

**City Council
Sense Minutes
February 13, 2012**

EXCERPT

PUBLIC HEARING: Initiation of: (1) a Zone Change from CC-L (Community Commercial with a Landscape Combining District) to PF-D (Public Facility with a Site and Design Combining District) and (2) a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Streamside Open Space to Major Institution / Special Facilities, for the Ronald McDonald House at 50 El Camino Real/520 Sand Hill Road.

Mayor Yeh advised he would not be participating in this Item as his wife was a Stanford University student.

Council Member Klein advised he would not be participating in this Item as his wife was a Stanford University faculty member.

Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams indicated Amy French would make the presentation, and noted Russ Reich, Project Manager was present.

Planning Manager, Amy French reported Staff requested the Council initiate requests for rezoning and Comprehensive Plan re-designation to support the expansion of the existing 47-room Ronald McDonald House at 520 Sand Hill Road, adjacent to this site. She stated the proposal was for the same zoning and land use designation as the current Ronald McDonald House, established in 1979 via a CUP approval. She indicated the Ronald McDonald House was associated with Lucille Packard Children's Hospital and provided services to young patients and their families during treatment. She noted representatives from the Ronald McDonald House were present. She said the 1.7-acre site was owned by Stanford University, and was to be created by a proposed lease-line boundary. She reported the site was significantly vegetated with oaks and eucalyptus, and an existing pedestrian bike path wound through the property roughly parallel with Sand Hill Road. She reported the site's current zoning was Community Commercial with a Landscaped Combining District, and proposed zoning was Public Facility with a Site and Design Combining District. She noted the existing Comprehensive Plan designation was stream-side, open space; and the proposed designation was Major Institution, Special Facilities. She stated following initiation the applicant would submit an application for Site and Design Permit Review and CUP. She explained the Planning and Transportation Commission would review the applications and the Environmental Review document prior to final Council action on the rezoning and Comprehensive Plan designation, as well as the CUP and Site and Design Review. She indicated the Architectural Review Board would review the site and building design. She reported the proposed building was

approximately 46,000 square foot; the applicant would share the plans; the building would provide approximately 68 new rooms and 79 parking spaces; and the new building would be approximately 1 foot taller than the existing Ronald McDonald House building. She said the building would not impinge upon the San Francisquito Creek stability area, as the proposed lease-line boundary was outside of the streamside slope protection area. She indicated the building as shown in concept plans was approximately 70 feet from Sand Hill Road, significantly beyond the site's 24-foot special setback along Sand Hill Road. She said the current sidewalk would be moved closer to Sand Hill Road; and trees would be relocated or removed to accommodate the new building and surface parking area; the existing signalized intersection at Sand Hill Road and London Plane Way would provide access to the project driveway. She indicated a traffic impact analysis would be prepared to ensure no adverse impacts from traffic or parking; and the analysis of the project's consistency with Comprehensive Plan Policies, Site and Design Review, CUP findings, and Environmental Review would be presented to the Planning and Transportation Commission for review and recommendation to Council.

Honey Meir-Levi, from the Barron Park Neighborhood, stated she would explain the genesis of the project, and then the architect would provide a detailed review of the architectural picture and the site plan analysis. She explained Ronald McDonald House was the community's home-away-home for critically ill children and their families. She reported over 90 percent of the young residents were facing a life-threatening illness; and their parents and families were facing financial impacts and the need to disrupt their family lives to find the advanced medical treatment their child needed. She commented they were seeing the demand for extended care grow due to the amazing medical advances of recent years. She noted the average length of stay was six nights in 2003 and 24 nights in 2011, with stays lasting one and two nights to a year or more. She remarked the needs of longer-term families were quite different from families who stayed six nights. She stated the House expansion, while meeting the specialized needs of these families, was also meeting the needs of the community as the Lucille Packard Children's Hospital expansion would increase the need for services. She indicated the greatest impact by far was the change in medicine. She reported they were seeing sick children who needed longer stays with much higher degrees of disruption to their families. She said previously only parents stayed at the House while their children stayed in the hospital; today children, their siblings and parents stay at the House for many months. She explained the wait list expanded six years ago to the point that an expansion was necessary; therefore, they began the process of evaluating and planning for growth. She stated the wait list had continued to grow from 15 to 20 families to 30 to 40 families a night being turned away to hotels and waiting rooms. She indicated growing demand and needs determined expansion was critical to provide housing for desperately ill kids and their families. Not only was Ronald McDonald House the best equipped to support the families and assist them, but also instrumental in mitigating the impact of these families on the community. She noted the House provided a shuttle service to and from the hospital, marketing, and clothing shopping. She explained families arrived at Ronald McDonald House in May only to realize in October they would need winter clothing, and they were there to respond to those needs. She reported the House, using its own minivans and volunteers, kept families safe, healthy and off the roads; provided a trusted

environment where doctors could release their patients early, freeing up beds for another ill child; and partnered with the hospital to enrich the families' experience and hold the family safe during this transition. She explained the current and planned facilities were specifically designed to bring together families; offer them privacy; offer them an extremely high level of cleanliness that their immunosuppressed children needed; and to support them through their tumultuous stay. She presented photos of the current building, the "pollywog" down to El Camino Real, and the building site. She noted it was a well-conceived building that tied into the current site. She reported the expansion would save \$1 million a year in annual operating costs over the cost on a per-room basis of the current building, due to economies of scale. She indicated the expansion was an exceedingly efficient use of land with communal kitchens, communal dining rooms, play rooms, playgrounds, minimal office space, and entire housing pods which could be converted into immunosuppressed wings. She said hard work was going to trip abatement, because so many families were unable to bring cars due to financial constraints.

Wei Wen Shau, Architect for Ronald McDonald House, presented a design solution for the needed expansion for the House. An aerial photograph indicated the most appropriate if not the best expansion of the house. He stated the proposed design continued the beauty and line from the existing House along Sand Hill Road to the London Plane Way to form a sense of urban street enclosures. He indicated both sides of Sand Hill Road would extend to a shopping center to the east. He noted there would be many functional spaces and a shared program between the new and existing facility. He said his first design concept would be to form a circulation spine, which would link both facilities through a so-called activities tree created by adjoining an existing outdoor meditation garden located under a large oak tree. He commented that the concept should drive the design, and attempt to create a sense of community among guest families, as similar to a home setting as possible. He explained the proposed expansion would be designed with the same architectural features and vocabulary as the existing building with wood-frame construction on a concrete foundation. He believed this project would be a positive contribution to the community while adding interest to the skyline of the City.

Council Member Espinosa asked Staff to discuss zoning and possible uses for the property down to El Camino Real.

Senior Planner, Russ Reich asked if his question was possible future uses for the rest of the parcel or the part being rezoned.

Council Member Espinosa replied no.

Mr. Reich reported the current zoning was Community Commercial.

Council Member Espinosa inquired if that zoning applied all the way down to El Camino Real.

Mr. Reich responded yes, but it had a landscape overlay.

Council Member Espinosa asked what the required setback from San Francisquito was; if it became so narrow that there was a possibility of development closer to El Camino Real.

Mr. Reich indicated there was a 50-foot streamside bank stabilization area that came from the top of the bank. He stated Staff had not reviewed that question to determine how narrow the property became at that end. He reported there was a special 24-foot setback from Sand Hill. He said the property became narrow at that point and there wasn't a lot of opportunity for development.

Council Member Espinosa stated there was a likelihood of development at least partway. He thought lots from the curve on probably would not allow development. He understood this project was addressing a backlog, but was trying to understand the increased need that came with the additional growth of Children's Hospital. He inquired whether this project would address anticipated need or current overcapacity.

Ms. Meir-Levi responded they had partnered with Children's Hospital to bring in a medical strategic planning consulting firm. It was their considered opinion that, including the Children's Hospital's expansion, the Ronald McDonald House expansion should add between 65 and 70 rooms. She stated the House expansion planned for 68 rooms.

