determined by the planning commission. Publicly accessible open space types include, but are not limited to, paseos, plazas, forecourts and entryways, and outdoor dining areas. Publicly accessible open space must:

(i) Contain site furnishings, art, or landscaping;
(ii) Be on the ground floor or podium level;
(iii) Be at least partially visible from a public right-of-way such as a street or paseo;
(iv) Have a direct, accessible pedestrian connection to a public right-of-way or easement.

The applicant is proposing to utilize two main areas as publicly accessible open space. The first area would be along the O’Brien Drive frontage where the applicant has proposed a landscaped area in front of Building 1 as publicly accessible space for passive use. The majority of the public open space would be located along the northern edge of the project site, near the meeting space building in the rear of the parking structure, which would serve as more active and semi-active space. During Phase 1, the area in the rear of the parking structure would be accessed either directly from the parking structure or from a sidewalk on the eastern side of Building 1 connecting the space to O’Brien Drive. During Phase 2, additional publicly accessible open space would be provided north of Building 2, connecting the meeting space building to Willow Road. At this time, the applicant has not identified specific furnishings or art for the publicly accessible open space areas. The Planning Commission should consider the criteria for the publicly accessible open space and provide feedback on the applicant’s proposal with regard to the general functionality and usability of the publicly accessible open space.

The applicant is requesting the removal of 13 trees in the existing planting areas, parking lots, and City trees in the public right-of-way. Ten of these trees are heritage in size and would require heritage tree removal permits. If all removals are approved by the City Arborist, the applicant would be required to replace the value of the existing trees and comply with replacement standards for City trees.

Community amenities
As mentioned previously, the LS-B zoning district permits bonus level development, subject to providing one or more community amenities. As part of the ConnectMenlo process, a list of community amenities was generated based on public input and adopted through a resolution of the City Council. Community amenities are intended to address identified community needs that result from the effect of the increased development intensity on the surrounding community. Improvements already required of the project pursuant to existing laws and regulations (such as the publicly-accessible open space, and street improvements determined by the Public Works Director) do not qualify as community amenities.

The value of the community amenity to be provided in exchange for the bonus level development potential must equal 50 percent of the fair market value of the additional GFA of the bonus level development. The applicant must provide an appraisal performed by a licensed appraisal firm that sets a fair market value of the GFA of the bonus level of development. If an on-site amenity is not proposed, applicants have the option to pay an in-lieu payment equal to 110 percent of the required amenity value. The applicant has indicated that they intend to pay the in-lieu payment to satisfy the community amenity requirement.
Utilizing the in-lieu payment option would enable the applicant to satisfy its community amenity obligations prior to initiating construction on either phase of the project, which would alleviate any issues regarding provision of community amenities in a phased project.

**Design standards**
In the LS zoning district, all new construction and building additions of 10,000 square feet of GFA or more must meet design standards subject to architectural control review. The design standards regulate the siting and placement of buildings, landscaping, parking, and other features in relation to the street; building mass, bulk, size, and vertical building planes; ground floor exterior facades of buildings; open space, including publicly accessible open space; development of paseos to enhance pedestrian and bicycle connections between parcels and public streets in the vicinity; building design, materials, screening, and rooflines; and site access and parking. Modifications to design standards may be requested through a use permit.

**Architectural style and materials**
The design of the proposed life sciences buildings would have a contemporary architectural style, utilizing low-e blue tinted bird friendly glass, along with glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC) panels for the majority of the building facades. The glass portions of the facades would have aluminum mullions. The GFRC panels would be white and the vertical accent panels would be gray.

Both buildings would generally be rectangular in shape with east-west orientations. The main façade for Building 1 would run along O’Brien Drive and would feature a decorative, V-shaped structure on the eastern facade creating an awning above the main entrance. Building 2 would have a more slender façade along Willow Road with a grey GFRC tower creating the main entrance. Each building would have a rooftop deck for employee use. A portion of each rooftop deck would be covered with a metal panel trellis. Rooftop mechanical equipment would be screened with corrugated aluminum paneling.

The parking structure would be primarily constructed of concrete. Two different colors of flexible metal mesh would be used to screen vehicles and provide variety on the elevations. The meeting space building attached to the parking structure would complement the two R&D buildings and be constructed of the same materials, however it would also feature perforated metal of varying colors to maintain an architectural relationship to the garage structure. The meeting space building would also have a rooftop deck, however it would not feature a metal trellis similar to the R&D buildings.

**Building modulations**
The design standards for the LS-B zoning district require modulations on facades facing publicly accessible spaces. A building must have a minimum of one recess of 15 feet wide by 10 feet deep per every 200 feet of facade length. Building 1 would include a modulation along O’Brien Drive. The zoning ordinance states that the modulation must reach the base height (at least 45 feet) at a minimum. The applicant is requesting a use permit to modify the building modulation requirement on Building 1 to allow for the building modulation to only extend to 34 feet in height. The applicant states that the podium height of each floor is proposed to be 17 feet in height and that requiring the modulation to reach 45 feet would place the top of the modulation between floors. The alternative would be to modulate the building to the top of the third floor, reaching a height of 51 feet, which would comply with the modulation requirement. The Planning Commission should consider an appropriate approach to the building modulations on Building 1. Additionally, the modulation depth, as currently proposed does not appear to meet the minimum 10-foot depth because the measurement was taken from the stair tower rather than the main face of the building. Staff has requested that the minimum 10-foot depth be provided in the next iteration of the design.

Building 2 would only require modulations along the north elevation where the building faces the publicly
accessible open space. The applicant has proposed a modulation 10 feet in depth and 32 feet in width, which complies with the modulation requirement. The front elevation facing Willow Road does not require a modulation since it is less than 200 feet in width. However, the applicant has proposed two modulations to provide visual interest to the façade.

