



HOUSING COMMISSION EXCERPT MINUTES

Wednesday, August 4, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025
Administrative Building Conference Room, First Floor

Chair Boyle called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. in the Administrative Building Conference Room.

ROLL CALL –

Commission Members Present: John Bautista (arrived at 6:10 p.m.), Patricia Boyle (Chair), Carolyn Clarke (arrived at 5:50 p.m.), Anne Moser, Brigid Van Randall (Vice-Chair).

Commission Members Absent: None.

A. PUBLIC COMMENT #1 – None.

B. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. Beltramo's BMR Agreement

John Beltramo introduced himself, as well as Daniel Beltramo and land use attorney Amy Nefouse (the applicants). He distributed copies of the proposed site-plan for the project and described the project's history. He outlined what he perceives as several problems with the City's BMR ordinance. He made a case for the financial infeasibility of three on-site BMR units, which are specified in the BMR Agreement currently in place (approved by the City Council on August 1, 2006). He described the Beltramo's modified proposal for meeting the City's BMR ordinance.

Amy Nefouse described the current status of the project's land use entitlements and argued that a modified BMR proposal is absolutely necessary to the project's ability to secure financing and get built. She stressed that it is critical that the Beltramo's be able to demonstrate a minimum 20 percent anticipated pro forma return and explained how three on-site BMR units would make this impossible given current estimates.

City Attorney Bill McClure described City staff's recent negotiations with the Beltramo's. He explained the provision of zero BMR units on-site was not an option from staff's perspective because the City had never approved a housing project of ten or more units that didn't have at least one BMR unit. He asked that the Commission provide conceptual approval and/or feedback regarding a modified BMR Agreement (rather than focusing on the details regarding dollar and percentage amounts, he said). He noted such details would be worked out by City staff and subject to City Council's approval.

The Commission posed questions and discussed these matters at some length. Commissioners acknowledged the financial infeasibility of three on-site BMR units

but expressed support for at least one unit plus payment of in-lieu fees (as outlined in Attachment D of the staff report). Commissioner Bautista suggested graduated percentage participation for the revenue sharing component. The Commission expressed considerable support for this idea and directed staff to explore the idea further.

John Beltramo said it may have worked for them to provide more BMR units had the City's ordinance been more flexible and not required that BMR units be the same as market rate units. He said there was a slight miscalculation on one of the pro-forma schedules (attachment E4 of the staff report) and distributed copies of a corrected schedule. The applicants thanked the Commission for its consideration.

F. ADJOURNMENT – 7:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Megan Nee, Management Analyst