Council Member Espinosa referenced correspondence from a member of the public raising concerns about the process and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). He asked for the City Attorney's feedback on the appropriateness of tonight's discussion.

City Attorney, Molly Stump stated the process was appropriate in that the Council could initiate. It was one of the ways that these types of projects could move forward under City Ordinances. She stated CEQA would flow from the Council's decision. She had reviewed the comment and understood the commenter's perspective, but did not believe there was a problem.

Council Member Espinosa expressed concerns with families crossing San Antonio to reach the mall and hospital. He asked if there had been discussions, among Staff or with the applicant, regarding crossing improvements, especially for people with disabilities, at the previous and proposed sites. He knew the City was trying out new technology for accessibility at crossings.

Mr. Williams reported Staff was aware of those issues at those intersections and had alerted the Transportation Department, but had not studied that. He indicated they would study it as part of the circulation network with the project as it moved forward.

Public Hearing opened at 10:22 P.M.

Kate Yablonsky stated she was a social worker for the bone marrow transplant team at Lucille Packard Children's Hospital, and was present to offer her wholehearted support for the proposed expansion of the Ronald McDonald House. She hoped to convey the urgency and desperation of the need for more capacity at the Ronald McDonald House. She noted Lucille Packard Children's Hospital funds provided to assist families with the cost of hotels was quickly dwindling as it was close to the end of the month. Even with the discounts, the cost of local hotels was prohibitively expensive for more than one or two nights. She indicated she had been at Packard for over four years, and Ronald McDonald House had always been a scarce and precious resource.

Gloria Ramos introduced herself and her daughter, Ariana Ramos, who was 13 years old and had undergone a kidney transplant. She stated they were currently staying at the Ronald McDonald House, and had tried to stay at the Ronald McDonald House while locating a donor; however, the Ronald McDonald House and nearby hotels were full. She reported they stayed in a hotel quite a distance from the hospital which they could afford. She said they had stayed at three different hotels before and after the transplant, and at the Ronald McDonald House for three weeks. She explained Ariana caught an infection and they had to move from the Ronald McDonald House, which was absolutely crushing. She said the Ronald McDonald House was phenomenal in providing opportunities for families to meet and share stories. She noted organizations provided meals for families staying there. The House had a computer room, weight room and activities for children. She explained the Ronald McDonald House and its Staff was a tremendous help and alleviated a lot of stress and frustration.

Ariana Ramos said the Ronald McDonald House provided activities for kids such as the click room and the Riley pets. She stated people provided lunch and dinner, and the House had shuttles and cares for trips to the hospital and shopping.

Gloria Ramos added an additional benefit was walking to the hospital.

Bri Carpano-Seoane reported she was the Family Services Director at the House, where she and her team provided services to the families and served the families daily. She explained when a family stayed at the House for six days, services such as massage therapy and scrapbooking seem sweet and nice; and when that stay is beyond six days or 20 days, the opportunity to provide community became a necessity. She stated what the House provided could not be duplicated in a hotel, nor in a sleep space shared with strangers. She said it was the opportunity to provide families with the services needed so they could focus on their children's well-being.

Mike Baird stated he was a CPA with an office on Park Boulevard and a volunteer. He explained the click room mentioned earlier was a computer room for kids. He reported the House created a playroom and other areas for children to be involved in other interests. He noted it was amazing to see whole families engage in conversations with distant family members through Skype. He reported Ronald McDonald was affordable housing and was world-class healthcare. He stated the number one discussion and debate in America was quality healthcare and affordability, and Ronald McDonald House represented quality healthcare and affordability.

Bern Beecham stated he was present as a Board Member of the Ronald McDonald House Board and as a volunteer at the front desk every week. He referenced prior discussion of families turned away and Children's Hospital's future growth. He explained one of his tasks as a volunteer was to call families turned away, which was difficult. He indicated the Ronald McDonald House had negotiated rates with a few hotels; however, as the economy slowly improved the number of hotel rooms was decreasing. He knew families couldn't afford even the discounted rates at hotels. He noted the Ronald McDonald House charged \$10 per night, but didn't turn away anyone who couldn't pay. He said the need was there for expansion and for the families served. He noted the Council had many decisions to make based on the facts of the issue and on how the proposal fit into zoning requirements. With regard to intersections and crossings, he noted the Ronald McDonald House provided shuttles to the hospital and shopping, and made it possible for families not to travel throughout Palo Alto, which was a benefit to the community overall. He looked forward to the Council approving the Staff Recommendation.

Christopher Dawes felt he couldn't add much to the good comments previously made. He appreciated the support behind the hospital renewal project. He noted the construction was well underway and Council Members would receive an invitation to the official groundbreaking in the fall. He stated it was scheduled to open for patient care in December 2016. He thought the project was very important to the hospital, patients and entire community; and was a great resource which would be utilized and valued. He strongly urged the Council to support the project.

Herb Borock commented two contradictory events were happening concurrently. First Staff's recommendation was to initiate a rezoning. Under that Agenda Item, he stated the Council couldn't rezone based on what a project might be or the kinds of information presented this evening. Second, he said the Council had treated this Item as if an applicant had applied for rezoning rather than a recommendation from Staff for rezoning. He noted Vice Mayor Scharff had given the applicant an opening statement of 10 minutes and Council Member Espinosa had asked a question of the applicant; however, there was no applicant on this Agenda Item. He explained there was a project that had been segmented into two parts: one part occurring tonight, and the other was the future Sight and Design Review and CUP. He noted there would then be an Environmental Review for the Council's action and for the applicant's action. He stated the only justification in the Staff Report was that the process would give the Ronald McDonald House the feasibility of moving quickly in order to avoid the need to commit resources to purchase other sites. He stated this was not moving forward quickly. He indicated the Ronald McDonald House had filed an application for rezoning on October 27 and paid fees; however, the application did not include the fees for an Environmental Assessment, a CUP, or the Architectural Review. He thought Staff should have told them they needed a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and suggested a Site and Design Review, at which point the Ronald McDonald House could have completed the application. He stated they would have already had the hearings before the Planning and Transportation Commission, the Architectural Review Board, and possibly the City Council. He didn't think the main issue was not paying fees because the Council initiated the zoning. He

thought they and Staff wanted to believe the Council's action tonight would approve the project before there was an Environmental Review or application. He believed it was a bad idea and the Council should provide clear direction to Staff that this was not the kind of report the Council should receive.

Public Hearing closed at 10:42 P.M.

Mr. Williams stated the Code was clear that a zoning change could be initiated by the City Council, by the Planning and Transportation Commission or by the applicant. He indicated the applicant had made application to the City in this case, and Staff felt it was appropriate to initiate that through the Council, because of the nature of the request, the public good being presented by this applicant, and prior discussions of alternative sites. Staff thought it was important to receive initial feedback to provide the applicant. He reported the Code was not clear regarding the initiation process, but was very clear about the zoning process proceeding through the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) and then to the City Council. Staff felt it was within the parameters and intent of the Code to come before the Council for initiation of this application. Staff did advise the applicant that a Comprehensive Plan Amendment would be necessary, and indicated the Site and Design issue was a Staff recommendation. He indicated the applicant would want to obtain the whole package, including rezoning and Site and Design, because that was needed for action by the Council. He noted Site and Design would be performed when the Environmental Review was performed. He stated the Council and P&TC would have the whole package of Environmental Review, Site and Design, zoning change and Comprehensive Plan when the project was next presented.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to accept Staff recommendation to initiate the rezone request from Community Commercial with a Landscape Combining District (CC(L)) to Public Facility with a Site and Design Combining District (PF(D)) and initiate the request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Streamside Open Space to Major Institution/Special Facilities for 50 El Camino Real.