**Ground floor exterior**

Ground floors fronting publicly accessible spaces are required to have a minimum transparency (e.g. clear glass windows) of 40 percent along mixed use collector streets and boulevards. The applicant has provided diagrams calculating the ground floor transparency, and staff has determined that the proposed buildings are generally compliant with transparency requirements. Additionally, the proposed buildings are generally compliant with the minimum ground floor height requirement of 15 feet, and entrance requirements of one entrance per public street frontage.

**Summary**

With regard to the application of basic LS district design standards, staff believes that the application would generally be in compliance based on preliminary staff analysis. However, a use permit would need to be approved to modify the building modulation requirements for Building 1. The Planning Commission may wish to provide additional feedback on how the proposed building, parking structure, and site layout could be modified and refined for a more cohesive style between all elements of the project before it advances to the full submittal stage.

**Green and sustainable building**

In the LS zoning district, projects are required to meet green and sustainable building regulations. The proposed buildings will be required to meet 100 percent of their energy demand through any combination of on-site energy generation, purchase of 100 percent renewable electricity, and/or purchase of certified renewable energy credits. The new buildings would need to be designed to meet minimum LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) requirements for their respective sizes, with LEED Gold BD+C required for Building 1 and LEED Silver BD+C required for Building 2. Other green building requirements including pre-wiring 15 percent of the total required parking stalls and installing EV chargers in 10 percent of the pre-wire locations, and incorporating bird-friendly design in the placement of the building and the use of exterior glazing, including water use efficiency, placement of new buildings 24 inches above the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) base flood elevation (BFE) to account for sea level rise, and waste management planning, would also apply to the project. Details regarding how the proposed building would meet the green and sustainable building requirements will be provided as the project plans and materials are further developed.

**Planning Commission considerations**

The following comments/questions are suggested by staff to guide the Commission's discussion, although Commissioners should feel free to explore other topics of interest.

- **Building Height.** Is the proposed building height acceptable within the context of other existing and proposed development in the area?

- **Architectural Design and Materials.** Is the architectural design of the proposed building appropriate for its use as a life sciences building and for the overall vision of the Bayfront Area? Does the Commission believe that the proposed materials are appropriate for the building? Does the Commission believe that a use permit can be granted to modify the building modulation requirement for Building 1?
• **Parking Structure.** Does the overall design of the parking structure feature good proportion, balance, and materials, or do certain elements need more attention? Is the parking structure of appropriate size with an appropriate number of parking spaces for the development?

• **Site Access and Layout.** Is the proposed site circulation to the parking structure and the service/loading areas generally acceptable?

• **Outdoor Chemical Storage.** Should the safety-rated chemical storage units proposed at the rear of the site be included as part of the use permit application, or should the applicant wait until a future tenant with specific hazardous materials uses has been identified to pursue a separate administrative hazardous materials permit? Should a different location be considered for the chemical storage units?

• **Public Open Space.** Is the proposed pathway along the northern project boundary suitable to serve as public open space? According to the LS zoning regulations, publicly accessible open space must contain site furnishings, art, or landscaping; be on the ground floor; be at least partially visible from a public right-of-way; and have a direct, accessible pedestrian connection to a public right-of-way. Does the proposed design meet the intent of publicly accessible open space? Should additional features be considered? Is the landscape strip along O’Brien Drive adequately designed to serve as publicly accessible open space?

• **Overall Aesthetic.** Is the overall aesthetic approach for the project consistent with the Planning Commission’s expectations for new development in the LS zoning district?

**Correspondence**

As of the writing of this report, staff has not received any written correspondence regarding the project.

**Impact on City Resources**

The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

**Environmental Review**

Study sessions do not require analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). With regard to the overall project review and action, the terms of a recent settlement agreement with East Palo Alto require projects seeking bonus level development to complete an EIR. City staff is coordinating with the project sponsor to select a qualified consultant to complete the environmental review and prepare an initial study and EIR for the proposed project. The City Council must authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with a qualified consultant to perform the environmental review. Depending on the initial study, a focused EIR may be prepared only on the topics that warrant further analysis but would include a transportation and housing analysis at a minimum, per the terms of the settlement agreement. The EIR would also need to study the impacts of the intermediate conditions, to study the effects of the continued operations of the remaining portion of 1320 Willow Road during construction of Phase 1 and prior to construction of Phase 2. The Planning Commission would take the final action on the project entitlements, including the EIR, after the completion of the environmental review and any revisions to the plans based on feedback from the Planning Commission and Planning staff.
Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 1,320-foot radius of the subject property.

Attachments
A. Location Map
B. Project Description Letter
C. Project Plans

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

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Chris Turner, Assistant Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
Nira Doherty, City Attorney
Project Background:

Tarlton Properties proposes a phased project to replace three existing single-story buildings with one 5-story new research and development building, one 4-story new research and development building, a parking garage and a 2-story square foot commercial building. The 9,000 square foot, 2-story commercial building is planned to be meeting space, which will be provided for free to area nonprofits, community organizations, and community members, in addition to Tarlton tenants. The three existing building addresses are 985 and 1001 O’Brien drive, and 1320 Willow Road. The existing buildings are located on three parcels. A lot line adjustment is requested to adjust lot lines between 1001 O’Brien and the neighboring 1035 O’Brien property in order to make the lot lines perpendicular to the right of way, as well as to merge lots on the project site. This project will be phased, with up to several years between Phase I and Phase 2. Therefore, a development agreement is requested. The anticipated tenants are R&D/ life science.