Council Member Price believed the Staff Report was clear in its presentation. She appreciated the applicant's and public's comments. She stated it was clear from the presentation that an expansion of Ronald McDonald House was necessary and overdue to meet the increasing needs for extended services for critically ill children and their families. She said it was important that children and families in these circumstances have easy access to advanced medical treatment and to support. She indicated the Site Plan and Architecture and Design were well articulated and compatible with the existing building and site characteristics. She was sure there would be additional comments regarding the details of the design, but she was impressed and thought it would be a wonderful project. She commended the relationship between the outdoor space and the building. She stated it was wrenching and moving to hear these stories and experiences, and she could only imagine the extreme stress these families suffered in these circumstances. She explained this project and the details before the Council clearly illustrated the success, warmth and compassion of the program designed to meet the extreme needs of ill children and their

families. She felt it was an impressive program, and Palo Alto was fortunate to have the program in the community. She said it provided hope and a caring environment and created a future for children and their families. She was pleased to make the Motion and stated it was an exciting opportunity to move forward.

Council Member Burt concurred with Council Member Price's statements. For those concerned about additional development within the community, he stated this project would likely demonstrate a net negative trip impact as people would be walking and taking a shuttle rather than driving. He felt it was an exceptional service, and it was important to recognize that. He said Ronald McDonald House was supported by volunteers and donors within the community and elsewhere as a basis of shared values. He thought taking this initiative to help support the Ronald McDonald House was the least the City could do, thought the Council wholeheartedly supported the Ronald McDonald House efforts and he looked forward to the task ahead and the services to be provided.

Council Member Espinosa thanked everyone for attending. He was excited by the project and glad the site had worked out. He commented the proximity of housing to the hospital was important to the healing that takes place. He stated the Council was not approving a project tonight, was not usurping a process. He was glad the Council was able to publicly acknowledge that it was excited to identify this site which was perfect for the Ronald McDonald House.

Council Member Shepherd thanked the Ronald McDonald House supporters for sitting through a long meeting. She stated the stories touched her heart and reminded her of tours of Stanford Hospital and Children's Hospital. She felt Stanford had an ability to create community and it was felt in the hallways of the hospital. She indicated it was a very busy place and yet a very kind and exciting place to be. She was grateful this particular site was so close to Palo Alto and available to Palo Alto's. She explained having this accommodation was an appropriate use of this particular property at this particular site. She didn't take it lightly that the Council was moving property into the zoning category Public Facility, as it was intended for the highest and best use of the community. She couldn't think of a better or higher use for this site.

Council Member Schmid was delighted to participate in the initiation of this project, and looked forward to the detailed review by the Planning and Transportation Commission, Architectural Review Board and the Environmental Review.

Vice Mayor Scharff found the applicant's and former Mayor Beecham's stories moving. He stated it was a fantastic community asset and appreciated their work.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0 Klein, Yeh not participating, Holman Absent

1 **50 El Camino Real**: Request by Huiwen Hsiao on behalf of The Board of Trustees of the
2 Leland Stanford Junior University for a Rezone of a 1.57-acre site from Community
3 Commercial with a Landscape Combining District (CC(L)) to Public Facility with a Site
4 and Design Combining District (PF(D)), an amendment to the site's Comprehensive Plan
5 Land Use Designation from Streamside Open Space to Major Institution/Special
6 Facilities, Site and Design review and a Conditional Use Permit amendment for a
7 proposed 70 room, three story, 51,948 square foot building for an expansion to the
8 existing Ronald McDonald House program, and Approval of a Mitigated Negative
9 Declaration for the property located at 50 El Camino Real.

10
11 Chair Martinez: Ok we are going to move to item, which was previously item one now two,
12 which is a site and design review of 50 El Camino Real, the expansion of the Ronald McDonald
13 House. And we shall begin with a staff report.

14
15 Russ Reich, Senior Planner: Good evening. Thank you Chair Martinez and Commissioners. The
16 application before you this evening is for the expansion of the existing Ronald McDonald House
17 facility. The proposal includes the following: a zone change request from Community
18 Commercial with Landscape Combining District to Public Facility with a Site and Design
19 Combining District; a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation amendment from Streamside
20 Open Space to Major Institution/Special Facilities; a Site and Design for a proposed new
21 building with three stories, 42 feet tall, 52,000 square feet, 70 guest rooms, and 69 parking
22 spaces; and a Conditional Use Permit for the proposed hospital accessory use. Another aspect of
23 the proposal not included here would be a lot line adjustment to incorporate the area delineated
24 in the plans into the existing Ronald McDonald House site through a lot line adjustment so they
25 become one parcel.

26
27 Chair Martinez had asked me to provide the public and the Commission just with some kind of
28 clarity and a definition of the description of the different zoning designations and Comp Plan
29 Land Use definitions. So the Community Commercial zoning designations intended to create
30 and maintain major commercial centers accommodating a broad range of commercial uses of
31 community wide or regional significance. The Landscape Combining District is intended to
32 provide landscape open space as a separation between commercial and residential uses. The
33 proposed Public Facilities zone district is intended to accommodate governmental, public utility,
34 educational, and community services or recreational facilities. The Site and Design Combining
35 District is intended to provide process for review of development in environmentally sensitive
36 areas including established community areas which may be sensitive to negative aesthetic factor,
37 excessive noise, increased traffic, or other disruptions in order to assure that the use and
38 development will be harmonious with other uses in the general vicinity will be compatible with
39 the environmental and ecological objectives and will be in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

40
41 The land use designations Streamside Open Space is defined as a corridor by pairing vegetation
42 along natural streams ranging from 80 to 310 feet wide. And the Major Institution/Special
43 Facilities land use designation is defined as uses that are institutional, academic, governmental,
44 and community service uses and lands that are either publicly owned or operated as nonprofit
45 organizations. And examples include hospitals and City facilities.

46
47 A little history, the City Council initiated the rezone application back in February of this year
48 and then the application, the Applicant went through a preliminary architectural review in July of

1 this year and their comments are provided in your staff report. There were some public
2 comments at the initial City Council hearing. Relatively all of them were positive in relationship
3 to the proposed project and there was one member of the public who felt the application was
4 incomplete. In terms of any other public comments there was one phone call from a resident in
5 Menlo Park who had concerns about potentially viewing the building. So we've actually worked
6 with the applicant to take steps to transplant some of the trees that would have otherwise been
7 removed from the site to the area between the building and the creek providing additional
8 screening back there.

9
10 Really the tree impacts are the only significant impacts identified for the project. There's 91
11 trees on the site 70 of which are proposed to be removed. Only 14 of these trees are protected by
12 City ordinance, but under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review to remove
13 an ordinance protected tree would be a potentially significant impact. And so there's a series of
14 mitigations proposed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to address the tree removal
15 issue. So 14 of those protected trees 7 of them would be removed and 4 of those 7, excuse me 3
16 of those 7 would actually be transplanted. So we're really only losing 4 of the code protected
17 Oak trees.

18
19 Another mitigation measure to note was that this area is an area of high sensitivity related to
20 potential archeological remains. And so there is a condition of approval to do a mitigation
21 measure to do further testing to ensure that whether or not there are archeological remains and
22 whether further measures will be needed in order to preserve those. With that I will go ahead
23 and finish and let the applicant do their presentation. Thank you.

24
25 Chair Martinez: Thank you. Let's hear from the applicant. You will have 15 minutes for your
26 presentation.

27
28 Laura Boudreau, Chief Operating Officer Ronald McDonald House: Good evening, I'm Laura
29 Boudreau and I am the Chief Operating Officer at the Ronald McDonald House at Stanford.
30 Great, thank you. And I want to thank you for taking the time to talk with us a little bit about our
31 expansion plans, but before we get into the details I want to give you a little bit of background on
32 the organization and why the need is so critical for this expansion.

33
34 For more than 30 years the Ronald McDonald House at Stanford has been providing a home
35 away from home for the families of critically ill children who are being treated at the wonderful
36 Lucile Packard Children's Hospital. Everything about the house is really geared towards the
37 whole family. It's a place where parents and siblings and often the patients themselves can stay
38 together during treatment and recovery. The house is really designed to build a sense of
39 community among the families. We have very modest sleeping rooms, but we have these
40 wonderful communal spaces where people can come together for meals, family activities, and
41 it's a place where people bond with other families and really create lifelong bonds. The house
42 also helps ease financial concerns for families. We ask for \$10 a night to stay at the house and
43 we never turn anyone away for an inability to pay.

44
45 In our 30 year history we've expanded twice already to keep up with the growing demand. And
46 with the advances in medical science and with the reputation of Packard and with their upcoming
47 expansion we're currently seeing an unprecedented demand for services. Ten years ago the
48 average length of stay at the house was 6 days. It is now 29. What that means is we have fewer
49 rooms that turnover. We are currently turning away 40 to 50 families every night from Ronald

1 McDonald House. In fact, we recently hit an all-time high of 67 families on our waiting list. I
2 think you would find that the hospital social workers, the doctors, the families all agree that the
3 Ronald McDonald House is where they need to be. So on behalf of the 67 families on the
4 waiting list we want to thank you for taking the time to discuss this project with us. And right
5 now I want to turn it over to Gregg Davis to talk about the details.

6
7 Gregg Davis, Board of Directors Member Ronald McDonald House: Thank you Laura, thank
8 you Commissioners. My name is Gregg Davis; I am the Member of the Board of Directors for
9 the Ronald McDonald House at Stanford. I'm also the Chairperson for the Building Committee
10 and I was heavily involved in the first expansion back in 2002 so many of these issues are very
11 familiar to me as well.

12
13 Let's see, which one of these. So many of you are already familiar with the site and the area and
14 I believe staff has done a great job of rounding out the project and what it consists of. So the
15 area we're speaking of is the area adjacent to our existing house. The red indicates the lot line
16 adjustment that we are requesting to make that one large parcel for the house and the zoning
17 change. The next slide shows you approximately where the house is proposed to be built. The
18 shape and size are all in respect to the trees in the area as well as the creek setback and the
19 neighbors in Menlo Park adjacent and close proximity to the existing house as possible.
20 Obviously the dream or the best scenario would be to have the houses connected in some way,
21 but it is physically impossible out of respect for the site and the trees to accomplish that. So we
22 are doing our best to mitigate and have a happy medium between the two houses being adjacent
23 to each other.

24
25 This is the rendering of the current site and where it sits and then the new house is going to be
26 tucked closer up and to Sand Hill respect the creek setback. Clearly the existing house is not
27 within the creek setback and cannot be touched or mitigated, which was the same case in 2002.
28 So we're bringing the whole structure forward to the house.

29
30 The trees I think are extremely important which Mr. Reich has commented on. We are adding
31 trees per the plan. We have taken steps in addition to the staff report that already occurred. We
32 have changed our plans to save trees 53 and 35. I believe that's comment D4. So we have
33 altered the bike path to make it a little more meandering. We have narrowed the driveway to the
34 minimum of 20 feet in front of the spaces there and done that to accommodate saving two more
35 additional trees that are on the list to be saved. And I believe this is showing you here really how
36 green and how blocked the house will be and how the greenery and the trees surrounding it are
37 going to be planted back through and some of these of course are new and some are existing
38 trees. These are just the standard tree protection plans which we'll be taking of course to protect
39 all of the heritage trees and so on which you are very familiar with.

40
41 I wanted to give you a perspective, I know the bike path and the trees have always been a big
42 concern. It is being maintained and will continue to be a class one bike path. The bike path this
43 is the perspective of what it looks like now standing right about London plane facing toward the
44 bike path. And when the house is there this is the view and then we were adding the additional
45 trees here to continue the greenery and allow the bike path to meander through the trees and
46 continue on with just the one breakage in London plane.

47
48 The preliminary Architectural Review Board (ARB) there was a driveway at the side of the
49 building that led to, allowed us to have the wider width to get to the underground parking garage.

1 We removed this driveway completely. This saved an additional tree as well as allowed us to
2 narrow that driveway significantly to allow the trees to be saved.

3
4 It is important in our minds that the houses be connected at least through this narrow driveway
5 because most of our families are transported by shuttle. I think that's very important. Very few
6 families have vehicles at the house. If they do it may be one. Many times that vehicle goes back
7 with one of the parents to their jobs and to work. Many times both parents can't stay with us
8 during the course of treatment during the length of time. So they use the shuttle service
9 continually throughout the day. It is a private separate shuttle from the Marguerite bus due to the
10 health concerns for the patients and their families. So this shuttle will be in our minds we are
11 planning the stops to be at the old house and then of course at the new house. And we want to
12 avoid that shuttle having to go multiple times a day onto Sand Hill Road to make the loop. So
13 this is why we're trying to maintain that driveway and connectivity. Also we envision people
14 not knowing what house they're going to check into the old side or the new side. So we would
15 have that convergence for them to move between the two houses.

16
17 These are some of the renderings for the exterior. We know it's very important to reduce the
18 massing to have different roof undulations and so on to make it not look as massive and large.
19 And we've also been designing and making sure we've designed elements from the existing
20 house into the new house so they fit together into one look and feel for the area as close as we
21 can. This is the front entry structure with the children on top. And we'll show you through these
22 series of slides these are the elements from the existing house and as Commissioner Michael said
23 he drove by recently or today on bicycle and some of the design elements from the existing
24 house, the children's wall, the star windows and so on you can see continuing the continuity in
25 the new house in the new structure. From the back we are of course adding a significant number
26 of trees to help the sight lines and also to enhance the area. And these trees are all indicated with
27 these renderings and drawings here.

28
29 The square footage is 52,000. It's 1.57 acres. We're about 28 percent parcel coverage so we're
30 well within all the parameters that would be required. Parking wise a correction to staff was
31 we've actually changed it a little bit and we actually are now going to get 72 parking spaces on
32 the site. So we have a total of 72 on the site. We actually lose three from the old building but
33 we have 69 and we only have 47 rooms so we're well over. But the actual new project has 72
34 parking spaces in and of itself.

35
36 I think also staff did a tremendous job summarizing in the comments that all the other impacts
37 that have been noted are all minimal. I don't think it's, I'm happy to address them in any way,
38 shape, or form. But noise and all the other things are addressed very well in the staff comments.

39
40 I do want to address the archeological situation. I was heavily involved with that when that
41 occurred at the first Ronald McDonald House. We did find some Native American bones and
42 remains primarily on the west side of the project, west of the elevator shafts. There was some
43 found at the Vi Hyatt area. We found very little or minimal artifacts to the east side more closely
44 called the El Camino side. Certainly there is a chance for that to exist. We are very familiar
45 with that and we are more than happy to follow all of the mitigation recommendations to ensure
46 that we do not disturb what is there and then if it is disturbed to properly handle it per the
47 recommendations which we did comply with in 2002.

1 Other than that we would greatly appreciate your support. This project is desperately needed for
2 the community. The number of families we're turning away is pushing the traffic and pushing
3 the people into different areas including sleeping in their cars. The hospital hasn't even
4 expanded and we are over blowing the wait list. And we would appreciate the Commission's
5 support in this project. Thank you.

6
7 Chair Martinez: Thank you very much. We're going to open the public hearing. We don't have
8 any speaker cards, but... Oh, so we do. But before going to the speakers, I'm going to ask
9 Commissioners if they have any questions of either the applicant or staff on this matter. Yes,
10 Commissioner Panelli.