Existing buildings
- Building use is storage, office, R&D
- Total 90,600 sq. ft. (0.49 FAR)
- 114 uncovered stalls on the surface parking lots
- Minimal landscaping at the front entry of 1320 Willow; no sensitive habitat

Proposed buildings
- One 4-story and one 5-story R&D building
- Total 228,262 sq. ft. (1.24 FAR) of R&D
- 545 Parking stalls (511 in parking garage and 34 surface parking spaces)
- One commercial building for community and tenant use, total 9,683 sq. ft (0.04 FAR)
- All buildings to be elevated 24” above BFE (12.8’)
- New entry lobbies facing O’Brien Drive and Willow Road
- High performance bird friendly glazing with aluminum mullions.
- Mechanical equipment located within roof screen.
- Environmentally sensitive and pedestrian friendly landscaping along three sides of property, including facing the public right of way and Peninsula High School.

Site, Utilities:

Public open space is provided in multiple locations for Phase 1 and 2 of the project. In Phase 1, 30% of the publicly accessible open space is located along O’Brien Drive adjacent to the street/ sidewalk. 70% of the publicly accessible open space is located adjacent to existing and proposed publicly accessible open spaces on three adjacent properties: playing fields for the Mid-Peninsula High School, Greenspace at 20 Kelly Court, Willow Village public park and Community space. The publicly accessible open space will also provide community access to the commercial
building which will provide pedestrian access to the facility which is located close to the Belle Haven neighborhood.

The Applicant has designed the publicly accessible open space for this project in response to community comments that asked for public open space to be aggregated with other proposed and existing open space, and to provide connections with that space from public rights of way. It is anticipated that these contiguous open spaces could eventually be linked to more publicly accessible spaces proposed along the Hetch Hetchy corridor. Additionally, publicly accessible open space leads from public rights of way to the commercial building. Since this building will provide community and meeting space for non-profits and members of the surrounding community, it is anticipated that the publicly accessible open space will work in conjunction with the building to extend public indoor/outdoor space. In Phase 1 and 2 combined, 38% of the publicly accessible open space on the project directly fronts either Willow Road or O'Brien Drive, with the remaining open space is directly accessible from those public rights of way and connecting to other existing and proposed publicly accessible open space. Phase 2 connection to the Public open space along the Hetch Hetchy corridor is directly connected to and visible from Willow Road as well as to O'Brien Drive via a pathway that is accessible to the public but is not counted towards project totals. Directional signage for phase 1 could be added if required to clarify that areas are open to the public.

The existing site is served by all required utilities and public services including a 4" water line for fire sprinklers. Proposed project will provide:
- New fire department connection (FDC) and backflow preventer.
- All new electrical connected underground from existing service on O'Brien Drive.
- Two new sprinkler risers for each of the building and parking garage.

**Allocation of Uses:**

The two R&D buildings are designed to accommodate life science tenants with anticipated ratios ranging from 30-45% office and 55-70% lab areas. Tarlton Properties has supported a variety of tenants over the last 36 years. In the last 15 years the tenants have predominantly been R&D type facilities. These have included companies that design medical devices and services, develop clean technology products, and engineer environmentally sustainable foods. All tenants require lab-related, clean manufacturing environments. The open office areas adjacent to the labs provide technical working areas for scientists, lab technicians and researchers. The open office areas also provide working space for sales, marketing and office support staff. Since these companies are in the development stages of their products, their R&D staff is proportionately larger than their support staff.
Phase 1 of this project is anticipated to be initiated immediately after entitlement. During phase 1 it is anticipated that the Wine Bank (or tenant) in the western side of 1320 Willow will remain operational. Phase 2 will follow in or before 2035.

**Project Phasing:**

**Phase I**
- Removal of 985 and 1001 O'Brien Drive buildings as well as east half of 1320 Willow building.
- New 5 story building on O'Brien Drive
- New 4 story parking garage
- New 2 story community building

**Phase II**
- Removal of west half of 1320 Willow building.
- New 4 story building on Willow Road
- Addition of 2 stories to parking garage

**Parking and EV to Support Uses:**

341-568 parking spaces are required, based on the LS zoning calculation of 1.5-2.5 parking spaces/1000 sf.

545 parking spaces provided:
- 11 near the front door or on the ground floor of the garage will be striped for accessibility.
- 60 additional stalls will be designated for EV charging stations including EV accessible parking stalls.

The applicant owns and operates numerous life science facilities in Menlo Park and is continually monitoring parking needs for life science users in Menlo Park. The proposed parking is based on the applicant’s assessment of needs at the time the project will be operational, and considers a TDM program that includes carpool, vanpool, and participation in carshare, bike share, and a district wide shuttle program that is timed for common commute lines on BART and CalTrain. The project TDM is designed to reduce project trips by at least 20%.

Garage Phase 1 will be built as a 5-level structure in order to provide staging space for Phase 2 and eliminate the need of reshoring of Level 3 and Level 4.
During Phase 1, parking will be only available from Level 1 to Level 4. Vehicular access to Level 5 will be blocked by bollards that could be removed for fire department access only. During Phase 2 construction, Level 6 and Level 6.5 will be completed. Staging will be on the existing Level 5.

**Recology:**

Waste Zero Specialists from Recology San Mateo County will review project and provided trash and enclosure guidelines. Recommendation letter will be provided upon approval.

**Flood Elevation:** This site has a B.F.E. of 12.5 and 12.8 per the FEMA map indicated on the topo. The Public Works Department has advised to use 12.8 for the overall site. The building slab will be elevated 24” above BFE.

**Impervious Area Calculations:** Preliminary calcs are included with CUP package.

**Hydrology Report:** To be provided after the CUP package resubmittal.

**Landscaping and Project Site Amenities:** Proposed site amenities and plants complement fourteen other Tarlton buildings along O’Brien Drive.

**Community Amenities:** Community amenities will be met through payment of the in-lieu fee, consistent with Section 16.44.070 (4)(B).
## PROJECT DATA

### BASE FLOOD ELEVATION:
12.8 FT

### MUNICIPAL CODE:
CBC 2019

#### BUILDING OCCUPANCY:
BUSINESS (B)

#### TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION:
I-B

#### FIRE PROTECTION:
FULLY SPRINKLERED

#### ALLOWABLE AREA:
UNLIMITED

#### ALLOWABLE HEIGHT:
180 FT; 12 STORIES

### ZONING REQUIREMENTS:

#### LEGAL JURISDICTION:
MENLO PARK, CA

#### ZONING DESIGNATION:
LS-B

#### MAXIMUM HEIGHT:
110 FT + 10 FT FLOOD ZONE

#### FAR MAX (1.25):
228,520 SF

#### COMMERCIAL FAR MAX (0.1):
9,683 SF (0.04 FAR)

### PARKING STANDARDS

#### R&D 1.5 - 2.5 SPACES / 1000 SF

#### AMENITIES 2.5 - 3.3 SPACES / 1000 SF

#### EV STALS
10% OF TOTAL + 5% EV READY

#### BICYCLE:
1 PER 5,000 SF
SHORT TERM: 20% & LONG TERM: 80%

#### REQUIRED:

- SHORT TERM: 9
- LONG TERM: 38

#### TOTAL:
47

**FLOOD ZONE NOTE:** PROJECT TO BE DESIGNED AND CONSTRUCTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT FEMA REGULATIONS AND THE CITY’S FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION ORDINANCE.

### PROJECT SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT SITE AREA:</th>
<th>183,616 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PHASE 1:**
| SITE:             | 123,738 SF |
| (N) 1005 O'BRIEN DR | 154,565 SF (1.25 FAR) |
| (N) COMMERCIAL:   | 9,000 SF (0.04 FAR) |
| (CONFERENCE CENTER) |
| **PHASE 2:**
| SITE:             | 59,878 SF |
| (N) 1320 WILLOW RD | 73,817 SF (1.23 FAR) |

### SUMMARY:

#### R&D AREA:
228,262 SF (1.24 FAR)

#### COMMERCIAL AREA:
9,683 SF (0.04 FAR)

### BUILDING HEIGHTS:

#### LEVEL 1 ELEVATION:
14.8 FT (2FT ABOVE BFE)

### PARKING:

#### CAR:
SEE SHEET A6.1, A6.2 & A13.1 - A13.3

#### BICYCLE:
10% OF TOTAL + 5% EV READY
SHORT TERM: 20% & LONG TERM: 80%

#### REQUIRED:

- SHORT TERM: 9
- LONG TERM: 38

#### TOTAL:
68

### SHOWERS

- 1005 O'BRIEN DR: 6 (PHASE 1)
- 1320 WILLOW RD: 2 (PHASE 2)

#### TOTAL:
8

---

**Flood Zone Note:**

PROJECT TO BE DESIGNED AND CONSTRUCTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT FEMA REGULATIONS AND THE CITY’S FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION ORDINANCE.
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EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS - SITE PHOTOS

1320 WILLOW RD - NW ELEVATION

1001 O'BRIEN DR - SW ELEVATION

985 O'BRIEN DR - S ELEVATION

10 KELLY CT - E ELEVATION

1001 O'BRIEN DR - SE ELEVATION

985 O'BRIEN DR - SE ELEVATION

1320 WILLOW RD - SW ELEVATION

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
985 OBD EXISTING GROSS AREA

10-28-2021 C.U.P. RESPONSE 1
06-23-2021 C.U.P. SUBMITTAL

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

"BLDG TO BE DEMOLISHED"

SCALE: 1/16" = 1' - 0"

985 OBD EXISTING GROSS AREA
EXISTING 1320 WILLOW
TYPE III-B
OCC: S-2/B
GROSS AREA: 50,045 SF
(1-STORY & CATWALK)
HEIGHT: 21.7 FT

TO BE DEMOLISHED AT PHASE 1

TO BE DEMOLISHED AT PHASE 2

1320 WILLOW EXISTING GROSS AREA

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
NOTE: THIS SITE HAS FIBER OPTIC LINES LOCATED ON OR ADJACENT TO IT.
NOTE: THIS SITE HAS FIBER OPTIC LINES LOCATED ON OR ADJACENT TO IT.
9:56
9:56
8#0
8#0
9:56
8#0
9:56

HETCH HETCHY
1005 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
O'BRIEN DRIVE
PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
1340 WILLOW RD}

LEGEND
EXISTING PROPERTY LINE
PROPOSED LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT
SITE COVERAGE
OPEN SPACE
PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

PHASE 1 OPEN SPACE DIAGRAM
985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

SHEET NOTES
PHASE 1
AREA
123,738 SF

SITE COVERAGE:
64,136 SF

OPEN SPACE
REQURED = 24,748 SF (20% OF SITE)
PROVIDED = 33,762 SF (27% OF SITE)

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
REQURED = 12,374 SF (50% OF REQ'D OPEN SPACE)
PROVIDED = 14,574 SF (59% OF REQ'D OPEN SPACE)

© 2020
BIM 360://Tarlton - 1005 OBD/10025002_A_1005OBD_SHELL_2020_Central.rvt

10-28-2021 C.U.P. RESPONSE 1
06-23-2021 C.U.P. SUBMITTAL

C17
Phase 1 + 2

Project Site Area: 183,616 SF

Site Coverage: 82,720 SF (All Structures)

Open Space:
Required = 35,734 SF (20% of Site)
Provided = 54,547 SF (30% of Site)

Public Open Space:
Required = 18,352 SF (50% of Req'd Open Space)
Provided = 24,384 SF (66% of Req'd Open Space)