11
12 Commissioner Panelli: Yeah, I have a couple questions for both. I want to get some clarification
13 on the parking so I'm going to ask the applicant. You said there will be 72 new spaces, but that
14 sounds like gross new spaces. You're going to lose three from the old site though. Is that
15 accurate?

16
17 Mr. Davis: Correct.

18
19 Commissioner Panelli: Ok. And then my question for staff is I noticed that for the existing
20 building 47 rooms, 64 spaces. I'm not sure if that's before or after you lose the three. It seems
21 like there's so many more parking spaces per room. My question for the Applicant there is why
22 is that ratio so much lower? And my question for staff is what's required under the code? Go
23 ahead, applicant.

24
25 Mr. Davis: Our understanding is it's under the zoning that would be proposed and the use permit
26 we're required to have one parking spot per room. So the 72 would comply. The over existence,
27 the large number of parking had occurred because we share a back lot with the Vi which was the
28 Hyatt at the time. So the, that lot is a large lot that is shared through a joint agreement that was
29 all done in 2002 and so on, so there's a lot of parking spaces in the back of the house. We also
30 have an underground garage in the existing house that has a lot of spaces. So we ended up with a
31 lot more spaces than we actually needed or even use today.

32
33 Chair Martinez: Commissioner can I do a follow up question to your parking? I would assume
34 that in your existing house and from looking at the drawings for the new plan that there are a
35 number of volunteers and staff. It looks like there could be up to 20 offices in the new plan. So
36 there's a, I don't want to call it significant, but there's an administrative function and a service
37 provider function that I would assume that's there. Can you talk about how that impacts your 70
38 parking or your joint parking analysis? We didn't get that in the staff report.

39
40 Mr. Davis: We felt that the additional parking we have since we're so far in excess on the other
41 side would be, that would be the additional parking for staff and so on that would be necessary to
42 use. Again the majority, you know, there's meeting the technical requirement of one per room,
43 but then the majority of the families, a large number of them do not have a vehicle. Many of the
44 families either bring one, drop one off, and they take it off site. They don't really see a need to
45 leave their car there for 40, 60, some families have stayed for a year. And all transportation is
46 done through the shuttle service. So we certainly want to comply but we have always been very
47 high on parking. I mean we have lots of parking normally. So we do not anticipate that being an
48 issue, but between the two sites together and being connected we will have plenty of parking in
49 our opinion for staff and for the guests.

1
2 Chair Martinez: It seems that way, but how many staff and volunteers do you expect between the
3 two facilities?
4

5 Mr. Davis: We currently have eight employees, is that about right? Eight full time? Laura can
6 probably address this better.
7

8 Ms. Boudreau: We currently have about 15 full time staff. We'll be adding about 12 more staff.
9 But a lot of that is also shifts, so we'll have people there on the weekends, evenings, and
10 overnights so it won't be that everyone's there at the same time. And again with the parking
11 situation that we currently have we don't use all the spaces that we need. It's the same situation
12 with volunteers. We have a large number of volunteers; we actually have about 150 currently
13 and will be ramping that up somewhat proportionately. But again those are shift volunteers so
14 there are only a few people on at any given time.
15

16 Chair Martinez: Ok, thank you. I'm sorry Commissioner. Did you have a follow up Vice-Chair?
17

18 Vice-Chair Michael: Yeah I had a question that relates to the Streamside Open Space, which is
19 the current zoning. And just coming down Sand Hill Road starting with Stanford West and Vi at
20 Hyatt and the existing Ronald McDonald House I have the distinct impression that what you're
21 proposing is very appropriate to that area. However, the, when you get to the Streamside Open
22 Space, it's quite, it is open and it's very attractive and the trees and such as you go closer to El
23 Camino that isn't going to be built on under the current plans, but I notice when you go behind
24 the Vi at Hyatt there's a road and there's people who are out walking there and they're walking
25 their dogs and so forth and it gives them visual access to the creek, which is pleasant. And I
26 wondered, and then when you come to the Ronald McDonald House your existing facility has
27 just a fence so that access to the creek doesn't continue past the back of your facility. Is there
28 going to be access to the public to the creek side? It looks from the plan as if that would be
29 possible. Could you talk about that?
30

31 Mr. Davis: I don't have the exact plan in front of me, but in essence we've, I don't know if we
32 can go? Russ, does this go back? Let's see. Oh, sorry. The back. Thank you. So there is lots
33 of room behind the proposed project to go to the creek. There's actually close to 80 feet back
34 there. So there is lots of room and none of that area will be enclosed or fenced. It will not be
35 part of our project so the public definitely has full access to go through the open space and
36 wander all the way up to the existing house currently.
37

38 Chair Martinez: I'm sorry Commissioner Panelli. We kind of cut you off so continue.
39

40 Commissioner Panelli: Alright so going back to staff about my question about what's required so
41 I'm hearing one space per room, but then there are also a number of administrative space uses in
42 that building. So can you shed some light or give a little more color on the parking needs?
43

44 Mr. Reich: Be happy to. So the use is pretty unique it's not a standard use that's defined in our
45 code but we look at it as a hotel type use. It provides guestrooms for people to stay. And so the
46 requirement of the code is one parking space per room and that doesn't assume that every guest
47 staying in the facility is going to be driving to the facility. It accounts for staff as well. So the
48 code requirement of one space per room is inclusive of the people staying as well as the staff that
49 would be working there.

1
2 I actually did an onsite inspection to look at their existing parking and there were 21 spaces that
3 weren't being used and I was only looking at the underground garage and the spaces at the front.
4 I wasn't sure all the spaces in the back which ones were for this facility and which ones are for
5 the adjacent because I know that they have some shared agreement. But I did note that there was
6 a number of open spaces back there as well. So, they're not incorrect in saying that they're over
7 parked right now. They've got a lot of parking spaces that they don't use. So per the code
8 because there's going to be 117 rooms we would expect that the sites combined would have at
9 least 117 parking spaces, but it looks like they are going to have 133. So they are significantly
10 over still in terms of what the code would require.

11
12 Commissioner Panelli: But I have the same concern that our esteemed Chair has, which is when
13 you add full time staff, which I understand is limited and shift based, but then volunteers as well
14 and although hotels generally don't have 100 percent occupancy it sounds like Ronald
15 McDonald House will for quite some time. And I just don't want to see a situation where we
16 assume one thing and in reality..(interrupted)

17
18 Mr. Reich: Right. The parking requirement for hotels is of the understanding of full occupancy
19 so while they may not always be fully occupied the requirement established in the code is geared
20 toward the understanding as if it was fully occupied.

21
22 Commissioner Panelli: But didn't you just say that doesn't account for any staff?

23
24 Mr. Reich: No what I was saying is that the calculation does account for staff. So it doesn't
25 assume that everyone coming to the facility is driving a vehicle. So there may be staff that take
26 the bus or take the train or that walk and there may be family members that do the same. People
27 may take a taxi or arrive in another way. And so the calculation doesn't assume that every
28 person occupying a room is going to have a car parked at the facility.

29
30 Commissioner Panelli: Ok, but the long and short of it is for this zoning designation that's being
31 requested the amount of forecast parking spaces is sufficient?

32
33 Mr. Reich: Yes, it's sufficient and especially based on physical observance of how the facility is
34 used. They really don't use all the parking that they even have currently.

35
36 Chair Martinez: Ok, before we go further with Commission comments and questions I would
37 like to give the public a chance to speak. And we have four speakers? Four speakers and you'll
38 each be given three minutes.

39
40 Vice-Chair Michael: So the first card I have is from Michael Rubenstein followed by Gregg
41 Davis.

42
43 Michael Rubenstein: I'm going to pass for right now.

44
45 Vice-Chair Michael: Ok, Gregg Davis followed by the speaker Laura Boudreau

46
47 Laura Boudreau: We've just presented

48
49 Vice-Chair Michael: Ok and then Sherri Sager would be the speaker to follow or Sherri Sager.