Phase 2

Area: 59,078 SF

Site Coverage: 21,284 SF

Open Space:
Required = 11,976 SF (20% of Site)
Provided = 20,765 SF (35% of Site)

Public Open Space:
Required = 5,988 SF (50% of Req'd Open Space)
Provided = 9,810 SF (82% of Req'd Open Space)

Site Coverage:

Open Space:

Public Open Space:

Legend:
- Existing Property Line
- Proposed Lot Line Adjustment
- Site Coverage
- Open Space
- Public Open Space
GROSS FLOOR AREA:
- LEVEL 1 R&D AREA: 29,738 SF
- LEVEL 2 R&D AREA: 28,307 SF
- LEVEL 3 R&D AREA: 30,933 SF
- LEVEL 4 R&D AREA: 30,933 SF
- LEVEL 5 R&D AREA: 30,933 SF
- ROOF STAIRS & ELEV.: 1,407 SF
- ROOF CONFERENCE: 1,604 SF
- ROOF STORAGE: 510 SF
- CHEMICAL STG.: 200 SF
- TOTAL: 154,565 SF

OUTDOOR ROOF DECK:
- CIRCULATION: 1,594 SF
- LANDSCAPE: 1,385 SF
- SEATING/OPEN AREA: 999 SF
- TOTAL: 3,978 SF

BUILDING (FAR):
- R&D AREA
- ROOF STARS & ELEVATOR
- CONFERENCE ROOM
- ROOF STORAGE

BUILDING (NOT INCLUDED IN FAR):
- ROOF DECK SEATING
- ROOF DECK CIRCULATION
- ROOF DECK LANDSCAPE
- ROOF (UNOCCUPIED)

SITE SERVICE (FAR):
- MECHANICAL

SHAFTS/OPENINGS

CHEMICAL STORAGE

R&D AREA

ROOF DECK CIRCULATION

ROOF STORAGE

CONFERENCE ROOM

MECHANICAL

SHAFTS/OPENINGS

CHEMICAL STORAGE

1" = 50'-0"
NOISE FROM ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT WILL NOT EXCEED 50 dBA MEASURED AT 50 FT

MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN

MEDICAL SUPPORT POST: 8" OAK, TYP

TRELLIS

MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN AREA

FOOTPRINT 26,850
STAIR TOWERS 1,050

AREA (SF) 1005 O'BRIEN DR
BUILDING 27,412
STAIR TOWERS 3,521
ROOF CONF & STG
AMENITIES 3,417
BUILDING 32
STAIR TOWERS 1,033
ROOF STG
GARAGE
FOOTPRINT 26,850
STAIR TOWERS 1,050

HEIGHT (FT) 87
99
101
34
43
45
49
57
59

TOTAL
1005 O'BRIEN DR
BUILDING 27,412
STAIR TOWERS 3,521
ROOF CONF & STG
AMENITIES 3,417
BUILDING 32
STAIR TOWERS 1,033
ROOF STG
GARAGE
FOOTPRINT 26,850
STAIR TOWERS 1,050

AVERAGE HEIGHT 66.91
AVERAGE HEIGHT MAX 77.5 FT (INC. 10 FT FLOOD ZONE)
* INCLUDES 2 FT RAISED GRADE ABOVE EXISTING GRADE TO ACCOMMODATE FLOOD PLAIN REQUIREMENTS

AVERAGE HEIGHT 66.91
AVERAGE HEIGHT MAX 77.5 FT (INC. 10 FT FLOOD ZONE)
* INCLUDES 2 FT RAISED GRADE ABOVE EXISTING GRADE TO ACCOMMODATE FLOOD PLAIN REQUIREMENTS

MEDICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN AREA

MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN

TRELLIS

*EMPLOYEE USE ONLY*
LEVEL 1 0'
LEVEL 2 17'-0'
LEVEL 3 34'-0'
LEVEL 4 51'-0'
LEVEL 5 68'-0'
ROOF 85'-0'

MECH SCREEN: ALUMINUM PANELS

TRELLIS W/POWER COATED EXTRUDED ALUMINUM LOUVERS

GFRC

BIRD-FRIENDLY, SOLAR BLUE GLAZING

BIRD-FRIENDLY, SPANDREL GLAZING

ROLL-UP DOOR

SOUTH ELEVATION
1" = 30'-0"

WEST ELEVATION
1" = 30'-0"

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

1005 O'BRIEN BUILDING
ELEVATIONS

© 2020 BIM 360://Tarlton - 1005 OBD/10025002_A_1005OBD_SHELL_2020_Central.rvt

4-28-2021 C.U.P. RESPONSE 1
6-23-2021 C.U.P. SUBMITTAL
4-15-2021 D.R.T. REVIEW

10-28-2021 C.U.P. RESPONSE 1
06-23-2021 C.U.P. SUBMITTAL
04-14-2021 B.T. REV002
NOISE FROM ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT WILL NOT EXCEED 50 dBA MEASURED AT 50 FT

AMENITIES - ROOF

3/32" = 1'-0"

1 AMENITIES - ROOF

*EMPLOYEE USE ONLY*

NOISE FROM ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT WILL NOT EXCEED 50 dBA MEASURED AT 50 FT

HEIGHT CALCULATION - PHASE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>HEIGHT (FT)</th>
<th>TOTAL HEIGHT (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1005 O'BRIEN DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>27,412</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>26,850</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE HEIGHT: 66.91
AVERAGE HEIGHT MAX 77.5 FT (INC. 10FT FLOOD ZONE)

*INCLUDES 2FT RAISED GRADE ABOVE EXISTING GRADE TO ACCOMMODATE FLOOD PLAIN REQUIREMENTS

LEGEND

- MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN AREA
- ROOF ACCESS & CIRCULATION
- ROOF TOP TRELLIS

© 2020 BIM 360://Tarlton - 1005 OBD/10025002_A_1005OBD_SHELL_2020_Central.rvt

AMENITIES ROOF & HEIGHT CALCULATION

A10.13

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
LEVEL 1
0'' RAISED GRADE
BIRD-FRIENDLY, SOLAR BLUE GLAZING
METAL PANEL SYSTEM CLADDING ON GFRC

LEVEL 2
16' ROOF
32'-0"
16'-0" T.O. STAIR TOWER
43'-0"

PERFORATED METAL PANEL SYSTEM
METAL PANEL SYSTEM CLADDING ON GFRC
BIRD-FRIENDLY, SPANDREL GLAZING
BIRD-FRIENDLY, SOLAR BLUE GLAZING

MECH SCREEN: ALUMINUM PANELS

GFRC

NOTE:
ALUMINUM FRAMES AT WINDOWS AND DOORS

LEGEND
SOLAR BAN 70, SOLAR BLUE LOW-E GLAZING, WITH A BIRD-FRIENDLY 2'' x 4'' CERAMIC DOT FRIT PATTERN
VITRO SOLAR BAN 70XL, CLEAR LOW-E GLAZING, WITH A BIRD-FRIENDLY 2'' x 4'' CERAMIC DOT FRIT PATTERN
GLASS FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANELS
SAND BLASTED FINISH TBD
GLASS FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANELS
SAND BLASTED FINISH TBD
CORRUGATED ALUMINUM PANELLING
COLOR TBD
NOISE FROM ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT WILL NOT EXCEED 50 dBA MEASURED AT 50 FT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT CALCULATION - PHASE 2</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>HEIGHT (FT)</th>
<th>TOTAL HEIGHT (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1005 O'BRIEN DR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>27,412</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS/ROOF CONF &amp; STG</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS/ROOF STG</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GARAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>26,850</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1320 WILLOW RD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG (NORTH)</td>
<td>10,158</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG (WEST/SOUTH)</td>
<td>7,790</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIR TOWERS / TOWER</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE HEIGHT**

71.30

**AVERAGE HEIGHT MAX 77.5 FT (INC. 10FT FLOOD ZONE)**

*Includes 2ft raised grade above existing grade to accommodate flood plain requirements

**LEGEND**

- MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT / ROOF SCREEN AREA
- ROOF ACCESS & CIRCULATION
- ROOF TOP TRELLIS

*EMPLOYEE USE ONLY*

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

DES ARCHITECTS

A11.5
1320 WILLOW NORTH ELEVATION

1" = 30'-0"

ALUMINUM LOUVERS

BIRD-FRIENDLY, SOLAR BLUE GLAZING

PAINTED METAL AWNING

2' RAISED GRADE

 soir

1320 WILLOW EAST ELEVATION

1" = 30'-0"

ALUMINUM LOUVERS

BIRD-FRIENDLY, SOLAR BLUE GLAZING

PAINTED METAL AWNING

BIRD-FRIENDLY, CLEAR GLAZING

SECONDARY ENTRANCE

DFE 14.6 FT

BFE 12.8 FT

LEVEL 4

LEVEL 3

LEVEL 2

LEVEL 1

T.O. PARAPET

72'-0"

ROOF

BFE

LEVEL 4

LEVEL 3

LEVEL 2

LEVEL 1

T.O. PARAPET

72'-0"

ROOF

LEGEND

SOLAR BAN 70, SOLAR BLUE LOW-E GLAZING, WITH A BIRD-FRIENDLY 2" x 4" CERAMIC DOT FRIT PATTERN

VITRO SOLARBAN 70XL CLEAR LOW-E GLAZING, WITH A BIRD-FRIENDLY 2" x 4" CERAMIC DOT FRIT PATTERN

GLASS FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANELS

SAND BLASTED FINISH TBD

GLASS FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANELS

SAND BLASTED FINISH TBD

CORRUGATED ALUMINUM PANELLING

COLOR TBD

GROUND FLOOR FRONTAGE

1,914 SF

GROUND FLOOR TRANSPARENCY

REQUIRED: 766 SF (40%)

PROVIDED: 939 SF (49%)

PROPOSED GLAZING RATIO

NORTH ELEVATION: 11,000 SF
SOLAR BLUE GLAZING: 3,250 SF (30%)

EAST ELEVATION: 7,200 SF
SOLAR BLUE GLAZING: 2,500 SF (35%)
CLEAR GLAZING: 250 SF (4%)

NOTE:
ALUMINUM FRAMES AT WINDOWS AND DOORS

KEY PLAN

1320 WILLOW NORTH ELEVATION

1320 WILLOW EAST ELEVATION

1320 WILLOW BUILDING ELEVATIONS

A12.1

C58
PHASE 1

1. CONCRETE STRUCTURE: COLOR TO MATCH DUNN EDWARDS FOSSIL

PHASE 2

2. FLEXIBLE METAL MESH: COLOR TO MATCH DUNN EDWARDS FOSSIL

3. FLEXIBLE METAL MESH: COLOR TO MATCH DUNN EDWARDS CHARCOAL SKETCH

4. METAL STRUCTURE: COLOR TO MATCH DUNN EDWARDS CHARCOAL SKETCH

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
PARKING COUNT

PROVIDED AT PHASE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD:</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE (4 LEVELS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV (10%):</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE EV:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV READY (6%):</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN AIR/POOL (8%):</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN AIR/POOL (2%):</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1005 O'BRIEN DR: 332 SPACES

CONFERENCE CENTER: 23 SPACES

PROVIDED AT THE GARAGE, SEE 1005 O'BRIEN DR PARKING COUNT FOR ACCESSIBLE, EV, EV READY CLEAN AIR/POOL.