1
2 Chair Martinez: We don't usually come back though, so if you're thinking about speaking we'll
3 call on you again towards the end.
4

5 Sherri Sager: Thank you Commissioners, Commission Chair Martinez. I'm Sherri Sager and I'm
6 hearing representing Lucile Packard Children's Hospital this evening. And we are here in total
7 support of the application by the Ronald McDonald House. We are very proud of the partnership
8 that we have with Ronald McDonald House in caring for the patients who come to the hospital
9 who are critically ill. Over the last year in particular, but over the last several years we have
10 looked to strengthen that partnership in terms of some shared programing and working very
11 closely together.
12

13 This project is a necessity in order to be able to continue to care for the patients that we care for.
14 And the way it's being laid out we're looking at ways where we can minimize the impact on our
15 patients in terms of being able to have more programing at the house when they don't need to be
16 at the hospital so they aren't coming back and forth. And in order to do that they need the bigger
17 house for the programming during the day as well as the rooms and the spaces for the families at
18 night. It's an incredible community service and we stand in full support. And I'm happy to
19 answer any questions on behalf of the hospital. Thank you.
20

21 Chair Martinez: I do have a question for you. I was going to let you walk a little further.
22

23 Ms. Sager: It's ok.
24

25 Chair Martinez: The Children's Hospital is expanding and with the new expansion is 70 new
26 rooms going to meet the demand? What's your expectation?
27

28 Ms. Sager: We believe so because as you may recall from our countless public hearings before
29 the Commission over the last four or five years we are building into the hospital into the new
30 rooms private rooms that will have capability and capacity for two parents or guardians to stay at
31 the hospital. Where the Ronald McDonald House plays an incredibly important role, for
32 example on our patients, for our patients who may be awaiting a transplant or getting cancer
33 therapy where even the kids don't have to be in the hospital all the time but they have to be very
34 close by. And so having the Ronald McDonald House allows those kids to maybe have their day
35 treatment or their waiting on their list, but to have that proximity. So we fully expect that with
36 the capacity that we're building into the new building as well as what Ronald McDonald is
37 proposing that we will be able to meet the demand.
38

39 Chair Martinez: Thank you for that.
40

41 Ms. Sager: You're welcome.
42

43 Chair Martinez: Next speaker?
44

45 Vice-Chair Michael: So I believe everybody who's submitted a card has been heard from. Have
46 we missed anybody?
47

48 Chair Martinez: We are going to hold the public hearing open. If we say something that you
49 don't really agree with and care to speak just raise your hand and we'll try to call on you

1 throughout this deliberation, or something you like. We'll put it positively. Commissioners,
2 comments, questions? Commissioner Keller.

3
4 Commissioner Keller: Thank you. So I have a few questions. First if you look at the site plan
5 which is A1.0 the alignment of the bike and pedestrian path at the driveway seems to be
6 somewhat problematic. And firstly I'm wondering whether there's a tree that divides the
7 driveway and is that an existing tree or a new tree?

8
9 Mr. Reich: That's a new tree.

10
11 Commissioner Keller: And it looks like if you see the path, which is the right of way property
12 line it looks like the bike path sort of impinges slightly to the bottom of the page from that and
13 then if you see the width of the bike path it doesn't look like it will pass by where the oval is for
14 the divider of the driveway. Am I looking at it right or is, or am I confused here?

15
16 Mr. Reich: There may be a slight narrowing of the path in this image. We can certainly have that
17 adjusted to move the planter for that proposed tree the foot or so that it might need to maintain
18 the width of the path. But we would make sure the width of the path is maintained.

19
20 Commissioner Keller: Great. So I think that that's a good thing to move that back slightly so
21 that the width of the path is maintained. I mean that's important. Great, thank you.

22
23 The second thing is a comment about the 70 feet that there is behind from the top of bank there's
24 a 50 foot easements for the, what's HCP? I'm not sure what HCP stands for, but I assume that's
25 related to the creek? But there was a comment in the staff report about 70 feet needing to be
26 maintained by our streamside ordinance and I noticed that it looks like you get 70 feet possibly
27 where I guess where it says, "ease line boundary." The building recesses in there, but when you
28 get to the driveway on the right hand corner by my eye I realize I'm not, I don't have a measure
29 here, but it looks like the corner of the driveway is within 70 feet of the top of bank in the right
30 hand corner. And I'm wondering if there are issues with having a driveway being with that? It's
31 outside the easement, but it's within 70 feet as far as I can tell.

32
33 Mr. Reich: So the, I believe it's 80 feet that was referenced in the code and that's in reference
34 from the building to the top of bank. So the parking lot and that corner, I guess the upper right
35 hand corner of the project that certainly is closer to top of bank, but it doesn't put a structure
36 there. It's the parking lot and landscaping, it's still 50 feet away which is the basically the key
37 limitation. It's our code requirement that there be a no development within 50 feet of the creek
38 and there's also other jurisdictions that would get involved if there was anything proposed within
39 50 feet of the creek. So their out of that with the entirety of the project, but what was referenced
40 was the location of the building relative to the top of bank.

41
42 Commissioner Keller: Thank you and thank you for correcting my thing that that's 80 feet rather
43 than 70. The next issue is to what extent is this site required to treat groundwater onsite versus
44 have it runoff? Sorry, let me repeat that. To what extent is the site supposed to treat the
45 groundwater as opposed to there being runoff that's collected by the sewer system?

46
47 Chair Martinez: You mean storm water?

48
49 Commissioner Keller: Storm water, yes. Right. Storm water, thank you.

1
2 Chair Martinez: And you mean retain rather than.. (interrupted)
3

4 Commissioner Keller: Retain, that's right. Retain storm water as opposed to having it runoff
5 onto other sites. Thank you.
6

7 Mr. Reich: The site is subject to the C3 requirements is what I think you're referring to and they,
8 if you notice in the drawings they've actually created a number of areas for retention onsite for
9 storm water. I believe the engineer is here if they wanted to go into detail about the measures
10 that they're employing in order to comply with the C3 requirements. But yeah, they will be
11 preventing onsite storm water from running off site.
12

13 Commissioner Keller: And there's no need for pervious paving over by the driveway, by the
14 parking lot to do that?
15

16 Mr. Reich: They're actually doing some pervious paving in the project. Again if you want to
17 have the engineer go into detail they can talk about that, but there's adequate landscaped areas
18 around for the water to drain into.
19

20 Commissioner Keller: Thank you. Is this site add to our, does this site fulfill the requirements
21 for housing units under the Housing Element or does it not because it doesn't have kitchens or
22 whatever? I mean can we use this, can we use this development to say we're "Hey, we have
23 more housing" for the Housing Element?
24

25 Amy French, Chief Planning Official: No, generally housing is not something that would be a
26 temporary stay. It's got to be a long term stay and so I wouldn't count these towards our housing
27 numbers for Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) purposes.
28

29 Commissioner Keller: Ok, thank you.
30

31 Ms. French: There's no kitchen. It's not a dwelling unit. These do not count as dwelling units
32 because they don't have a kitchen.
33

34 Commissioner Keller: Thank you. The next question is does Ronald McDonald House have
35 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures? Is it eligible for any of the measures
36 that Stanford has, does a fine job with or is it not eligible for any of those? Or does it have its
37 own?
38

39 Mr. Reich: I actually don't know if they employ any measures currently. Based on the parking
40 requirement they're not required to employ any, but we could ask the, well they do have their
41 shuttle that actually reduces a lot of vehicle trips. But maybe the house manager could explain
42 whether or not they do have other measures that they employ to reduce vehicle trips.
43

44 Commissioner Keller: Well in particular it seems that this is a particularly impacted location for
45 commutes. So to the extent that it's possible for at least the employees, I'm not sure that much
46 can be done with the visitors and the residents, but in terms of the employees to the extent that
47 there could be things like Go Passes or the like or eligibility to use the shuttles. For example,
48 like the U line that comes from the East Bay to Stanford. I'm wondering if that kind of thing
49 were available to the Ronald McDonald employees then that would reduce the impact on an

1 already impacted road. Not that it's required, I'm just wondering to the extent which that's
2 something that is possible. Is that something the applicant can talk to? Can you speak to the
3 micro... [trails off]
4

5 Ms. Boudreau: Yes, that's not something that we're currently doing, but we would be very
6 interested in looking into that as the staff grows.
7

8 Commissioner Keller: Great, thank you. I think that that would also help in terms of retention of
9 staff and reduction of people being late because they couldn't get to you because of traffic.
10 Exactly. And my final question had to do with how is schooling provided for those who are
11 currently at the Children's Hospital or at Ronald McDonald? And please identify yourself for
12 the record.
13

14 Sherri Sager, Chief Government Relations Officer Lucile Packard Children's Hospital: I would
15 be happy to answer. I'm Sherri Sager, Chief Government Relations Officer for Lucile Packard
16 Children's Hospital. That's actually one of the things I'm really excited about. Right now the
17 schooling is all done at Packard and so we have worked out an arrangement with the school
18 district and with Ronald McDonald House that we're actually going to have a classroom at
19 Ronald McDonald House so that the kids that are staying at the house can do their schooling at
20 the house rather than being shuttled back and forth to the hospital. So we think that's a win-win
21 for everybody.
22

23 Commissioner Keller: Thank you very much. That's all of my questions.
24

25 Chair Martinez: Follow up. Related to the Transportation Management Program is the Ronald
26 McDonald House eligible for the Go Passes that are part of the development agreement for the
27 hospital or is this something that we would have to nudge them to provide?
28

29 Aaron Aknin, Assistant Director: That's something we'd have to look into and work with the
30 applicant on. We don't have an answer to that right now.
31

32 Chair Martinez: Ok, that's fine. Commissioners? Commissioner Tanaka.
33

34 Commissioner Tanaka: So one question is, I heard the comment that because the rooms are all
35 booked all the time that people are sleeping in their cars and I was wondering where are these
36 cars being parked?
37

38 Mr. Davis: The majority of those that are sleeping in their cars or staying in their cars are at the
39 hospital, adjacent to the hospital because they want to be next to their family member. I think
40 it's also very important that even though the hospital's doing a tremendous job with their
41 expansion in having sleeping spaces for the two parents I think if anybody's tried to get any real
42 sleep in a hospital that's not going to really happen. The other thing that's very important is that
43 the hospital does not allow the siblings into their structure for health purposes obviously. So we
44 support the entire family and encourage the siblings when they can to stay with their family
45 member getting treatments and so on and so forth. So it's more of a family community situation.
46

47 Commissioner Tanaka: Do you happen to know how many people actually are sleeping in their
48 cars on average?
49

1 Mr. Davis: We don't know, I mean the hospital and the social workers does a tremendous job of
2 trying to find them local hotels when they're available and when they're willing to give space,
3 some at discounted rates. Many times the university or the area is having events that the local
4 hotels will not allow the families to stay during that time period. I don't know if Laura has any
5 statistics or Sherri but we certainly do know that many people have been staying in their cars in
6 different places. I don't know if we have any statistics. I wonder if the hospital does?

7
8 We do have some local families that offer to have people stay. I mean there's all kinds of
9 programs we're trying to relocate these people now. I'm sorry is that what you're talking about?
10 So we do have local families that offer their homes at times when it's convenient for them that
11 they offer those. And there's the hospital arranges with those and people can sign up for that.
12 So we do have a philanthropic community that attempts to help as well.

13
14 Commissioner Tanaka: And do you think that once this is built that that problem would be
15 alleviated or do you think it would still continue?

16
17 Mr. Davis: We believe it will be alleviated. The hospital and the Ronald McDonald House
18 commissioned a study with a professional group that does hospital management and room
19 management and that study bore out somewhere around 68 to 72 rooms, which is what we're
20 building. I don't have the exact study in front of me but that was pretty much what we based this
21 structure on. That study was done in conjunction with the hospital and included the expansion of
22 the hospital and what their new room makeup will be. These are the best guestimates of the
23 experts that they think this is will hold the capacity for a long time, but of course it's very
24 difficult to predict. I mean the great thing is the hospital has been able to save a lot more
25 children and therefore they're staying there a lot longer. So, and the acute rate at Lucile Packard
26 Children's Hospital is obviously extremely high. So the length of stay just keeps increasing with
27 the advances in technology. So the study took all those things into account and we are building
28 to that study and we believe that it is adequate.

29
30 Commissioner Tanaka: Ok great. Thank you. And then just a question for staff. Was a traffic
31 study done on this in terms of how much, maybe staff could just briefly comment on if they think
32 this is going to be a net increase in traffic or roughly the same or perhaps a decrease in traffic?

33
34 Mr. Reich: So there was a traffic study done. It's associated with the environmental document
35 and it does specify that they found that it would not increase the volume of traffic.

36
37 Commissioner Tanaka: Ok, great. And then my last question is for the crosswalks are going to
38 go directly to the new building. Are these signalized or are there, because I imagine some kids
39 might be walking between here and the shopping mall and maybe you could talk a little about the
40 safety issues there.

41
42 Mr. Reich: It is a fully signalized intersection so that the new driveway would be the fourth leg
43 of what's now a three way intersection. It's important to note that the bike path will actually be
44 directed to the intersection such that it will be controlled by the lights so to avoid conflicts with
45 the bike and the driveway.

46
47 Commissioner Tanaka: Ok and then the crosswalks I don't know what they are right now. Are
48 they lit? Because I imagine there might be kids walking and maybe kids who are less than able?

1 Mr. Reich: What is the question? You're asking if they're lit?

2
3 Commissioner Tanaka: You know, what, I guess sometimes the, I was wondering about the
4 safety issues with the crosswalks. Do they have lights in them?

5
6 Mr. Reich: No.

7
8 Commissioner Tanaka: Ok. Thank you.

9
10 Chair Martinez: Commissioners we have three items. The Land Use Designation, the Site and
11 Design Review, and Rezoning. I'd like to see if we can get through Site and Design Review and
12 have a motion on it. So if we can direct our comments towards that first we can come back to
13 the initial study and rezoning. Commissioner Alcheck? Anyone else on site and design issues?
14 I have some.

15
16 I love the project, so I don't want to come across that somehow I'm in opposition but I am in
17 opposition to the process because as I looked at the drawings they're quite well developed.
18 They've gone, the Council initiated the process. The ARB gave their initial review and we find
19 ourselves having to make a recommendation site design and initial study and I think it's fairly
20 late in the process for us to make anything of substantial value other than saying we like the
21 project as I did initially. And that's troubling because the project can only get better as its
22 reviewed in its right sequence like land use and that's a big prerogative of the Planning
23 Commission to talk about land use and traffic and circulation. And I would have been inclined
24 to make some comments about the site plan early on, that I feel a bit hesitant about because the
25 development and the ideas of it, the environmental review of it have gone forth so far. And I
26 really want to make a point to staff more than to the applicant for this project that this isn't the
27 right time for us to be having our first review of the project. And I would like to see us, like I
28 don't know why but after the Council initiated it for us to really look at the site issues, at the
29 traffic issues, at the circulation issues, things that are important to the project and important to
30 the Planning Commission and for us to be looking at that now is just unfortunate.