TOTAL REQUIRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LS ZONING:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; DEVELOPMENT:</td>
<td>341 - 568 (1.5 - 2.5/1,000 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL (CONF. CENTER):</td>
<td>23 - 30 (2.5 - 3.3/1,000 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED V4.1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; DEVELOPMENT:</td>
<td>618 MAX (3.4/1,000 SF - 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENITIES (CONF. CENTER):</td>
<td>27 MAX (3.6/1,000 SF - 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV/ CLEAN AIR SPACES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS ZONING:</td>
<td>10% EVCS, 5% EV READY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALORES:</td>
<td>16% EVCS, 8% CLEAN AIR/POOL/CARPPOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED V4.1:</td>
<td>10% EVCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC2019: ACCESSIBLE EVCS PER TABLE 11B-22B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROVIDED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROVIDED AT PHASE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE (2 LEVELS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD:</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV (10%):</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE EV:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV READY (6%):</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN AIR/POOL (8%):</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN AIR/POOL (2%):</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1320 WILLOW RD: 190 SPACES

KEY PLAN

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

PARKING COUNT & GARAGE SECTION

DES ARCHITECTURE ENGINEERING

A13.1
C68
LEVEL 5 - RAMP (4% CONTINUOUS) - PHASE 1

LEVEL 6 - PARKING ON RAMP (4% CONTINUOUS)

LEVEL 5 - PARKING ON RAMP (4% CONTINUOUS) - PHASE 2

LEVEL 6.5

GARAGE PLANS PHASE 2

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
Plan View

- Concrete slab to hold 60,000 pounds
- 6" concrete curb or rubber bumper at internal perimeter

South Elevation

- Open above gates on casters
- 1/4" x 1/8" long cane bolt, painted
- 1/2" x 1/8" long x 1/4" pipe sleeve set in concrete

West Elevation

- Coil coated corrugated metal roof panels
- Painted HSS post
- Coil coated Alu. cap (sloped), attach to retainer clips each side
- Painted CMU wall
- Coil coated corrugated metal roof panels
- Painted HSS post

East Elevation

- Open above gates on casters
- 1/4" x 1/8" long cane bolt, painted
- 1/2" x 1/8" long x 1/4" pipe sleeve set in concrete

North Elevation

- Coil coated corrugated metal roof panels
- Painted HSS post
- Coil coated Alu. cap (sloped), attach to retainer clips each side
- Painted CMU wall
- Coil coated corrugated metal roof panels
- Painted HSS post
### TREE INVENTORY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE/\TRE NO</th>
<th>TREE NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>REGULATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>C77</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mistletoe (Prune - Medium)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mistletoe (Prune - Medium)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mistletoe (Prune - Medium)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mistletoe (Prune - Medium)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXISTING TREE DISPOSITION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE/\TRE NO</th>
<th>TREE NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>REGULATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mistletoe</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mistletoe</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mistletoe</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oak (Prescribed - Medium)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oak (Prescribed - Medium)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oak (Prescribed - Medium)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. **EXISTS** FROM PRIOR SURVEY ON FILE 03/22/2021
2. **ALL TREES IN EXISTENCE TO BE REMOVED**
3. **TREE #111: 10-28-2021**

---

**TARLTON**
985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

---

**EXISTING TREE DISPOSITION TABLE**

**L1.2**
SHEET NOTES:
1. DIRECT RUNOFF FROM UNCOVERED PARKING AREAS AND/OR DRIVeways ONTO
   VEGETATED AREAS.
2. MINIMIZE IMPERVIOUS SURFACES.
3. PROVIDE SELF-TEARING AREAS.
4. PRELIMINARY DESIGN IS BASED ON THE SIMPLIFIED APPROACH OR FLOW-BASED
   DESIGN APPROACH IN WHICH THE SURFACE AREA OF THE TREATMENT MEASURE IS
   DESIGNED TO BE 4% OF THE IMPERVIOUS AREA TO BE TREATED.

LEGEND:
- PROPOSED STORMWATER DRAINAGE AREA BOUNDARY
- RETENTION BASIN
- SELF-TREATING AREA

ABBREVIATIONS:
- SWDA  STORMWATER DRAINAGE AREA
- SWTM  STORMWATER TREATMENT MEASURE

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT TREATMENT MEASURE SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAINAGE AREA</th>
<th>STORMWATER TREATMENT MEASURE</th>
<th>TREATMENT MEASURE DESIGNATION</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>IMPERVIOUS AREA (SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>TREATMENT AREA REQUIRED (SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>TREATMENT AREA PROVIDED (SQ. FT.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDA 1</td>
<td>RETENTION AREA</td>
<td>SWDA 1</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>11102</td>
<td>4440</td>
<td>4440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDA 2</td>
<td>SELF-TREATING AREA</td>
<td>SWTM 2</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR  
1320 WILLOW RD  
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LEGEND
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA
- EXISTING PERVIOUS AREA

IMPERVIOUS/PERVIOUS AREA SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERVIOUS AREA (SQ. FT.)</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS AREA (SQ. FT.)</td>
<td>137168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AREA (SQ. FT.)</td>
<td>138426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE: 1” = 50’-0”

985 & 1001 O’BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

PHASE 1 OVERALL EXISTING PERVIOUS/IMPERVIOUS AREA
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LEGEND
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA
- PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA
- PROPOSED PERVIOUS AREA

IMPERVIOUS/PERVIOUS AREA SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pervious Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>27400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>11026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>139426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE: 1" = 50'-0"
Sheets Notes:

1. Sheet range from uncovered parking areas and/or driveways into vegetated areas.
3. Provide self-treating areas.
4. Preliminary sizing is based on the simplified approach or flow-based sizing approach in which the surface area of the treatment measure is designed to be 4% of the impervious area to be treated.

Legend:

- Proposed stormwater drainage area boundary
- Detention basin
- Self treating area

Abbreviations:

SWDA: Stormwater Drainage Area
SWM: Stormwater Treatment Measure

Stormwater Management Treatment Measure Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage Area</th>
<th>Stormwater Treatment Measure</th>
<th>Treatment Measure Designation</th>
<th>Total Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Impervious Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Detention Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Treatment Area Required (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Treatment Area Provided (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDA 1</td>
<td>DETENTION AREA</td>
<td>SWM 1</td>
<td>13432</td>
<td>11542</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDA 2</td>
<td>DETENTION AREA</td>
<td>SWM 2</td>
<td>26635</td>
<td>23465</td>
<td>3179</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDA 3</td>
<td>DETENTION AREA</td>
<td>SWM 3</td>
<td>19223</td>
<td>18177</td>
<td>10446</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

985 & 1001 O'BRIEN DR
1320 WILLOW RD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
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NOTE:
SEE SHEET C2.1 FOR PROPOSED GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN.

SECTION A TO A: NORTH TO SOUTH
HORIZ. SCALE: 1'-80", VERT. SCALE: 1'-10"
Additional Comments Received after Staff Report Publication
February 14, 2022

Planning Commission of the City of Menlo Park
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Re: Community Meeting Space at 1005 O’Brien Drive/1320 Willow Road Project

Members of the Planning Commission:

We are pleased to have the opportunity to present a new state of the art research and development facility proposed for 1005 O’Brien Drive and 1320 Willow Road in the City’s Life Science (“LS”) District (“Project”) at February 14th’s Planning Commission meeting. We are writing this additional letter to the Commission in advance of that meeting to clarify the description and use of the “Community Meeting Space” building proposed for the Project.

As the Commissioners know, the LS-B District Code allows properties to be developed with up to 125% FAR for primary research and development (“R&D”) space with bonus-level development. The Code also allows properties the option of adding to that primary use with 10% FAR for commercial uses, which are any uses allowed in the LS District other than office, light industrial, or R&D. (MPMC § 16.44.050.) We have been asked in the past to think about how development in the District will bring in the surrounding community, and make connections with surrounding neighbors. To this end, Tarlton Properties has met with members of the surrounding community to determine what needs they see as unmet by existing and proposed development in the area.

What we have repeatedly heard is the need for well-designed, inviting meeting spaces for community groups, civic organizations, advocacy groups, and other non-profits. And that the community meeting spaces should have adequate parking and be within walking distance of neighboring residential communities like Belle Haven.

Based on this input, Tarlton redesigned the Project to include a 9,600 square foot building dedicated to free meeting spaces for community groups that would have ample parking, be walkable from Belle Haven, and most importantly be open to the public. DES architects designed publicly accessible open space on the property to not only aggregate with other proposed open space in the area (another request from the community), but so that open space would draw the public from Willow Road and O’Brien Drive onto the property and to a facility with meeting spaces, catering area, and indoor-outdoor opportunities. Tarlton has already identified several non-profit and community groups, including Mid-Peninsula High School and Eternal Life Church, as users of the building for meetings, church group activities, and after-school activities, and is confident from outreach that many more will use the space.

We agree with planning staff that conference rooms and centers that serve only the property tenants but exclude the public are an extension of R&D and office use. We have proposed those spaces in other projects and have included them in the calculation of R&D square footage. But that is not the case with this building - this space is designed to serve a need that the surrounding community has
identified – well-designed, free, attractive meeting space that serves as a gathering place for community groups from the surrounding neighborhood. District employers (including tenants on the property) who want access to this space would be able to – as stated in the staff report - but only in the same way that any other group would – by making a reservation through an easily accessible web portal.

Community Meeting Space does not have a defined use category under the City’s Zoning Ordinance. It is therefore at the discretion of the Planning Commission to determine whether this use is similar in character to the uses enumerated in the District. The factors that govern the Commission’s consideration are (1) the effect on the public’s health, safety, and welfare; (2) effect on traffic conditions; and (3) effect on orderly development of the District and City at large. (MPMC § 16.02.050.) We suggest that this use is unlike office or R&D uses, which operates to the exclusion of the public from buildings and the property, which serves only specific tenants, and which generates traffic primarily during peak commute hours.

Instead, under the considerations listed in the Code, this use is more similar to enumerated commercial uses in the District, such as private recreation, private schools and churches, services, or community education/training - the common thread of which is to bring the public onto the property, at any reasonable hours, in order to meet or recreate. Considering the factors listed in Section 16.02.050:

1. Effect on the public’s health, safety, and welfare: The Community Meeting Space would have no direct or indirect negative impact on public health, safety, or welfare. The Community Meeting Space would provide safe and accessible space for community groups to gather.

2. Effect on traffic conditions: The Community Meeting Space is within walking distance and close to Belle Haven residences, and therefore would reduce the distance (VMT) people need to drive to meetings. Primary public use would be outside of commute hours and would not add significantly to peak hour delay.

3. Effect on orderly development of the District and City at large: The building fits with all development regulations and standards and is surrounded by publicly accessible open space and landscaping. The Community Meeting Space is connected to existing and proposed development through sidewalks and pedestrian walkways. Ample parking is provided, with a direct pedestrian connection from the parking structure to the building.

This Community Meeting Space is separate from and in addition to the community amenities that the Project will provide to the City under the code for Bonus level development. As a need identified by the community that Tarlton would like to include the community meeting space building in its Project. We look forward to the input of the Planning Commission on how best to meet this identified need, and are happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

Sincerely,

John C. Tarlton
President & CEO
Tarlton Properties, Inc.