31
32 For example, I would have suggested that the frontage road in front of the new expansion is kind
33 of an unfortunate use of land. That the entrance to the site is at the signal, which makes sense
34 from a traffic engineering point of view, but if you miss that signal in the entrance you're going
35 to see the entrance to the building as you pass by and have to go back again. If the entrance
36 could have been placed near the lobby entrance we could have done away with all of that
37 frontage road development. We could have probably preserved many more trees. And hearing
38 that there's a shuttle that takes people even are concerned about left hand turns could have been
39 mitigated because it's a shuttle coming back from the hospital that would be making a U-turn to
40 get back to the entrance to the building. So the whole sort of arrival and circulation and all that
41 paving in front impacts the use, the sense of the friendliness, the safety to families that are
42 walking on this street, and the initial study, because one of the things that is offered in the initial
43 study in the Neg Dec is that there are no impacts because the building is set 70 feet back from the
44 road. Well, yeah, but it's 70 feet of paving in front of the building that I, in my view would have
45 been unnecessary if we would have been able to weigh in at an earlier date. That we could've
46 raised the issue, staff and the applicant could have gone back to the drawing board and really
47 come back with a better parking circulation entrance plan then what we're going to go forward
48 with now.
49

1 And I support the project. I feel the need. I hope it's enough. But it's part of our process that
2 when you look at the role of the Planning Commission only serves to help. It doesn't serve to
3 diminish a project like this. Because I don't want to say, but I don't think there's anybody here
4 that doesn't really appreciate everything that Ronald McDonald House does and the children's
5 hospital, but it's really the City's fault. I don't want to say the Planning or, but it's our fault for
6 not being able to weigh in earlier on this. So, Commissioners any further comments on Site and
7 Design? Ok. Do we have a Motion? I think, pardon?

8
9 Commissioner Keller: I believe we have to let the Applicant respond to the comments and a
10 closing.

11
12 Chair Martinez: Oh, before we have a Motion on that?

13
14 Commissioner Keller: That's correct.

15
16 Chair Martinez: Ok. So we're taking these one at a time. Does the applicant care to address
17 anything that's been stated or have any closing remark in terms of the site and design issues?

18
19 Mr. Davis: I just had a couple of quick comments. I appreciate your comments regarding the
20 process and we respect the input. In fact many of these things have been changed and altered
21 several times because of feedback from different organizations within the City. It is important to
22 us that they are connected only because there will be probably confusion between the old and the
23 new and if they do miss that driveway then they can very easily make the next right hand turn
24 and come back through our internal connecting driveway rather than having to go back out onto
25 Sand Hill, but we completely respect the trying to mitigate that and that flow. Again we've
26 narrowed that down to 20 feet, which is the minimum that we can squeeze there to try to
27 minimize the impact of that road and we eliminated a underground parking garage entrance next
28 to the meditation garden which was brought to our attention doesn't make a lot of sense to have a
29 meditation garden next to a driveway so to an underground garage. So we agree that we respect
30 all of your input and we think the project has only gotten better because of the input from the
31 different organizations and we appreciate that. Thank you.

32
33 Chair Martinez: Ok. Thank you very much for that. Commissioners, comments, motion on Site
34 and Design? Commissioner Keller.

35
36 Commissioner Keller: I'm wondering if we should do Site and Design first because in some
37 sense if we, it's hard to do site and design first if we do the Rezone it's sort of a sequence. So
38 we probably should, I would recommend that we do the rezoning first and then the Land Use
39 Designation. I'm not sure if there's anything else or if we should just do it all at once?

40
41 Chair Martinez: Staff, do you have any, want to weigh in on the process?

42
43 Mr. Akin: Typically you can do it all at once. I mean it's up to the Commission though the way
44 that you want to do it. If you want to take individual comments on each that could be a way to
45 go, but typically you can do it, you can do it all in one motion.

46
47 Chair Martinez: Ok, well if there's, let's do it as one motion then I don't seem to get any great
48 sense of a preference here. Commissioner Keller do you have a preference one way or the other?

49

1 MOTION

2
3 Commissioner Keller: Yes. I'll just move the staff recommendation. I don't think anybody has
4 made any recommendations for any changes, so I'll just move the staff recommendation as
5 stated.

6
7 SECOND

8
9 Chair Martinez: Ok, motion by Commissioner Keller and second by Commissioner Alcheck.
10 You want to speak to your motion?

11
12 Mr. Akin: There was just one, there was just Commissioner Keller commented on the bike path
13 and alignment with the tree well.

14
15 Commissioner Keller: Yes, but that's just a design element. I don't think that that rises to the
16 level that it needs to be in the motion.

17
18 Mr. Akin: That's fine.

19
20 Commissioner Keller: Yeah.

21
22 Mr. Akin: Duly noted.

23
24 Commissioner Keller: I, that, and sometimes that's what the ARB can consider. So basically this
25 is a project that should be rezoned that it as stated. The Comprehensive Plan should be changed
26 accordingly, and the Site and Design Review should be recommended for approval and the
27 Mitigated Negative Declaration should be accepted. All those are recommendations for the City
28 Council. I believe I've covered all of them. And also the Conditional Use Permit should be
29 granted for this particular project.

30
31 I think that the rezoning meets the necessary requirements. I think this is an excellent project
32 and I think, I'm very sympathetic to what the Chair said in terms of the process. When the
33 Council makes an initiation it sort of does limit the ability for the Planning Commission to
34 provide useful early feedback to the process, but I think that other than that I think that we have a
35 good project that should proceed forward for the benefit of the community. Thank you.

36
37 Chair Martinez: Commissioner Alcheck, speak to your second?

38
39 Commissioner Alcheck: I appreciate hearing from all the speakers tonight about this project. I
40 also sympathize with Chair Martinez' comments. I think that the land use here is appropriate.
41 It's all, it's not without caution that we consider the idea of rezoning open space and in particular
42 the loss of so many mature trees. I think there's something poetic that we're losing 70 trees but
43 we're gaining 70 rooms. I think what you do as an organization is very important and a major
44 public benefit, but the goal whenever we're reviewing projects like this is that the ultimate
45 design, the prevailing development represents the best development that was possible. And so I
46 really appreciate the sentiments that you mentioned, but I think that this is a very positive
47 development and a good, and a preferred land use. So, I second the motion.

48
49 VOTE

1
2 Chair Martinez: Thank you. Any other, anybody else want to speak to the motion? I have a
3 couple of comments on the Neg Dec. As much as we all want to support the project as fully as
4 we can I think we also have to be diligent about the quality of the documents that we produce to
5 support it. And I don't know whether it's under aesthetics or under another category, but
6 Commissioner Alcheck did refer to this. The taking of what's called creek side open space and
7 rezoning it to a public facility requires more than saying there's no significant impact. Taking,
8 changing the landscape, losing open space has to be addressed I think in a much more substantial
9 way in our initial study and our Neg Dec that, and I would urge you to put some more work into
10 that it's a significant, consider it a significant impact and what we are doing to mitigate that
11 impact and planting more Live Oaks along the street. Making the gardens really more of what
12 this open space is that we're losing. I don't know what it is, but it comes up a little bit empty.
13

14 When we read the negative impact, the Neg Dec and we don't see that we are really considering
15 the loss of this California landscape to another use without putting forth some significant
16 mitigations. And so my comment is that I will vote to support it, but I would really ask that it
17 undertake a little bit more work to really make it stand on its own. There's no question that the
18 use is outstanding. The change of use that the community is sacrificing open space for a very
19 substantial use, but we need to put the, take the responsibility to say how we are addressing these
20 changes in a I think a more responsible way. So with that I'm going to also support the project.
21

22 So any further comments Commissioners? None. Then let's call for the vote. Those in favor of
23 the Motion say aye (Aye). Any opposed? The Motion passes unanimously. Thank you all and
24 thanks for your great work and good luck with it. Yeah, we will take a 10 minute break before
25 picking up item number 3.
26

27 MOTION PASSED (6-0)
28

29 **Commission Action:** Motion to approve staff recommendation by Commissioner Keller, second
30 by Commissioner Alcheck. 6-0
31